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Ottawa, Ontario / Ottawa (Ontario)
--- Upon commencing on Thursday, June 2, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. / L'audience débute le jeudi 2 juin 2005 à 9 h 00

THE REGISTRAR: Veuillez vous
asseoir.
THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning. MS EDWARDH: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Good morning, Mr. Minister. PREVIOUSLY SWORN: WILLIAM C. GRAHAM

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Good morning, ma'am.

EXAMINATION
MS EDWARDH: I would like, if I
could, to turn to some general concepts, if $I$ could, Minister Graham, and the first of course is the concept of diplomatic protection which involves, obviously, the provision of consular services through the Department of Foreign Affairs; correct?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And, indeed, the
Department of Foreign Affairs is the only department that has directly as its mandate the provision of consular services?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Rests in your hands, broadly speaking, and in those of others in the department, like Mr. Pardy?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: There is a
special department within the department for consular services which include passport services, services for Canadians abroad, and other items of that nature. And within the embassies, for example, you tend to find the consular section is a different section from the political and other sections.

MS EDWARDH: But no other government department or agency has any mandate with respect to the provision of those services?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Not to my -no, ma'am, no.

MS EDWARDH: Now, I want to just understand who the ambassador is, because it is clear that an Order in Council is passed naming an ambassador, but $I$ want to put some general propositions to you.

We have been told, Mr. Minister, that the ambassador wears, in a representative capacity, many hats; in other words, he is
entitled to represent many of the interests that the Canadian government may have in respect of a foreign nation.

Do you agree with that
proposition, sir?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And, of course, one of the hats he wears is the hat of ensuring that full and proper consular services are provided to Canadian citizens who may be detained in a foreign state?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Within the responsibility of the embassy that is there, yes. He is the representative of Canada, as such, in the foreign country for all purposes -- all purposes.

MS EDWARDH: I want to just ask a little bit about the consular services generally, and in Mr. Arar's particular case.

Certainly one of the primary
things that consular services do is that they try to ensure that a Canadian representative has access to Mr. Arar, someone like Mr. Arar, who is detained; correct?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Correct.

MS EDWARDH: They also --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Within the general concepts of diplomatic protection which you mentioned in your first question which, as you know, is governed by the Vienna Convention and is therefore subject to matters as to what is the nationality and other matters of rights guaranteed under the Vienna Convention.

Those are the only rights one has. We seek to get as much as we can, but we are circumscribed by the rights which are laid out in international law.

MS EDWARDH: Let me just talk generally about the objectives of the Government of Canada, because we do know while the Vienna Convention gives certain rights to individuals and to the government, if both Canada and the country in question are signatories there are also policy issues of what the government seeks to provide?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: First of all, we have agreed that one of the basic things that consular access is designed to do is to ensure that someone from the consular service has spoken to a detainee -- actually had physical access to him?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. MS EDWARDH: And one of the other aspects of a consular service is that if a detainee has not been charged, consular service would include encouraging the state authorities to either release the detainee or charge them and have them properly tried.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right. Give
them an opportunity to defend themselves.
MS EDWARDH: Right. And that is
part of consular services?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And if, in fact -- I view that, Mr. Minister, as nothing more than an obligation on the part of Canada to try to bring to an end the arbitrary detention of someone who is not facing charge or standing trial. That is one of the purposes of consular services.

In other words, what $I$ am saying, very simply, Minister Graham, is that one of the objects of Canada's representations is to bring to an end mere detention of a person and see that they are charged, tried or released.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes,
recognizing that we do so within the framework of
public international law --
MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: -- and the law of the country where you are operating, because public international law establishes, of course, that country. So the length of detention, the nature of detention, other things, would be very much governed by the law of the place where you are. And in terms of consular efforts, we try and do our best for Canadians wherever we are, but we have less leverage, if you like, in some cases than in others, depending on where the jurisdiction they are held and the nature of the case.

MS EDWARDH: But certainly, for example, even if the state of affairs in Syria permitted military intelligence to detain on an unlimited basis, it was the position of the department, pursuant to its mandate to deliver consular service, to ensure that Syria understood that the Government of Canada wanted an end to detention or a charge and trial?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, clearly. MS EDWARDH: Now, if there is
going to be no charge and trial and you are
seeking an end to detention, it seems obvious that part of the consular services offered are to seek the release and return of a person like Mr. Arar? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. That is exactly what we tried to do.

MS EDWARDH: In fact, that is one of the core functions in a case like Mr. Arar's of consular services.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Now, you will agree with me, Minister Graham, that persons held in detention, particularly if they are held incommunicado, or only have consular access, can reasonably be described as extremely vulnerable? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. MS EDWARDH: Do you agree with
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HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. MS EDWARDH: And I want to talk a little bit about the kind of common information that you would expect consular staff to try and get with respect to a detainee in their discussions with a detainee.

First of all, it would be clear that they would want to find out in their
discussions with a detainee whether there was any understanding on the part of the detainee of what charge they faced. That would be one thing?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: They would also want
to understand if the detainee had been told
anything about the basis of the charge?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Which may indeed
require the detainee to discuss information about the offence that is alleged against him and the detainee's response?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would imagine
so, if you are going to be effective, yes. You want to get as much information as you can to be effective.

MS EDWARDH: And sometime, indeed, we know that consular services have extended to trying to gather together evidence that might exist in Canada that could assist the detainee in respect of the charges they face or the sentence they face in the foreign jurisdiction?

Indeed, that is what --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I personally
was never involved at that level in any case where

I authorized such. This may well be true, but someone like Mr. Pardy, or someone like that, who did this all the time would be better positioned to illustrate the practice.

I would imagine we would do that, but $I$ personally didn't have any occasion to authorize such in any of the cases $I$ was involved. MS EDWARDH: Right. As a matter
of principle as opposed to practice?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: As a matter of principle, $I$ assume we would try and do every possible thing we could for the security, the wellbeing of the individual in that foreign jail, as I said, within what we could do within the framework of the law of the country and what we were entitled to do in international law.

That would extend to everything we possibly could do.

MS EDWARDH: And of course that would include the provision of information to defence counsel representing that individual? HON. BILL GRAHAM: If that was appropriate in the case, yes.

I think in this case, for example, at one point for Mr. Arar we looked at getting

Mr. Lockyer, you will recall, when there was talk about a trial and see if we could get him to help and things like that.

Other cases I have been familiar with where we have tried to get counsel in other foreign countries and work with those counsel. I think you and I know of a few cases where we have done that.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. Indeed, I am just going to put to you a general proposition.

Mr. Pardy testified that if the Syrians were going to charge and try Mr. Arar on the basis of certain admissions he made during interrogation, he fully expected the ambassador, or the embassy, would provide to defence counsel in Syria that information, the actual interrogation, and anything else they could, so they could dispute the voluntariness of those statements.

He fully expected that would be done?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mr. Arar expected?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { MS EDWARDH: No, Mr. Pardy } \\
& \text { expected that the embassy -- }
\end{aligned}
$$

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: -- if it had
Mr. Arar's statement and knew anything that would assist in challenging that statement --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: -- would provide it
to defence counsel in Syria so they could
effectively represent Mr. Arar?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would assume so, yes; right.

MS EDWARDH: I want, if I could then, to raise an issue with you that $I$ think has troubled some of us as we have heard the evidence, Mr. Minister.

You will be well aware -- and I can take you to the documents if you need to -that every Canadian who wants to know about consular services is told through the documents of the department and the website that there is, in general, a promise of confidentiality in respect to the communications?

Would you like to see it? We have P-11 --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. If you say that, Ms Edwardh, I trust your statement. It is
certainly logical to me.
But if you wish to have a look at
it --

THE COMMISSIONER: What was the reference?

MS EDWARDH: It is P-11. I
believe it is tab 14.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MS EDWARDH: It is page 4. These are double-sided pages. And it begins under the heading "Protection, Advice and Assistance".

Do you see that, Mr. Minister?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: P-11?
MS EDWARDH: $P-11$, tab 14.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights --

MS EDWARDH: Then we are in the wrong place.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Which would be, presumably, a former judge of the Supreme Court of Canada.

MS EDWARDH: No. It should look like this.

THE COMMISSIONER: Tab 14 ?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I am sorry, I
went to 11.
P-11, tab 14; sorry.
MS EDWARDH: This is a fairly arcane exercise, so you will have to bear with us.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, it is all
right. I am starting to learn. It is no more arcane than many things in government. Don't worry.

MS EDWARDH: Under the heading "Protection, Advice and Assistance", page 4, in the third paragraph, it says:
"If you are detained or arrested in a foreign country and you choose to talk to Canadian consular officials, any information you give them will remain completely confidential and is protected under Canada's Privacy Act.

It will not be passed on to anyone other than consular officials concerned with your case, without your permission. You have the right, for example, to
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determine who will be notified of your situation and who will act as your representative. Your family and friends will not have access to any information without your consent. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police and other police agencies have their own international contacts, however, and may know of your circumstances through these sources."

So that is what goes out to the Canadian public, Mr. Graham.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right, right. MS EDWARDH: And I am going to suggest to you that this is an important promise, because if you are really going to help someone who faces charge, perhaps trial or detention without charge, you need to have as much of an ability to communicate openly and directly with those persons, and that promise of confidentiality facilitates that communication.

Would you agree?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: We have learned that,
in this particular case, details of consular visits were shared with both the RCMP and CSIS.

I am going to ask you to turn up
Volume 1 of the DFAIT exhibits, and it is tabs 31 and 32 I want to look at.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I am sorry, which tab?

MS EDWARDH: Let's start with tab 30.

This is a note by Ms Girvan in respect of her contact with Mr. Arar while he is detained at the Metropolitan Detention Center in New York.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Ms Girvan is
the consular official?
MS EDWARDH: Consular official,
yes, absolutely, who saw Mr. Arar when he was detained by the U.S. authorities.

And she obviously -- as Mr. Pardy has testified, this note indicates to him that she informed Mr. Arar of the nature of the confidence and asked his express permission to communicate with others, and he replies his brother,
mother-in-law and wife, anyone who can help him, including his company, Mathworks.

So he clearly gives a consent, and I will leave it for the Commissioner to decide the scope of that consent and will not moot it with you.

But over to the next tab, tab 31, we begin with further notes of Ms Girvan's consular visit of October 3rd. She does it in a number of stages.

I would take you down and if you
just scan through this, it is very clear she reviews with Mr. Arar the nature of the allegations, and they are set out there in 1 to 4, explaining that the allegations were served upon Mr. Arar on October 2 nd ; and further then, she describes the information provided by Mr. Arar. This is close to the bottom, the second-last paragraph.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "At one point, two } \\
& \text { immigration officers spoke to } \\
& \text { him and told him that they } \\
& \text { were going to send him to } \\
& \text { Syria. He said that he asked } \\
& \text { why, since he had not been to }
\end{aligned}
$$
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Syria for years and all his family is in Canada."

Do you see that, second-last

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Then over on at tab 32 there is a continuation of the interview.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry, this is
a note from consul to whom? Just kind of a note on the file sort of thing?

MS EDWARDH: This is, we
understand, a method whereby the consular staff can enter into the system their observations and recollections and notes of their consular visits --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: So it is sort of an aide-memoire of what has taken place. MS McISAAC: It is actually an electronic file for each consular case.

MS EDWARDH: And it can be shared then with anyone who needs access to it to give direction, advice. So this would be viewed by others in Ottawa.

Is that a fair statement? You are content with that?

MS MCISAAC: I believe the evidence was in the consular affairs department in Ottawa.

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: That is the evidence.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, absolutely.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: Then we go to the next tab and consistent, $I$ think, with what you just said, Mr. Minister, we see that further to making notes of what happened during the consular visit, there is a description of the interrogation to the extent in the second line it says:
"He says that they kept
asking about a man called Abdullah, who lives in Ottawa and is also of Syrian origin. He apparently runs an import/export firm. The two families know each other..."

And then:
"Further, Abdullah's brother had a 'start-up' business..."

So there is a discussion of what
the focus was of the FBI and other persons' interrogation of Mr. Arar.

Do you see that? That is the gist of it?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: Now, in addition to the information arising from this consular visit, we now know through the testimony and the documents that other consular visits, the content of other consular visits were shared with the RCMP and CSIS.

The ones shared with the Mounties, in my review of the documents, would include this one, the first visit in New York, then three other visits.

Could I have the Minister be given Exhibits P-93, 94, and 95.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And without going
through it in detail, what we know about these documents -- and let me start out with $\mathrm{P}-93$. This is a record from the Head of Mission, Ambassador -- I am sorry, it is a record from Damascus and it is signed or sent by Mr. Martel, approved by Mr. Pillarella, and either is a record
of --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I am sorry, I have P-94 and 95 here.

I was looking at a letter from Ms Mazigh to Mr. Chrétien, so that is not helpful.

MS EDWARDH: It is not at all.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: P-93? P-93 has
gone missing.
MS EDWARDH: Let me just show it
to you. It is not fair -- this test doesn't include you having to memorize them all.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: It would be hard to memorize them because $I$ haven't seen most of them. That is another problem.

Sorry. This is from Damascus
to...?
MS EDWARDH: It is coming back. HON. BILL GRAHAM: And it is dated

October $23 r d$.
MS EDWARDH: Yes. It reports the
observations of Mr. Martel. It is signed, I guess, by him and approved by the ambassador. It comes back to Ottawa and is a report of the first consular visit.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.

MS EDWARDH: And you will see by
the fax pages -- and I think I can ask you to just assume -- that it was faxed to the RCMP on November 4th, first of all to, I think, headquarters and then down to the investigative unit that was conducting an investigation into Mr. Arar's activities?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That is up at the top there, November 4th, RCMP. Is that what it is?

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: So it goes down right
to the level of the officers, or the division, that is conducting the national security investigation?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: Then, in addition to that consular visit, you will see in $P-94$ the notes of the contact between Marlene Catterall, the Member of Parliament, and Mr. Assadourian. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right. MS EDWARDH: Their communication with Mr. Arar as well as with members of Syrian Military Intelligence, and that too we know was
shared with the RCMP.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: And then at Exhibit P-95 -- I am sorry. I, too, have --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: For me, this is a letter --

MS EDWARDH: Yes. If you turn in to the letter, Mr. Minister, several pages, you will see --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right,
Damascus.
MS EDWARDH: Page 5, yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: This again is a memorandum. It is sent from Damascus describing the August 14 th consular visit.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: Now, my question, sir, is: We also know -- and the page reference, if anybody wishes it, is 3469 of the transcript of Gar Pardy -- that there was a sharing of similar kinds of information with CSIS. They got the January 7th consular visit and the April 22 nd one as well.

The question is very general. We
will start with this: Did you know that in the Arar case, specifically, information from consular services was being provided to the very same entities who declined to support Mr. Arar's return and at least one of which was conducting an active investigation in respect of him?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well during the course of this, over the period of time, I would have had to assume that these conversations had taken place because of the information $I$ had. But nobody said, "Look, we are sharing consular information with the RCMP and CSIS."

But my understanding, of course, is that the way the system works in the Department of Foreign Affairs with the security officer that we had, Mr. Livermore, and others working under him, that their job was to act as a liaison between the Department of Foreign Affairs and security elements for the purposes of the department getting information which it needed to do its work and presumably also to provide other departments of the Government of Canada information that they needed in order to provide for the security of Canadians or anything else that they were doing.
Apart from that, I wouldn't
have -- nobody would have said to me, you know, we have consular information here and we are sending this off. Nobody would have brought that to my attention.

MS EDWARDH: I hear you, Mr. Minister, as saying the following: While no one would have needed then to bring that to your attention in the manner you have just described, it was your understanding of the very function of the security group in the department that they were in a position to make a decision to share it if it were appropriate?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.
With the emphasis on "if it is appropriate".
MS EDWARDH: And so, whether you
knew, $I$ take it you certainly would condone the sharing of this kind of information to the RCMP and CSIS in Mr. Arar's circumstances.

Is that what you are saying?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: If it was
appropriate, as you said. I assume I am entitled to rely on the officials in my department acting within the law and customs of Canada, knowing full well not only what is said in statements such as
this, but the rights of individuals under the Charter and the rights of the state itself to have security information on people, which we discussed in Parliament on a regular basis when we discussed Bill C-35 and how we were going to protect ourselves as a society against the new threats of terrorism.

So I assumed that we set up in our department communications, ways in which this could be done, but they would be done in a way that was consistent with Canadian law and practice.

MS EDWARDH: And we have heard, sir, that the only law that applied in these circumstances were those provisions of the Privacy Act that would govern the sharing of information?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: You are
advising me that as a matter of law. I can't answer to that. That is for the Commissioner to determine.

MS MCISAAC: I am not sure that would be fair. That was the only law that was discussed. I don't think anyone said it was the only law that would apply.

MS EDWARDH: I am sorry, it is not
my recollection of Mr. Livermore's --
THE COMMISSIONER: It is certainly
the only law that was referred to in evidence. I don't recall if it went the one step further and said no other laws applied.

I think that is Ms McIsaac's
point.
MS EDWARDH: Let me put my
understanding.
I understand from Mr. Pardy and
Mr. Livermore that the basis upon which they shared the information was the Privacy Act and the exceptions thereto.

I think that is a fair --
THE COMMISSIONER: I think that is fair.

MS EDWARDH: And is that your
understanding of how the sharing of information
arrangement worked within your department?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I never would have had a discussion with anyone concerning the specifics about the grounds under which information was shared or not shared. I was entitled to assume that in my department my officials knew what the nature of the legal
constraints were on them and the way in which they would operate, and they operated within the law.

I mean, I would have thought anything else was a legal conclusion that somebody would have to argue as to whether or not that was done appropriately in this case or not.

MS EDWARDH: I am going to ask you, sir, and $I$ take it then you are really saying that you were above any specific knowledge as to the information-sharing that took place in the case of Mr. Arar but generally assumed that it would go forward, assuming it was appropriate.

And that determination of whether it was appropriate, you left to others to make?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I don't know if
I would put it $I$ was above it. I would put it that, given the nature of the business of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is running 500 things at once, $I$ could not delve into the operational details of every single file being conducted in my office.

As I pointed out in my introduction here, we were into the Iraq war, we were into hundreds of things.

I assumed that the officials were
doing their job in accordance with the laws and practices of Canada, and nobody ever brought to my attention any suggestion that they were not. Nobody came to me and said, "Hey, there is a red flag here."

And I couldn't, with a department of 7,000 people, be expected to know -- I think I am entitled to assume that people are doing their job in accordance with the laws and practices, and these are very knowledgeable people.

MS EDWARDH: One of the things that is troubling, if you look at those documents that I have provided to you, P-93, 94, and 95, Mr. Minister, is that there is nothing on the face of the document that expresses any condition or caveat about its use.

Do you see that, if you look at them? Nothing says how the document can be used or how it can be transferred or not transferred to other entities or agencies.

MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner, I am having some difficulty with this.

The evidence before you to date is that Mr. Pardy made the decision with respect to information that could be shared. He gave
extensive evidence the other day under questioning from Mr. Cavalluzzo as to whether the sharing was appropriate or not, why he did it, what factors he took into account. I believe Mr. Livermore gave some evidence to that effect as well.

This witness was not present for this evidence. He was not involved in the decision-making. And, indeed, one of the difficult matters you will have to address is whether any of this information-sharing was appropriate.

I am not certain that given -- I am quite certain that Mr. Graham would have some opinions on it if he were given access to all of the information, explanations, and evidence. But to give him bits and pieces seems to me to be unhelpful and unfair.

THE COMMISSIONER: But I think, in fairness, the line of questioning simply to this point is directed at knowing whether or not the Minister was aware that this was going on. And he has indicated that the details weren't within his knowledge and the explanation for that.

I think that is a fair line of
questioning to determine whether or not he knew
and for him to give explanations.
Now, the next question that is being asked $I$ think is, as I anticipate it, was going to be along the same line, suggesting there are no caveats on this. And I anticipate the question is: Were you aware that information would be shared without caveat?

I am not proposing to tell you to ask.

MS EDWARDH: Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner, you can ask that question.
THE COMMISSIONER: It is a limited line of questioning, but $I$ think it is fair to ask the Minister if he knew; and if he didn't, to ask him the explanation.

So along those lines I am content
that the line of questioning proceed. If it turns out the Minister didn't know and gives his explanation, then we have it. That is it.

Go ahead, Ms Edwardh.
MS EDWARDH: Mr. Minister, that is indeed the question $I$ wanted to put to you.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: This was just a
stratagem to get the Commissioner to figure out the right question.

MS EDWARDH: That's right. He always phrases it so much better than I do.

THE COMMISSIONER: The frustrated lawyers.

MS EDWARDH: So let me pose the question as posed.

Were you aware that documents -were you aware of any arrangement in the department that required an understanding about shared information? Were caveats --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: You weren't aware.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, I was not.
I frankly don't know whether this was subject to caveats or not, whether the practice of the people when they sent these things was to say this is under certain wraps, or anything else.

I wouldn't know that and there is no way I could have been engaged in that level of information-sharing within the departments and between other government departments.

I certainly agree with you, this says it was shared. I don't see anything on the piece of paper that says it is subject to a caveat, whether there is a caveat somewhere else
that $I$ don't know that $I$ can't speak to.
MS EDWARDH: Now, being the person who is really responsible for the discharge of consular functions in the Government of Canada as Minister, can we agree, sir, that information, if it is shared from consular visits, should be the subject of some control?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, it is subject to the controls of the Privacy Act, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and any other legal provisions which would apply to this subject matter, which I am not, without a great deal of instruction and time, able to go into.

I would have thought that the sharing of that information is also governed by the security concerns of this country. And the question is, of course, that the Commission will have to determine as to whether or not there was the right balance in this case between the security concerns, what the legal provisions were at the time, et cetera.

But that would be a matter of pure hypothesis on my part. And at this point, without being a lot more familiar with the case, I couldn't really speculate on that.

MS EDWARDH: Fair enough. We will
leave that difficult task to the Commissioner.
But we can agree that it is
obvious that the information provided to Canadian citizens who want to dial up the nature of the consular services and confidentiality is such that what is told to them in this manual is inconsistent with the practice of sharing information with police officers and with intelligence forces?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, the manual speaks for itself, and that is what it says.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, it implies that if the Mounties are going to find out, of course, they will find out through other means, not through consular services. That is the implication.

The very last part I read to you, sir, says the that RCMP has other sources.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: So any honest
Canadian reading that would conclude that their information, both personal and about their charge and about the evidence, would not be given to the

RCMP; they have other sources. It wouldn't come from consular services?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I am not trying to be difficult, but $I$ am not in a position to guess what any reasonable Canadian citizen might think on reading this document. Any Canadian citizen on reading the document will think what they think when they read that document. And there are 30 million of them so there might be 30 million different opinions.

I am not trying to be tricky here.
I don't disagree with the basic thesis of your statement, that the document on its face seems to suggest that there wouldn't be a sharing of information.

MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: And $I$ am
perfectly -- I quite accept what you are saying.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you. My only
point.
I want to just turn briefly to the conversation or area that you dealt with in describing your meeting, the first meeting, with Alexa McDonough at the Halifax conference.

You have said that Ms McDonough
asked you a series of questions and you accepted the proposition that you may have advised her to be careful of any representations she made about Mr. Arar because of the information that you had heard, and $I$ think you specifically related to information provided by Mr. Cellucci, who told you they were justified, et cetera.

Do you recall that line of
questioning?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS EDWARDH: And I take it from what you are saying, Mr. Minister, is that you certainly had formed no opinion or no belief, based on any information you had, that Mr. Arar was a person -- we use the term "bad guy" or alleged to be involved in activities of a criminal nature or terrorist.

You had no information, no belief about it?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, absolutely not. That is the meeting in early October -MS EDWARDH: Yes.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. I mean at that point all I thought -- when I am dealing with Members of Parliament, if $I$ have information that
is relevant for them in the conduct of their business, $I$ give them the information.

At that point $I$ just said look, Cellucci has said there is all sorts of stuff around about this, and $I$ want to make sure you know that up front.

That is not to say that $I$ in any way said it was right or wrong because, frankly, at that point nobody knew exactly what it was. MS EDWARDH: I just want to confirm with you that at the time of your conversation with the ambassador, all you testified to was that he told you that they were justified and there was evidence he had contact with people. I take it, sir, we can't know what the content of the briefing is, but did the ambassador at that time or thereafter give to you, as Minister, details of the information that he said the American government was in possession of?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: He gave me details of how some information had been acquired from certain communications, materials owned by Mr. Arar, but he never gave me a name or anything specific like that. He just said, "Look, our officials know, because we did this and we did
that, that this person had contacts with al-Qaeda," which is all in the record, what he said. So that is basically what he said.

MS EDWARDH: And this person was the person who Mr. Arar may have had contact with?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, yes.
MS EDWARDH: Right. And you made that comment when you answered the question to -or answered a question posed by Commission counsel. So there were no names and it was a highly general description --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: -- that Mr. Arar may have had some contact with someone who had contact --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: -- with someone in al-Qaeda?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. Which is what you would expect from an ambassador.

MS EDWARDH: Right. But did you ask him to obtain for you whatever information that could be given to you as Minister of Foreign Affairs? Did you ask for the specifics and whether he could provide them to you?

MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner, I am going to have to object that any details -- I am not going to stop the Minister from answering the question.

I simply want to point out that the details of his discussions with Mr. Cellucci and any specific information exchanged is a matter for which the government claims national security in connection with the free flow of information and protection of international relations.

Of course, the Minister will be back for an in camera session at some later date and can definitely answer these questions or any other questions at that time.

THE COMMISSIONER: This question was general in nature, the one that is being asked now. I didn't myself think that this question was offensive.

MS McISAAC: I am not saying the question was offensive, but $I$ just wanted to put that on the record so $I$ wouldn't be interrupting further on, just to warn the Minister on where we stand on the issue -- or remind him, I should say.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is not
helpful because one never knows how far one opens
these doors and says you can't go into that room. I totally -- maybe I can help you by answering the question. At that particular time, we are talking about the very beginning, I would not have asked the ambassador, "Look, if you have told me that, give me the details." I would assumed anyway in security matters, he wouldn't give me details. He wouldn't have given me any more than he gave me.

As is very clearly from the public record and the earlier evidence that I gave to Commission counsel, the real issue that I pressed the ambassador, Mr. Powell and others on, was the specifics. "Look, you are saying that someone in Canada told you to go ahead and do this. Can you give us the name of the person who told you to do that?"

But other details I would not have -- because $I$ was trying to get details from the ambassador about conduct that he said had been taking place in Canada. I didn't press him about details of his own security people and what they did in the United States itself. I think that was a very different thing.

MS EDWARDH: Then I will ask another general question, because $I$ don't get to come to these in camera hearings and put my questions.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Oh.
MS EDWARDH: My next general
question is: Later, and through the course of the year when you were vigorously pursuing the objective of having Mr. Arar returned, when you had asked departments, you know, who said what, give me the answer here --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That is right.
MS EDWARDH: -- did you get
details from the ambassador?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well --
MS EDWARDH: I don't mean the
name. Did you get details of the facts upon which they said they were relying --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: -- from the U.S.? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, I did, from Mr. -- but not details of names of people, just details of what they did, that they had obtained information respecting contacts that Mr. Arar had had.

MS EDWARDH: And that was the beginning and end of it?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, through the whole course of this, that was the consistent story of Mr. Cellucci's, which was basically, "We had every reason to do what we did," and he gave me, you know, basic arguments underlying his reasons why he did it, without getting into a lot of specifics.

And then, as you will recall from
the public evidence $I$ gave the other day and everything else, he consistently said to me there was somebody in Canada that was involved. I consistently said, can you help us by telling us who that was, and he never -- and in the end he said that was wrong.

MS EDWARDH: Right. Certainly there are two things you are asking. The first issue is -- and we can come to it in detail, if you want. But the first issue is did Canadians give information?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And the initial
response, in your $Q s$ and As, was that, to your knowledge, no information had been given by

Canada.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, I couldn't have said that.

MS EDWARDH: We can take you to October $17 t h$, the $Q s$ and As, and that is at tab 97. Let's take a look at that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Tab 97?
MS EDWARDH: I think it is this
one. Perhaps it is more narrow. This is the Qs and As that you were provided and there is a series of exchanges at the very end of these Qs and As, at the last page, page 4 of 4 , Mr. Minister.

It starts, I guess, on page 3.
Let's just read them.
"What has Canada done to
protest the actions of the
United States?"
"Answer: The Minister of Foreign Affairs met with the

American Ambassador in Ottawa on October 15 and protested the action of the United States in deporting Mr. Arar to the United States."

## StenoTran

I think that is obviously an
error. We know he wasn't deported to the united States.
"Earlier representations were made to the American
authorities in Washington on October 11 once we learned of the deportation of Mr. Arar to Syria.

It is our understanding that the American authorities maintain that Mr. Arar was
legally deported from the United States but we have not yet received an official
response to our protest.
Question: There have been allegations, including those used by the United States in ordering his departure, that Mr. Arar is a member of Al

Qaeda. Are these allegations accurate?

Answer: The Department of
Foreign Affairs is not aware

## StenoTran

of information to support the allegation that Mr. Arar is a member of Al Qaeda. Question: Have Canadian authorities provided information to the American authorities that alerted them of the travels of Mr. Arar? In so far as the Department of Foreign Affairs is concerned, no."

That is the exchange. And it does relate to alerted them to the travels.

But certainly at that time, $I$ am going to suggest, you had no information, or did you, that Canadian authorities had provided information to U.S. authorities about Mr. Arar? HON. BILL GRAHAM: What date is this?

MS EDWARDH: This is, I think,
the -- let me go -- October 17th.
MS McISAAC: The information comes over on the 18th, at tab 104.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: May I make a general observation?

MS EDWARDH: Sure.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: To begin with, these questions and answers are questions and answers given to me by the department to aid me to answer questions if $I$ am asked. I might not have said anything that is said here. This doesn't represent any opinion of mine.

MS EDWARDH: No, sir --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is just an aide-memoire. This is like -- I could hand you my book for Question Period and you would see answers in there and you would say: God, you didn't give the same answer in the House of Commons. Quite often I don't give the answer the department gives me at all because $I$ either agree or disagree with it.

All this is helpful, but it is not helpful in terms of what $I$ might have said to anybody or what my own opinion was. This was only helpful in the sense that there is a huge bureaucracy down below me grinding up all sorts of things for me to understand. That doesn't mean that is what I say. It doesn't mean in any way -and that is one of the problems $I$ have had in this hearing. I am continually being put documents and
said, "Well here's this, what about that?" And I say well I didn't necessarily say that or have anything to do with it. This is one of those things.

