



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Science and Research

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 047**

Thursday, June 1, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. Lloyd Longfield





# Standing Committee on Science and Research

Thursday, June 1, 2023

• (1100)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.)):** I call the meeting to order.

Welcome to our witnesses.

This is meeting number 47 of the Standing Committee on Science and Research. Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Members are attending in person in the room. We also have one member on Zoom this morning.

Please address comments through the chair when you're speaking. I remind you that when you're on Zoom, you should be muted until you're speaking.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(i) and the motion adopted by the committee on Tuesday, February 14, 2023, the committee commences its study of the Government of Canada's graduate scholarship and post-doctoral fellowship programs.

It's my pleasure now to welcome our witnesses more formally. We have Anna Toneguzzo, acting vice-president, government and stakeholder partnerships, Colleges and Institutes Canada. From the University of Saskatchewan, we have Debby Burshtyn, dean, college of graduate and post-doctoral studies.

You will each be given a maximum of five minutes for your opening remarks, after which we'll proceed to rounds of questions. I'll give you some signals when you're getting close to the time. When you're over the time, I will ask you to wrap things up quickly.

We'll start with Anna Toneguzzo for five minutes.

**Ms. Anna Toneguzzo (Vice-President (Acting), Government and Stakeholder Partnerships, Colleges and Institutes Canada):** Good morning. My name is Anna Toneguzzo, and I am acting vice-president, government and stakeholder partnerships at Colleges and Institutes Canada, or CICan.

Before I begin, I want to thank the members of the committee for the opportunity to appear. I also want to acknowledge that I am speaking to you on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe nation.

CICan represents over 140 colleges, CEGEPs, polytechnics and institutes, as well as—it may surprise you—10 universities across Canada. We drive knowledge, build capacity and advance the growth of our sector and the contributions we can make to the

Canadian economy and Canadian society. In fact, tens of thousands of students at colleges contributed to applied research projects in 2019-20—an average of six per project—with many going on to roles in which they directly or indirectly support research, both basic and applied, be it at institutions, in government or in industry.

Let me be very clear: CICan is supportive of improving the amounts offered to promising scholars under the Canada graduate scholarship and post-doctoral fellowship programs. It is important that Canada keep pace with the increasing competition for talent and highly qualified personnel in science and research, both at colleges and universities. These awards have not seen an increase in about two decades, while inflation since then has reduced the real value of the awards by almost half. As a matter of both fairness and competitiveness, it is imperative that the government act to correct the situation.

A doctoral program involves years of intense study and high expectations. The tri-council currently asks students to take on this immense challenge on a stipend of either \$21,000 or \$35,000 per year, if any. In contrast, in 2021 the median income in Canada was \$68,400.

That is for students who are fortunate enough to receive one of these awards. With only a few thousand of these awards available, in contrast to about 280,000 graduate students studying in Canada, the conversation we are having today is a small subset of a broader issue.

[Translation]

I'll use the remainder of my time by inviting the committee to consider the role colleges can play in promoting higher education and research. Approximately 120 colleges in Canada are eligible for tri-council funding, and many have active applied research programs.

Graduate students and postdoctoral fellows can play a role in supporting colleges' applied research and still have the time they need to conduct and advance their own research. This expertise could be highly complementary to the expertise, equipment and capacity already available in nearly 700 college research centres and laboratories across Canada.

Colleges are hiring more and more full-time researchers to support their growing applied research activities. It's a unique learning and educational environment with great potential for hosting graduate students on exchange with their home institutions, as well as post-doctoral fellows looking to both advance their own research and improve their skills to be ready for industry. In fact, some colleges and CEGEPs are already doing so. The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and the other two councils should consider ways to make sure graduate students and postdoctoral fellows are well supported in their studies.

• (1105)

[English]

I believe it is more important than ever to examine the way we can bring the post-secondary sector more closely together. This is one such example of an innovative way we could contribute to that goal.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your questions.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

Now it's over to Debby Burshtyn from the University of Saskatchewan.