MS EDWARDH: We can't put to you
what you really said in the House, so --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I understand
that. That has to be one of the weirdest rules known to man.
--- Laughter / Rires
HON. BILL GRAHAM: After all, what
I said in the House of Commons has been in every newspaper and it is in Hansard. So we can all go and get it if you want to get it.

MS EDWARDH: We are not allowed to do that either.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I don't
understand that, Mr. Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I just accepted
the argument of the House of Commons that you can't.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I will speak to the Speaker about that. That has to be seriously goofy, but anyway. I don't see why a commission of inquiry can't know what went on in the House of

Commons. After all, the Canadian public is entitled to every day.

So this is a bit nuts, but there you go. That is not my -- obviously you are not here to get my opinion about that.

MS EDWARDH: No. That is quite helpful.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That is not the only nutty thing that happens around here. MS EDWARDH: But let me just stop you about this. I know we have no evidence that you spoke these words, Mr. Minister.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Let me put this
proposition to you. A responsible group of civil servants, working to discharge their duties under your direction and management of the department, is going to do its best to, in theory, provide you with the accurate information?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.
But you started your question with
saying, would $I$ have conveyed the idea that no Canadians had spoken to Americans about Mr. Arar?

That is not what is said here.
"Have Canadian authorities
provided information to the American authorities that alerted them to the travels of Mr. Arar?"

That is a totally different
proposition --
MS EDWARDH: Fair enough, fair enough.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: -- which has nothing to do with the suggestion that there was information exchanged between the United States and Canadian authorities about security cases, police cases, kidnappings, drug deals, and everything that goes on every day between our two countries.

MS EDWARDH: So if there was information -- and we may come to it at a later date -- that suggested that the Canadians had alerted the U.S. that Mr. Arar was travelling to the U.S. --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: -- that would be the
kind of information that that question clearly relates to.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That answer
would be inconsistent with.
MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: But I believe that when this was prepared -- I don't know who it was prepared by. But I believe it was prepared by somebody who honestly believed the truth of that when they -- I don't believe I got -- I mean, I may not have totally agreed with the way in which my department framed things when they sent them to me, and so $I$ may have chosen a different way of saying them.

I think I legitimately believe that they were consistent in trying to give the best advice they could on the basis of the information they had at the time.

MS EDWARDH: You have to assume the factual assertions embedded in that are based on the knowledge of the department?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. And, quite frankly, $I$ have never in the history of being the Minister of Foreign Affairs found that anybody in the department has ever tried to mislead me by giving me bad information.

I have certainly got some information that $I$ had a lot of trouble believing,
but I never would suggest that the people who gave it to me weren't giving it to me in good faith.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, of course.
Let me just take you to the next
tab, tab 105.
This would be a communication from Mr. Pardy to Mr. Pillarella, the ambassador in Damascus. It is copied to the intelligence group in DFAIT, of which Mr. Heatherington is one of the senior officials, and it makes the statement that Mr. Arar is not a subject of a police investigation in Canada and can return to Canada at any time.

And at this time, October the 19th, had you been informed of anything different? HON. BILL GRAHAM: What date is

## this?

MS EDWARDH: October the 19th.
Mr. Arar is still not found.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. On October the 19th, my personal knowledge about Mr. Arar was extremely limited. I knew that a Canadian of Syrian origin had been in New York, had gone missing. We were still trying to trace him. But all this business about whether he was the subject
of a police investigation or not, or anything, was the type of information $I$ wouldn't have had at that time, ma'am. I just basically knew this. You know, something like this wouldn't be brought to my attention. MS EDWARDH: Fair enough -MR. CAVALLUZZO: If I could interject at this point in time, to be fair to the witness, in terms of tab 84 , there was a briefing that went to Mr. Graham from Mr. Pardy which concerned a meeting which contained information that $I$ think my friend is asking about. Unfortunately it is redacted -MS EDWARDH: Well ...

MR. CAVALLUZZO: The information
is redacted therein. But in terms of the Minister's knowledge at a particular point in time, this would indicate that there was a briefing relating to what is being asked about. MS McISAAC: I note that the last page indicates that the RCMP is still in the process of promising to provide a response to questions from the department --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, you might want to -- you will recall, Commission counsel,
that we had a discussion about some of these issues, like briefing note to the Minister is produced in the meeting with the American Ambassador. Again, whether I would actually see the note, or whether I would be briefed on its context by Mr. Fry or others in the office, and say, look, you are going to see the ambassador at lunch today. Here, you had better be aware of this.

I don't necessarily have time as I am racing between meetings to read all the documents.

I don't know to what extent this would go to the actual intricacies of Mr. Arar's case. But my own recollection is that at this early period of time $I$ basically would have known the facts that Mr. Arar was missing. We were trying to trace him. We believed that he was either in Jordan or Syria and were trying to -and I spoke to the Syrian ambassador when I was down there around this time to say, hey, do you know where he is? Can you help us?

And the effort at that time was focused not on what Mr. Arar might or might not have done, but on how do we find out where

Mr. Arar is so we can try to help him.
MS EDWARDH: If I could just stop
you for a moment, Mr. Minister, it puts counsel at an almost unseemly disadvantage when, in fairness to the witness, I am asking a question about some document -- in fact, $I$ am not being fair to the witness because $I$ can't bring it to his attention. I just want you to know, Mr. Minister, that we don't have that reference in the document. The Government of Canada has redacted it, and I am not able to adequately identify any unfairness in the question. I am working in the dark here. HON. BILL GRAHAM: I am not suggesting that. I wouldn't think you were being unfair.

THE COMMISSIONER: Let me just
comment. I think that is a fair point you make, Ms Edwardh, and I don't take the suggestion from the comment was that you were trying to be unfair. You are working as a cross-examiner under unusual circumstances.

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I am certainly
well aware of that and $I$ appreciate what you are
doing and the constraints that you are under. MS EDWARDH: Thank you,

Mr. Commissioner.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: May we take it
that the witnesses are operating under similar unusual circumstances in trying to give answers to these questions?

THE COMMISSIONER: How about the
Commissioner?
MS EDWARDH: Your concern is
noted.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: We are sort of part redacted and part not.

MS EDWARDH: I know it poses
problems on trying to answer questions.
The concern $I$ have about tab 105,
and I just want to see if you --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS EDWARDH: Is the statement made
to the ambassador, as everyone is searching for Mr. Arar and we are getting close to the date when the Syrians finally confirm. The information that the department really had you will see at tab 104. And we know that Mr. Pardy had a meeting with others, and with the RCMP, and posed
to them a series of questions, the answers to which are set out in tab 104, and in a less redacted version in the Garvie report at page 30 . Could you give the Minister the Garvie report, please. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry, what is this? This is a -MS EDWARDH: This is the investigation conducted internally within the RCMP as a result of a number of complaints, and it is a chronological discussion of what the RCMP did. But you will see, at page 30, there was a meeting on $I$ think the 15 th or $16 t h$ of October with the RCMP and with Department of Foreign Affairs officials, and a specific set of questions were posed and they were answered prior to the 19th of October. I believe they were answered on the 18th.

And the answers, if you just review those, disclose a number of things. One is that there is a free flow of information between the U.S. and Canada in respect of these investigations. Do you see that? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.

MS EDWARDH: And, two, that the
U.S. authorities learned of Mr. Arar through a sharing of information. Do you see that?

And the information was shared by
the RCMP to the U.S. authorities?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is the
answer to the second question here?
MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And that Mr. Arar was connected to an ongoing RCMP investigation that involved individuals also of interest to U.S. authorities.

Do you see that?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I see about inability to lay charges --

MS EDWARDH: No, no, go back. It is still part of the second answer, I am sorry. "U.S. authorities learned of ARAR through a sharing of information between RCMP investigators and U.S. authorities. ARAR was connected to an ongoing RCMP investigation..."

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.

MS EDWARDH: And then what we have -- and I am trying to understand whether there is a liberty taken in the communication with the ambassador at 105, when shortly thereafter the same person who posed the questions to the Mounties, and got those answers, writes 24 hours later that Mr . Arar is not a subject of a police investigation in Canada.

It is one thing to say he can return at any time. But does that not appear to be inconsistent with what the RCMP have said? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry, the inconsistency being that, in the first document you showed me, there is a suggestion they shared information because he was a subject of interest to the police in Canada. MS EDWARDH: And then -HON. BILL GRAHAM: And then in a subsequent document they say the RCMP has no information concerning any threat associated by Mr. Arar?

MS EDWARDH: No. The second document -- let me read you the lines:
"ARAR was connected to an
ongoing RCMP investigation
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that involved individuals
also of interest to U.S.
authorities."
Do you see that line?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Are we looking
at --
MS EDWARDH: Second answer, second
sentence -- oh, you may be looking at the wrong document.

Are you looking at the Garvie
report, Mr. Minister?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. Sorry, the
Garvie report?
MS EDWARDH: Second answer, second
sentence:
"ARAR was connected to an ongoing RCMP investigation that involved individuals also of interest to U.S. authorities."

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And then perhaps in context we should also read the fourth question. About halfway through the fourth question it says:
"The U.S. authorities were
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> advised that the RCMP was interested in ARAR from a criminal perspective."

Do you see that?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Is this in the Garvie report?

MS EDWARDH: Yes, the fourth question and answer, halfway through the fourth answer.

> "The U.S. authorities were advised that the RCMP was interested in ARAR from a criminal perspective."
> HON. BILL GRAHAM: The second-last sentence here.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. Do you see

> that?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: So we have both the acknowledgment that, according to the RCMP, there is an ongoing RCMP investigation of a criminal nature and it links up with individuals also of interest in the U.S. So that is what the Mounties have said?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.

MS EDWARDH: And $I$ want to now go
to what your ambassador is told.
He is told, if you look at tab
105, under paragraph (a) --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I was looking at tab 104, sorry.

MS EDWARDH: Tab 105, under (a),
in the last line:
"Mr. Arar is not a subject of
a police investigation in
Canada and can return to
Canada at any time."
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: Now, that doesn't appear to me, Mr. Minister, to be consistent with what the Mounties have just said.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, it
clearly isn't on its face, but $I$ have no idea of who wrote what to whom, or why they made up their minds to say what they said. So there could be all sorts of reasons why there is an inconsistency.

MS EDWARDH: Well, that is what I wanted to ask you about.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Was there an
inconsistency?
MS EDWARDH: Obviously.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I mean, anybody who reads the documents can see that, but $I$ can't help you with anything else about it because $I$ am not an RCMP officer, and obviously this is a note from Gar Pardy.

MS EDWARDH: Right.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would have to assume you would have to ask Mr. Pardy what he knew at the time that he wrote this document to know why he said what he did.

MS EDWARDH: Or whether there is some other purpose in communicating that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, if there was, it wasn't something that $I$ would know anything about, obviously.

On October the 18th, is this?
MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I mean, you
know, you are asking what went on two years ago. My recollection is $I$ am in Halifax at a diplomatic function talking to a hundred ambassadors, working, doing my job. I am not aware of what Mr. Pardy is doing back in Ottawa.

MS EDWARDH: No. But I am concerned about information that appears to not be accurate, and $I$ am wondering whether there is any purpose you can identify for us in giving this information to the ambassador at this time. HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. At this, I really -- no. MS EDWARDH: We will have to ask --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I could not.
You will have to ask Mr. Pardy.
MS EDWARDH: Okay. Now, let me understand one other feature of the ambassador's role.

Is he generally under your direction? In other words, to whom is an ambassador accountable?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, of course ultimately to the Prime Minister of Canada, because ambassadors are appointed at the pleasure of the government and on the personal appointment by the Prime Minister of Canada, as representatives of the country.

You will recall that in the past the practice was their letters, in fact, were
signed by the Queen. They are now signed by the Governor General because they are the official representatives of our country abroad and speak for Canada as a whole.

They report to me as the Minister of Foreign Affairs, but in the course of their duties, they might have dealings with -- I personally, as Defence Minister, deal directly with ambassadors, with the approval obviously of the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In the former department,
Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the ambassadors were also engaged in international trade matters to which they would report directly to the Minister of International Trade.

So all I can say is that probably
they would talk to the immigration people in their office who also reported directly to the Immigration Minister, and where there is security people, if there is military liaison people, they theoretically come under the broad chapeau of the ambassador. But you can appreciate there is a whole of government in every embassy, and the ambassador is the official who is at the top of
that pyramid, if I could say, but represents, depending on the size of the embassy and its complexity, possibly, you know, a dozen or more government departments.

MS EDWARDH: So my question, though, is: If in fact there is any ultimate accountability for the ambassadors' actions, is it to all of those various Ministers --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: -- or is it
ultimately to you, and then the Prime Minister?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: In practical
matters, it would be me. I would have to answer in the House of Commons; $I$ would be ministerially responsible. I would have to take responsibility for, if you like, actions of ambassadors. Even if they were acting for something else, basically, they come under the authority of the Ministry of International Affairs, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. And indeed, if we were to remind ourselves of the legislative framework governing the Department of Foreign Affairs, it is obvious that it is the Minister and the department in whom Parliament has reposed the duties and obligations to deal with Canada in its
international affairs?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. MS EDWARDH: All right. Then let me go --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Unless it is the Finance Minister out doing his thing, or the Prime Minister out doing his thing, or somebody else out doing --

MS EDWARDH: But it becomes
important because there may be times when an ambassador's functions and duties, in representing so many different interests, may appear to conflict, and we will come to that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: It happens all the time in international affairs. It is one of our great problems in international affairs today, as I said. Sometimes the Finance Minister may be saying something different from the International Affairs Minister, who may say something different from the Trade Minister.

We do our best to coordinate
everything if we possibly can. But I don't disagree that there are challenges in managing different roles in portfolios which sometimes can have different approaches to these issues. That
is certainly a fair way to put it.
MS EDWARDH: We will come to this in some detail, but ultimately the building of a consensus about what the message should be to international partners and allies and to foreign governments, it is ultimately the Minister of Foreign Affairs who speaks for Canada in those dealings.

Is that correct?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. This came
up in Commission counsel's questions earlier, a similar sort of thing. You are charged to speak for Canada. But that is right. And the ambassador and myself would speak for Canada. But that is subject to, of course, coordination through the Privy Council Office and everything that I am speaking for the Government of Canada. I am not off speaking for the Government of Canada on whatever $I$ happen to think $I$ want to speak about. You know what $I$ mean? You are subject to the constraints of actually speaking for the Government of Canada.

MS EDWARDH: And so the management of multiple messages -- and I want to talk about some multiple messages, because I am going to
suggest, Mr. Graham, that Mr. Arar's case is a study in multiple, and confusing, and conflicting messages sent by entities within the government. That is where $I$ am going.

You will agree with me that we have certainly been made alive to the fact -- and I can take you to the exhibits, if you want, but we might be able to do this a little more quickly if you just recall -- that there is evidence of the confusion left in the minds of the Syrian Military Intelligence officials, through a visit of CSIS, where they apparently took the view that Canada did not want Mr. Arar returned?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am. MS EDWARDH: You are also aware that Mr. Cellucci, in some of his public comments, referred to the fact that Canadian authorities didn't want Mr. Arar returned? You covered that yesterday.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Oh, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And certainly it is fair to say that there are clear mixed messages, if that were the case. If in fact the Syrians got the impression, rightfully or wrongfully, in a sense, that Canada didn't want him home and the
consular officials were saying "give him to us and let him come home", that would be a mixed message, no question?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.
MR. DAVID: So I want to talk a little bit about the processes involved in sorting out these mixed messages.

I take it that Mr . Pardy spent some time -- we can look at it in more detail, if you want -- building up a deck. We have called it a deck. I thought it was a deck of cards for a long time because of all the redactions, but it was a PowerPoint presentation, talking about how there might be a reconciliation of conflicting interests or messages, and ultimately he said his deck, or suggestion, was not adopted.

I would invite you quickly to turn to tab 756 .

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay. This might be a distraction, but we do have a saying amongst the politicians that decks were invented by bureaucrats to ensure that we can't think about things.

MS EDWARDH: Well, I am going to make you think about it.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: The whole process of decks around this town is a highly controversial matter in terms of whether it further analysis or not, but that is the reflection of someone who is coming to the end of his career, instead of the beginning.
--- Laughter / Rires
MS EDWARDH: And this is --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry, which number?

MS EDWARDH: Tab 756, at page 2 in particular.

You are probably as confused about the nature of these documents as I am, but this looks like a meeting held on December 4th, 2003, that involves Assistant Deputy Ministers. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry, 756. MS EDWARDH: 756.

MS McISAAC: We should point out that this is likely just a draft.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is "ADMmtg on deportation \& detention $001 . w p d "$ on the top of it?

MS EDWARDH: Perhaps my friend would tell me where the final version is, and I
will refer the Minister to the correct document. MS McISAAC: I don't actually know
if there is a final version of this. I just know that by the setup and the fact that there is no number on it would suggest that it is a draft.

And, of course, when the documents were produced for the Commission, documents were retrieved from backup drives and hard drives of computers and such.

So I don't actually know -- maybe
Ms Verma or Mr. Cavalluzzo can help -- whether there is in fact a final of this.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: We are certainly unaware if there is a final version. However, obviously government counsel can ask Mr. Heatherington if there is one. We don't seem to have it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Why don't you go ahead and you ask your questions on this with the forewarning that this may be a draft.

MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
What $I$ am really searching for is some understanding whether, under your management, the department was able to identify a mechanism to
resolve disputes or conflicts between the interests that can come into play.

This document suggests,
Mr. Minister, that the dispute mechanism that is under discussion in December 2003 -- and this is the one that refers to the audit, the internal audit, that is to take place with respect to current consular policies, practices and procedures, and it goes on:

> "DFAIT has a legislative requirement to 'conduct all ... consular relations on behalf of Canada'. This we have done and are doing, but it often means that we (DFAIT consular officials) find ourselves in a state of confrontation with Canadian security authorities (CSIS and the RCMP). This is unlikely to change, but there must be more transparency and openness between Departments and agencies to avoid the sort of 'nasty surprise' and
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> 'failure to understand' each other's motives that have marked some cases."

Whether this is a draft, sir,
would you agree, from your experience as the Minister, that this observation about a state of conflict sometimes in some cases is an accurate observation from your knowledge?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Oh, sure, but it is not restricted in government to this.

I mean, if you want to get into the Foreign Affairs -- if you want to get into the trade department and talk about the relationship with the agriculture department, you will see what disputes are about because of no trade negotiations.

I can take you through a hundred cases I worked through when I was Foreign Affairs Minister where Privy Council Office was going one way, the military want to go another, and we have to coordinate. That is what government is all about. That is what we are trying to do. MS EDWARDH: But $I$ am only interested in this dispute, not all the other ones.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, this dispute --

MS EDWARDH: And I take it you agree that this is a fair characterization that there is from time to time a situation of conflict and confrontation?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.
MS EDWARDH: Fair enough.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well this is the way Mr. Heatherington puts it: conflict and confrontation. There is no question in my mind that the Arar case, and other cases that $I$ was involved in, brought up the issue that the purposes of the security agencies are often not the same as the purposes of our department and, in fact, the responsibilities are not the same responsibilities and that you have to try and accommodate those two with the right balance. Whether or not in terms of confrontation, I did discuss these issues a couple of times with Mr. Easter. How could we coordinate for the interests of Canada and Canadians to be better?

But I think you would have to ask someone like Mr. Pardy or Mr. Heatherington about
the extent to which there was confrontation in this specific case.

MS EDWARDH: Let's leave confrontation to the side. I am much more interested in conflict.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: That in managing the respective mandates, sometimes the actions of one undercut the other. That is what $I$ am interested in.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Fine.
And what is proposed here:
"At the earliest possible stage ..."

It is down in the next paragraph.
"... there must be an
inter-departmental 'meeting of minds' to ensure that all
parties are able to fulfil
their mandates without
stumbling over each other."
And I am going to say "and
undercutting one another", obviously.
Do you see that?
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HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Now, do you know whether while you were Minister of Foreign Affairs -- and I do appreciate this is close -no, it is not close to the election. I think I am a year out.

But do you know whether a mechanism was created for an interdepartmental committee of some kind that could make sure that there was coordination in these kinds of cases?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: What is the
date of this memo?
MS EDWARDH: My understanding is
it is December the 3rd -- 4th, 2003.
So Mr. Arar would have returned --
I am sorry, you want to ...
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mr. Arar
returned in November, to my recollection.
THE COMMISSIONER: October.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: In October. MS EDWARDH: This document may -let's just use it for its ideas. It may not have gone anywhere.

But my question is: Given the
Arar case and other issues in these high-profile
cases, do you recall there being a resolution mechanism set up to sort out this conflict?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would respectfully suggest that the Deputy Minister, Mr. Harder, would be the best person to give evidence on this subject. I don't want to drag somebody else into this hearing --

MS EDWARDH: He will appreciate that.
--- Laughter / Rires
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. I am sure he will kill me.

But the fact of the matter is, as a result of all the issues that arose under this case, the Sampson case and other cases with which you are familiar, we certainly felt that in the department we had to review our practices in terms of consular management, how we could be more effective, both in protecting the interests of Canadians abroad and also how we could have a better form of intergovernmental coordination around these issues.

So there is always a lesson
learned out of every experience.
My recollection is that we sought
to come up with a memorandum for internal use for the consular affairs department, to know how we could manage better consular relations in countries like Syria, Saudi Arabia and others, where there were really large legal challenges and practices that were incompatible with Canada, and on the other hand how we could have a better coordination.

Those coordinations, if they took place, for example, in the way in which the Government of Canada works, would be either at the Deputy Minister level -- and the Deputy Ministers meet on a regular basis to share information and work together.

For example, my present Deputy Minister at the Defence Department, we meet with Foreign Affairs regularly because we need to know all sorts of things. They do that and seek to coordinate action.

I don't know if specifically there was, below that level, set up an interdepartmental coordination or clearinghouse or discussion place along the lines of Mr. Heatherington's recommendation.

But on the surface it would seem
certainly an idea very much worth pursuing, given the experience that we had had in these cases. MS EDWARDH: Because, quite frankly, if one stands back from the Arar case and looks at the broad brush strokes of what happened, you have your officials, Mr. Pardy in particular, trying to send one single consistent message to the Syrians, which is "let him return home or try him fairly on charges so that he can defend himself".

That is the message?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Which is the message I entirely subscribed to myself and sought to convey.

MS EDWARDH: That was indeed, though, only part of the message delivered by Mr. Pillarella, and that is the nub of the problem.

Mr. Pillarella, who ultimately is responsible to you -- and I will take you through this now, Mr. Minister -- is continuously -- and I don't mean to be inappropriate -- but somewhat enthusiastically asking for and receiving the products of Mr. Arar's interrogation and the investigation by the Syrian Military Intelligence.

If you accept that as true for a minute -- and we will come to the actual facts, and maybe you will want to review them now. But if at one hand Mr. Pillarella and Mr. Martel are saying "please send him home; send him home as quickly as possible" and on the other hand are saying "please give us more information or information", or things like that, then the Syrians are getting two messages, I am going to suggest to you. And they come in this phrase: "do your investigation", which means keep him there. And the other phrase is "send him home." And there is a conflict.

And that is really the nub of the problem in Mr. Arar's case.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Again, without going through all the documents and without knowing what Mr. Pillarella was doing in Damascus and we are doing, I hear what you are telling me. My response would be that the ambassador also had a responsibility to get as much information as possible so that the ambassador could act with knowledge and information.

And as Foreign Minister, I would be anxious to know everything so that if, for
example, $I$ am meeting with the Syrian Foreign Minister, $I$ would want to know the bad stuff as well as the good stuff. Someone has to get the information for me. I cannot be an effective advocate for Mr. Arar or anybody if I go into a meeting with another Foreign Minister and I haven't been given the full goods by my ambassador about the situation in the country.

You are sort of suggesting that he was inappropriate in what he did. So we may have to go through all of that. That is going to be a long discussion which the Commissioner is going to have to decide because that is a matter of conclusion, not a fact.

Let's get the parameters of what we are talking about here.

In matters of intelligence, we depend on SIGNET, we depend on a lot of electronic intelligence, we depend on a great deal of intelligence from different sources. Our ambassadors and our diplomatic corps in a country are one of the best sources we can get for contextual understanding of the nature of that information.
intelligence services made the mistakes they have made in recent time, which have been very high-profile and which have led us into some very serious problems and have been highly political in certain countries that are close allies to Canada, are precisely, in my view, because technical information was allowed to prevail over the human information obtained by intelligent people in the field.

I would not want the Commission to do anything which, in turn, would suggest that we should inhibit what our people are doing in terms of being able to convey information.

Then somebody has to analyze that information and decide does this make sense or does it not make sense in the context of which it is? But somebody has to have, you know, the whole picture.

As I said, if I go back for me, I would want to have the whole picture, and then I would have to decide -- it is a judgment: Okay, what do $I$ believe here? What don't I believe?

But I have to have the whole picture, and so do our ambassadors.

So I would put Mr. Pillarella's
conduct in the light of that context rather than in the light of saying $I$ am encouraging the Syrian authorities to believe in giving me information. I don't think that is an appropriate conclusion to draw.

MS EDWARDH: Because certainly the problem is while there may be a justification, as you framed it -- which is not contextual, though. It is not contextual, because we are not talking about context. We are talking about taking and seeking the proceeds of interrogation and a statement.

While there may be a justification from the world of intelligence, you have to agree that, justified or not, there are consequences for seeking intelligence through this means, and one of them is to give the Syrians the clear sense Canada is interested in the intelligence they gather. That is the message.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I think that is -- I think that is a total conclusion that you are drawing in the light of your analysis of the facts, and it is not a conclusion that $I$ personally would draw.

```
I think that is a total, utter
```

supposition. I think that in these circumstances you would have to know fully the circumstances and the questions that were asked.

But $I$ would suggest to you that if
the ambassador knew that they had information
about Mr. Arar and he was seeking to protect Mr. Arar and he didn't try and find out what information they had, he would be derelict in his duty in trying to help Mr. Arar because he would be boxing in a dark room where he wouldn't know what case he had to meet.

So maybe if you are right, if he went in and said, "Hey, I want to join in this investigation," that would be inappropriate. But I didn't see any suggestion of that in this case. We are talking about a fine line here. You are trying to take me to make conclusions about what he did. I would respectfully suggest you should address those questions to him and let the Commissioner decide whether or not what he did in the circumstances were appropriate, because anything you and I do is mere second-guessing after the fact on the basis -- in a very complicated case.

MS EDWARDH: All right. But we
can agree that it is a fine line and it is easy to slip over it if in fact you end up undermining the principal message that Mr. Arar is someone who should be returned home or tried? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right. MS EDWARDH: That would be wrong? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.

And in the case of the CSIS visit, in this case, clearly something went wrong there and some information was -- so there you might go there. Whether the ambassador's conduct went that far and slipped over that line is a matter of judgment that $I$ guess the Commission, in the fullness of time, will come to a conclusion about with the full knowledge of the evidence. But I would have to have been there, seen the circumstances, had a feeling of what was going on.

I have to tell you, my belief is that whatever he was motivated by, it was a sincere desire to try and get Mr. Arar out of jail.

Now, if he went too far in doing that, that is a judgment. But $I$ have to tell you, I believe that to have been his motivation.

MS EDWARDH: I want to deal with the hierarchy of duty here.

Mr. Pardy said to us that while the ambassador wore all these hats in representing Canada's interests, in the circumstances of the Arar case, his preeminent obligation was to the wellbeing of Mr . Arar and his return or trial.

Do you accept that?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: That was certainly my view, my role as well. I always took the view that Mr. Arar, of whatever matter, was a Canadian citizen, bearing in mind the Syrian aspect and all of that --

MS EDWARDH: Of course.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: That he was a Canadian citizen; that he was entitled to our protection. And if there was an offence that had been committed by Mr. Arar or anybody else, that they should be tried and dealt with by our police standards, by our standards in our country, where a fairer opportunity of defending yourself takes place.

And that is the primary obligation in these circumstances.

MS EDWARDH: You took that as your
primary obligation, but that was also the ambassador's primary obligation; correct? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. MS EDWARDH: I am told that a number of people could very usefully have a brief break.

THE COMMISSIONER: How are we doing time-wise? It is 10:30. MS EDWARDH: I will move through this, and $I$ hope to finish by 11:00, 11:10. I know Ms McIsaac has a few questions, and $I$ know we are finished at 12:00, drop-dead time. THE COMMISSIONER: We will take the morning break for 15 minutes. HON. BILL GRAHAM: I could provide a deck for you if we could cut this all down.
--- Laughter / Rires
--- Upon recessing at 10:29 a.m. /
Suspension à 10 h 29
--- Upon resuming at 10:49 a.m. /
Reprise à 10 h 49
THE REGISTRAR: Please be seated.
Veuillez vous asseoir.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner.

Mr. Minister, just to move to one of my last two areas, $I$ want to deal specifically with the matter of your knowledge of the risk or probability that Mr. Arar was the subject of torture or detained in conditions of confinement that fell below the standards set out in the Convention Against Torture.

Mr. Cavalluzzo asked you some questions about the initial period of time where Mr. Arar really disappeared between his departure from New York on October the 8th, the early morning hours of the 8th, and the confirmation you received on October 21 st that he was in Syria, and that confirmation came through the department.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And $I$ want to deal with whether or not, in the period of time shortly after October 21st, you have any position you would like to convey to the Commission as to whether or not your departmental officials, in a verbal briefing or otherwise, conveyed to you that there was a substantial risk, and even a probability, that Mr. Arar had been the subject matter of an interrogation and held in conditions that fell below the standards in CAT during that
period.
Do you recall ever having a verbal
briefing of that kind?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: You said in answer to
Mr. Cavalluzzo's question the following, at page 4135 of the transcript -- and it related to the suggestion that Mr. Pardy would have shared his concern with you about the conditions of detention and interrogation.

You said this:
"Well, I have a lot of respect for Gar Pardy, so he might well have passed it up the chain. As I say, it may have been brought to my attention, it may not. I don't have any specific recollection, because at this time I see the whole continuum of what took place over the case of Mr. Arar."

And then you go on and say: "My recollection at this time is we were particularly
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anxious to make sure that we had consular access, and that we did have consular access and the information in fact came back saying that while Mr. Arar clearly was in detention in a place where he was not being treated the way we would treat people that he had not been tortured.

I just want to focus on this
initial period of the month of October.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: Is it your evidence, sir, that Mr. Pardy may well have made some reference to his concern about the condition of detention and possible means of interrogation of Mr. Arar by Syrian Military Intelligence?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. Going back to what $I$ was saying the other day and certainly going back to the events, it is certainly clear that we knew that Syria as a jurisdiction was not going to conduct itself the way Canada did. That is clear.
Without a specific, in-depth
knowledge of the conditions in Syrian jails or their interrogation methods or anything else, there is no doubt that we had concern about the welfare of Mr. Arar. But that concern, to my best recollection, did not extend to the idea that he had been or would be tortured.

And certainly in that earlier period, and particularly after the first consular visits, and we started getting consular visits, we were -- I think as $I$ said the other day, given the fact that they had taken the position that he was a Syrian citizen, we were quite surprised at the alacrity with which we got a consular visit. That is partially true because the other two that were being held, we were told, "Sorry, we know that we've got Canadians, but we don't care about that."

So we were surprised with the alacrity with which we got consular access. My understanding, from the results of those consular visits, was nobody said we believe there has been torture used at that time.

MS EDWARDH: And nobody, I take it -- because I don't want to misunderstand the language of torture.

I take it no one also said to you
that there may have been force, physical force, used to obtain statements, which in some jurisdictions would be torture and in others it may be less than torture.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: But no one said that
kind of thing?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, exactly. Or, for example, as you said, the
two dimensions: one would be physical treatment, the other would be the conditions of detainment, which wouldn't measure up to the standards that are set out in the international convention.

There, too, one didn't at that
time, specifically at that time, know of the conditions of Mr. Arar's detainment. He certainly made that clear subsequently. But at that time, we would not have known about him being held in a dark cell by himself, that treatment.

MS EDWARDH: No, but there was certainly nothing that you knew about the conditions of detention that could exclude that they fell below the standards set out in CAT? HON. BILL GRAHAM: That is fair.

We didn't know enough to know one way or the other, at least at my level --

MS EDWARDH: That was your
impression?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS EDWARDH: So I need then to explore this, because one of the things we do know about Syria -- and while you graciously phrase it that the jurisdiction of Syria does not conduct itself as we do in Canada, we also know that, particularly when the person is detained by military intelligence outside of the usual police and court structures, that there are substantiated claims of torture in the obtaining of confessions within that regime.

Would you agree with that
proposition?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I certainly
would agree with it now. Whether, you know, at that particular time, my degree of knowledge of Syria and its conditions was considerably less. Then obviously we became educated about it. MS EDWARDH: And your degree -HON. BILL GRAHAM: And as you point out, the difference between military
detention and other detention, these are things that at that point would have been finer points that $I$ would not have been aware of.

MS EDWARDH: Sorry, I didn't mean
to cut you off.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, that is all
right.
MS EDWARDH: I draw from that that
you have no recollection of being provided with information from your consular division to say, "Well, we have good news and bad news: (a) he's there; but (b) he's in detention held by the military intelligence, and our last dealing with them was with Mister..." I think it is El Maati. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.

MS EDWARDH: "-- and we have been
told that Mr. El Maati was tortured."
That is the bad news.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: The El Maati
link was not, at least drawn from me. I believe he is the gentleman that was in an Egyptian jail at this time and who had described his condition when in Syria.

MS EDWARDH: Right, in August of 2002 .

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That link
eventually came -- you know, certainly -- as the case progressed, we discussed everything more and more. We got more engaged ourselves.

So there would have been more and more discussions: what can we do? Is there a danger here?

The good news/bad news aspect of it for me really was the suggestion, at some fairly early on point, that they were alleging that he had been a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, which we knew was certainly bad news in Syria. I mean, this was like -- I certainly was aware enough of history of Syria and how they had been treated by the regime to know that this was not good.

But then again, we were also given pretty quick assurances, well, look, that is maybe an allegation but it doesn't make sense given Mr. Arar's age. So they may be alleging that, but that is something we can disprove. But it wasn't a comforting thing.

MS EDWARDH: I want to come then the very simple question. Mr. Cavalluzzo asked you, and $I$ think you quite fairly said you are not
sure whether it made a difference.
Had you had a clear indication
from your consular staff that there was a reasonable probability that Mr. Arar was subject to conditions that fell below the standards in CAT in these initial periods, you were asked whether you would have done anything differently with Syria or the U.S., and your answer, I think, was: "Well, we certainly would have been energized but you are not sure you could have made any difference."

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: Now, I want to talk about the difference you would have made if you had been so energized by that information in respect of your dealings with the Solicitor General and the rest of the Government of Canada.

I am going to suggest very simply, Mr. Graham, if you had been armed with that information that there was a reasonable prospect that Mr. Arar was being tortured in Syria, that you would have said to your colleagues much more clearly, "We will speak with one voice because this is not acceptable by Canadian standards and we will bring this man home, if we can."

Isn't that fair?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: In terms of the
internal Government of Canada pressures --
MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, that is
the type of thing -- I mean, I can't remember whether it was this time or not, but at one time I sat beside Wayne Easter in the House of Commons, and so you discuss things. I said, "Wayne, here's a guy being tortured, you know? We have to get moving on this."

It would have been a reasonable, absolutely reasonable, approach. One would have gone, maybe even to the Prime Minister, and said, "Look, what are we going to do here?"

When I said I am sure not one would have altered the event, I don't want to drag in other cases, but my experience in the case of Mr. Sampson was -- it had somewhat instructed me in these cases because $I$ had been sent by the Prime Minister as his envoy to talk to Prince Abdullah about Mr. Sampson in September of 2001 , and it was at that time that we believed we had actual proof of torture by virtue of statements by other inmates that had seen this happen, and I
raised this with the Crown Prince.
But when I was asked about that, for example, by the press here in Canada, I always said, "I will not comment on those allegations because they might make Mr. Sampson's position more difficult," and I would have done the same for Mr. Arar.

Had we known and I had been asked, you know, publicly, "Why don't you make more of a ruckus publicly?", my position would have been, "Mr. Arar is in jail. We will do things that are for his good."

So I think the energy thing would have, as you said, been more along the lines of how can we move the process faster to be persuasive?

But I do come back to what I have said. Given what I have learned about Syria and how they operated and our ability of the levers we had, and the actual little few levers we had over the Syrian government, $I$ don't know to what extent we would have been able to advance the case any faster.

But I do have to say to the family that if in fact it could have been advanced
faster, I certainly myself would have tried to do my best to do that.

MS EDWARDH: And my point only is,
it may well be that one could not have had any impact with your colleagues south of the border. But I am focusing solely on this issue, Mr. Minister: That it is inconceivable to me that had you had the information and that you called a meeting of your colleagues and the senior officials in CSIS and the RCMP and looked Commissioner Zaccardelli in the eye and said, "Listen, this is what $I$ believe is going on and we must speak with one voice because of this issue --"

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: -- that you would have gotten a letter, or the Prime Minister would have written, if the judgment was that such a communication could be effective in assisting in his release.

You would have gotten that letter a lot sooner, or gotten cooperation from your colleagues rather than them insisting that they stood aloof?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, there is
no doubt about it. We had a lot of discussions about the letter, and $I$ understand Mr. Pardy is coming back, and he certainly was instrumental in trying to get interdepartmental consensus around that and worked extraordinarily diligently on it. I think that -MS EDWARDH: And couldn't get it. HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, because -and, again, this is going to be for the Commission to determine and the evidence is going to have to be in respect of the police saying, well, they would say what was consistent with what they had in terms of the facts but they weren't prepared to go further.

What we were trying to do and what I was trying to do was find language which, even if it was consistent with there being a police investigation, would say but there is not a crime having been committed here. So there was a constant sort of -- could we find language which could accommodate the fact that there had clearly been an investigation, which they couldn't say there had never been an investigation, that wouldn't have been true. We couldn't have asked them to say
something that wasn't true. But on the other hand, with my lawyer's hat on, we are constantly saying: But could we get you to say lots of people are subject to investigations around here and they often don't lead to anything and there is not evidence of culpability here; there is just evidence of conversations and things like that? It could go somewhere; it could go nowhere.

MS EDWARDH: That's right.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: That could be true of a lot of stuff going on in society. MS EDWARDH: And where I was going with this, $I$ took it from your earlier answer that had the issue of torture been clearly placed on your deck, that that would have been a matter you would have brought to the table in the conversations and would have put the urgency under you that you described earlier?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I think maybe Mr. Pardy probably, knowing him, he would have come to us and said, "Look, I am having a lot of trouble in my discussions, interdepartmental discussions; they are not going as quickly as we like. There is a man who is being tortured in Syria. We have to move faster on this."

I am sure he would have done that. MS EDWARDH: And you would have acted.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would have been responsive to that, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And you would have acted with your colleagues and told them what the problem was?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And, if necessary,
brought it to the Prime Minister?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, we did, eventually, as you know, bring it to the Prime Minister and he did act.

MS EDWARDH: I am troubled by the message you got, as you have described it, Mr. Minister, and $I$ want to take you to a couple of consular notes and ask you whether or not the greyness and ambiguity in these notes should have been brought to your attention.

Let me start, sir, with tab 123, because I hear you saying it didn't come to your attention.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: What didn't
come to my attention?

MS EDWARDH: The concerns about the detention and interrogation and techniques, and things like that.

And where $I$ am taking you, sir, is, first of all, to the very first meeting that was held by Mr. Pillarella on the $22 n d$ of October with Syrian Military Intelligence.

It is part of our record now that he got access to the head of that group, General Khalil. I won't go through mentioning his name again, but he was at the highest levels.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And one of the
interesting observations is General Khalil -- and this is October 22 nd -- says Mr. Arar really arrived at the border the day before and he has already been interrogated and admitted his connections with terrorist organizations. Do you see that in paragraph 3, the first line?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, but we know that the statement he got there the day before was inaccurate.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. It was not the truth. But you would have no reason to doubt, I
take it, that at least your consular officials had been told that within a period of 24 hours the Syrians had extracted a confession from Mr. Arar? That is what they are told,
anyway.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And you can agree with me that based upon the information you had, that that was a fairly startling admission at that time?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: That they could
have come to these conclusions in such a brief period of time?

MS EDWARDH: Yes, that is what
that said.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mr. Arar sort of arrives at the border and says, "Hi, I am a terrorist"?

MS EDWARDH: That is right.
Exactly. It has all the hallmarks --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: This is not
a -- yes.
MS EDWARDH: It has all the
hallmarks of an interrogation that we know now to be that of a person held incognito and subject to
techniques of interrogation that are not acceptable in Canadian society and involves the use of force. It has got all the hallmarks right there.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I
honestly don't know that. That is your conclusion.

MS EDWARDH: All right. So you don't accept that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I don't
say $I$ don't -- I mean, $I$ just don't know enough of the circumstances of what went on with the ambassador and the consul to know whether they had that suspicion or not. I honestly don't.

MS EDWARDH: Well if they didn't, they should have. If in fact they were confronted with the information that in 24 hours there had been this confession, $I$ am going to suggest they should have had suspicions. Their index of suspicion should have risen.

Is that fair?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, they may have.

MS EDWARDH: They may have.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: That may or may
not be fair. I think that is a conclusion -- that is a conclusion --

MS EDWARDH: Would your index of suspicion, Mr. Minister, be raised -HON. BILL GRAHAM: If I had been there?

MS EDWARDH: -- if you had got
this memorandum, and been told that within 24 hours there had been this confession?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: With the benefit of the hindsight of what $I$ know now, for sure.

MS EDWARDH: All right.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: At that
particular moment?
MS EDWARDH: You are not sure?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I don't know.
I mean, I was focused on -- you know, we have the American ambassador, trying to figure out how we could get to him, how do we get consular access. We are relieved at -- I mean, you can't tell you -- I don't say that there was a euphoria, but there was a real sense of relief that we got the consular access.

MS EDWARDH: And Mr. Pardy has
said that. There is good news. You've got a body and it is alive.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: And they have agreed we can talk to him instead of telling us to buzz off.

MS McISAAC: Can I ask, Ms Edwardh, in fairness, to take the Minister to the actual report of the first consular visit -MS EDWARDH: I was just about to do that.

MS MCISAAC: Thank you.
MS EDWARDH: That is Volume 2.
And you will find the first report of this visit -- just a moment.

It is tab 130 .
There are some interesting observations. This document is sent from Mr. Martel. He is the person who had consular access, and he is the person who then forwarded his observations -- well, also, notably, his observations are approved by the ambassador.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: And then we get certain information about this visit. And it starts out:
"Arrived on site at 1000 hours and was greeted by an officer who declined to give his identity. Meeting ... was cordial and took place in one of their offices."

And so it is clear from this, and
the comment at paragraph 3, that Mr. Arar was brought to the office, the meeting lasted about 30 minutes, and it was not possible to see where exactly Arar was being detained.

So you will agree with me that what you have there is nothing more than something that is quite empty. It could be the best of conditions of confinement, and it could be the worst.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely.
MS EDWARDH: All right. And then there is this statement:
"After shaking hands, Arar was shown a seat at a distance."

Do you see that observation?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: Would that, sir,
raise your index of suspicion if you were reading this report, as Minister of Foreign Affairs? Would you expect the reader to be concerned that Mr. Arar was placed at a distance?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would be more concerned by the next paragraph, paragraph 4, but --

MS EDWARDH: And we will come to that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Clearly the circumstances were not ideal. There is no question about that.

MS EDWARDH: And then, in addition
to being told that he was placed at a distance, there is the observation that there were questions asked in accordance with instructions received.
"... but it was obvious subject was not free to answer all of the questions."

So I am going to suggest to you that one of the things we know about this is this is an interview taking place under the nose of one or more Syrian Military Intelligence officials in circumstances where Mr. Arar is clearly not free to say anything in a candid way to the consular
officials.
That is pretty obvious, right?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: So you don't know
what he would say and you can't tell where he is detained. So those are our two observations so far.

Thirdly:
"Subject appeared to be
healthy but this is difficult
to assess. He looked
resigned and submissive.
Numerous eye signals seemed
to indicate he was not free
to speak out. At least this
is the impression we had."
So would you agree, Mr. Minister, that the reflection here, that Mr . Arar looked "resigned and submissive" is a matter that would certainly raise your index of suspicion about his treatment?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I think the whole memo was designed to convey to the reader that there were concerns about his condition. There is no question about that. That is why I
think the memo was drafted the way it was.
It was by somebody saying, look, there are potential problems here. We don't know what they are.

MS EDWARDH: You get more than you don't know what they are. You know you don't know how he is being detained and you don't know what he would say to you if he were free to speak. But you do know that from his behaviour he looks cowed by the environment that he is in, "resigned and submissive".

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, that is a fair deduction to draw from that wording.

MS EDWARDH: And he is being also
told what to say through promptings. All right?
"When prompted further for answers ..."

I am sorry, he was stopped from saying.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: We have him being prompted actually at paragraph 7. You may not have the full paragraph 7. We now know that the answer that he was being provided for well by his Syrian host was in fact dictated to him. We now
know that.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: So all of that
combines to a very troubling situation; fair enough?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: And it also is information, $I$ am going to suggest to you, that leaves open a myriad number of possibilities, but certainly that the conditions of confinement and interrogation fall below the standards in CAT? Completely open from this.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, they fall
below standard. I am sorry, I am not an expert enough in CAT to know whether they fall below the standards of CAT. That is a legal conclusion somebody else can draw.

But we certainly are not -- we totally agree that the conditions are far from ideal, and that access has been inhibited by the Syrian presence. That is clear. That he was disoriented -- I mean the statement that he makes here on the next page, "I am Syrian and I obey the law of Syria", we know from Mr. Arar that he considered himself a Canadian and that is what we
considered him, too.
MS EDWARDH: So he is being forced
to parrot what is being told to him by military intelligence?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Or possibly
saying things which would reflect on the way in which he would be treated, so he would be well-treated. I mean, in these circumstances, you might -- I don't know what would motivate you to say one thing or another.

MS EDWARDH: Well, he certainly
later said that this is nothing more than an instruction --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: -- and it reads that
way.
Now, Mr. Pardy said to us that upon receipt of this memo, it merely confirmed his reasonable suspicion of improper and abusive interrogation, and nothing that he thought about when he received this memo was inconsistent with Mr. Arar's later public statements of his treatment. And those later public statements of his treatment clearly point to severe physical and emotional abuse, particularly during the first two

## StenoTran

weeks of confinement.
So when he read this, that is what he read into it. And that doesn't surprise you, does it, given the tenor of this memo?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Pardy
said what he said. I don't know whether I would be surprised or not if he had said it to me.

But what surprises me is that was
not conveyed to me. I was not told that that was a conclusion that had been drawn by anybody. So that would be surprising.

MS EDWARDH: That is the concern
we are going to come to because there is a briefing memo we are going to look at in a minute.

But $I$ would like to take you to --
oh, I am sorry.
I want you to be aware that what
Mr. Pardy said of the conditions that were viewed here was that given the complexity of issues around torture, it would be impossible to assess it one way or the other from what Mr. Martel saw or described in the memo.

You accept that?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would
accept -- Mr. Pardy is pretty expert in dealing
with these sorts of cases, and of course he is secondhand. He is reading a briefing from Mr. Martel. I don't know whether he has spoken to Mr. Martel or just read the notes or what.

MS EDWARDH: Well, he may have
done both.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: I want to then turn
to tab 129.
I understand, sir, that these are briefing notes, and of course I -- I am sorry. These are questions and answers that are prepared by the department for you.

Is that correct?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: For use in the House of Commons that you are not allowed to look at.

MS EDWARDH: I don't even want to hear about Parliament. We will run afoul of some rule.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I seriously do not understand something that is on television every day and in Hansard is ...

Anyway, we will come back to that before we are finished.
--- Laughter / Rires
MS EDWARDH: Let's go to this.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would assume
that these come from, when I always had -- you know, a briefing book normally for use in the House of Commons, but clearly if $I$ am going to a press conference or something else, I might use them as well.

MS EDWARDH: We have agreed that embedded within them are factual assertions that you rely upon, even if you might wish to phrase things differently when you actually address the matter.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, the department is giving me the best advice they can; yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. So I now come
to the first page of these briefing notes:
"Question: What took place
today during the first
Consular meeting with
Mr. Arar?"
So this is October $23 r d$.
And the proposed reply put into
your hands is, first of all:
"Canadian Consular Officials from the Canadian Embassy in Damascus met with Mr. Arar earlier today, in the presence of Syrian authorities.

Mr. Arar appeared in good health.

He asked about his family..."
Well, with the greatest of
respect, this seems to me a very optimistic view that is being put into your mouth, Mr. Minister.

One might have said while Mr. Arar
is alive and we have had an opportunity to see him, we are unclear about the conditions in which he is being detained or why he behaves the way he did.

I mean, this is a good news
answer, and $I$ am going to suggest to you it is not very compatible with the first consular note sent back by Mr. Martel. It is not consistent with the concerns that cry out of that note, to say simply "he is in good health".

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, it is
certainly putting a pretty positive gloss on it,
there is no doubt about that.
MS EDWARDH: And had you had the
note in front of you and an opportunity to say what you would read into that note and given the concerns of Mr. Pardy and others, I gather, about his condition, you would have been less positive, would you not, in the way you were with Mr. Sampson?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would have said we are not in a position at this time to comment on his condition. That is what $I$ would have said. But we look forward to future consular access to be able to work on making sure that he is being properly treated, something along those lines, $I$ think would have been more responsive. MS EDWARDH: Right. And then if $I$ flip over to tab 145, it is clear that Mr. Pardy has some concerns because he is sending -- no, I'm sorry.

Right. It is the first paragraph there. He is sending this to Mr. Martel at the embassy in Damascus and he is copying again -HON. BILL GRAHAM: May $I$ just go back to the business of the statement? MS EDWARDH: Sure.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: You would have to get somebody -- and I don't know whether the Commission wants to get in this type of business too deeply.

My legislative assistant would work with me in trying to get the best answers we could for the House of Commons; responsive, correct answers.

The problem often with the system is that the people preparing answers for the House of Commons are not -- you would have to find out, going through the paper trail here, to what extent this person who wrote that actually had either seen this memo or talked to Gar Pardy or what.

I get fed information through
so -- one of the problems in any large organization, $I$ don't care whether it's the Government of Canada or anything, is that these layers of information come to you and it kind of gets interpreted by different people.

I don't know who would have
prepared this. But I always -- and I am still the same in the present department $I$ am in. I sit down with my legislative assistant and I go through the questions and $I$ say, "Wait a minute.

I can't say that. Where is this coming from?" This is kind of -- everything's always phrased in very vague terms because then you can't, quotes, "get into trouble". So, who prepares it and on the basis of what? If it is really important to you, I think you would have to kind of dig a bit deeper. You might just find that it was prepared by somebody who didn't know all the facts. And so that may be the reason $I$ was provided it, as opposed to somebody deliberately trying to mislead.

I just don't know. You know, you can't know --

MS EDWARDH: No, you can't know
that. I appreciate that.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: The system is
so complicated.
But $I$ certainly agree with you in your conclusion that the statement on that piece of paper --

MS EDWARDH: Is misleading. HON. BILL GRAHAM: -- is not inconsistent with the documents you showed me. MS EDWARDH: It is inconsistent.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: It's not consistent, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Now, I want to go to the second consular visit, as I said to you, at tab 145. And there is just a note.

Mr. Pardy, who has obviously
picked up the signals from the last consular visit, says at the end of the first paragraph:
"Also to see whether there is any change in Maher's presentation/demeanour over the past six days."

So he is looking for, I suppose, a response to whether he still appears submissive, et cetera. He's got a concern; fair enough?

And so when the next consular visit does take place, we get at tab 147 an answer directly to Mr. Pardy's inquiry, at paragraph number 5 at tab 147.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: 147?
MS EDWARDH: That's correct, paragraph number 5. Mr. Martel answers directly the query about changes in his demeanour and presentation.
"Two changes were noticed in
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Maher's presentation. He did not seem to be disoriented anymore and he seemed to be able to speak freely and without fear. Officials have agreed that reading material such as Canadian magazines can be given to him. Mission will provide."

And I put to Mr. Pardy that it was certainly apparent, if you read this correctly, that Mr. Martel observed but did not record in the first consular visit that Mr. Arar was disoriented in that first consular visit.

That is the information he took. HON. BILL GRAHAM: That's a conclusion you could draw from this statement, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. We have --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Sorry. This is
to Mr. Pardy, is it, from Mr. Martel?
MS EDWARDH: Well, this is
instructions -- this is an answer from Mr. Martel and it does go to JPD. Do you see that?

And that is Mr. Pardy's
designation.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: So he is the first person on the "To" line.

The second person, for the record, on the "To" line is ISD, which is Mr. Livermore.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Okay. You know
the acronyms better than me.
MS EDWARDH: I've been studying
them, sir.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Good for you.
Lucky you.
MS EDWARDH: I do that for
recreation.
Then they are saying -- we will
come to whether there needs to be a better protocol for writing consular materials.

I want to bring you to one more tab, tab 640 .

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Six-four-zero?
MS EDWARDH: Yes. And that will be in Volume 7.

I'm sorry, I want to compare that -- my apologies, Mr. Registrar -- to tab 276, which is the note of the January 7th consular
visit. So you need both.
Tab 276, Mr. Commissioner, is in
Volume 3.
I just have some quick questions here.

It's quite clear that on January 7th Mr. Martel makes the observation that at the end of the meeting he -- and this is found in paragraph 9.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Paragraph 9 of 275?

MS EDWARDH: Of 276. That's
Volume 3.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, I have it.
MS EDWARDH: And paragraph 9
describes the conversation that Mr. Martel had at the end of the meeting. He says he spent considerable time discussing detention and he said that the Syrian officials:
"... went out of their way to
say Arar was receiving
special treatment. They said
he was being kept in a
separate room and not mixed with other detainees, was
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 given decent clothing and was provided with the necessary food and water."One of the troubling things is
that language "they went out of their way to say he was receiving special treatment, he was kept in a separate room" is, in fact, nothing more than a huge red flag being sent out; that if someone is being kept separate and apart -- and certainly Mr. Pardy seemed to understand that -- they are in isolation. They are not mixing with the prison population.

Do you recall, sir, ever being
told that Mr. Arar was being kept in isolation and not being mixed? A bad sign, a bad sign. Months of solitary confinement falls well below what would be experienced in this nation.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, I don't specifically recall that.

MS EDWARDH: You don't recall that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: But it would certainly depend on the nature of the institution you are being held in as to whether you want to be mixed with the common criminals or not.

I have heard of situations where people are quite happy not to be mixed with the general population.

MS EDWARDH: That's probably --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: There have been
lots of stories where you would rather not be mixed up with the general population.

So I don't know enough about their
system, $I$ don't know enough about this case, $I$ don't know enough to draw the conclusion you just drew. But $I$ certainly know enough to say that this says that he was being well looked after and in a separate room, which they are putting in a positive light. You are saying the reverse.

I don't know. I just wouldn't
know enough about the system as to whether or not you could draw from that an iron-tight conclusion that being in a separate room was a bad rather than perhaps a good thing. I don't know enough about the jails or who was in it.

But when you read the stories that you used to with the Gulags, there were times when if have read any of Solzhenitsyn, you will know very well people didn't want to be in a room with a bunch of other people who were going to steal
their clothes, beat them up, and generally treat them badly.

So I don't know enough about this jail or the conditions in it to know anything about whether this was good or bad.

MS EDWARDH: All right. So if I can just go back to the other memorandum which should be open on your desk, tab 640. I ask you to open that.

This is sent to Michael Chesson, copied to the ambassador in Damascus and also to Mr. Fry of your office. And this brings us forward to the August 14 th information that $I$ want to address to you.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: It is my last really important area.

It is pretty clear, Mr. Minister, that you went out on a limb when you spoke very shortly after the August $14 t h$ consular visit and announced that Mr. Arar independently confirmed that he had not been tortured, because there was nothing -- certainly we have established -nothing independent about it; fair enough?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, on the
basis of the documents, yes, we now have as opposed to what $I$ was told when $I$ was going downstairs to have my scrum --

MS EDWARDH: Okay.
MR. LIVERMORE: -- which I am
trying to, you know, reconstruct in my mind.
I am pretty cautious about the way
in which I approach these scrums. And while I have misspoken myself in scrums -- I did in the case of the Chicoutimi, for example, but it was based on information $I$ was given.

I normally am pretty careful about given information.

Now, I don't know whether somebody told me independently or whether $I$ was just given the overall impression that, look, this was by far the best consular visit, were by far the best sort of conditions, a feeling that Mr. Arar had been able to convey, you know, real truth without being inhibited.

That was the sort of sense I had when $I$ gave that scrum, and that's one of the reasons $I$ was really pleased to do it, because of course it had come after the allegations that had been made at the London meeting and which were of
great concern to us.
MS EDWARDH: Right. So let me just follow through with that a bit.

You knew that one of the focuses of this August 14th consular visit -- and I'm not going to put to you the language of rebut. But at least from your perspective, it was to explore the allegation that Mr. Arar may have been recently tortured or tortured at all.

That was one of the purposes of that visit?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: All right. And the information you got from your staff --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, because the statement in London obviously raised a lot of alarm bells to say, "Hey, we're going to go back and see him."

MS EDWARDH: Of course.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: There were two meetings, I think, wasn't there? One with the ambassador and then one with Mr. Martel, that actually saw Mr. Arar.

MS EDWARDH: Well, the person who had the consular visit, who met with Mr. Arar and
made the observations, was Mr. Martel.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: I want to know, sir,
do you have any recollection of who briefed you about that visit that left you with the impression or the information that there was this independent confirmation that he was not tortured?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: It probably
would have been either somebody from my office or my communications director, who would have talked to somebody in my office, who would have talked to somebody who would have received this information.

MS EDWARDH: So what is important for our purposes is, I take it then you are saying you have no recollection of speaking directly to Gar Pardy.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, no. I
mean, the way this happened was, as I said, I was going down to do a press scrum on Wellington Street in Toronto about Mr. Sampson --

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: And on the way down, my cell phone -- well, not my cell phone, but whoever was with me, their cell phone. They said, "Minister, we do have up-to-date information
about Mr. Arar and here's the up-to-date information."

So that would have come through my office. It certainly wouldn't -- I wouldn't have had direct contact with Gar Pardy. I was just being briefed by somebody in my office with their best understanding of what had taken place.

MS EDWARDH: All right. So we
can't trace that to anyone who would have the mandate, within consular affairs, that came up through a system.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: So let me just ask you this question. One of the concerns that people have had about your statement was that there were other things known about Mr. Arar's confinement. Indeed, on that very same visit, he said he had been mentally destroyed and made other comments about the size of his cell and that he had been kept in complete darkness.

You will agree with me -- well,
Mr. Minister, were you given that information? HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, no. I would have been just given the information that I gave to the press when I made that statement. I
wouldn't have been given -- we are talking about a 30 -second conversation.

MS EDWARDH: Sure.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Not a reading
of a briefing note or in-depth information, you
know? So that's about all I would have -- I would have been conveyed an impression but not the details.

MS EDWARDH: And certainly it's also fair to say if you had been told that he had remained for months alone in a tiny cell that was 3-by-6-by-7 and had been kept in darkness during those many months, only to have the privilege of access to either his gaolers or consular officials, you would never have said that this man has not been tortured, would you have, if you had known even those facts?
--- Pause
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I would have been more cautious in the language I used. I mean, we are getting into what is torture as opposed to detention. But $I$ certainly would have been more cautious, $I$ agree, with the language $I$ used.

MS EDWARDH: Well, certainly if
the conditions of confinement are such that someone is in fact robbed of their fundamental emotional and mental balance, and our understanding of torture certainly extends to psychological torture --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MS EDWARDH: -- I am going to put
it one more time: You would never have put yourself in a position, without a lot of advice, to say anything about whether he was or wasn't? HON. BILL GRAHAM: No. I was informed he had not been tortured, so that's what I said.

MS EDWARDH: And if you had known those three facts, you would have said no such thing; fair enough?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I certainly
would have been much more cautious about what I
said, yes. I believe what we were trying to
convey at that particular moment was that Mr. Arar was in good condition at that time.

You will recall that the
circumstances were that the meeting in London, my recollection was, it was suggested that he was being tortured at that time, and that was the
suggestion that came out of the London conference. So then I'm hit. They're saying, "You know, Mr. Arar is being tortured." I am able to say, no, we just saw him yesterday. He's not being tortured. I mean that's the only purpose of what I'm trying to say here.

I'm not trying to go through what happened to him four months before, or what happened to him the day before, and who he talked to, and whether his -- I mean, all I'm told is -there was a press conference at which it was said he was being tortured.

I was given information, we've seen him, he's not being tortured. We had one of the best meetings we ever had with him. It was one of the most open ones. He's not, actually being tortured. That's my recollection of how -MS EDWARDH: Fair enough. And indeed Mr. Pardy made the point to us, very clearly, that the focus of the consular visit was about whether he was being tortured now. That was his understanding of what was at issue, that was his understanding of the answer, and in a sense $I$ hear you saying that. The problem, Mr. Minister, that I
have with this, is it discloses a very interesting understanding of what is torture, because someone can be beaten to extract a confession, or someone can be maintained in conditions that constitute torture without a finger being laid on them -now, we're getting into the definition of torture.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: But everything that
you're saying about your conclusion implies you were confining your consideration to whether someone was beaten or abused in an interrogation process, rather than the whole context that could result in the destruction of someone emotionally?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: I was confining
my statement to what $I$ was told were the
conditions that $I$ was told to say were the
conditions. So that's all $I$ was doing.
I wasn't doing, in the 20 seconds
I had walking down the stairs, $I$ was not doing a three-hour analysis of -- you know, you can appreciate the circumstances.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, I can.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: So -- I mean, I
understand what you're saying to me, and I don't disagree with saying that there's an element to
something that would be torture that isn't necessarily just physical mistreatment. So I don't disagree with that. Whether that's appropriate in these circumstances, as $I$ say, my understanding of the circumstances was the allegation had been made he had been tortured and that I was told: "Look, we've had a good meeting with him. He's not being tortured. Go ahead and say that." So that's why I said it.

Maybe I went to far by saying "independently." You know, that may have been a bit of a -- that was perhaps something I shouldn't have said. But $I$ do believe it was an honest attempt on my part to convey to the press the best information we had at that time about his condition.

MS EDWARDH: Now, the only point I wish to make is, at no time at all during the whole period that Mr. Arar was in detention did your officials ever get a chance to truly understand the conditions of confinement of Mr. Arar.

They were never permitted to see where he was, where he stayed, the size of his
cell, whether he ever had exercise, or any of those -- those were taken right off the table. HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, the only time, and particularly $I$ personally knew about it, was when I met with Mr. Arar, when he came to my office and he described not only how he had been treated physically but also the conditions of his detainment, and so $I$ do not believe that any of the officials ever would have had an opportunity to do that.

MS EDWARDH: To do that. Until he
came home?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS EDWARDH: And $I$ want then to deal with -- I know my time's run out. I have one last question to ask you and then I'll sit down because I understand you have to leave here very soon, Mr. Minister.

My issue with you is about the consular agreement that was reached between the United States and Canada. I hesitate to call it an agreement. It's an understanding. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right. MS EDWARDH: And $I$ just want to make it very clear that despite all of its
frailties -- and we can describe them in detail, and I'm sure they're almost self-evident -- it was premised on a bona fide belief on your part that had you had notice, or should you get notice in a future case like that of Mr. Arar, that active representations could be made that would prevent -- likely prevent someone being removed to Guantanamo or Syria or Egypt if they were a Canadian citizen?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS EDWARDH: And you believe that to be the case?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: With an opportunity to speak directly and make those representations, cases like Mr. Arar will not happen to Canadian citizens?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, that's my belief. Because I think our understanding of this was that a certificate had to be signed by someone in high authority in the United States, and my belief that that certificate would not have been signed if we were able to get to Andy Card or someone in the White House or the National Security Council. We could say, "Look, there's a
real problem here." There would be a delay long enough where we could do something about it.

One of the biggest problems we had in this case was, before we could do anything, he was already gone, that decision was made, and Mr. Arar was gone.

I believe that the notice requirement -- preferably -- we would have preferred, obviously, a requirement that no one would be transferred, but we weren't going to get that from the United States authorities obviously --

MS EDWARDH: I understand.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: But it is my belief that, as a second best, this gives us the best guarantee of protection we can get.

MS EDWARDH: And that leads, I
suppose, inexorably to this statement that, had your officials read the situation differently and seen the risk Mr. Arar faced, which would have been "notice", then you, sir, on behalf of the department, would have gone into action at the highest levels to make representations to permit a Canadian citizen to be deported to Canada?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. If I had
been informed, of course, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And certainly, from
our perspective, it's clear that no such
information was ever given to you even if it was
of a tentative kind, that the Americans are
threatening or concerned about it? You got none of that in the first few days of Mr. Arar's detention? We know that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, we only
knew he had gone, was gone, when -- we still weren't sure where he was until October 21 , whenever it was.

MS EDWARDH: Before Mr. de Bané travelled to Syria, he had a briefing that, we understand, was given by Mr. Pardy. Did you, sir, attend that briefing?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: Were you briefed about that briefing?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No.
MS EDWARDH: So then you could not add anything at all to what the contents of that briefing was?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, I could not.

MS EDWARDH: Okay. Those are my questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,
Ms Edwardh.
Ms McIsaac?
EXAMINATION
MS McISAAC: Minister Graham, I'd
like to start my examination by simply having you review the various actions that Canadian officials took in response to the situation that Mr. Arar found himself in Syria.

And if $I$ could preface my question by just reminding you of those actions.

The first consular access, and the first visit, was on October 23, 2002.

On December 19, you called in the ambassador to Canada from Syria in order to discuss the Arar situation with him.

On January 27, you placed a call to the Syrian Foreign Minister, Mr. Shara'a.

On April 22, the parliamentarians, Ms Catterall and Mr. Assadourian, travelled to Syria and delivered a letter from you to the Syrians.

In the month of June, there was a
proposal to have you send directly to the Foreign Minister a letter, which was then overtaken by the Prime Minister's letter to the President in July. And indeed in September, I believe the evidence was, that there was discussions of having Mr. Chrétien actually call the President of Syria to follow up on the letter, but then the announcement was made that Mr . Arar was going to be returned to Canada.

Now, what I'd like you to do,
looking back on the response of Canadian
officials, and, in fact, using the benefit of hindsight, what is your assessment of the approach that was taken, and I guess the question really being: If you had it to do over again, are there other steps you believe you could have taken? --- Pause

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well -- yes, that's pretty difficult, to rewrite history. But it goes back a little bit to the question of Ms Edwardh to me about, well, if you had known the situation of Mr. Arar, you know, would this have been more intense?

I think, probably what we did here was, on the best advice of people who had been
through this situation before, a persistent continual ratcheting up of measures.

You start with the ambassador. What can you get there? Because if you start at the top and you shoot that and it's gone, then you've done everything and, hello, you missed. So you don't start at the Prime Minister, you start at the bottom and you work your way through the -- you work your way through the ambassador.

Then we used, as you say, the parliamentarian route and contacts and personal contacts, my contacts, meetings that you're at, international meetings.

And then ultimately, as $I$ say, the meeting with the Foreign Minister in New York, to raise it again, and ultimately, it's my belief -nobody else seems to agree with me very much because Mr. Arar was shortly released after that -- but I thought that my conversation with Amir Moussa had some effect, because I felt he was a very powerful guy in the Arab world, and $I$ think if he put through a phone call it would have had some effect.

So one was constantly looking for
wherever you could do that.
Now, if we had known the
circumstance, I might have picked up the phone with Amir Moussa three months earlier rather than taking advantage of a personal meeting I had? Perhaps.

If we had known the conditions, I think my conversations with Mr. Cellucci, the American Ambassador, $I$ would have said, "Look, this is -- you bear some responsibility for this. What are we going to do together about this?"

So, yes, we could have done things differently. But in the light of what we knew at the time and the nature of the practices of what we were trying to achieve, $I$ honestly believe we did, you know, the best we could and with the best motives and everyone was trying their best to get Mr. Arar out as quickly as we could.

Clearly we would have preferred that he had gotten out earlier, and I'm very sorry that he was not, for obvious reasons.

MS MCISAAC: All right. Thank
you.
Moving to a different topic.
Mr. Cavalluzzo raised with you, when you testified
on Monday, and if $I$ could ask the registrar to give the witness tab 262 , please?

This is your discussion with the Syrian ambassador in December --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: 262.
MS McISAAC: -- of 2002. 262,
please.
That would be your discussion with the Syrian ambassador?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, ma'am.
MS McISAAC: And Mr. Cavalluzzo
took you to your two messages, as I understand it, to the ambassador wire: (1) release Mr. Arar, we would like to have him come back to Canada or -and I'm reading from the third -- actually fourth paragraph:
"...Syria suspects that he is guilty, if they would charge him so that he could defend himself against the accusations. He noted..."
-- meaning you --
"...that he should not be held in limbo for a long time not knowing what he is
accused of doing."
And that was the message.
Then if $I$ could ask you to look at
tab 505?
HON. BILL GRAHAM: That's the one book I don't have.

MS McISAAC: Tab 505 is a letter dated May 9, 2003 from Mr. Neve, the Secretary General of Amnesty International?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS McISAAC: Do you have that, sir?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Open letter regarding the case of Maher Arar.

MS McISAAC: Yes. Just to situate you, this letter comes after the parliamentarians' trip to Syria and the threat at that point that Mr. Arar would be charged.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MS McISAAC: And if I could bring you to the second page of that letter -- again, it's the second paragraph:
"In light of these reports..."

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.

MS McISAAC: Mr. Neve says in his
open letter:
"In light of these reports, Amnesty International calls upon the Canadian government to make it absolutely clear to Syrian authorities, and to press the U.S. government to similarly make it clear to Syrian authorities, that the following international human rights standards must govern in this case:

- Mr. Arar must be released immediately if he is not charged with a recognizably criminal offence.
- If such charges are laid and relate to accusations of involvement in the Muslim Brotherhood, there must be specific allegations of his involvement in criminal activity, beyond mere membership. Detention on the
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basis of mere membership in the Muslim Brotherhood, without further charges of a recognizably criminal offence, would contravene international human rights standards such as those guaranteeing freedom of expression and freedom of association."

And next:
"- Any trial of recognizably
criminal charges, must meet
international standards for a
fair trial and should not be
conducted in secret by a
military court or tribunal.
Mr. Arar's right to legal
counsel and to visits with
his family must be
scrupulously respected. If
Syrian authorities are not
prepared to respect
Mr. Arar's right to a fair
trial, he should be released

StenoTran
or returned to stand trial in Canada."

And could I ask you, please, to comment on your discussions with the ambassador and how what you were asking for compares to what was being stated by Mr. Neve?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I think Mr. Neve is basically saying in his letter, in many ways, what we've tried to do in many of these cases.

Amnesty is a very respected organization that has had tremendous experience here, and we're all in these situations where, if somebody is held abroad, your first desire is to get the person home. That was clearly what our preferred route was too.

But since the Syrians had been
saying to us they intended to try him for, particularly, this Muslim Brotherhood, I think Mr. Neve in his letter to me is basically saying what we then tried to achieve.

You say, okay, if you're going to try him -- there's no way we can force you to hand him over to us, so then the only alternative is, apart from just leaving him in limbo, which as

I've said is not acceptable, is to have a trial which would be as open and fair and as transparent as possible.

I know counsel for the Commission expressed with me the other day some cynicism about the possibility of that, you know, in Syria, and I think that's a recognizable fact in dealing with many countries around the world where the trial procedures and protections for individuals are never the same.

So what we try and do in those circumstances is, at the same time, impress upon the foreign government that we want access, we want the fair trial, and, if possible, we try and get an observer or somebody appointed who can move that along.

In this case we went to
Mr. Lockyer to see if we could have somebody there. If we felt there was going to be a trial, we said, well okay, let's see if we can put some pressure on the government, et cetera.
So, again, this is not unlike our
previous conversation about the consular agreement with the United States. It's a second best, but it's better than the worst alternative, which is
to do nothing and to have the person in a state of incarceration without any redress.

MS McISAAC: Just being conscious of the time, sir, I'll just have one last question for you, and that is: You may be aware that Ms Catterall testified, $I$ believe it was yesterday, and possibly the day before as well, that she had some concern about the extent to which you were aware of the gravity of Mr. Arar's situation in Syria, and $I$ was wondering if you would have a comment with respect to her concern? HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, I didn't see Marlene's testimony, but I do recall that when she came back from Syria, she said to me, "I did not appreciate, you know, how serious these charges were against Mr. Arar. You know, why didn't you", I guess, "give me more of a heads up or something?"

And I think what I said to her
was, "Look, I mean, I can't -- I don't know what the Syrians were going to tell you about Mr. Arar and don't necessarily accept everything they say at face value. But $I$ did my best to convey to you there were problems, but we believed he should be brought back. He's a Canadian, we should bring
him back."
I wasn't going to, you know, paint for her some sort of a picture that there's a host of allegations against him which could be totally and utterly foundless. So I gave her the basic facts.

She then, I think, found that the Syrians, when she got there, had, you know, raised allegations that were much more serious, in her mind, than what $I$ had conveyed to her at the time.

I wasn't seeking to misconvey to her. I told her that we had problems. That's why she was going.

So I can't -- I don't know exactly
what motivated her to take that position, but I tried to tell her facts, but $I$ didn't try to paint Mr. Arar in a worse position than we believed was appropriate.

MS McISAAC: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,
Ms McIsaac.
Mr. Cavalluzzo?
EXAMINATION
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Mr. Minister, I
have four or five questions --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, sir.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- and we'll have
you out of here in short order.
The first question relates to a
number of questions you were asked relating to disputes within government between agencies, between ministries, and so on and so forth, and the effect hopefully at the end of the day is that Canada speaks with one voice, and you were shown a number of decks and memos concerning possible solutions.

The question that I have for you is, in these particular circumstances, when Mr. Pardy was using his best efforts to get Mr. Arar back but was running into some interference from other agencies who had their own mandates and so on and so forth --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- the question
that $I$ have for you is: What was the Privy Council Office doing?

Isn't the Privy Council Office to be the centre at which these disputes within government should be resolved so that Canada speaks with one voice?

And the question is a simply one:
Where was the Privy Council Office?
--- Pause
HON. BILL GRAHAM: I do not recall
speaking to the Clerk personally about these issues, but $I$ would have to believe that in the interdepartmental, you know, discussions that Mr. Pardy was having, there would have been a representative from PCO there.

There normally would be, and it would either be the Assistant Secretary for Foreign Affairs or the security person who would be there.

I mean, you'd have to check the record to see. I'd be quite surprised if that were not the case.

And ultimately, of course, the Privy Council Office would have been involved when it was decided to send a letter by the Prime Minister, because they would be directly involved in making sure that that letter was in conformity with what they thought was the appropriate thing for the Prime Minister to say, and you will recall that letter was basically the same as the one that we were arguing about that $I$ didn't send.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: But ultimately, so that we properly understand the machinery of government, it is the role of the Privy Council Office to resolve these differences so that, at the end of the day, Canada speaks with one voice? HON. BILL GRAHAM: It's the role of the Privy Council Office to resolve them at the bureaucratic level; it is the role of the Cabinet, and personal relationships between the Prime Minister and Ministers, to resolve them at the political level.

And sometimes the role of
government, the object is, if at all possible, to resolve them at the bureaucratic level before you take them up to meetings between Ministers and the Prime Minister, but we do that, in the normal course of government, all the time.

When I was Foreign Affairs
Minister, I assumed what $I$ was doing was absolutely right and the Defence Minister didn't know what he was talking about. I now assume the reverse.
--- Laughter / Rires

> It is the natural human nature of things.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right.
The second question relates to questions relating to torture and whether, if you were notified of the torture allegations, whether -- you said before that would have energized you.

And the question that you had, when you were responding to me and Ms Edwardh, is whether there would be any different result and it's hard to speculate.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: But we do have empirical evidence before us as to what happened when you did hear of the allegations of torture, and of course I'm talking about in the summer of 2003, when the Syrian Human Rights Committee stated in their report that $M r$. Arar was tortured. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm. MR. CAVALLUZZO: And what you did, and we don't have to go back to the documents, but what you did, you immediately tried to call the Syrian Foreign Minister, had trouble getting through to him.

However, you sent your Assistant Deputy Minister in to see the Syrian Ambassador to

Canada. He sat down and protested, and so on and so forth.

And lo and behold, what happened within a few days was that Mr. Pillarella was called in to the Syrian office and was told that Mr. Arar could have the next consular visit on August 14.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you recall
that, that Pillarella --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes, yes -- no.
Certainly, sir, yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: So that it would appear that -- and just to put total context here. Mr. Arar's previous visit was April 22. So it was a huge period of time between April 22 and August 14.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: So that I'm
putting it to you, when you became aware of the allegation of torture, that you did become energized, you had your officials do certain things, and $I$ suggest to you that there were results.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Mm-hmm. Well,
we certainly got faster movement. At least we got the consular visit, as you say, and I think there was the discussion, too, with the head of intelligence that was in the record, yes.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, the third question is related to that, and that is, that we got into the press scrum on August 14, and you were given certain information and you responded as a result of that information; and the focus of your officials at that time was to physical torture, as Ms Edwardh pointed out.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right. MR. CAVALLUZZO: And probably the reason for that is that the Syrian Human Rights Committee had alleged a certain physical torture, and your officials seemed to be suggesting that you should go in to see Mr. Arar and find out if that was going on, and so on and so forth. And the question that $I$ have is, as Ms Edwardh has pointed out, the fact that someone is mentally destroyed, as a result of his conditions of detention, is torture, within the meaning of the Convention Against Torture. HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes. MR. CAVALLUZZO: And the question
that I have for you is that, after Mr. Arar's situation, you said that you were going to -- or within the department, you were going to instigate a study or a report so that your officials would become more sensitized to torture in countries like Syria.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: And once again, I ask you -- you instigated that report, and I'm once again -- I'm asking Government counsel, I guess, at this point in time, whether we do have such a report.

We've asked for that information before, and $I$ just want to know if we have the report or not, because $I$ think it would be very useful for the inquiry, and $I$ do put that --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: You'll recall that I -- this was sort of November. What are our lessons learned? How do we do better? I changed portfolios in January, so $I$ wouldn't be -- but it was my understanding that this was a work that was ongoing in the department. But $I$ couldn't speak to it.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: We'll check to see if we could get that report, because I think
it would be very useful to us, if it exists.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: The fourth
question $I$ have for you relates to Mr. Pillarella, and, as you know, he was the Ambassador in Syria at the time.

You were asked certain questions by Ms Edwardh as to whether it was appropriate for Mr. Pillarella to get an investigation report that was done by the Syrians respecting Mr. Arar, and your response was a common-sense one; that is, if we're going to try to do everything we can to help Mr. Arar, the more information we have, the better, and you said that you thought that Mr. Pillarella would have been derelict if he didn't take that information back.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Right.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: And perhaps
that's correct. But I guess the important question isn't whether Mr. Pillarella got the information from Syria, but isn't the important question as to what Mr. Pillarella or DFAIT did with the information after they came back -- or after the information came back to Canada? For example, were you aware that
that information was shared with CSIS and the RCMP ?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Specifically, no, but -- I mean, I'd have to sit down and have a discussion about the appropriateness of whether that is to be shared or not. But the fact that it was shared? No, I wouldn't have known that.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: And that's
certainly a very important question --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: But I would make the assumption that any information that came into my department, that related to national security issues, we have Mr. Livermore's office there that acts as coordinator, and whatever is the appropriate action to be taken in respect of that information will be taken by the department. MR. CAVALLUZZO: But as a lawyer, wouldn't you have a concern -- wouldn't you have a concern if a Canadian detained overseas is under investigation, for example, by the RCMP, and I sit down with my consular official and I'm totally candid, tell my consul official everything that I think is relevant to why I'm in detention, and that information is brought back to Canada and shared with the RCMP, who is investigating me? As
a lawyer, instinctively, don't you find that offensive?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: We'd have to look and see whether or not it was inconsistent with Canadian law and practice.

I mean, there's a lot of things, as I said, that when we discussed Bill C-36 and changed the Criminal Code to deal with how we respond to terrorism, we anguished a great deal about how we would get the right balance between protecting civil liberties but ensuring that a subway bombing like Madrid does not occur in Canada and that Canadians are properly protected, and that balance is presumably what this Commission is all about.

And so I don't think that my opinion, one way or another -- because you'll be familiar with all these circumstances. You'll have to make -- the Commissioner will have to make that judgment, if it was appropriate in these circumstances.

But I do say to you that, as someone who is in Canadian public life, I believe that the Canadian public strongly believe that they must be protected by their government, which
is one of the fundamental obligations of government, as well as to make sure that our civil liberties are protected, and then they expect us to be able to find the right balance to do that. MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right. And certainly there are a number of factors that you take into account. But that very information -or that very information that we're talking about in this case, raises in spades that very important question --

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Absolutely. MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- about the
appropriate balance --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- between
national security and civil liberties --
HON. BILL GRAHAM: This case -- I
guess that's why we're having this inquiry.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Final question,
Minister. You were asked a number of questions relating to whether Mr. Pardy gave you information.

And the first question $I$ would have is -- you've known Mr. Pardy for a while. You were his Minister. And I'm wanting to know
whether you could express your view as to Mr. Pardy's performance in his position as the head of consular services while he was under your supervision.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well,
Mr. Pardy -- I mean, how well I knew Mr. Pardy -I met with him on several occasions. So what I'm going to speak to, to some extent, is his reputation in the department, which is only hearsay from my perspective.

But I have to say that, as his Minister, my understanding of Mr. Pardy was that he was a highly motivated, extremely capable, and very entrepreneurial person who did his best to achieve results in some of the trickiest situations in which Canadians can sometimes find themselves and where there is no easy solution and no -- often where there's no real law or not many guide books.

Mr. Pardy was extraordinarily
effective and very respected in the role in which he played, and $I$ think -- he was certainly appreciated by me; and my experience was, talking to people that were in the position of Ms Mazigh and others that had dealt with him, that they
always felt that he was going to bat for them and doing his best possible job.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: My final question
relates to communications between you and
Mr. Pardy. You were asked a number of questions as to, well, did Mr. Pardy tell you this? Did Mr. Pardy tell you that?

How did you communicate with Mr. Pardy? Was it just through these Q\&A's that we looked at, was it through briefing notes, or did people in your office communicate with Mr. Pardy?

HON. BILL GRAHAM: No, sir. I mean, you can appreciate, with all -- everything else I'm doing, I'm doing my job, and I had 12 political staff on my floor, including links with the department. Mr. Fry in my office, who will be giving evidence --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: -- was the person on top of this file, and he might have talked to Mr. Pardy several times in a week whereas $I$ would only talk to him once a month. But he would have been in regular contact with him, along with the other
parliamentarians, with Ms Mazigh, with other actors in this case on a regular basis.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay.
Thank you, Minister. Those are my
questions.
HON. BILL GRAHAM: Well, thank you very much, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,
Mr. Cavalluzzo.
Thank you -- let me thank you,
Minister, on my behalf and the people working in the Commission, for the time and effort you have put in to giving your evidence, coming here -you've had to come back twice, I appreciate that, and the straightforward and helpful way, thoughtful way, that you have given your evidence. I'm very appreciative of that.

HON. BILL GRAHAM: Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner. I have to say that, as I said, obviously you have a very heavy responsibility, because getting the balance right, in a free and democratic society, with the threats that are there today, is probably one of the biggest challenges we have, and $I$ want to wish you and counsel the best, and I'd like to say to Mr. Arar,

Mrs. Arar, that no doubt things might have been better handled if we had known everything in retrospect, but $I$ honestly believe that the people in our public service are motivated by the highest desire of conduct to help people and do the right thing in these very difficult circumstances, and I was very proud to be their Foreign Minister. Thank you, sir.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

We will then rise, and we're going
to resume at -- two o'clock? Two o'clock.
THE REGISTRAR: Please stand.
--- Upon recessing at 12:14 p.m. /
Suspension à 12 h 14
--- Upon resuming at 2:03 p.m. /
Reprise à 14 h 03
THE REGISTRAR: Please be seated.
Veuillez vous asseoir.

MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner,
Mr. Pardy has asked me to make a request of you with respect to his testimony.

I have canvassed my friend and,
given my own anticipated cross-examination -- or re-examination, which of course is always
difficult -- I have my doubts that we will be able to finish this afternoon.

Mr. Pardy is understandably concerned, as am I, that his evidence going in piecemeal with witnesses in between, raising issues which, because of his position, he has to respond to, is simply not an expeditious way of doing it.

We appreciate that the Commission has a schedule, and we certainly concur with the Commission's desire to stick to that schedule, but if the result is that Mr. Pardy's evidence, which is obviously extraordinarily important evidence, does not go in in a sort of fixed, coherent manner, that is not fair to Mr. Pardy. It is not helpful to the Commission.

And my strong suspicion is that,
once we hear some of the witnesses who are scheduled for the week after next, it will be necessary to hear additional evidence from Mr. Pardy in any event.

Accordingly, it is our request that if we can find another date where we could finish Mr. Pardy's testimony -- I understand Mr. Cavalluzzo has some questions, Ms Edwardh
could complete her cross-examination in one session, and then I could complete my re-examination -- it would be far better for all concerned.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Cavalluzzo, how long will your examination be?

MR. CAVALLUZZO: My examination
will be no longer than 15 minutes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Ms Edwardh, how long do you think you will be?

MS EDWARDH: I would expect, Mr. Commissioner, to be around 90 minutes, maybe ten or fifteen minutes more, depending on how loquacious my friend is, or I am.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have any comment on the suggestion made by Ms McIsaac?

MS EDWARDH: I think Ms McIsaac's observation that it isn't really fair for Mr. Pardy to have his evidence dribble in, where in fact he finds himself doing a running commentary on everyone else's evidence, I think that is a very fair observation.

I had hoped by making really solid
efforts to bring my cross-examination to a close in around 90 minutes that that would have left my
friend sufficient time to do re-examination. And I understand there may be matters that are quite narrowly defined that require Mr. Pardy's re-attendance, and that of course is up to Commission counsel and Ms McIsaac. I may indeed be of that view as well.

But it would be from my perspective ideal if we could get done basically today, and then deal with recalling him if it was necessary.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Ms McIsaac, how long do you expect
to be?
MS McISAAC: Of course it's always difficult, sir, but $I$ had anticipated it might actually be as long as two and a half to three hours -- hopefully less. That is certainly an outside estimate.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think there is an advantage -- we will go ahead this afternoon.

Mr. Pardy, let me say to you that I think it is unfortunate if we have to do it in a piecemeal basis and you do have to come back a third time.

First of all, from my standpoint, I can assure you that $I$ am able to understand the evidence, and even though it's done in a piecemeal basis I am able to follow it and put it in perspective.

I think it is important that we proceed, and clearly we are going to be able to finish Ms Edwardh's cross-examination today. Government counsel may or may not finish. I say this with respect, Ms McIsaac. Typically, because you are efficient and get to the point, you take much less time than you do estimate.

If we can finish today, I think
that is good. And if we have to sit late, I am prepared to do that.

It may be that you will have to come back because there is further evidence. Other witnesses are in the same position. That is the nature of a public inquiry.

But I think that we should go
ahead and do the best we can and make the best use of our time.

So we will proceed.
Mr. Cavalluzzo?
PREVIOUSLY SWORN: HENRY GARFIELD PARDY

EXAMINATION
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Commissioner, there are two areas that $I$ would like to spend with Mr. Pardy. One is the area of documents that have become less redacted in terms of the process, after Mr. Pardy's evidence last week, and also an area concerning Senator de Bané, who testified yesterday.

I would initially like to refer to the less-redacted document.

Maybe we will look at the memo of June 5th. You will recall there are two memos, June 3rd and June 5th, which are virtually identical.

But we can look at the June 5th memo, which is Exhibit $\mathrm{P}-103$.

Mr. Pardy, I took you through other aspects of this memorandum, you may recall, in your direct examination last week. However, I would like to refer you this afternoon to those portions which have been removed in terms of redactions, starting at paragraph numbered 9 .

I am going to be dealing with paragraphs 9 through 13.

Starting with paragraph 9, it
deals with the police interest in Mr. Arar. At that point in time, once again we are at June 5th of 2003 .

In your memorandum, you set out what the interest of the police is in Mr. Arar. For example, you say:
"... CSIS initially indicated
that it had no interest in Mr. Arar ..."

And Canadian police officials
have:
"... stated that their interest in Mr. Arar was based on his contacts with persons in Ottawa who were of interest to them."

So we see that the interest is related to contacts or associations with other people.

The paragraph goes on to identify who those contacts are, Mr. Almalki and Mr. El Mati, who are both, it says, former residents of Ottawa. And it goes on to describe their detention situation in Egypt and Syria.

And the question $I$ would have at
this point in time: This description of the police interest and the CSIS interest in Mr. Arar as of June 5th, 2003, was given to you at the meeting with CSIS and the RCMP on or about May 12th of 2003?

MR. PARDY: No. It goes back to the discussions we had with them on October 16 , 2002, the memorandum that Superintendent Wayne Pilgrim sent to us on October 18th, and certainly there were other discussions then over that intervening period, coming up to, as you say, the meeting at the PCO on May 12 th .

Certainly it is an encapsulation
of that information.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay. Regardless of the evolution, the fact is that paragraph 9 would set out the status of the police interest in Mr. Arar as of June 5th, 2003?

MR. PARDY: I think so, yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, paragraph
10, the unredacted portion now, deals with information from Canadians to Americans. I won't read the whole thing but point out that in the second sentence it says:

```
"In your meetings ..."
```
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And of course this a memorandum or letter to the Minister Graham:
"In your meetings with the American Ambassador and Secretary of State Powell late last year, both stated that American action in deporting Mr. Arar was based on information from Canadian authorities. The American Ambassador reiterated this in response to a question from a member of parliament in a private meeting a few weeks ago."

Can you identify who that Member of Parliament is?

MR. PARDY: No. I think perhaps a bit of shorthand was used there. This was the dinner meeting at the Ottawa Harvard Club, and I was under the impression when $I$ wrote this that the information had come through Ms Catterall, but I think subsequent testimony has said that Ms Catterall received it from an official in the PMO.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right. And I understand that the information that you received was that on April 29th of 2003, Mr. Cellucci was speaking to the Harvard Club of Ottawa and in that speech indicated that there were Canadians who did not want Mr. Arar back.

Is that fair, words to that
effect?
MR. PARDY: That summarizes the consistent position that the American government, or officials in the American government, took with us, yes.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Then the memorandum goes on and it states it is clear the RCMP was consulted by the Americans prior to their decision to deport Mr. Arar, but again we have no complete understanding of what was discussed. Now, just two questions there. In terms of this information that the RCMP was consulted by Americans, was that, once again, coming from that October 18th, 2002, memorandum from Wayne Pilgrim to you?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: And then it goes on to state:
"We have no complete understanding of what was discussed."

Why is it as of June 5th, 2003,
that you do not have a complete understanding? MR. PARDY: Well, I think it's the issue which has been amply described over the last few days: that the RCMP's method of operation was that they did not share information that related to criminal investigations with people outside of the force. That, I think, still continues to be the case and some people have argued that that is one of the essential principles of democratic government.

And that was clearly the case. We did not have the details, and we were sort of looking back into that area, $I$ think, with some measure of not knowing exactly just what was going on in that particular sector.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: So this is
virtually almost, well, October, three months -nine months after the event, you still don't have a better understanding of what was said and discussed between the Americans and the RCMP? MR. PARDY: No. I think on that
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very specific issue, the most precise information we ever had was that contained in Superintendent Pilgrim's message or memo of October 18th.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: We move on to the next paragraph, which is paragraph 11 in the June 5th memo, dealing with the CSIS visit in November of 2002 .

It states:
"CSIS officials visited Syria earlier this year and discussed Mr. Arar with their counterparts."

Now, did you know that their counterparts were the Syrian Military Intelligence at this point in time?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay. It goes on:
"They did not meet Mr. Arar." And then it says:
"Subsequent to these discussions, Syrian officials informed us that they were informed by CSIS officials that Canada did not want to
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have Mr. Arar returned. The CSIS officials denied that they had said this to the Syrian..."

And then the next part was
unredacted before.
Dealing with this, once again, it seems to be a perennial problem.

Just to give you some context from your earlier evidence and the evidence of Minister Graham, before January 16th of 2003, DFAIT officials, including the Minister, were advised that the Syrians were getting a message from somebody that Canada or certain agencies or people in Canada did not want Mr. Arar back.

Do you recall that evidence?
MR. PARDY: Yes, and I am just
trying to think. The date you use is January 16th, 2003. Was that the first instance in which we were given this information by the Syrians?

MR. CAVALLUZZO: January 16th. I used that date because that was the call from Mr. Graham to Mr. Shara'a, the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

MR. PARDY: I would need to check
the written record. We received this information from the Syrians on three occasions, it's my recollection: once from the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; once, I think, from the General; and once from the Syrian Ambassador here in Ottawa.

It was a consistent message, but it was spread over six to eight weeks. But I can't recall when we heard it for the initial time.

Can somebody remind me of that, when it was first said?

MS McISAAC: The January C4 from Ambassador Pillarella, which we will find, where the Ambassador says that he received -- that is the one in which he said they told them Mr. Arar didn't want to come home, and that the CSIS -- the security services didn't want him.

We will find the reference for
that in a minute. It's January.
MR. PARDY: Was that the
conversation, though, with the Deputy Foreign Minister or the general? That is what $I$ can't recall. In any event --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: In any event, you
are getting a number of messages --
MR. PARDY: A number of messages.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- from the
Syrians saying what's going on with you guys.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: And then on
January $16 t h$ or thereabouts we have the Minister of Foreign Affairs of this country phoning the Syrians, in particular the Syrian Foreign Minister, and says "Whatever you have heard, the message is clear: Canada wants Mr. Arar back"?

MR. PARDY: Yes. And as you know, from the very first message we sent to the embassy in Damascus from the Department of Foreign Affairs, that message was that we wanted Mr. Arar back, and $I$ don't think that there is one message in the thousands of pages that you have there of our work on this case that would indicate any hesitation on that issue whatsoever on our part. MR. CAVALLUZZO: And $I$ certainly don't dispute that.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: But there appears to be hesitation from others, and let me bring you through time.

MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: The next event we have after January 16 is we come to March 21, and at a meeting between a couple of Members of Parliament and Ambassador Arnous, he once again indicates that there is, if we can put it nicely, confusion in the Syrians' minds as to what Canada wants in respect of Mr. Arar's release.

Of course, I'm talking about that memorandum -- or note that was taken by Myra Pastyr-Lupul. It says that Catterall and Assadourian had met Arnous, and this is what was said.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay.
So here we are, three months
later, a couple of months later, still confusion in the Syrians' mind.

We then have the April 22 visit of the two parliamentarians to Damascus and Mr. Arar, and lo and behold, here we are, June 5, 2003, which is a period of at least six months, half a year, where we are still of the view that Syrians still may be confused as to what the intentions of Canada are.

So that the question $I$ have is a very simple one, and that is: Could no one, no one, speak to CSIS and say, "Could you send a three-line letter to the Syrians and say, "Forget about this confusion, ambiguity, whatever you want to call it, the Government of Canada, including CSIS, wants Mr. Arar back in Canada"? Did anyone ever do that?

MR. PARDY: We had some meetings, and as you see in the third sentence in paragraph 11 I report that CSIS officials denied that they had said this to the Syrians.

The conversation that Ms Catterall and Mr. Assadourian had with Ambassador Arnous on March 21 or 20 , the day before, $I$ think it was, brought out the element that maybe the Syrians were confused as to the intent of a comment that the CSIS officials had made, and certainly what we were trying to do throughout this whole period, as you will recall, is to get some degree of coherence within the Canadian position. We never achieved that until the Prime Minister intervened, and $I$ think the first intervention wasn't just the letter to the President of Syria but I think the first intervention was a letter to Dr. Mazigh,
where the Prime Minister set out what his position was on the issues, and that was the first time.

But security and police
organizations, $I$ think they are all over 21 and they can answer for themselves as to why they did not feel -- I can sort of interpret to a certain extent --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: I don't want you
to interpret. They will be here and they will answer these questions.

MR. PARDY: Exactly, and I
think -- but certainly from the perspective of our actions, we tried to convince the Syrians that there was no ambiguity on the part of the position of the Government of Canada.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: And doesn't
that -- certainly as a Canadian, I'm very
concerned that we have a Canadian lingering in jail in a foreign country such as Syria, with, as I said before, not a stellar human rights record, while it would seem to me a simple letter of three lines, or no more, could have clarified this confusion in the Syrians' minds and could have activated them in some way so that Mr. Arar could have returned to Canada earlier than he did --

MR. PARDY: That's one inter -I'm sorry, I'm interrupting you.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: No.
MR. PARDY: That is one
interpretation.
Another interpretation, I mean, over a long experience of dealing with governments. Governments interpret information to their maximum advantage.

My view would have been, or one element in certainly my views on all of this, is that the Syrians themselves found it advantageous to establish some ambiguity as far as the position of the Government of Canada was concerned.

I don't think they were ready to release Mr. Arar much before they actually did so, for a variety of reasons that we went over in my direct testimony.

And so in the sense of whether or not $a, ~ a s ~ y o u ~ p u t ~ i t, ~ a ~ t h r e e-l i n e ~ l e t t e r ~ f r o m ~$ CSIS to the Syrian Military Intelligence would have made much difference, I'm -- I'm not sure.

The Syrians were quite comfortable, $I$ think, in terms of where they found themselves and whether or not they overinterpreted
or misinterpreted a comment by CSIS officials, well, maybe next week or the week after you might have a chance to examine some of this.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Well, the problem with that, Mr. Pardy, is you say that the Syrians took the advantage --

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- of the failure
to clarify the confusion. It would seem to me, why not eliminate the advantage, so that they can no longer, if they were taking advantage of the ambiguity, eliminate it? It's one more factor that --

MR. PARDY: This was a more robust case, if $I$ can use that term, in terms of the events that were going on around it.

In other cases, the Syrians just didn't -- as far as they were concerned, they didn't even need an advantage. They just denied all possible access to the Canadians that were in detention and basically just acted accordingly.

In this case, there was this additional level of sophistication, if $I$ can use that term.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right. Well
then, let us move on.
Paragraph 12 talks about what kind of leverage we have with the Syrians at that point in time, and it talks about the current tensions between the Syrians and the United States concerning their role in Iraq.

I guess we had discussed this earlier, to a certain extent, as to the considerations that would be part of the equations that the Syrians would be assessing in terms of releasing Mr. Arar or not.

And there's another -- I guess another political factor that we should bring to bear, and that of course is, at around this point in time there was legislation introduced in the American Congress, in particular on April 12, 2003, wherein the Americans were discussing taking economic sanctions against Syria.

And in fact over time the President did decide that he was going to pursue economic sanctions against Syria.

And presumably that would be another political consideration that we have to put into the equation in terms of the Syrians' response at this point in time.

MR. PARDY: Very much so.
I think I've given some comment on this issue, of those larger geopolitical issues that were playing, and $I$ think it's instrumental the title given to the American legislation that was being discussed throughout most of 2003 in Washington and was, I think, signed into law by President Bush in January of 2004 , the title of that legislation was the Syrian Accountability Act and Lebanese Sovereignty.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Restoration Act.
MR. PARDY: Sovereignty
Restoration. Which gives you, really, in a very concise phrase, American policy with respect to both Lebanon and Syria.

And Syria being the object of both issues, if you like, as detailed in that legislation, were obviously concerned, and I think their efforts in the -- certainly in the months of 2003, and I think there is some, certainly, evidence out there in the media that the Syrians were making every effort to establish sort of an operational relationship with the United States, and unfortunately, Mr. Arar was part of the -- I don't want to say "bargaining" here, it's not
quite the right word -- but certainly was an element in the discussions.

And that, $I$ think perhaps more than anything else, was a determining factor in Syrian decision-making.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, the final paragraph that I'd like to refer to in Exhibit P-103 is paragraph 13 -- this once again is the June 5 memo -- and it relates to the cooperation of CSIS and the RCMP, and it states:
"In recent days, we have discussed the case with both CSIS and the RCMP. They have maintained their positions that Mr. Arar, while not under investigation in

Canada, is a person of interest to them because of the evidence of his connections with others who are. In these circumstances, they will not provide any direct support in having Mr. Arar returned to Canada."

I just want to ensure that we're
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aware that as of June 5, 2003, that this was the position of CSIS and the RCMP. That they would not provide direct support to having Mr. Arar returned to Canada.

MR. PARDY: Yes, $I$ think this accurately reflects my understanding of their position, and I think subsequent to this memo, as we tried to firm up the language in the letter that we wanted Mr. Graham to send to his Syrian counterpart, $I$ think the evidence on record would show that there was probably a hardening of their position in the aftermath of this memo.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: And is there
any -- do you have any idea as to why their positions would be hardening subsequent to this memo?

MR. PARDY: No. Whether or not through their system, their investigations, they were getting additional information; but certainly I found, when they provided language -- when we suggested that maybe we can upgrade the language that Mr . Graham would include in his letter, they came back with language which said to the effect that there is now a national security investigation of Mr. Arar, and that I regarded as
a considerable increase in their position.
Before, as $I$ said here, that Mr. Arar was a person of interest, and then we've jumped to the language that they had suggested, that he is subject to a national security investigation.

Now, I do not know what a national security investigation represents. They capitalized the words in their thing to us. And whether there was any such thing. But the language itself denotes that a hardening of -- not a hardening, an increase in their views as far as Mr. Arar was concerned.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, you said something earlier in your testimony which may be related to this, and I'd like some assistance from you on this, and that is, you were discussing with either me or Ms Edwardh about the strategy of having a political campaign to support -- or a highly public campaign to support the efforts of getting a Canadian detained abroad back to Canada. One of the things you said interested me, and that is that that kind of highly visible or public strategy may have a negative impact on certain agencies in Canada. Do you recall that testimony?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I do.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you think that
that was operating here as far as RCMP and CSIS was concerned as Mr. Arar's public campaign in Canada became more visible, their position hardened somewhat?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
My testimony, I think, was that my
main concern was that the activities in Canada, in support of Mr. Arar, was going to be detrimental to our efforts with the Syrians.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right.
MR. PARDY: And in terms of my own
experience over the years, that's been the main dynamic that I've been concerned with, with respect to campaigns such as this in Canada. But in this case, and it's very
rare, I think, as you probably know, for us to have a case like this, where the role of CSIS and the RCMP are so important.

But over that time, and $I$ think in answer to a question from Ms Edwardh, I said that I think one of the issues here, because Ms Edwardh was trying to make the point to me that this publicity was quite instrumental in convincing the

Canadian government to take action, and I said, no, it was my view that perhaps it had a detrimental effect on the position of the RCMP and CSIS and they're willing to be cooperative on this issue.

And that's a thought that had not appeared before in any of my previous experiences, by and large. We've never had a case like this quite before.

It's an idea that certainly $I$ had given some thought to and I think I've said to -and I've concluded that, yes, that certainly would be an element that had led to this hardening of the position here.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Well, I find that absolutely amazing, that a Canadian agency would harden its position as a result of people exercising their guaranteed freedom of expression under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Are you sure that you think that's what caused or was part of the hardening of their position?

MR. PARDY: No, I said it was one of the elements that went into it.

I don't know whether or not there
was additional evidence that had been collected that would give support to some of their original suspicions.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right.
MR. PARDY: But when asked about the various elements that could have gone into this --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right.
MR. PARDY: -- I identified this as one of them, yes.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay.
Interesting.
There is another document, P-104, which $I$ wonder if the witness may be of assistance to.

This is another document that has been added since your testimony. And you may be able to help us; you may not recognize it.

We originally had -- as you can see it's an e-mail dated November 19, 2002 , from Jonathan Solomon to Gar and Myra, your colleague, and it says:
"We should make sure that the press line that comes out is talks about DFAIT as a whole
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and not only of the Consular section. I would also suggest that 'have no information linking her husband with terrorist organization' is not strictly accurate. Better to say 'We have no reason to believe that he is a member of a terrorist organization'."

And the other document has printing on it. This is three pages in. And this is the addition is this new document with the either printing or handwriting on it, and I'm wondering, is that your handwriting?

MR. PARDY: No, I write better

## than that.

--- Laughter / Rires MR. CAVALLUZZO: That answers that question. MR. PARDY: But can you tell me what it says? I cannot make out the first sentence there at all. MR. CAVALLUZZO: I believe it says:
"We are not handling any of
the law --"
THE COMMISSIONER: "Enforcement

> activities."

MR. CAVALLUZZO:
"-- enforcement activities.

- We cannot make a statement about the facts of the case."

MR. PARDY: I think that -- I
stand to be corrected, but $I$ think that would have been a comment that Ms Pastyr-Lupul would have made, $I$ think, in reaction to the suggestion being made by Mr. Solomon here, that this was not our area of expertise and therefore we would not provide advice that went beyond what we were doing ourselves.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay. Then
that's helpful. And we are going to have her testify so we can ask her about that.

Now, the final area, Mr. Pardy, relates to evidence that was given by Senator de Bané yesterday, and I understand that you were either in the hearing room or watching it on TV so that you observed the testimony. Is that correct?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I did.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: And in particular, what I'm going to ask you about are statements such as where Mr . de Bané was saying that at a briefing that he was given prior to his visit to Syria and Saudi Arabia in July of 2003, that at the briefing he was told that the Americans had said something like this to the RCMP, and that is, that, "We're prepared to give Arar back to Canada on the condition that you arrest and put him in prison and charge him"

And Senator de Bané went on to say that the Canadian response was, "We have a Charter of Rights, and we do not have cause to charge him and put him in jail."

I'm wondering if you recall that testimony, because if you do, I'd like to ask you several questions about it?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I do.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Okay. Thank you.
The first is, do you recall
briefing Senator de Bané in respect of his trip to Syria on behalf of Mr. Arar and Saudi Arabia on behalf of Sampson?

MR. PARDY: I recall in general terms that, yes, I put together a group of people
that would meet with Senator de Bané. Is it July 5 or 11, 2003? Is the --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Well, we have a tab number, 473.

MR. PARDY: But I think it was
July 11, was it?
MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner, I
can advise that as a result of the comment by Mr. Cavalluzzo that that particular document was fully redacted.

I have reviewed the document, and the reason that it is fully redacted is that it does not, in fact, mention Mr. Arar's situation at all. It relates solely to Middle East issues in general to give background information to the Senator.

MR. PARDY: Was the date July 11
or 5, that the briefing took place?
MR. CAVALLUZZO: I can't help you
on that. What we have in the public documents just says: Senator de Bané visited Damascus July 19, 2003, topics and intervention points. That's obviously the date of his trip. MR. PARDY: Let's just say the first half of July certainly. Because he was in

Saudi Arabia on the 17 th, $I$ think it was, so the week before would have been perhaps the appropriate time we would have met with him, yes. MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you recall approximately how many people would have attended this meeting?

MR. PARDY: Well, any meeting at Foreign Affairs usually has a dozen people there, yes.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you recall
some people who attended besides yourself and Senator de Bané?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I do.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Why don't you
share some names with us.
MR. PARDY: I think Mr. Fry from Mr. Graham's office was there, the director of the political affairs division for Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States, Ms Carmen Sylvain was there, I think Ms Valerie Smith, who was her deputy director was there. I think, from the Syrian desk, I think, we would have had Mr. Harold Hickman and perhaps Mr. Michael Chesson, and then from my own bureau, certainly we would have had Ms Patty Goodfellow, and Ms Myra Pastyr-Lupul. I
think that would have been roughly the group of people there.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, did you keep notes of this meeting?

MR. PARDY: No. I was speaking.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: And you would have followed those talking points which we could find in tab 473?

MR. PARDY: No, I would have spoken off the cuff. My recollection is that the meeting was probably 90 per cent on Mr. Sampson, the case in Saudi Arabia. It was a very complex case for a number of reasons, and we were getting close to the point where we thought that the visit by Senator de Bané could be influential in tipping the balance in the right direction, and I think our assessment was not bad. Mr. Sampson was released, I think, in approximately three weeks after the Senator's visit.

And the rest of it, in terms of Mr. Arar -- not that it was any less important or anything like that, but $I$ think the message was more clear-cut and more to the point. The issue there was to deliver a letter from the Prime Minister to the President of Syria, and to make
direct appeal from the Prime Minister to the President of Syria for Mr. Arar's immediate release.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Now, do you know if anyone took notes or minutes of that meeting?

MR. PARDY: I don't know, no. Whether access to the records that you have would suggest that others at that meeting --

MR. CAVALLUZZO: I guess I can ask government counsel if other participants at the meeting have notes, and certainly we would review the notes.

MS McISAAC: We will certainly make further inquiries. I would hope they have been turned over, if there are any, but we will inquire.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Let's just focus in on -- I understand that there are a number of Middle Eastern issues that were discussed as well as Mr. Sampson, but $I$ want to just focus in on Mr. Arar obviously and ask whether you recall briefing Senator de Bané concerning Mr. Arar during which you may have talked about some communications between the Americans and the RCMP?

MR. PARDY: I would have attempted to give the Senator a complete understanding of this case, because when you send somebody out at this level to discuss with officials of foreign governments, and especially the President, you try to give him as complete an understanding of the issues that were involved in this matter.

Certainly the role of the United States was a significant one, and in that $I$ certainly would have attempted to give the Senator some understanding of their role, not only initially on this case but certainly in subsequent developments on the case and possibly as an influence in Syrian decision-making. You wanted to arm the Senator as much as possible so that when these issues came up, he didn't have to turn to somebody else for an answer.

As you know, the Senator is a very
knowledgeable person on Middle East issues and certainly has been a superb emissary for Canada on issues in the Middle East.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you recall what you told him, if anything, about American communications with Canada concerning Mr. Arar, which obviously would have been during his
detention in the United States between December $26 t h$ of 2002 , and or about October 7 th or 8 th? MR. PARDY: Yes. But my starting point for this would have been the memorandum from Superintendent Pilgrim that he sent to me on October 8th, 2002. Apart from our discussion with the RCMP on October the 16th, I think, that was the only record that we had of the exchanges between the RCMP and American officials. To this day, that is the only written record that $I$ have of such exchanges, and $I$ would have based my comments on Superintendent Pilgrim's report to us. MR. CAVALLUZZO: I wonder if the witness might be shown the Garvie report, which is Exhibit P-19.

If you refer to page 30 of $P-19$, you will see that there is a memorandum. At the top it says October 18th, 2002, and it states:
"Supt. Pilgrim responded to
the specific questions posed
by DFAIT and forwarded his
response to Insp. Roy."
Who, as we know, was the DFAIT LO.
"The response was as
follows."

## StenoTran

And then we have the answers to the questions that you had posed at the meeting on October the $16 t h$.

Is this the memorandum to which
you refer?
MR. PARDY: Yes, it is, except for
the redacted sections.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: I guess the most
pertinent question and answer would be found ten lines up from the bottom where it says:
"Did the U.S. approach
Canadian authorities
regarding the possibility of
Arar's deportation?"
And the answer is:
"U.S. authorities requested
the RCMP provide information
that might assist in the
filing of criminal charges
against Arar. U.S.
authorities made enquiries as
to the level of interest the
RCMP had in pursuing Arar
criminally. They also made
enquiries as well as the
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RCMP's ability to refuse Arar's entry into Canada. The U.S. authorities were advised that the RCMP was interested in Arar from a criminal perspective. They were also advised that where Arar is a Canadian citizen, the RCMP could not refuse his entry into Canada."

Is that the exchange of
information -- questions, answers, and so on and so forth -- that you think you may have given to Senator de Bané at this briefing?

MR. PARDY: Essentially, yes, but I would make one small addition, and this is in the second-last sentence, which is the sentence that says:
"The U.S. authorities were
advised that the RCMP was
interested in Arar from a
criminal perspective."

But in discussions, $I$ think, an additional clause was added to the effect that they did not have sufficient evidence to see to
the laying of criminal charges. I think that element was also certainly very much in my mind, because it did come up at a number of times subsequent, yes.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Right. So that you would suggest that wherein Senator de Bané said that the words you used at this briefing were the Americans saying, "We're prepared to give Arar back to Canada on the condition that you arrest and put him in prison and charge him" is incorrect, but this version, as in the Pilgrim letter, with the qualification that you have given, is what you would have said?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I think different people in the room could have interpreted my comments -- I was not reading from Superintendent Pilgrim's letter to me. I was providing a general overview as to what $I$ understood to be an element in this case, and obviously different people might have come to slightly different conclusions as to the import of what $I$ was saying here.

But the only information -- I come back to -- what we had on this important element in the case was what was said here in this memo from Superintendent Pilgrim.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: You would agree with me, though, that perhaps Senator de Bané was given a reasonable implication of what he was told. In other words, if you said to him that the Americans said to the RCMP "can you refuse him entry into Canada? Can you charge him criminally?" that perhaps a reasonable implication may be that if you are not prepared to arrest and charge him, we are not going to send him up to Canada?

MR. PARDY: On that -- I was
speaking, and obviously $I$ wasn't interpreting every word that $I$ was saying here. And I think Senator de Bané, who has given evidence of how he interpreted this, there are other people who were in that room who are -- I think one person in particular is scheduled to give testimony here. I think you can put that proposition to them as to whether this was a unique interpretation or not.

But certainly what $I$ was acting upon was this information, and I think throughout all of our correspondence $I$ think on this case, as you will see, where this issue comes up, this is the language that we have tried to use.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: A couple of final
questions, Mr. Pardy.
MR. PARDY: Your 15 minutes are
long up.
--- Laughter / Rires
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,
Mr. Pardy.
MR. PARDY: And I have been
taciturn too.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: You sound like a Court of Appeal judge. I usually go on and sit down.

One would be: When this exchange occurred between the Americans and the RCMP, it was obviously before October 18.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Do you know what
date that exchange occurred?
MR. PARDY: I think -- and, again,
in part $I$ think my memory has been influenced by releases of information under ATI that was reported in one of the newspapers around June or July of 2004. This was information, I think, from RCMP records. My memory suggests that this was quite early on in the process that these exchanges might have taken place.

But as I say, the ATI records from
the RCMP I think will give you --
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Well, why don't
we look. Take a look at P-21. There's an indication there when the conversation was --

MR. PARDY: What page is that?
MR. CAVALLUZZO: $P-19$, page 21.
MR. PARDY: This is the Garvie
report?
MR. CAVALLUZZO: The Garvie
report.
You will see at the bottom below
the redaction, this is October 5th, which is a Saturday -- October 5th, 2002 .

It says somebody told somebody:
"... that 'as Arar is a
Canadian citizen, we (the RCMP) cannot refuse him entry into the country.'"

So likely this exchange occurred
on October the 5th, if we can accept this.
MR. PARDY: That is a Saturday
morning. Assuming the RCMP were working on a Saturday, yes. Or it might have reflected something earlier. I don't know.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Let us assume that some RCMP people work on Saturdays.

MR. PARDY: But I would suggest to
you that the ATI records are probably a bit more fulsome in that area.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: And they may not work on Saturday, but $I$ know that you do, because in checking your e-mails, you are not only working on Saturdays and Sundays but you are sending e-mails at three o'clock in the morning. So it is likely one could have contacted you on Saturday, October the 5th.

I am wondering if anybody in the RCMP phoned you, or anybody in DFAIT, saying I just had this strange conversation with the Americans about Mr. Arar. You guys should know about this.

MR. PARDY: No. All of my meetings and conversations with the RCMP were in normal working hours.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: Are you aware
whether anybody in DFAIT became aware of that conversation on or about October the 5th, or October the 6th, or October 7th?

MR. PARDY: No, until I think --
you mean in terms of dates, I don't think we were ever certain of that.

But I think in terms of the content of the conversation, that was reflected in Superintendent Pilgrim's report to me. MR. CAVALLUZZO: On October 18th? MR. PARDY: On October 18th. MR. CAVALLUZZO: Thank you,

Mr. Pardy.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Ms Edwardh?
EXAMINATION
MS EDWARDH: I would like to provide to the witness for his comments an article written shortly after Mr. Arar's return entitled "U.S. urged Canada to hold Arar; Canada refused to make arrest - Americans sent him to Syria", written by Mr. Graham Fraser.

THE COMMISSIONER: That will be P-116.

MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
EXHIBIT NO. P-116: Article entitled "U.S. urged Canada to hold Arar; Canada refused to make arrest - Americans
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sent him to Syria", written by Graham Fraser, and published in the Toronto Star on October 9, 2003

MS EDWARDH: Mr. Pardy, the reason
I am showing you this is this article was written on October 9, 2003, very shortly after Mr. Arar had come home, and the interesting thing about it is that, if you read it carefully, it discloses a remarkable similarity to the very conversation that Senator de Bané described yesterday.

It begins with, in the second paragraph:
"U.S. Officials seized Maher Arar when he was changing planes in New York last year and sent him to Syria because Canada would not guarantee he would be detained when he returned to Ottawa, an official involved in the case says."

And then let me jump down two more paragraphs, beginning with "When it was noted".

Do you see that?
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MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH:
"When it was noted that Arar was a Canadian, Canadian security was contacted. "They asked, 'Do you have anything on him,'" an official closely involved in the case said, on condition that he not be quoted by name.
"'Yes, indeed,' they were
told. 'He's watched because
he has been to Afghanistan
several times.'"
On the basis of that, the
official said, Arar was
arrested when the plane
landed in New York."
Now, here is the conversation:
""Then they said to the
Canadians 'If we transfer
that man to you, can you give
us the assurance that you
will lay charges against
him?'", the official said.
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"And the Canadian police told them 'No, we don't have anything to lay charges against him. We can't bring any charges.'

And the American said 'If you aren't going to do anything, if you are going to let him go free ...'"

According to the official, Canadian officials replied, "Wait a minute, he has already worked for two years in Boston and you never bothered to do anything about him.
"And now he's back in Canada ... all we can say is that he has previously been in Afghanistan. That's not enough given our Charter of Rights."

The American said, "Obviously we can do nothing with you," ..."
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And I am going to suggest, Mr. Pardy, that remarkably the same gist to the Senator's comment certainly is in this article, that some official -- undoubtedly another Deep Throat -- has made it very clear that there was a query and Canada's inability to arrest, charge, or detain meant that the Americans would not return him? That is certainly the implication.

MR. PARDY: The text speaks for
itself, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And you will agree that it bears a quite remarkable similarity to the Senator's comments?

MR. PARDY: Yes, up to a point.
The only thing $I$ can guarantee you is that, as you know, for better or worse, I always spoke on the record before retirement. And after retirement, I always spoke on the record with respect to this case --

MS EDWARDH: I wasn't suggesting
that was you, Mr. Pardy.
MR. PARDY: I am just making sure we understand each other. There's a lot of other people behind you that are going to draw conclusions from your questions that basically are
totally unwarranted here.
In this case, I don't know. A lot of other people had information about this case. There are things there that $I$ see are in error right off the top.

He has been to Afghanistan several times. Well, that is not factually correct.

MS EDWARDH: You don't know what is in the RCMP or the CSIS brief. They may think he has been there 16 times.

MR. PARDY: It could very well be, but the issue here is where that information came from.

MS EDWARDH: Certainly. But we don't know.

MR. PARDY: We don't know. But I am saying in terms of my own understanding of the information, when $I$ spoke to the media $I$ think $I$ tried to be as accurate as possible in terms of the facts, and I did not distort any of the facts for any particular reason.

MS EDWARDH: While I can agree that from your perspective this may hold an error, certainly the implication of this article, which is of the same tenor as the comments made by the

Senator, would indicate that the person making the remarks is really someone speaking from the police or intelligence perspective, not from DFAIT's perspective?

MR. PARDY: Possibly.
MS EDWARDH: Let me go to another
area. Thank you, Mr. Pardy.
We have fussed around about this
poor confusion left in the minds of the Syrians through some remark or inadvertent misunderstanding led by CSIS, and we have asked you innumerable times about it and we have asked the Minister about it. And it dawned on me, when Mr. Cavalluzzo was asking you again about it, that we are all on the wrong path.

There was no confusion, Mr. Pardy. The Syrians were quite right when they read the refusal of the RCMP and CSIS to step up to the plate and make any statements as a very strong indication that they did not support Mr. Arar's return.

You went to get the letter. You couldn't get it. And $I$ have no doubt that the Syrians aren't wrong at all. They read the situation right. Fair enough?

That is a very reasonable
hypothesis, isn't it?
MR. PARDY: I would say an
hypothesis. Whether it is completely reasonable or not, is an entirely different matter. The day that $I$ understand the inner workings and thoughts of the Syrian government, let me tell you, it is going to be a rare day that happens.

I think given all of the issues
that surround this case, to reduce it down to one hypothesis $I$ think is entirely misleading for everybody involved.

MS EDWARDH: But $I$ am only
interested in one thing.
It is possible that the Syrians were just using an ambiguity, as you said. They found it. It was in their self-interest to exploit.

Leaving that aside for just a moment, if one takes the proposition that you as a senior diplomat knew -- you needed the assistance of the RCMP and CSIS to convey a message. That is why you went to them; correct?

You thought it was the best way to get the message across?

MR. PARDY: Yes, absolutely.
MS EDWARDH: So you go to them and they say in various ways we won't support it. We are aloof from Mr. Arar's status -- whatever that means -- but aloof from his status.

Clearly you know you are on your own; correct?

MR. PARDY: No, I think there are others in the government that were quite willing to support -- insofar as CSIS and the RCMP, I think their corporate positions were as reflected I think in the documents that are before you, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. So their corporate position is, you're on your own. They're not going to take any step that you can extract from them to assist you. Right?

MR. PARDY: By the time we
succeeded, that was still the position, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And it seems to me the inexorable conclusion then to draw from that is that when the Syrians say that they felt that there were certainly aspects of Canada that didn't want Mr. Arar returned, they were certainly dead right in these circumstances?

MR. PARDY: As I said earlier to
you, that is a hypothesis that you can go with, but again, I'm back to the business that -- I mean, yes, there were elements in the Canadian government, and the documentation that $I$ spent a fair bit of my time writing reflects those difference and there are reasons for those differences -- but, and $I$ come back here to the point that we acting, in what we thought was -- as the -- acting for the Canadian government, that we were the ones that spoke and we tried to make that understood in Damascus.

And we only got it finally
understood when we were able to get the Prime Minister to sign the letters that he did, and we went with those to the Syrians.

MS EDWARDH: And this is the case. I mean, going around the RCMP and CSIS to the Prime Minister, this is the case --

MR. PARDY: I --
MS EDWARDH: May I just finish the question?

Even in circumstances where the message to the police force, the national police force in this country, was bring him home, and if you've got the evidence, charge and try him, you
were prepared to promote that message, and they still wouldn't support your initiative?

MR. PARDY: No, that was never a part of my messaging. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? But I certainly --

MS EDWARDH: Sure. I understood the message was: Send Mr. Arar home.

And the further message that you were prepared, and the Minister was prepared to make, was: And if there is evidence of criminal wrong-doing on the part of Mr. Arar, he will be tried -- he will be charged and duly tried under the laws of Canada?

MR. PARDY: I stand to be corrected, but if you go through the record, my position ended with the first part of your statement. That was to send Mr. Arar home.

I did not even add the suggestion that maybe -- something may happen to him once he arrived in Canada, and certainly $I$ was not comfortable either with the suggestion that was added in a couple of times in public comment to the Syrian government saying, well, you charge him. I did not like that proposition at all.

My position was, one level only:

Mr. Arar should be allowed to return to Canada. What happened after that was not my concern. MS EDWARDH: We're not
communicating --
MR. PARDY: Oh, I --
MS EDWARDH: Let me just put this statement this way:

The Mounties know that if Mr. Arar
were to be brought home, they know, that if they had evidence in which they could lay a criminal charge, that indeed he could be arrested, he could be detained or granted bail, he could stand his trial and defend it. They know that. They're police officers. Right?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: So that their refusal
to assist must be assessed in light of the knowledge that if they had any evidence, they could try Mr. Arar. They could charge and try him.

MR. PARDY: But you're asking me to interpret what was going on within the police side of the Canadian government, and I have --

MS. EDWARDH: Yes.
MR. PARDY: -- as the record
demonstrates, we had very little by way of hard information here. It was very limited information we had from the police or from CSIS with respect to Mr. Arar's activities, either in Canada or in the United States or some ten years ago in the Near East.

MS EDWARDH: Well, it leaves an even unhappier inference if you won't go with me to the logical state of if they have evidence they would duly charge him and he would be tried under our laws.

You're left with this inference: Knowing that they don't have evidence, that it's better off to leave him there because they might get evidence at some future date through some means, through some interrogation of Mr. Arar or somebody else.

MR. PARDY: No, I think my answer to the earlier question was that I had limited knowledge of what the RCMP may have known during this period, and $I$ think the testimony of a number of people was that this was a standard practice in the Government of Canada that information with respect to criminal wrongdoing on the part of Canadians was not shared by the national police
force with officials that did not have an involvement in the criminal justice system.

MS EDWARDH: Well, saying that
Mr. Arar -- writing the letter that Mr. Cavalluzzo proposes, that Mr. Arar should come home and the RCMP must be understood to be saying that Canada speaks with one voice isn't disclosing anything about a criminal investigation or a national security investigation.

MR. PARDY: Exactly. And that's what we tried to do and did not succeed on that particular point.

MS EDWARDH: Okay. So we'll let them account for their aloofness.

I want to ask just one question. At pages 4006 to 7, I had -- there was an inquiry made of you, Mr. Pardy, that consular reports were shared with CSIS --

MR. PARDY: Could you give me the tab reference and the book reference?

MS EDWARDH: I'm quoting you.
--- Laughter / Rires
MR. PARDY: Oh, okay. Is it in
the official records, or is that a newspaper article?

MS EDWARDH: No, no, no. This is the official transcript, but let me just -- this was a question Mr. Cavalluzzo put.

It's really directed through you
to my friend sitting beside me, that there were two consular reports shared with CSIS, and Ms McIsaac was going to seek clarification of that, and I'm at a point where I would like to ask the witness some questions to determine if there were those two reports and we have confirmation of that fact now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Ms McIsaac, can you respond to that?

MS EDWARDH: 4006-7.
MS McISAAC: I'm not certain $I$ was here for that testimony. Can you give me a moment, please?

Remember the very first day Mr. Baxter and Mr. Fothergill were here, which is another bit of a difficulty, but...
--- Pause
MS MCISAAC: I'm not sure what the question is. Sorry. As I say, I wasn't here, so I'm confused.

MS EDWARDH: I'm sorry.

Mr. Cavalluzzo had raised the -- sorry,
Mr. Commissioner.
Mr. Cavalluzzo had raised the fact, in his examination-in-chief, that two reports, one from the January 7 consular visit and one from the April 23, had been shared with CSIS, and I just want -- and there was some discussion about the fact that Government counsel would clarify that and whether we could know something of the circumstances and dates and whatever, and I'm asking whether $I$ can have that now or what the circumstances are.

MS McISAAC: I'm going to defer to Mr. Cavalluzzo, because we did discuss that, but...

MR. CAVALLUZZO: That was the situation where we had a sidebar, and there were two CSIS -- or there were two consular reports, one of January 7 and one of April 22, and the question was whether the Government was prepared to release certain information relating to those reports as to how they found themselves existing in a CSIS file, and $I$ had asked that that be checked.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think the
fact is, though, that you were able to establish they were in the CSIS file.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: They were in the CSIS file, but the question was one step further, and that is --

THE COMMISSIONER: How they got
there?
MR. CAVALLUZZO: -- in the CSIS
file, and that was the question.
THE COMMISSIONER: Right, yes.
Is the Government in a position to
respond to that yet?
MS McISAAC: Yes, we are. They were both provided by Foreign Affairs to CSIS. MS EDWARDH: May I ask one question through you, Mr. Commissioner?

THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, please do.

MS EDWARDH: Perhaps Ms McIsaac could indicate whether they were provided through ISI or ISD to CSIS.

MS McISAAC: They would have been provided through ISI.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Okay?
MS EDWARDH: Yes, and might we
take it that it was around the time those reports were written?

MS MCISAAC: I'm assuming so. I haven't looked at the actual dates, but I'm assuming so.

THE COMMISSIONER: Let's proceed with the line of questioning on that basis. I think that's reasonable. I don't suppose anything turns on the exact date.

MS EDWARDH: No, no, no.
THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Good.
MS EDWARDH: I have two or three questions and then I'll go back to a theme.

At page 4054 of your examination-in-chief, and perhaps I might take you there -- or maybe it's even... No.

It's my cross-examination of you, I'm sorry, Mr. Pardy.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want a
copy of the transcript, Mr. Pardy?
MR. PARDY: I would appreciate
that, yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: If counsel are going to cross-examine on the transcript --

MS EDWARDH: No, it's a question
that $I$ just wanted to ask about a reference. The witness is certainly -- I'm pleased to provide him with my copy even if it's even got yellow on it. Do you have an extra? 4054 to 4056 .

I can read it to you, and if you want to see it in black and white, that's fine. MR. PARDY: I read better than I hear.
--- Laughter / Rires MS EDWARDH: Okay. --- Off microphone / Sans microphone If you want to just look at the beginning of the exchange, you can take a moment. --- Pause MS McISAAC: I have found an additional one, if you want to give it to the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think we're moving along okay, Ms McIsaac.
--- Laughter / Rires
MS EDWARDH: And the particular portion $I$ want to draw your attention to... --- Pause

MR. PARDY: Yes, this relates to the question of the date in the Garvie report.

Exactly.
MS EDWARDH: There are two parts
to my question. Now if you go over to your response at 4056 . Just take a moment to look at that.
--- Pause
MS EDWARDH: And it's the first part of that $I$ want to start with asking you. The words that $I$ am interested in, Mr. Pardy:

> "I was also interviewed by Superintendent Garvie, and I provided --"
> THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second. We're having a microphone problem here. If you're asking the question, you should either use this microphone --

MR. PARDY: What was the page
again?
MS EDWARDH: 4056 .
--- Pause
MR. PARDY: It ends at 4053.
MS EDWARDH: Ms McIsaac, can you
help us?
MR. PARDY: I think, having read
it now -- please, go ahead. I've read the -- yes, okay.

THE COMMISSIONER: Let's just ask
the questions and we'll see how --
MS EDWARDH: The pages have are up
front?
MR. PARDY: I'm sorry, yes.
MS EDWARDH: I think my friend may
have put it at the front for you.
MR. PARDY: I'm sorry, there it
is. Yes, okay.
MS EDWARDH: You comment:
"May I comment as well on
that point?"
This is with respect to the October 2 reference suggesting that the RCMP may have known the allegations --

MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: -- against Mr. Arar
on the day he was served with the document.
And then you make the comment:
"I was also interviewed by Superintendent Garvie, and I provided him with a copy of the complete removal order
with this kind of information
there."
Do you see that answer?
MR. PARDY: Yes, I do.
MS EDWARDH: Sir, did you have a
copy of the complete removal order?
MR. PARDY: Yes, I did, but --
when $I$ was interviewed by Superintendent Garvie, I had a copy, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And where did you get that copy?

MR. PARDY: From CBS.
MS EDWARDH: Right. So you got it
from the Centre for Constitutional Rights?
MR. PARDY: No, direct from CBS,
and that was given to me in -- I think it was November of 2003, long after I had retired, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And I take it that the copy -- when you use the language "complete removal order", that there were some redactions in the removal order provided to you by CBS?

MR. PARDY: Yes, there were redactions, and as well the confidential addendum to the removal order was not included either. We're still looking for that, yes.
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MS EDWARDH: Yes. I was hopeful that you had the whole package when I saw this answer.

MR. PARDY: CBS is still digging, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, and I
understand, sir, you also -- you said:
"...copy of a complete removal order with this kind of information there."

I guess I am just asking what was the kind of information you were referring to? Was it information pertaining to the fact that the RCMP actually knew on October 2, or am I reading --

MR. PARDY: No, I was speaking more generally, $I$ think, there, in terms of the information generally about the -- and I think the point under discussion where the four elements in the American removal order that led to their conclusion that an exclusion order should be issued, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Now, in reviewing
this to continue my cross-examination, it seemed to me, Mr. Pardy, that your reluctance to accept
my suggestion this was all a little mistake that it was under the date of October 2, and it really was a later date, Mr. Pardy, can you assist us, do you have any information that the contents of the notice received by Mr. Arar were transmitted to the RCMP on October 2.

MR. PARDY: No. I think, going back, and the transcript here -- I was reacting to your suggestion that there was some simple explanation in terms of the date being wrong, in terms of the reference to October 2 in the Garvie report, and $I$ was not prepared to accept that at face value.

Superintendent Garvie, I think, demonstrated through his report that he was a meticulous recorder of those kinds of facts, and $I$ was not prepared to accept your suggestion that it was simply a mistake on his part.

MS EDWARDH: All right.
Certainly if Superintendent Garvie is correct, that the October 2 date is the one that should be applied to when the RCMP became aware of these allegations, they would have been aware of them at the same time Mr. Arar was in New York?

MR. PARDY: You can draw that conclusion, but $I$ have no information whatsoever to suggest -- to support your conclusion on that, no.

MS EDWARDH: Well, no. But, I
mean, if you're not prepared to suggest -- or accept the suggestion there's an error with regard to the date, then the obvious statement is that October 2 may be correct, and the RCMP may have information, the same information Mr. Arar got on the same day?

MR. PARDY: That is one
conclusion.
But, again, $I$ come back to the point that $I$ had no information to support your conclusion, and $I$ only can give testimony -- I think it's a fair assumption on my part to give testimony on things that $I$ know something personally about.

And in this one $I$ have no personal
knowledge, no.
MS EDWARDH: All right. Now, I want to just review one other brief error. We spent a fair time, on the last occasion $I$ was asking you questions, about the
distribution of information and your role in it. There were a few follow-up questions I should have asked you, but we called it a day.

You have described the basis upon which you acted, sir, and I'm going to just -- I don't want to explore it anymore, you fully put it out there, but you were saying Mr . Arar gave a consent and you acted on that consent. Is that a fair summary of your evidence?

MR. PARDY: Yes, and $I$-- can
I --not only was it consent, I think, and I've gone back and thought about the form of the words and the way they were recorded.

I mean, beyond giving permission for us to act on his behalf, $I$ read them as a cry, a plea for help. I mean, he's in a bewildering situation and he is interested in terms of whoever is out there to give him a hand.

So yes, the permission was there, but I saw something even more fundamental than that in terms of his words that he used and were recorded by Ms Girvan.

MS EDWARDH: Well, in any event, from the perspective of the law of privacy, what you were concerned with was consent, and that's
what you were acting on?
MR. PARDY: Yes. But, again, the other element in the privacy law is the issue of using the information in a way that is going to be helpful to the individual that is in difficulty. MS EDWARDH: I am struggling with that, because there are three prongs I just want to put to you.

You have a right or there is a right for the head of an institution to disclose information when the balance -- and the language the Act uses:
"...disclosure clearly
outweighs any invasion of privacy that could result from the disclosure and would clearly benefit the individual."

So that balancing. Sir, is it
your position you acted under this kind of assessment of the benefits and risks as set out in the Privacy Act?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Well if you did, sir,
then it is quite clear that the same section says
that if one discloses information in order to effect that balance, the following applies:
"The head of a government institution shall notify the Privacy Commissioner, in writing, of any disclosure of personal information under paragraph 2(m)."

That's the balancing one.
"Prior to the disclosure, where reasonably practicable, or in any other case forthwith on the disclosure, and the Privacy Commissioner may, if the Commissioner deems it appropriate, notify the individual to whom the information relates of the disclosure."

Do you know, sir, whether the head of the government institution made notification to the Privacy Commissioner in respect of the disclosures in this case?

MR. PARDY: No. And we took the position -- and it comes up fairly frequently in
our work -- that if one were to go the precise route that is laid out in the Act, then we are in the problem here of whether or not we can be effective in trying to help the Canadian to which that information applies.

As you know, in the Act as well
there is a section which states -- and I will paraphrase here a little bit, and certainly it was in the back of my mind at the time; was that it gives the right of a Canadian security or police organization to apply to the deputy head of a department that holds information. And pursuant to a legitimate investigation that is under way that then, in effect, a request can be made for all information that might be held by the second department. And there is that provision there. MS EDWARDH: Yes, but that wasn't acted on either.

MR. PARDY: It wasn't acted upon
but it's always there, and we have had instances where that has come to the fore. I was concerned that there not be wholesale release of information, certainly in my view a controlled release -- which it was, a very controlled release, that this was in support of Mr. Arar.

And I made the assessment, as you said -- well, did you do a risk analysis or something to that effect? I was very careful to make sure that any information that was released was not helpful. And if you go through every one of those reports, there is, I don't think, a sentence in them that would support the conclusion that this would have been helpful to an RCMP criminal investigation or a security investigation by CSIS.

MS EDWARDH: Well, I disagree, sir. You and $I$ both know what the first consular visit says, and you know that Mrs. Girvan reviewed the interrogation, the FBI interrogation, and established that Mr. Arar was interrogated about a man by the name of Abdullah, who we know now to be Abdullah Almalki, and his connection was adverted to and that information was provided to RCMP and/or CSIS.

MR. PARDY: But $I$ think the record demonstrates maybe that information may have come from Canadian sources anyway. I mean, I'm not quite sure where the -- the large inference that suddenly there is new information that is coming into the process --

MS EDWARDH: No.
MR. PARDY: -- that is not already on the record here.

MS EDWARDH: With the greatest of
respect, when it comes out of the mouths of someone in the consular visit, it may well be an admission that is damaging, and you are not sitting in CSIS' brief or the Mounties' brief and you can't make the assessment of how damaging that information may be to their perceptions of Mr. Arar?

MR. PARDY: No, I can't make that assessment, but $I$ can make the assessment whether or not, from my perspective, it could be helpful to Mr. Arar. And that was the only assessment that I needed to make.

MS EDWARDH: I want to go back, Mr. Pardy, and establish that the two exceptions, one being that there can be a balancing -MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner, I am having some difficulty here because I don't agree with Ms Edwardh's legal analysis that she is putting to the witness in the first place as to the limitations on the use of information under the Privacy Act.
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THE COMMISSIONER: We are not going to have the witness resolve the legal question as to whether or not it was properly used. I suppose that will be an issue that $I$ am going to have to address in the end.

I think if you frame your question, Ms Edwardh, so that you avoid having the witness draw the legal conclusion -- ask him his interpretation, which you have done, and on what basis he acted. I think that's about as far as you can go.

MS EDWARDH: One more factual question $I$ think may be of assistance to you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
MS EDWARDH: And that is when information is provided, Mr. Commissioner, pursuant to a request made to an investigative body, or by an investigative body for the purpose of enforcing the laws of Canada, which is one of the categories of exemption, $I$ just want to establish that there is a requirement under the Act that a record be kept as well and that the Privacy Commissioner notified.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think you can ask the witness if that happened as a matter of
fact. And then in closing, or in argument at some point, we can argue the other issue.

MS EDWARDH: Fair enough. And that's my next question.

Was any notification given to the Privacy Commissioner under either of those heads?

I think you have answered no with respect to the balancing and now with respect to investigation.

MR. PARDY: No. I think you have collapsed a couple of issues here in your question.

I made reference to the fact that
the head of a law enforcement or security organization in Canada, pursuant to a legal investigation, can make a request of another department of government for information. In those connections, in that kind of a situation, then very clearly there is a written record maintained. We have had situations such as this where -- and basically it's left to the deputy head of the department that holds the information to make the decision as to whether this kind of information should be released. If the deputy head were to state
"no, I'm not going to release it", then there is appeal to the Privacy Commissioner, as I understand the process.

And we did have cases where those written requests came in.

Now, what you are referring to was not a request from the RCMP or CSIS for information. It was a decision that $I$ made that we had information that was going to be helpful to them, or helpful to Mr. Arar, in terms of what we were trying to achieve here. And there is quite a distinction between the two.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, there is,
Mr. Pardy. All I am doing is wanting to make very clear that the procedure you adopted was exclusively by reference to the consent that you obtained, and that's all $I$ am doing, sir. There were no other provisions that you responded to or relied upon.

MR. PARDY: The consent in all of
these cases is the most important one, absolutely, yes.

MS EDWARDH: I would like then to
turn to the issue of your obligation, or the obligation of consular affairs, to provide some
insight into information you share.
For example, if you are sharing
information from a consular visit, such as the first consular visit in Syria on October 22 nd, do you think that you have any duty to ensure that the recipient of that information has a grasp over whatever limits or understanding you may put on it?

MR. PARDY: Yes, the caveat rules are certainly there, and $I$ understand them, yes.

MS EDWARDH: No, I am not so much talking about caveats, sir, as explaining that there may be things said during these interviews, such as "the Syrians are taking very good care of me and all my needs are met", that kind of statement.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: You know it's
baloney. But if you are handing it on to another entity, how do you ensure that the nuanced understanding you have is shared with that entity?

MR. PARDY: I think the documents
would speak for themselves. But in addition to the documents, there were conversations, some involving members of the RCMP and CSIS, but more
directly with the officials in the ISI group in Foreign Affairs, who very much throughout this process interpreted all of this kind of material very much in the same way that $I$ did. And they had daily conversations and the interpretation took place in that way.

MS EDWARDH: But as I understand Mr. Livermore's evidence, it was that when these materials were handed over, for example, to the RCMP, there was no briefing accompanying them that might alert them to some of the things that you would see in a nuanced reading of a document and that Mr. Livermore might see.

So does that cause you concern, if there was no briefing that went with it?

MR. PARDY: No, I don't think that's a complete assessment of the environment in which these exchanges took place. I think those discussions were going on. And I think as the paper record demonstrates, the officials in ISI, I think, were very attuned to my thinking with respect to how to interpret this material, and they certainly would have passed that on, those concerns or those issues on to the RCMP and CSIS, who they were in contact with on a daily basis.

MS EDWARDH: So on November the $3 r d$ or 4 th, the RCMP -- and we are going to hear from Mr. Cabana --

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: The RCMP and CSIS
received two documents. We understand that
they -- and let's deal with the Mounties for a moment.

They receive a document that purports to be an utterance of Mr. Arar given during interrogation. All right?

They receive that document because the ambassador obtains it and brings it back. MR. PARDY: Yes, that's the single sheet, yes.

MS EDWARDH: In addition, they would have received, at the same time, the consular note pertaining to the October 23 rd visit.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Now, sir, is it your
view that it would have been very clear to the officers upon receipt of that information that there was a substantial likelihood, even probability, that the interrogation of Mr. Arar
had taken place in circumstances where he had been the victim of abuse, of torture, of psychological torture, or whatever?

Would that have been evident, and should they know that?

MR. PARDY: The passing of those two documents, the November 3 rd one is not a consular document as such. The October 23 rd consular visit is very much of a consular document. The November 3rd one, I think one must categorize under the hat that the ambassador is wearing for other purposes here.

But in terms of the combination together, you put them together, yes. And I don't have the doubts that you seem to have that there is an inability on the part of either the RCMP or CSIS to interpret those documents in the environment in which they were produced, or in terms of the specific language that was used in them.

There is a way to interpret that information. And in addition, and $I$ come back to the fact that the officials in ISI -- one of them is probably one of the foremost experts in the Government of Canada on the Middle East -- would
have provided them with information, the context in which this stuff should be looked at.

MS EDWARDH: So your assumption
then in sharing -- and this is very important in understanding the motivation to share.

Your assumption in sharing, Mr. Pardy, is really important. It is when this material is provided, and it's provided together, in effect --

MR. PARDY: In this case, yes. MS EDWARDH: That the context and the information would be accompanied by a proper understanding of the limits that should go on to -- or the lack of reliability or the issues surrounding reliability that should be attached to those admissions?

MR. PARDY: Knowing an official
would look at every piece of paper that crosses their desk, and look at it in exactly that same way. And $I$ don't have any hesitation in suggesting that all of this material was looked at in that way, both by officials in Foreign Affairs and officials in the RCMP and CSIS. I mean, these are not people that sort of are rushing in one direction here, despite
the fact that the context in which they were working. But they were quite capable of interpreting how this information might have been produced.

MS EDWARDH: And would you share with me the view that it is part of the duty of the department, whether through your office or Mr. Livermore's office, to ensure that whoever is getting this information appreciates its strengths and weaknesses?

MR. PARDY: Oh, yes.
MS EDWARDH: Okay. So there is no doubt in your mind that the information was then shared from the perspective of ensuring that the recipient of the information properly understood the context in which it was obtained?

MR. PARDY: As I think my
testimony earlier on suggests, I was not sharing the information solely on the basis of the -- or the document solely on the basis contained -- or the information contained in those documents. There was a larger purpose at work here, and I think I suggested that to you in my previous testimony.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. I am not
concerned about your purpose. I am concerned that in the process of giving information from consular visits, which we have all agreed they have some special features -MR. PARDY: Yes.

MS EDWARDH: That in the process of sharing those with the RCMP -- and I'm not dealing with CSIS for the moment, with the RCMP, that you have confidence that they were properly contextualized and the strengths and weaknesses of the information would be identified to the recipient?

MR. PARDY: I think within -- your question sets up an ideal situation, that $I$ think if one were reduce this down to a working level, I don't have any doubts in my mind that the information was understood itself, the words that were used, and also the environment in which those words were produced, both in terms of interview with Mr. Martel and the piece of paper that the Syrian Military Inteligence produced and gave to Mr. Pillarella on November 3rd, yes.

MS EDWARDH: So if in the course of Mr. Arar's interrogation the Syrians said -and they did this with the first interview. He
had been there, according to them, less than a day, when they had extracted from him a confession that he belonged to some terrorist organizations. MR. PARDY: Pakistani based. They didn't say terrorist. They said a Pakistani organization that was active in Montreal and possibly --

MS McISAAC: Commissioner, this is the very information that was contained in the summary that Mr . Atkey prepared --

MS EDWARDH: No, it's not, I'm
sorry.
MS McISAAC: Is it somewhere else?
MS EDWARDH: Make your submission.
MS McISAAC: Well, if $I$ am
mistaken, $I$ apologize. But $I$ didn't know that the detail of what was in the statement or material was available otherwise than in the summary which had been prepared by Mr. Atkey, which had not yet been released.

If I am mistaken, I apologize. MS EDWARDH: With respect, the reason that there was an objection taken to the release of it was that the detail was sufficiently lacking that it leads to, I thought, a
misunderstanding. And $I$ don't need to take the witness any further.

But I thought it was clear that we had a record before us relating to the first interrogation, and my friend has referred to it a number of times. It describes the Syrian official saying -- sorry, Mr. Cavalluzzo.

I obviously need a lot of help,
Mr. Commissioner.
MR. CAVALLUZZO: If you take a
look at tab 123, you will see the information.
THE COMMISSIONER: 123?
MR. CAVALLUZZO: Correct.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
And this is where $I$ got the Pakistani reference, and this is what $I$ am referring to, in paragraph 3.
"According to ... Arar has apparently already admitted that he has connections with terrorist organizations..." So the word "terrorist" was there. And then there is another blank. "... alluded to Pakistani groups) ..."
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In the plural.
So that certainly is up front on
October 22 nd.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Do you have any
objections if $I$ go any further?
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, just ask
your questions. If there are objections, Ms McIsaac can make them.

MS EDWARDH: I have managed to
completely lose my place, Mr. Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to
take a --
MS EDWARDH: Yes, if we could have a few minutes.

THE COMMISSIONER: We can take a ten-minute break.

How are we doing time-wise? I am
just thinking --
MS EDWARDH: Can $I$ do it on a
three-to-one ratio too?
THE COMMISSIONER: No. Only
Mr. Cavalluzzo gets away with that.
MS EDWARDH: I will try to move through the rest of it.
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Let's see. I started around 10 to 3:00, I believe, and thought I would take 90 minutes. I will take 90 minutes.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's great. Do you have any better idea yet, Ms McIsaac, how long you are going to be? MS MCISAAC: I still think I'm going to be longer than $I$ usually am. An hour and a half maybe?

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. One of the things you might talk about during the ten-minute break is, with the witness, as to whether or not this is something we can complete today. I'm prepared to sit as late as 6 or 6:30, if we can do that.

MR. PARDY: I'm good for ten

$$
o^{\prime} c l o c k .
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--- Laughter / Rires
THE COMMISSIONER: That's a
witness I like, Mr. Pardy. We'll rise for ten minutes.

THE REGISTRAR: Please stand.
--- Upon recessing at 3:40 p.m. /
Suspension à 3 h 40
--- Upon resuming at 3:54p.m. /
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Reprise à 15 h 54
THE REGISTRAR: Please be seated.
Veuillez vous asseoir.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner. Thank you for the moment to reflect on where $I$ was. I had lost it.

We were talking about the obligation and duty to ensure that information shared is properly contextualized, and I took you to this document, that being the report from Damascus in respect of the first consular contact, and I guess it's not consular contact, this is a contact from the ambassador to the head of military intelligence on the eve of the first consular contact.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And I thought it was important, because we would assume that being -this is setting up the consular contact, that this kind of document and these kind of statements would be shared through ISI with the RCMP and/or CSIS, given the working relationship in this case. Is that fair?

MR. PARDY: I don't know for certain, but you could assume that information
such as this would have gone through ISI, yes. MS EDWARDH: Right. So, here, it's just as much -- there is just as much a need to contextualize this information, Mr. Pardy, as there is the actual consular information?

MR. PARDY: Absolutely, yes.
MS EDWARDH: Because indeed we have the General announcing to the Ambassador, there's already been a confession. Right? MR. PARDY: Yes. MS EDWARDH: And you and I know, that, if we assume, as we do today, that Mr. Arar has been held in detention incognito and interrogated during this period, that confession is probably worth nothing more than even the paper it's written on?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I think one could -- unless one could take elements out of that, out of what is said in that report, and to verify them through some independent means, then the information is nothing more than words on paper. Yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. And certainly that's, of course, what any intelligence or police agency would want to do, is determine whether they
could verify so they could make their own case against Mr. Arar?

MR. PARDY: Or not make a case.
MS EDWARDH: Yes. Either way.
MR. PARDY: Either way.
MS EDWARDH: And certainly you
would want to be very sure that they didn't operate on the assumption that this admission was per se like a confession obtained by a police officer in a Canadian investigation? It's a whole different kettle of fish?

MR. PARDY: Yes, it's quite
different, although I don't fully subscribe to your analogy to the Canadian situation because, as you know, there have been some very bad scenes in Canadian investigations that have led to some terrible results.

MS EDWARDH: Well, I would be the first to admit that, sir, but if we have a professional police officer in Canada, and they know that what they're saying to people is to give them instruction as to their rights, and indeed they do not offer inducements, do not threaten, and do not abuse, they're going to get a statement, in theory, that is nothing like the
statement you would expect to be obtained by Syrian Military Intelligence?

MR. PARDY: In the best of all
possible worlds, this was certainly not it, no.
MS EDWARDH: Right.
Now, we have another piece of
information that comes back after April 22, when Mrs. Catterall and the other MP are informed by military intelligence that Mr. Arar is about to shortly stand his trial, and it will be alleged that he's a member of al-Qaeda and that he trained in 1993 in Afghanistan. Do you recall that evidence?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Right. And we know that that went directly back to the RCMP as well, and it went also to CSIS?

MR. PARDY: But that information was in the November 3 piece of paper as well. Up to a point, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Up to a point.
MR. PARDY: Yes. There was an
overlap to some extent. Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Right. Well, you can
circle the same information --

MR. PARDY: Absolutely, yes. MS EDWARDH: And that's exactly what it appears to be doing in this case? MR. PARDY: Yes. MS EDWARDH: Now, the point I'm just simply making is that, having been told -Mrs. Catterall having been told and I guess Sarkis -- I've forgotten his last name?

MR. PARDY: Assadourian.
MS EDWARDH: Assadourian. Having
been told that Mr. Arar had gone to Afghanistan and trained in a camp for a period of time, I would take it you would want the intelligence and policing authorities in this country to approach that information with as much caution as they did the first suggestion that he's admitted to having terrorist connections?

MR. PARDY: Yes, and I think I've given testimony that $I$ attach really no significance to going to Afghanistan in 1993, and certainly everybody that $I$ was in contact with -that was the understanding I gave them, that the information itself was of no value in and of itself.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. But I don't
want to talk about the historical context and the fact that western governments were supporting those elements in Afghanistan.

I am just going to talk about for a moment, sir, that given the conditions that you now know existed with respect to Mr. Arar's detention and his interrogation, you would have said you were in Afghanistan training in 1993 under those conditions.

MR. PARDY: That I was? MS EDWARDH: Sure. MR. PARDY: Possibly, yes. MS EDWARDH: I certainly would have.

MR. PARDY: But again, when $I$ make
those kinds of connections, it is very important that history be understood in this context, because we are all here because of history, and that is a very important consideration. When one looks at these individual pieces of information, they need to be judged as much as verification from outside sources as verification against the historical record.

MS EDWARDH: I understand that
point. My point, though, is different. That when
statements are coerced, or beaten, or tricked, or whatever out of persons who are held in those kinds of conditions, they are unreliable unless they can be confirmed by completely independent information?

MR. PARDY: Absolutely.
MS EDWARDH: All right. And of course, in order to draw the conclusion of unreliability, the persons receiving this information must be alive to the reasonable prospect of how these admissions were obtained; right?

MR. PARDY: Oh, yes, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And so in passing on this information, you would agree with me that it was the duty of the Department of Foreign Affairs to make sure that the recipient of the information properly understood its context?

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
Just for a quick clarification, my
friend has taken you through Exhibit 103 in some detail, but $I$ have one other question $I$ wish to ask.

There is a reference to CSIS on
page 3 and it says:
"CSIS officials visited Syria earlier this year..."

MR. PARDY: Is that the one --
MS EDWARDH: I'm sorry. That is
the fourth page, paragraph 11.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: This document is
written by you in 2003?
MR. PARDY: Yes. May and June, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. So the ordinary construction of that language, Mr. Pardy, would indicate that CSIS had visited Syria sometime after January 1st, 2003 --

MR. PARDY: Yes, that was a mistake that never got picked up; that is correct.

MS EDWARDH: I just wanted to
clarify whether they in fact had gone more than once, to your knowledge.

MR. PARDY: I might have started this memo in December. Sometimes it takes a while to get them out.

But certainly it was November, as I testified, on Thursday, I think it was.

MS EDWARDH: And so, to the best
of your knowledge, I take it, you have no information that CSIS attended on more than one occasion before your departure on August 31st, 2003?

MR. PARDY: That is correct, yes.
MS EDWARDH: I want to deal with
the chronology for one moment. There is a
reference in it that $I$ wish to have you expand upon, if $I$ could. Just give me a moment.

It is $P-106$, if the witness could
be provided with that. Thank you.
And in particular, sir, $I$ am
looking at the second page of the chronology.
Do you have that in front of you
now, Mr. Pardy?
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And it is halfway down the page under the notation "23.12.03", under " (C) ".

Do you see that reference?
MR. PARDY: Under 23.12 .03 , yes.
MS EDWARDH: And that date?
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: It states:
"In its annual report on human rights in Syria, the Canadian Embassy in Damascus..."

Let me stop there. Am I correct, sir, that on an annual basis the embassy gathers information about the situation in human rights and provides it to the department?

MR. PARDY: Yes. It is a standard instruction that all embassies are under to report on a standard list of conditions in each country.

MS EDWARDH: Is it something like the Country Report that is posted on the State Department website in the United States?

MR. PARDY: It's better.
MS EDWARDH: It's better.
And I take it that document is not to be made available to us, but this is the only summary $I$ can find.

MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: It says in the annual
report:

> "... refers to the persistence of allegations of torture of Arar during his
imprisonment in Syria."
So am I to understand, sir, that the embassy was picking up persistent allegations of torture throughout the year that Mr. Arar was in Syria?

MR. PARDY: I need a context in terms of when the actual report was completed, I think, by the embassy. This suggests that there certainly was some -- how much time here? Was the report produced in January of 2003 , or was it September of 2003?

I think we need a timeframe here
too. And I think this gives you -- that timeframe, I think, would give you a better understanding of this.

I am not disputing the fact as displayed in that statement.

MS EDWARDH: I am not in a position to assist you, sir, because I am the one here who doesn't know anything about the timeframe, but maybe someone will tell you if that is not a matter over which national security confidentiality is claimed.

My friend is looking, and I am hopeful this will assist you.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: If we could just wait
a moment, Mr. Commissioner?
--- Pause
MS MCISAAC: The information
suggests the report itself is dated the $23 r d$ of December, but we are trying to figure out...

MS EDWARDH: If we use that as our working hypothesis, if we can use that term, Mr. Pardy, certainly this would suggest that the embassy was picking up information, through whatever sources it had, that constituted persistent allegations of torture in respect of Mr. Arar.

MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: I have searched
through the document, sir. Leaving aside sources -- and we don't want to compromise those -- can you assist us as to whether or not those persistent allegations of torture that came to light while he was in prison were ever passed on to you?

MR. PARDY: I may have been the source of some of them. So in a sense, there was no -- as a community in terms of a group of people
that were looking at the conditions under which Mr. Arar was suffering, I think we were talking to each other extensively and certainly the comment being made by a variety of organizations, $I$ think principally Amnesty, the comments made by Dr. Mazigh, the comments being made $I$ think by a variety of people, that this was an important element in terms of understanding what was going on.

So I don't think this comes as a novel element to me at all.

MS EDWARDH: No. And you have described your own conclusions and hypotheses. But certainly it is fair to say from this information, assuming it is written correctly on the page, that the information is not solely coming from Canada but it is also coming out of Syria?

MR. PARDY: Yes. I think the embassy, as was suggested by comments by other people, was certainly not just talking to officials of the Syrian government. They were talking to a variety of people, and I think this kind of -- and particularly in terms of private Syrian citizens who may have been subject to this
sort of thing.
So there is a variety of sources for this kind of information, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Now, I have to ask
one question: From the information you received from your sources in Syria, did you ever acquire information that Mr. Arar was tortured in prison while he was there?

MR. PARDY: I am sorry, could you repeat the beginning of the question? I wasn't quite sure of the premise that you were putting forward here.

MS EDWARDH: Were you privy ever to information from Syrian sources through Damascus --

MR. PARDY: Okay.
MS EDWARDH: -- that Mr. Arar was being tortured in prison?

MR. PARDY: I don't think that there is anything in the written record, but I would have had discussions, I am trying to think, certainly with the ambassador. And as you know, there were numerous telephone calls that I had with Ambassador Pillarella.

And I am trying to think that
there was another person that contacted me, and while that person was not in Syria, that they did have some contact into Syria, and basically went over much of the kind of information that one sees in the public literature.

MS EDWARDH: And do you know from information provided to you from the ambassador whether he received information from Syrian sources that Mr. Arar was being tortured in detention in Syria?

MR. PARDY: Yes, my recollection is that -- I mean, we have touched on that issue. Now, whether he said "well, I was just out talking to a local taxi driver and this is..." No, it didn't come down to that level of detail.

But as I testified the other day, the working assumption that $I$ was using here, that in the initial days that Mr. Arar spent in the hospitality of his Syrian hosts, he -- and that was a tradition, that you did this in the early days, and the fact they allowed us in less than two weeks to go in to see him.

I think the interesting thing here is, and I think this is supported -- and while we didn't have that information at the time, what $I$
took from this, when they let us in, it gave us a benchmark against which we could measure Mr. Arar's state of mind and condition for all of the subsequent visits.

And certainly while initially the visits took place in a fairly compressed timeframe -- I think we had five visits before the end of December -- throughout that whole period there was an increasing level of confidence that the abuse did not continue in the intervals between visits.

So that is where our level of
confidence started. Now, it fell off, I think dramatically, after January 7th, where the visits almost closed down. We were in again on February 18th, April $23 r d$, and then not until August the 14 th.

And that was the troublesome thing about the information that came from SHRC, and I think I mentioned that in my testimony.

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
MR. PARDY: There wasn't a
timeframe for it. So that is why when it was detailed in the letter to Dr. Mazigh on July 29th, we took the action we did to see whether or not we
could go back in and measure Mr. Arar's condition at that time against our earlier observations of him.

MS EDWARDH: We have kind of gone away from my question.

Would you just go back to the question for a moment because $I$ think you have had an opportunity to develop that thinking earlier in discussions.

The question is this: Were you led to believe that the Canadian embassy, in the preparation of its human rights analysis, had independent information from Syrian sources about Mr. Arar's treatment?

MR. PARDY: I would need to see the report and to see what sources, because normally in those kinds of reports, sources would be identified. So I have no way of knowing a report that became available in December after I had left, just what the sources were for their conclusions here.

MS EDWARDH: I am sorry, sir, I cannot provide you a copy of this report in order to pursue any further discussions.

MR. PARDY: Well, maybe the

Commissioner has seen it, or counsel for the Commission, and then they can draw their appropriate conclusions on this, yes.

MS McISAAC: I was going to say we will review the report again and see whether there are any additional parts of it that can be released.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you,
Ms McIsaac.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner.
There is also an indication
here -- and we are going to come to the 14 th of August. But if you go down to the third line, it says that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "Mr. Arar told an embassy } \\
& \text { official, after his release, } \\
& \text { that he was mistreated during } \\
& \text { the first two weeks of his } \\
& \text { imprisonment, left alone } \\
& \text { thereafter but forced to sign } \\
& \text { a confession before his } \\
& \text { release." } \\
& \text { Now, this raises very important }
\end{aligned}
$$ questions.

I take it, sir, that -- were you aware of those facts, that that had been reported to an embassy official after his release?

MR. PARDY: No, I wasn't, but the
information that is suggested here is not materially different than what Mr. Arar gave public testimony to when he returned.

The issue of being forced to sign a confession before his release is almost a standard item in these conditions. I have seen it before in other countries. And that confession is used then as an intimidation factor possibly in terms of other family members or the possibility, heaven forbid, that Mr. Arar might want to go back to Syria.

MS EDWARDH: That would be a good way of re-detaining him and ensuring that he doesn't ever get out of prison again should he pass through the border?

MR. PARDY: In my life and in my experience, stranger things than that have happened.

MS EDWARDH: What $I$ would like to do though is show you -- could the witness be shown tab 508?

When Mr. Arar had his August 14 th
consular visit --
MR. PARDY: 514?
MS EDWARDH: No, 508.
You had both a written memorandum
provided to you and you, as I think testified, spoke to Mr. Martel after that visit.

Is that right?
MR. PARDY: No, I don't think I
spoke to Mr. Martel after that visit.
MS EDWARDH: I am sorry.
MR. PARDY: I stand --
MS EDWARDH: You have no --
MR. PARDY: No. There was a
report that came in, $I$ am sorry, on August the 14th, and I cannot recall that I spoke to Mr. Martel subsequent to that message.

MS EDWARDH: And we can get out the actual report -- perhaps we should. It's at 507. Just keep our hands there between the two documents.

I am going to tell you that it has been confirmed for me that tab 508 are Leo Martel's handwritten notes made immediately after the visit.

What Mr. Martel says when he, as you pointed out, was going in to see if there were recent signs of torture, but he does answer the question of the issue of torture in a very general way.

Is that fair?
MR. PARDY: I assume what you are
telling me is 508 is Mr. Martel's notes, handwritten notes, that he took. This is the first time $I$ have seen them in that sense.

MS EDWARDH: We will read them carefully.

MR. PARDY: You read them carefully. He writes worse than the last person, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, it looks like he is a doctor.

Let's look at what he formally reports to you.

At tab 507, under paragraph 3, he reports to you as follows:
"He was able to express
himself freely at times and he indicated that prison conditions had been more
difficult in the past than now. He mentioned he did not wish to have adverse media publicity as he felt this would only harm his case. 'The Press will know the truth when $I$ return home.' He confirmed he had not been beaten nor tortured."

Do you see that?
MR. PARDY: Yes, I do.
MS EDWARDH: So when you received this information that is reported to you, you will agree with me that it doesn't seem to limit itself to any statement of time?

MR. PARDY: That is correct.
MS EDWARDH: But you obviously had
in your mind -- and we will hear from Mr. Martel what he had in his mind -- that he was really going in to say what has happened in the very near -- or in the present tense because you were concerned about the report from the Syrian Human Rights Committee; right?

MR. PARDY: Yes, we made the
assumption that the human rights committee, since
they didn't attach a timeframe to their information, we took the worst possible interpretation and said: Well, did that happen in the last few days? Yes.

MS EDWARDH: I am going to just take you to the things that -- and that is all he says.

Now, if you go to his notes --
MR. PARDY: Can $I$ make a comment on that paragraph?

MS EDWARDH: Yes, certainly.
MR. PARDY: The words that are used there, and particularly the quotes that he mentioned, "The Press will know the truth when $I$ return home", I looked at that almost from a -for want of a better word, almost a psychological frame of mind here.

Here is a man that has just spent
11 months in some of the harshest conditions probably that exist around the world, and yet he can stand up and say -- there is hope in that statement. He is going to get out of there and he is still expressing hope that, "I am going to be out of here and I will then tell you exactly what has gone on."

I took some encouragement from this statement, I mean, the way it was reported. MS EDWARDH: Yes. But we have to be mindful of the fact that it is coupled with his own personal observation that his long detention has destroyed him mentally.

MR. PARDY: Absolutely. And as you know, people react differently to these kinds of conditions. We know a person in common who -some of the harshest conditions that $I$ think existed out there was ennobled by the process, almost, as it were.

So you take these things with some understanding of the range of possibilities that are out there, in that sense.

But overall, I was quite
surprised. We had not seen him since April and Mr. Martel goes in, and Mr. Arar stands up almost and says "look, I am getting out of here some day and I am going to tell the world what this was all about".

I took some encouragement from
that, because we did not have many messages like that out of this situation.

MS EDWARDH: I do want to go to

Mr. Martel's notes, if I could?
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: I have told you the circumstances under which they were made. And there is the first reference at the very top:
"Makes -- does not wish
adverse publicity..."
And that may be:
"Maher does not wish adverse publicity on case."

And then can you help me on this?
Maybe we will all read together, Mr. Commissioner.
Everyone has a good handle on a few words.
"Prison conditions. I will tell you the truth."

THE COMMISSIONER: "Asking Syria".
MS EDWARDH: "Asking Syria to release me or to see a judge. Which Syrian law I broke?"

That seems to be a question that Mr. Arar is asking.

MR. PARDY: $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
MS EDWARDH: "Present conditions.
I have not been paralysed, not beaten, not tortured.
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Very beginning, very little. 3 by 6 by 7."

So that seems to refer to the
dimensions of the cell?
MR. PARDY: I --
MS EDWARDH: From what you now
know?
MR. PARDY: I think Mr. Martel --
again, as $I$ say, if $I$ read this in the context, yes, that is the interpretation. Obviously the location of his confinement was as small as that.

MS EDWARDH: "Sleeping on ground."
MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: "Mentally destroyed."
MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm.
MS EDWARDH: It would appear very much the case, Mr. Pardy, that Mr. Martel in his notes at least was focusing on, as you noted, the present conditions. "Was he then being tortured?"

MR. PARDY: Let me see.
MS EDWARDH: It starts with
"Present conditions".
MR. PARDY: Yes, but he says in the last one, just before the numbers, 3, 6, and 7, that sentence, "very beginning, very little".

Is that accurate?
MS EDWARDH: We haven't heard from Mr. Martel.

MR. PARDY: This is why $I$ say
that. In terms of personal notes such as this, as you have seen with my own notes, one word can convey a lot as far as memory is concerned.

MS EDWARDH: I am going to suggest to you this accords with your recollection that you and Mr. Martel were focused on the present condition of detention and whether Mr. Arar was at that time being -- and I am going to use not just torture but physically tortured.

That was your preoccupation?
MR. PARDY: Physical torture is
always in some ways -- how can $I$ put this? -- the most important consideration that one looks for, because it is the physical torture that sets up the victim thereafter.

I have read cases where, I mean, somebody is physically tortured at the very beginning and thereafter there is no physical torture. But all you need to do is put on a recording of sounds and the sphincter starts to loosen. That is the reality of all this.

So you look to the physical
torture as an indication of what other things may happen, yes.

MS EDWARDH: I completely
understand and I agree, and perhaps we should get your observations about that.

But all I am trying to say is you testified, sir, that your preoccupation with the August 14 th consular visit was to ascertain whether Mr. Arar's current conditions involve the use of physical torture.

That is what you were focused on?
MR. PARDY: In order -- yes, what we had were a series of benchmarks. We saw Mr. Arar on eight occasions previous to that, and that gave us a set of benchmarks against which to measure what his state was on August the 14 th.

There wasn't a preoccupation with the last two days. It was a set of observations that could be compared with the other observations that we had, and they did not materially change except that there was more information direct from Mr. Arar during the August 14 th conversations than perhaps were available from the earlier ones.

MS EDWARDH: And you were looking

## StenoTran

to answer the suggestion in the Syrian Human Rights Committee report?

MR. PARDY: Not to answer them. I was looking for information that would give us, in effect, a standard against which one would talk about this to the Canadian public, yes.

MS EDWARDH: It does seem to me
that Mr. Martel is distinguishing the present condition from the very beginning in his very own note here?

MR. PARDY: Yes, I think so. I
think, as $I$ have already testified, that the working inference that we were using here was that those harsh conditions existed at the very beginning, and certainly then there was some amelioration of how he was treated.

But we had certainly never had any information about the physical confinement that he was subject to, this 3,6 , and 7 . There was never a previous reference to that.

I first heard about it when
Mr. Arar gave public testimony, yes.
MS EDWARDH: If you can just
answer -- I don't want to abuse the privilege of asking you questions, but if we could just get
through this by answering the question yes or no. Would you agree the note seems to distinguish between present condition and the very beginning?

MR. PARDY: Am I allowed a "maybe" here?

MS EDWARDH: Yes, absolutely.
MR. PARDY: I don't know. I mean, this is something that Mr. Martel sat down and wrote in the immediacy of that visit, and my understanding is that he is going to be here in a couple of weeks and will talk to you about all of this.

You are asking me to interpret what Mr. Arar meant here. I am sorry, I can't help you to the extent that you would like.

MS EDWARDH: Well, we get some better sense -- let me put the question very simply to you.

There is nothing in the consular note that would appear to tell you anything about the conditions of confinement, unless $I$ am missing them because they are redacted.

There is nothing to suggest that what Mr. Martel knew on August 14 th, when he
walked out of that meeting, about the size of the cell or sleeping on the floor or anything else, was communicated to you August 14 th?

MR. PARDY: I certainly can't
remember those numbers. They are very striking numbers, and I think it's the kind of thing that sticks in your mind the first time you hear them, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And they are striking because they are about the size of a grave?

MR. PARDY: Yes. Three, 6, and 7?
Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And in reviewing the report, we can agree that there's no discussion of that, nor any sense that the assertion he was not tortured was limited to the current conditions?

I will break that down in two, I am sorry.

MR. PARDY: Please, yes.
MS EDWARDH: There is nothing in the report that refers to the size of the cell or sleeping on the floor; correct?

MR. PARDY: That I see here. I
would need to be reminded of the redacted portions, but that is not possible, I take, under
these conditions.
MS EDWARDH: I am sorry,
Mr. Pardy. If I could, I would. I have no reason to think the government would redact the size of the cell, but maybe they would.

MS McISAAC: I don't believe that
is covered in the redactions.
MS EDWARDH: Thank you. It seems
it's not there then.
And the second important
observation is that there is nothing in this
report that conveys any limitation to the assertion "he confirmed that he had not been beaten nor tortured".

That would seem to speak as though
it applied through the entire timeframe of Mr. Arar's detention?

MR. PARDY: Yes, but I would
qualify it with the statement that Mr. Martel quotes here:
"The Press will know the
truth when $I$ return home."
So everything that was said was qualified, in my mind, by that statement.

MS EDWARDH: All right. Now, the
issue of course, though, is we do get -- I hear what you are saying, Mr. Pardy.

But the really critical issue is,
within -- I don't want to say a couple of hours. It may have been more; it may have been less -the Minister is standing there, pronouncing -maybe it's in 24 hours -- that there has been a consular visit, and Mr. Arar has independently confirmed that he has not been tortured. There is no limitation in time or place and there is no reflection of the fact that Mr. Arar is not speaking independently or outside of the sight of his Syrian guests. All right? So I need to know from you, Mr. Pardy, I think we all need to know, is how such a mistake, how such a briefing could go forward and the Minister could find himself in a position where he says that he was not alive to the concerns that you had about Mr. Arar from his initial interrogation, and then subsequently understood this to be confirmation completely that he had never been tortured?

Maybe you can help us understand how that miscommunication takes place, because you certainly testified, sir, that you had sent that
message both vertically and horizontally through the department.

MR. PARDY: And I think -- $I$ will
answer it in the general sense, and then try to come in with the specifics shortly thereafter.

MS EDWARDH: Thank you.
MR. PARDY: As the Minister I
think has given testimony, the maze that exists -and $I$ use that term quite deliberately in terms of something that is on my mind or on a piece of paper that $I$ wrote. By the time it gets to the Minister, it's a fairly laborious process.

The Minister -- and I think this
is the essence of his testimony. His activities and statements quite often, and particularly statements that are made on the fly, are made on the basis of verbal briefings from his staff.

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
MR. PARDY: And he also said that
it does not mean that everything gets completely passed in this process.

What amazes me in this whole
process -- and $I$ have been watching it for years -- is that anything accurate ever gets said when it goes through this process.

Mr. Graham was very, very good. I don't think that there was, apart from this one instance that $I$ can think of, an example where one word got mentioned that perhaps was inappropriate. And Mr. Graham has already testified to that fact.

MS EDWARDH: Absolutely.
MR. PARDY: But what you have to accept here is that it does not imply that other people did not have this information. And the value that they attached it, in terms of the passing it on to the Minister, is something for them to give evidence on.

But certainly $I$ think for people that $I$ was working with on a daily basis, I did not hide my views on this important issue. It was out there.

But as time passed -- how can you put it here? -- and you are dealing with the details of trying to achieve something here, whether it was coordination in government, coherence in government, or trying to get an MP visit done, or trying to get a Prime Ministerial emissary on his way out to Syria, you didn't sort of preface, every time you talked to somebody, "Well, $I$ think that back in October I thought
these terrible things were going on."
You sort of move beyond it because
there was a certain comfort factor in those meetings that we had with Mr. Arar up until -well, I would say February 18th. After that it was really spotty in that sense.

So there was a comfort factor.
And I think maybe we might have reflected that comfort factor in comments that we might have made upwards and more broadly in the department.

MS EDWARDH: Did you, sir, as well, give press interviews saying that, based upon this information, that Mr. Arar had denied being tortured?

MR. PARDY: I stand to be
corrected, but $I$ don't think that $I$ ever made that kind of a statement publicly, because it is an area that $I$ did not want to engage the public on because of the possible impact this could have. We were already working under serious limitations, both within the Canadian government and with the Syrians. I did not want to add to our difficulties in terms of what we were trying to do to get Mr. Arar out of Syria.

And those kinds of things, if they
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were displayed in the media, then that would have definitely added to our problems.

MS EDWARDH: So what we are left with, or what the Commissioner is left with, is in this labyrinth of communication the message gets sanitized, and it may be through error, simple error, it may be because the person doesn't value the message, or appreciate the significance of the message, or it may be for some other reason that $I$ can't for the moment think of, but there could be a bunch of reasons.

But it is clear, Mr. Pardy, that the message didn't get through at the beginning, in the first months of Mr. Arar's detention. And that is what is of concern.

MR. PARDY: I would not use the
word "sanitize" because that suggests an ulterior motive that is involved in all of this. I don't think there was any ulterior motive involved, either at the top or at the bottom on this issue.

I think the Minister has given evidence in terms of his general understanding of the events in the Middle East, and the conditions in Syria in particular, and the possibility that somebody like Mr. Arar could be subject to some
pretty nasty business.
I think that general understanding
was out there. But as the Minister has said, would it have made any material difference to our efforts?

I would make one statement
further: that if that information was generally talked about in the media, the material difference that it would have made would have made our job that much harder in terms of helping Mr. Arar.

MS EDWARDH: All right. But let me put another series of propositions and we can do this quickly.

It is clear, sir, that there is no
written record of you recommending that the Minister of Foreign Affairs be alive to the serious and difficult conditions of detention and probability of torture in the first two months of Mr. Arar's detention. There is nothing on the written record that gets us there.

Is that fair?
MR. PARDY: And as you will note
as well --
MS EDWARDH: Can we answer the
question?

MR. PARDY: It's not there. Can I give you an explanation? of why that would be the situation?

MS EDWARDH: Absolutely you can. MR. PARDY: As you know, our efforts to coordinate pieces of paper upwards that encompassed a variety of views around the government, it was one hell of a process. So my approach to many of these issues was to talk to the people directly involved, because I didn't have to coordinate with anyone.

And in terms of my views and in
terms of my views of what may have happened to Mr. Arar in the initial days of his incarceration, those views were certainly there in the minds of the people that mattered.

MS EDWARDH: Right. But just to be absolutely clear -- and we know you have said you sent this information up to the Minister's office. But do you, Mr. Pardy, have a recollection of speaking specifically to the Minister himself on this matter or would that have been a member of his staff?

MR. PARDY: It would have been a
member of his staff. I think our meetings with Mr. Graham on the case largely revolved around -and I am trying to think. There weren't that many.

The problem you run into, we probably had six cases going that involved the Minister at this point, and so there was a whole series of meetings with him.

The ones specific to Mr. Arar? I don't think there was more than two or three in the year in which this case went on, and I think they all related to -- well, one, the deck I think was discussed at one point briefly, the issue of coordination.

The other one was this old effort on the letter, $I$ think, in July -- or in June and July, yes, of 2003.

And in those meetings -- you are saying did $I$ suddenly say to Mr. Graham, you know, six months earlier, my view was that Mr. Arar had been abused and tortured and everything else -MS EDWARDH: I don't mean to belittle this at all. I just want to establish that you have no record, nor do you have any recollection of communicating this information to
the Minister at any time during your conversations?

MR. PARDY: Direct to Mr. Graham, no.

MS EDWARDH: That is all I am
asking.
MR. PARDY: That is not there, no.
MS EDWARDH: And is the staff
member who you most frequently dealt with on these issues Robert Fry?

MR. PARDY: It was Mr. Fry, but also Ms Lobo. And there was other person there, depending on what they needed information on. There was one other lady, I think it was the parliamentary -- Michelle Lobo was the press person for Mr. Graham. And there was one other person there. There were three of them, yes. MS EDWARDH: Let me put a general proposition to you.

The Minister has certainly left the suggestion that had he known that torture or conditions of confinement that didn't meet the standards of the western world at all were at play, it might have put the fire under everybody, or it might have put the fire under him, and that
he may have had different conversations with his colleagues at the cabinet table, the Solicitor General, and $I$ assume others, and he even went so far as to suggest he may well have talked to Mr. Cellucci.

So in retrospect, in retrospect, Mr. Pardy, I am asking you would it not have been more appropriate to not let this labyrinth perhaps alter the message but put it directly on the Minister's lap so there could be no doubt that he knew what the passage of time could mean?

MR. PARDY: I have said before that we were playing hockey on Saturday night, and I think we played it successfully, and the business of second-guessing myself on Sunday morning about what we could have done differently, I would rather leave that to the good graces of this Commission and its Commissioner and let him draw his conclusions as to whether or not certain things could have been done better.

I am so close to this, and the business of lighting the fire, my ass was already burning on this case. I didn't need anybody to light a fire under me to keep it going here. And a lot of other people were in exactly the same
boat.
So the idea of second-guessing
ourselves in the way that you suggest, I don't think it's appropriate in these -- maybe a year from now I might have a bit more perspective on it and I will sit down and we can have a drink together and we can talk about it.

In this context I think it's
unfair to a lot of people in terms of what they did to start second-guessing us at this stage based on partial interpretation of the information that may be available to you. And I would leave that to the Commissioner.

MS EDWARDH: I am not going to sit down and be quiet just yet, Mr. Pardy.

MR. PARDY: No, no, okay.
--- Laughter / Rires
MR. PARDY: I wasn't suggesting
that. I know you don't sit down --
MS EDWARDH: I want to put to you,
though -- we have the testimony of the Minister.
MR. PARDY: Yes, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And if you were
advising the man who took over your position or the next one, if you were giving them a piece of
advice, wouldn't that piece of advice be today: Make sure that in the communications that go up, when you ask for support in the hierarchy, that you are very clear. If you really believe that the person who you are trying to extend help to is a victim or is probably a victim of torture, don't be soft with that message because they may not hear.

MR. PARDY: Well, with all due respect to the importance of this question, $I$ am not prepared to second-guess myself on that particular issue yet. It may come to that.

But I am telling you that in terms of the support that the Minister gave to us throughout this case, it was -- and the record will suggest it -- there was never an opportunity.

But the downside on the issue of torture here was that if it got hung out there as a major element in this case, well, $I$ would suggest to you that Mr. Arar would still be a guest of the Syrian government.

I mean, this is a tough government to deal with, and let me tell you, it is not easy. And it is messages from Canada as you have already demonstrated, that caused additional difficulties
here.
MS EDWARDH: Because you have said that, Mr. Pardy, I have to ask one question. MR. PARDY: Last one.

MS EDWARDH: To what extent do
persons in your position as you were -- I know you
are not there now -- have to censor the
information that goes up the line in order that
those people who receive it don't make either
casual use of it or don't use it and cause mistakes to be made?

MR. PARDY: There wasn't a
censoring of the information going up here because in effect there were almost daily conversations with people in Mr. Graham's office. It was more an attempt to try to structure it so that when the information got passed verbally to other people that there was a deep sensitivity and understanding of the damage that such information could cause if it became a subject of public debate.

MS EDWARDH: And is that why it is not written down? We old lawyers are of the belief that one of the ways of making sure that information doesn't fall into the wrong hands and
be abused is you just don't write it down. You speak to the person.

MR. PARDY: Well, in government it's not much different. It's that in effect because direct conversation is still the main vehicle of conveying -- despite all of the bloody paper that is available to you on this case, it is still that personal conversation with an individual that is still the most important dimension here.

MS EDWARDH: And do we take it
from what your last comment that there were matters like the discussion of torture that you would not have written down in respect of Mr. Arar in order to protect that information but to exchange it on a verbal basis?

MR. PARDY: Well, part of the problem was that this was based on no hard information. It was inference. And it was only when Mr. Martel saw him for the first time on October 23rd -- I mean, one could almost -- and you can put another interpretation on this.

It wasn't relief that -- because we would have had a more difficult situation to deal with. It wasn't relief. Here was a man who
was standing up, he was talking to us, and was coherent.

So it wasn't sort of information
that you wanted to -- what's the word here? -- if it was just the opposite, our observations of Mr. Arar, then in effect we would have drawn quite different conclusions.

MS EDWARDH: We have been through the meanings you can attach to the consular visit, and $I$ do not want to go back there.

I am sorry, Mr. Commissioner, I am taking longer than $I$ said I would. The witness' answers are longer than $I$ expected they would be.

Shall I just keep going?
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think if
you can.
MS EDWARDH: Then let me go to another area.

We have a series of documents that I wanted to ask you about.

In the Garvie report at page 41 -one fact that is not a document -- there is a suggestion that the Department of Foreign Affairs, at the very top of the page, is making inquiry of the RCMP about whether they wish to or are
interested in pursuing an interview with Mr. Arar.
Do you see that?
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And this conversation
would have occurred -- I also have trouble with whether everyone is using the dates in the same way.

I think it is May 3rd.
MR. PARDY: May 14 in 2003. MS EDWARDH: It is May. May 14th.

Do you know, sir, or were you
privy to any discussions about the willingness of the Department of Foreign Affairs to act as a facilitator for any RCMP interview if the Mounties wanted one to take place?

Were you behind that in any way?
MR. PARDY: I was aware throughout this period that there was a possibility that they would like to go. It first came up in the context -- or just prior to the initial planning for the visit of Ms Catterall and Mr. Assadourian, there was a suggestion. MS EDWARDH: Do you know by whom? MR. PARDY: Oh, it was direct from the RCMP, I think, that they were interested in
going to Syria.
And I took the view, no. We had just come through the experience of $\operatorname{CSIS}$ and mixed messages being made and things like that, and I was quite firm on that.

The only thing I could get from them was a commitment that they wouldn't go prior to the visit of the MPs, which took place.

And then afterwards, $I$ think it came up once, and I basically stuck my elbows out and said no, this is not on. I think it would create difficulties for us.

And I don't think it came to pass whatsoever.

MS EDWARDH: So can you give us a little better sense of the timeframe?

The first one you said is planning
around --
MR. PARDY: It was March of 2003, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And I take it you dealt directly with someone specifically in the RCMP?

MR. PARDY: I think it was -- it certainly would have involved the RCMP. It was at
a meeting that ISI had put together and certainly there were representatives from the RCMP and CSIS in that meeting, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And that is in March?
MR. PARDY: That is my
understanding that it was in March, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And was there any
discussion -- well, at that time you put the
kibosh to the idea that they are going?
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: And it is raised, I
gather, on two other occasions?
MR. PARDY: I can remember one other, and $I$ think it was in May, thereabouts, and again, basically -- my recollection is that the people in ISI fully agreed with me on this point. So the message that is going back from the Department of Foreign Affairs was a common one on this issue.

But in this area, we were nervous
about it because the RCMP always retained the right to decide for itself what it needed to do overseas in respect of a criminal investigation. So we were of the view that we had to carry them almost, as it were, in terms of this
so that they didn't feel that they would exercise their right to go overseas and do an interview.

By the same token, $I$ think what we had on our side was a very clear statement from the Syrian Military Intelligence that they did not want to talk to policemen. They had been burnt by an experience where the German police went down to Syria, and they felt they were badly burned, and they said they would not deal with police going overseas.

And we used that as a little bit of a club against the Force as well.

MS EDWARDH: Right. And I take it when you say the RCMP always placed a reservation around there accession to not going, which was nothing more or less than $" i f$ we want, we will go, and you will not determine that for us", that's --

MR. PARDY: That is generally --
and that is the rule that is out there, as uncomfortable as it is in a case such as this.

But generally, as a rule, they
will decide. The Commissioner has great discretion, as you know, under the RCMP Act in this area, and he has been prepared to exercise it, too.

MS EDWARDH: But when they arrive in Syria, they report in to Mr. Pillarella, who represents the Government of Canada?

MR. PARDY: That would be the expectation, yes.

MS EDWARDH: So if Mr. Pillarela said to them, "Gentlemen, we have all been doing everything we can to resolve this issue with Mr. Arar. If we send you in there, it's not going to help the situation. Go home." He has the authority to do that?

MR. PARDY: He can try. But as you remember, back in October I sent a message to Ambassador Pillarella sensitizing him to the possibility that something could happen through the liaison officers who are posted overseas for both organizations.

But again, $I$ have seen things where RCMP will show up in a country without any reference to the ambassador, and that is possible.

MS EDWARDH: Right. So what you are doing is sending out warning signals to the Damascus embassy and to the liaison officers, I suppose --

MR. PARDY: No, it would be to
the -- liaison officers generally are more sensitive to the role of the ambassador in these things than necessarily people back at headquarters in the RCMP and CSIS.

So in a sense the ambassador is at the switch to a certain extent on these issues. MS EDWARDH: So certainly, in accordance with the proper protocols, despite the fact you didn't know CSIS was going to go and would have objected, one would properly assume that CSIS notified the ambassador and said, "We are presenting ourselves here pursuant to our mandate, and we have some work to do and here we are."

MR. PARDY: That is my
understanding of what happened, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And the ambassador is quite free, and indeed duty-bound to ensure that the activities of that branch of the Government of Canada do not fracture or break other initiatives if he felt it was required?

MR. PARDY: Yes. He has that role to play, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. So let's go then back to your understanding of the RCMP.

Is it your understanding, Mr. Pardy, that you were able to kibosh any effort on their part to actually travel to Syria to interview Mr. Arar?

MR. PARDY: I don't know in the definitive sense. I would hope that I had some influence on them.

But I would add to the other thing here -- and $I$ know that you will look at this with some degree of scepticism. The sharing of information that went on was meant to try to -what's the word here? -- to give pause to the idea that they needed to go to Syria for any particular purpose.

MS EDWARDH: Well, indeed, you
implied that when you say that you were carrying them. In one of the answers to a question $I$ posed, Mr. Pardy, you said you were carrying them.

If I understand you correctly, it's exactly that idea: that by sending them all the information --

MR. PARDY: Not all of the information; selected information. I don't agree with your concept of the sieve. There is no sieve on this issue, okay?

MS EDWARDH: The consular information is selective. Certainly they got whatever -- we know now they got whatever the Syrian Military Intelligence would give them from the investigation. They got that. That wasn't selective?

MR. PARDY: No.
MS EDWARDH: But you were hoping
that by giving them consular information that might back them off.

Is that right?
MR. PARDY: Information that in my mind, my judgment, would not cause additional difficulties for Mr. Arar with the RCMP and maybe might have softened a heart or two.

MS EDWARDH: And it's fair to say that having made -- now $I$ understand the reasoning here. But having made that decision, it's pretty clear that if that was -- it's late in the day. I was going to use the word buy-off. But if that is what was given to them in order to keep them happy --

MR. PARDY: Out of the equation in Syria.

MS EDWARDH: Out of the equation.

It tells us how important it was from your perspective that they actually not go around you and present themselves to Syrian Military Intelligence with the view to continuing a criminal investigation in Canada?

MR. PARDY: Well, after our experience on the CSIS issue, I think it was the single-most issue that caused me -- I would think about it almost on a daily basis. I did not want that to happen.

So anything I could do to prevent that from happening, $I$ think the price was a reasonable one yes.

MS EDWARDH: So when used the language -- which, granted, $I$ have a lot of trouble with, Mr. Pardy -- that giving the RCMP the consular documents was to benefit Mr. Arar, part of the benefit was keeping the Mounties out of the equation?

MR. PARDY: Yes, that is what $I$ have tried to say from day one.

MS EDWARDH: I am sorry. Keeping them at home.

MR. PARDY: Yes. And that could not be done by fiat or dictate, it had to be done
by co-option almost, as it were.
MS EDWARDH: And we do know that CSIS got some information too. So let me just ask you this: Was the decision in January, which was the first consular visit that CSIS got, was that decision on your part to provide CSIS that consular information done with the exact same understanding and purpose in mind: that maybe you could buy them off with this information so that they wouldn't go back?

MR. PARDY: My recollection was
that in terms of the process that I had with Mr. Solomon, I was never asked about a release of a document to CSIS.

My recollection is that all of the releases I did were related to the RCMP, and I would certainly make a distinction in my mind between the two organizations.

Now, you have said -- I am aware I think of three documents --

MS McISAAC: Mr. Commissioner, may
I assist, please?
I believe that there was evidence during the in-camera session, and I feel very uncomfortable because I do not accurately or
adequately remember the evidence. But I think the evidence would tend to suggest that Mr. Pardy probably was not aware of the sharing of that particular document with CSIS.

But, as I say, I simply cannot
recall the evidence sufficiently to feel
particularly comfortable in the circumstance that we are now in.

MS EDWARDH: Well, $I$ can ask the witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Just a moment. Mr. Cavalluzzo will comment.

MR. CAVALLUZZO: I feel confident that Mr. Pardy's recollection is correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Go ahead, Ms Edwardh.

MS EDWARDH: And that is that you didn't know it was being sent. Thank you very much.

You are comfortable with that as a footing to have the questions. You were not aware that Mr . Solomon provided them to CSIS?

MR. PARDY: I was not consulted.
MS EDWARDH: Okay. I am sorry.
You remember not consulted.

You must have been very angry, because you have made it very clear to this Commissioner that when the RCMP got information, they got it selectively and it was approved by you?

MR. PARDY: I had retired when that bit of information came my way on the CSIS.

MS EDWARDH: Right. So after you were retired and reflected upon the fact that it had been done without your authority, without your approval, $I$ take it that didn't conform to departmental policy?

MR. PARDY: Certainly in terms of my approach, it was that in effect anything that $I$ labelled consular information -- and I think this is Mr. Livermore's testimony as well. If it was consular information, then $I$ should have been consulted about it leaving the Department of Foreign Affairs.

MS EDWARDH: Right. And you were not consulted?

MR. PARDY: I was not on anything that $I$ went to CSIS that $I$ can reflect about.

But the RCMP, yes, I was consulted, and I made a deliberate decision about,
yes.
very clear, sir.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: I take it that you
have no understanding that differs -- no. Let me try again.

That CSIS has no greater right to the information than the RCMP. It would have to be done with someone addressing the provisions of the Privacy Act and going through whatever reasoning there was about the appropriateness of its release?

MR. PARDY: That is correct, yes.
MS EDWARDH: And I take it, sir,
that you are the proper person in the department to have gone through that calibration?

MR. PARDY: Exactly.
MS EDWARDH: And that you never
did?
MR. PARDY: And $I$ never did in
this instance, no.
MS EDWARDH: Would you like to
comment on the propriety of it being released without your consent or approval?

MR. PARDY: I think the
Commissioner is going to be quite capable of doing that when he looks at all of the information because I still do not have all the -- I have no information about the -- you are talking about something that $I$ am not aware of and generally $I$ don't talk about things unless $I$ know something about them, although you may disagree with that. MS EDWARDH: No.
--- Laughter / Rires
MS EDWARDH: I shall hold my
tongue, Mr. Pardy.
Now, sir, the record, in talking about the RCMP and DFAIT, we have another document where the CSIS liaison officer sends a memo to someone about questions.

Maybe we should show it to you.
It is $P-67$. I am sorry.
Could you show the witness $P-67$ ?
In looking at that document, sir,
does it help you identify that it came from the CSIS liaison officer in Foreign Affairs?

MR. PARDY: I don't know. It certainly ended up with CSIS. Where it originated, $I$ don't think it's self-evident from
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the words on the page.
MS EDWARDH: All right.
MR. PARDY: It ended up in CSIS.
I don't think -- their chop is on it there in
terms of what they were doing, yes.
MS EDWARDH: Let me ask you this, sir: Do you recall at any time in May and June or April, May, and June of there being discussions that, if the Mounties shouldn't go and you don't want CSIS to go, that ISI should go and travel to Syria?

MR. PARDY: No, I do not have any recollection of that, although I would not have the same anxiety level with some of the -- I know the person who would go, and I would take some measure of comfort in that person possibly being in Syria and talking to a variety of people.

MS EDWARDH: And do you know, sir, whether anyone of that type, in fact, travelled to Syria?

MR. PARDY: No, I do not believe that they did certainly prior to August 30, 2003. I know for a fact that nobody did.

MS EDWARDH: And you use the date of August 30, I take it, to mark your departure
from the department?
MR. PARDY: Welcome departure.
MS EDWARDH: I see. Okay.
--- Laughter / Rires
We have talked about the problems
that would have been created if the RCMP had
travelled from the perspective of trying to
interview Mr. Arar or interview, and indeed the problems that were precipitated by CSIS.

I'd like you to help us with this distinction, if there is one, because I don't see it, Mr. Pardy.

One of the issues that the
Commissioner will have to struggle with is the recurrent requests by Mr. Pillarella for the products of the investigation.

I mean, I can take you through the tabs, but $I$ think you're familiar with the record, Mr. Pardy, and we know that from the very beginning, Mr. Pillarella passes back to Canada information that there's a promise that he will get the products of the investigative brief of the Syrian Military Intelligence, right? It starts right from the get-go, the first day?

MR. PARDY: I wouldn't use the
word "persistent" at all. I think Mr. Pillarella's actions here were appropriate to the circumstances, and he tried to obtain information, and while the information may have been dual use, the opportunity was that that information could, in the end, be helpful to Mr. Arar.

And I think it would be wrong to characterize this with some degree of ulterior motive on the part of Mr. Pillarella. But persistence seems to suggest in this area just that very concept --

MS EDWARDH: I don't mean to suggest it. Let us put it this way: From time to time, and quite regularly, Mr. Pillarella inquired about, not just whether the investigation was over, but whether or not he could have information from the investigation? No judgment about it, but that's what he did.

And, as you pointed out, this
information was dual-use information.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: One of the uses was intelligence and other information to go to policing authorities in Canada, and the other part
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of the information was that it might be useful to Mr. Arar?

MR. PARDY: It was all useful to Mr. Arar and in terms of our management of the case.

Now, some of it may have been of some use to the security and police organizations back in Canada, but $I$ did not regard any of the information that Ambassador Pillarella obtained in this context as being information that was of no value to our assisting Mr. Arar.

MS EDWARDH: What was the dual
usage then?
MR. PARDY: The dual use was, in effect, it gave -- take the Afghanistan information, say, for example. The allegations of al-Qaeda.

That information then, in terms of the security and intelligence people, it gave them, certainly on the Afghanistan side, it gave them a very specific piece of information that they could and should have -- I don't know whether they did or not -- but it should have been investigated to see whether the time -- we're talking seven and a half months, $I$ think it was,
was that piece of information? -- that that could have established, well, if that didn't happen, the Syrian house crumbled in terms of the information that they were passing. So $I$ saw it in that context.

MS EDWARDH: And they may have
seen it as this is an important piece of intelligence with respect to Mr. Arar?

MR. PARDY: But it was not
important until it was verified through independent action by the Canadian police and security agencies.

MS EDWARDH: Well, that's your view of it. You know it's not important unless it's verified. How do you know that this same information, which was even leaked later on --

MR. PARDY: Mm-hmm?
MS EDWARDH: -- doesn't have its own intrinsic value to them without confirmation? MR. PARDY: I may have a slightly
higher opinion of the police force than is suggested by your question, quite frankly.

I have worked with them for a long
number of years, and $I$ think that that kind of information coming into their system gives them a
starting point that might have been of some value to our understanding of what happened in 1993, if anything happened in 1993.

MS EDWARDH: This, of course, is
the same police force that leaked the information after Mr. Arar came home -MS McISAAC: I don't think we know that.

MS EDWARDH: Hmm?
THE COMMISSIONER: Well, let's
just carry on.
MS EDWARDH: Is that an objection, though? I think it's important, Mr. Commissioner. THE COMMISSIONER: It's not established as to who leaked it so -MS EDWARDH: I appreciate that the name of the person may never be known. THE COMMISSIONER: Right. MS EDWARDH: But it may indeed be important that when someone is describing the interior office space of the RCMP offices -THE COMMISSIONER: But your question was, this is the same police force, which implies that it was an authorized leak by the RCMP itself, and what's not established certainly is
that. It could have been a single individual, albeit an RCMP officer.

MS EDWARDH: Okay. You're quite
right. Perhaps I misspoke myself. I'll leave it as it was. But certainly the suggestion is it's at least a member, if not a corporate decision.

MR. PARDY: Well, to balance the record, $I$ was interviewed about that leak as well. I mean, so the interviewing that went on was not unidirectional by any means. I think there was an effort to establish whether or not government itself, other parts of government, might have been involved, because the document in question was widely distributed. MS EDWARDH: Now, $I$ just have a couple of other questions and I am pressing the Commissioner's good graces.

I am troubled as well by the
suggestion that consular access -- there's a commitment by the Department of Foreign Affairs to providing consular access in the same way to persons alleged to be involved in terrorist activities as to an ordinary person who's been arrested for a common assault in Washington, D.C., and I'm troubled because, of course -- and I know
you've read the material because I gave it to you before you commenced your testimony, because it's very clear in the Khadr case that the position of the government, on behalf of the Department of Foreign Affairs, with respect to consular services, is that it is a matter of discretion, as to whether consular services will be provided in such a case.

Now, that may be a new position, because you have left -- this is litigation that commenced in 2004. But are you aware -- when you were there, was that the position of the department?

MR. PARDY: It's a legal -- it's a position taken by the lawyers in the Department of Foreign Affairs in terms of -- in a very narrow sense.

I never agreed with it and I objected to any suggestion that the delivery of consular services did not occur other than on the basis of obligation on the part of the Government of Canada.

Now, there are lawyers out there that are prepared because -- as you know, there are a number of civil suits out there.

MS EDWARDH: For failing to
provide service.
MR. PARDY: For failing to
provide. And there is already one decision at the Federal Court level that suggests -- and that's in relation -- that's in relation to the Khadr case, I think it is.

So that's out there as a matter of law, I suppose, if $I$ can use that term, but it's not a position that $I$ liked, and $I$ fought against it every time $I$ could.

MS EDWARDH: Right.
MR. PARDY: Yes.
MS EDWARDH: Certainly it's a position -- I understand, you, given your position in the department, that you fought against it.

But certainly it's a position, I'm
going to suggest to you, that CSIS and the RCMP took and promoted, because they wanted to put forward the view that consular assistance for these kinds of individuals was not to be given on the same terms as you would give it, Mr. Pardy?

MR. PARDY: I don't think that
their objection was as sophisticated as you suggest here.

MS EDWARDH: Perhaps not. What was their objection?

MR. PARDY: Their objection, in terms of -- largely arose from their very specific responsibilities under the CSIS Act and the RCMP Act, that they felt that that was their responsibility, and their responsibility did not involve providing assistance to the Department of Foreign Affairs on any consular case.

That's -- it has happened before, and I've argued this even with the RCMP, and we had some measure of success in obtaining cooperation from the RCMP on specific cases.

So I don't think that was based on this narrow view of some lawyers that the government was under no -- in terms of the obligation of government to assist Canadians.

MS EDWARDH: Was there any
concern -- no.
Did the RCMP or CSIS have the view that if consular assistance would be given to such persons facing such allegations, then it had to be coupled, fully, with the use of such information for intelligence and police purposes.

MR. PARDY: No, I don't think that
that is a conclusion one can draw from any of this.

MS EDWARDH: If I could have your indulgence for a moment? So I can speak to my client.
--- Laughter / Rires
--- Discussion off the record / Discussion
officieuse
MS EDWARDH: I have a couple more questions and then, Mr. Commissioner, I understand Ms McIsaac thinks she'll be several hours. I don't know whether we are just going to continue or --

THE COMMISSIONER: I'd like, if we could, to finish with the cross-examination, so that if we are going to be putting it over, I think $I$ would like it to be through that --

MS EDWARDH: All right. Now, I
just have a couple of questions.
One of the things I'd like you to
comment on -- and it was in unfortunate circumstances. I'm not suggesting malafides on anyone's part, Mr. Pardy, but when Mr. Lavertu went to Syria, he was unable, because of circumstances, as I read the note, to raise the
issue of Mr. Arar, although we had been instructed to try?

MR. PARDY: Yes, that was the commitment, that he was going to try to raise this, because every official visitor that we had going to Syria through this period, we wanted them to talk about Mr. Arar, yes.

MS EDWARDH: Right. And you'll
agree with me that for whatever the reasons, and we can expound upon them briefly, Mr. Lavertu's failure to raise the Arar case was an unfortunate -- may have given an unfortunate message to the Syrian authorities by not conveying that he was one of Canada's priorities?

MR. PARDY: Well, I did a message back to $I$ think Mr. Pillarella, which is in the file there, and raised that point with him, and I said -- and I think I used the word that it was unfortunate it was not raised for the very point you mentioned.

The ambassador came back and suggested in his reply that perhaps $I$ was being overly pessimistic on the actual effect of not raising it.
But again it was certainly
something that caused me -- because I wanted everybody to raise this case, yes.

MS EDWARDH: And you were worried by the failure to raise it in that context? MR. PARDY: In that context, yes. MS EDWARDH: Now, one or two last issues.

I got the feeling from some of your very late memorandums, particularly Exhibit P-100, where you are discussing with Ms Pither and Mr. Arar's wife events as they're coming up. But you had some sense that the upcoming trial was really, $I$ think, an opening gambit for negotiation, not going to be a real trial, an opportunity for the Syrians to save face. Do you recall those general conversations at that time? MR. PARDY: Oh, very much so. But

I would preface by saying that no trial was preferable in my mind, but if a trial, then it opened up the possibility of a -- because once a trial takes place, there is a decision, and assuming the worst, that he is found guilty and sentenced, then the opportunity is for executive clemency to take place, and that is a well-known feature of judicial systems in most parts of the
world, including Canada, although we don't do it very often in Canada at all. Other countries use it more extensively than we do. MS EDWARDH: Right. I wasn't even sure, when $I$ was reading your language about this might be an opening negotiation, whatever, that you were thinking there would be any real trial but, rather, that this was kind of a Syrian subterfuge that allowed an opportunity to think that maybe Mr. Arar would be released.

My only question about this isn't so much what you said because I think I understand the gist of it, is had you received any information through any communication from the ambassador or anyone else that gave you a sense that this might be developing?

MR. PARDY: No, that was my own
conclusion that $I$ had reached. I don't think there was anything in writing from the ambassador on this point.

What spurred me, I guess, in all
of this, there was a report $I$ came across, as I started looking up the record of the Syrian supreme state security court, which they were
going to use here, was the statement by one observer, and $I$ thought it was an informed observer, that 75 percent of the cases that went before that court was not based on any known Syrian law.

MS EDWARDH: That's troubling.
MR. PARDY: That is troubling.
But, again, it sort of gave me the
idea that maybe this was a political event for the Syrians and that could lead possibly to executive clemency once it was completed.

MS EDWARDH: All right. That's very helpful. Because it -- it's certainly a prescient sense, given what transpired.

MR. PARDY: I was even more
prescient -- sorry.
MS EDWARDH: It's late in the day.
Prescient?
MR. PARDY: It was with Stephen Watt, as you'll recall.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, yes.
Now, I have one -- I think one other question that $I$ want to deal with, and that is, $I$ want to know, Mr. Pardy, why you didn't share with Mr. Arar's wife the consular reports.

If they were provided to persons
who consented -- who Mr. Arar had consented to getting information, it's very clear that Mr. Arar's consent was directly given with respect to his wife, who was passionately wanting to know everything she could about Mr. Arar. And it's clear that she did not get those documents, although she got selected information from those documents.

And $I$ wonder if you would please explain why, despite the consent, that you did not make them available to her?

MR. PARDY: The approach that we use in talking to families about what's happening to a member in these kinds of circumstances is to provide everything. That's our starting point here.

Then we condition that approach by our experience in terms of how quickly the information, from my lips to the Ottawa Citizen, how much is going to be used in a public sense, because there were days when $I$ would speak to Dr. Mazigh in my office and within 20 minutes $I$ was getting calls from the media about statements that I made to her, which I found troublesome,
because you know my view generally on the role of the media on these issues, and -- it was that.

But having said that, we certainly did not -- we did give her complete reports that came in from Damascus. I think at one point we made arrangements for her to speak to Mr. Martel so she could get a sense direct from Mr. Martel in terms of what he was seeing, that sort of thing.

And we tried to give her what we considered to be information -- and I think it -I would say that 80 to 90 percent of the information that came in in consular reports did go to Dr. Mazigh in one form or another.

The trouble with the written reports that we were hesitant to do it in writing -- I would give her a copy of Mr. Martel's -- was that $I$ did not want to see those reports in the media in Canada. It's as simple as that.

Because $I$ felt that, if that were to happen, then, one, Mr. Martel would be less effective in terms of trying to do his job there and, secondly, the Syrians could have been very bloody-minded and would have shut down the access issue a lot sooner than they did.

MS EDWARDH: And I take it you did not feel comfortable telling Dr. Mazigh that if she wanted to receive these documents from you, she would have to play ball and make sure that they didn't fall into the public domain?

MR. PARDY: We had several
discussions on the whole issue of publicity in Canada.

MS EDWARDH: Yes.
MR. PARDY: We spoke on several
occasions about that. I think initially she was sensitive to that issue, but over time, that sensitivity $I$ think evaporated, and even at one occasion $I$ tried to enlist Michael Edelson in terms of speaking to her, her lawyer, on this issue. That's how strongly $I$ felt about it.

But there's a variety of
motivations. I can understand, I mean, the dynamic that's involved here, and we run into it literally in every consular case.

I would say of the major cases, where there are significant issues, I would say 60 percent of the people involved understand the need for sensitivity because of its impact on our ability to provide assistance.

In others, a dynamic is almost created whereby they get almost co-opted by the process, the advisors and the people that are around that provide comment about, okay, get this into the newspaper and this is going to do something for you.

I've always found that the supporters sometimes are not necessarily as clear-cut in their objectives as $I$ was on this one.

MS EDWARDH: Yes, but you can
agree with me, sir, regardless of your
observations there, that no direct request was made to her that if you want the actual consular reports, then you cannot release them?

MR. PARDY: I cannot -- I don't think it ever came up as an issue in the way that you've just put it.

It did come up at the very end, I think, when we had a meeting on August 19, and I think this piece of paper reflects that, and some of the things that was in the press -- they asked for it, and at that point -- I'm not quite sure -they had requested a copy of each of the consular visit reports, and I agreed that they could have
them at this point, and I'm not quite sure whether they were actually delivered or not because it took some time to abstract them and I had left by then.

MS EDWARDH: And $I$ want to put one other question to you, while your impression is that the full reports were given, $I$ think you mean full verbal reports were given in conversation with her --

MR. PARDY: I had I would say hundreds of hours of conversation about Dr. Mazigh, and I -- I mean, and in terms of what I was saying to her, I don't think there was any hesitation in sharing most of this information with her verbally.

I was concerned about the written reports getting into the media.

MS EDWARDH: If I were to suggest to you, sir, that at no time did anyone, including you, inform her that her husband was most likely in Syria for the period of time from the 8 th or 9th until October 21st, and she didn't learn that until almost September before he was released. She did not know that?

MR. PARDY: I cannot believe that

## StenoTran

at all. That was -- I mean, the assumption that we worked on, once Mr. Martel saw Mr. Arar on October 23 , when he said in that meeting that, look, I've been here since -- I don't know what -he only spent a limited amount of time in Jordan and on top of that, the Foreign Minister of Jordan told the Canadian ambassador that Mr. Arar had only been in transit in Jordan and I can't believe for a moment that in the conversation -- you ask me to pin it down.

I'm absolutely flabbergasted that
that suggestion is out there. That was not --
MS EDWARDH: Certainly I take it
from your response, Mr. Pardy, if that piece of information were inadvertently not provided, it would have been a mistake?

MR. PARDY: Oh, absolutely. MS EDWARDH: Okay. MR. PARDY: Because it was -- a large part of what happened afterwards to a certain extent hinged on that piece of information.

MS EDWARDH: Yes. Exactly. Mr. Pardy, thank you for your
patience. Those are my questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Edwardh.

MR. PARDY: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Why don't we
take a break during which counsel can suggest where we go from here and either let me know when we resume --

There are -- and I'd like to
involve Mr. Pardy in the discussions as well, so his wishes are taken into account.

What we have left is Ms McIsaac's
examination and the possibility of some re-examination by Commission counsel.

The choices being to continue with all or part of Ms McIsaac's examination today or to pick another date.

If we're picking another date, if we're going to have to go over, it strikes me that during the week that the lawyers are being called there may be some -- we're not talking about a lot of time, we're talking about less than half a day for certain. It may be that there's some flexibility in that week.

But, in any event, if you talk to one another about that, talk to Mr. Pardy and let
me know and we'll make the decision then. THE REGISTRAR: Please stand.
--- Upon recessing at 5:24 p.m. / Suspension à 5 h 24
--- Off Record Discussion / Discussion officieuse
--- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 5:33 p.m.,
to resume on Friday, June 3, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. / L'audience est ajournée à 17 h 33 , pour reprendre le vendredi 3 juin 2005 à 9 h 30
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