Please begin, Ms. Burshtyn.

**Ms. Debby Burshtyn (Dean, College of Graduate and Post-doctoral Studies, University of Saskatchewan):** Good morning, *bonjour, tansi*.

Thank you, Chair, for the opportunity to address this committee on an important topic for research trainees in Canada.

I am dean of the college of graduate and post-doctoral studies at the University of Saskatchewan, which is situated on Treaty No. 6 territory and the homeland of the Métis. I'm also president of the Western Canadian Deans of Graduate Studies.

I'm here to recommend that the federal government work with the tri-agencies to address the erosion of the value of the scholarships and fellowships.

As you well know, the dollar value of these awards has not risen since 2003. Staying within the current suite of programs, I would recommend that the Canadian graduate master's scholarship increase to at least \$25,000, the Canadian graduate doctoral scholarship increase to \$45,000, the agency-specific scholarships increase to at least \$35,000—or simply harmonize with the CGS-Ds—and the Bantings increase to \$90,000.

As a point of comparison, according to Glassdoor, the average salary a fellow received last year was over \$76,000 from the NRC, which indicates a Canadian market rate for post-docs in science, technology, engineering and math.

At the time the Vanier scholarships were introduced in 2008, the tax-exempt \$50,000 was a boon to the recruitment of outstanding international and domestic post-doctoral students. As well, the Banting fellowships were competitive by international standards. The failure to keep pace with inflation means that these scholarships no longer hold the same prestige nationally or internationally.

I want to fully recognize the increases the tri-agencies have made in the number of scholarships over the years, and most recently in creating equity within the scholarship systems.

The committee has heard from a variety of stakeholders already. They include students who have expressed the dire financial strains they experience in general, leaders of organizations of the universities and tri-agency leadership.

What I appreciate is that the committee wants to hear about how we fund graduate students within the university.

Offering competitive funding packages is vital to attracting and retaining graduate students and to preventing exploitation of early career researchers—full stop. My central message here today is in fact that the national scholarships should lead and impact the base-lines for student funding packages.

We at the University of Saskatchewan are currently implementing some dramatic changes to our central graduate scholarship programs, with a goal to bring every Ph.D. student to a minimum of only \$20,000 a year for four years. That \$20,000 is reached through a combination of scholarships, stipends from grants, and academic employment as teaching assistants.

Throughout the internal consultations, there was considerable push-back from faculty, who have to manage their grants, in terms of seeing those increases then leading to contractions of their research personnel. For doctoral students, many, if not most, of our STEM programs already provide \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year, and our internal central scholarships are also in that range.

In 2021-22 at USask, graduate student financial support was just over \$44 million. Of this, \$2.9 million was directly from provincial funds, \$7 million was from industry and non-governmental organizations and nearly one-third came from federal sources, with \$3 million of that in the graduate scholarships and \$10 million through the tri-agency grants. The other \$22 million comes from the university itself, and I'll break that down. About a third comes through endowed scholarships, and the other two-thirds, including \$8 million that I administer through the college of graduate studies, is from the university's operating budget. The vast majority of that is provided in scholarships, with \$5 million as academic employment.

To give you a sense of just how important increasing funding sits with graduate deans, we devoted our last western deans conference to the topic. We had a keynote address from an advancement professional on how graduate deans can better attract philanthropy, and discussions focused on sharing how to implement minimum funding guarantee policies within our organizations. We also discussed a lot about what a livable income is for a graduate student.

To conclude, now is the time for new investment to raise the value of scholarships and fellowships. We need to prevent exploitation and promote equity. Training as a researcher should not be accessible only to those with independent wealth.

We need to decrease the opportunity costs, including for those not wanting to take on added employment or external employment that delays their time in the program and ultimately their entry into the workforce.

We also need to maintain Canada's competitive position. The federal granting agency scholarships and fellowships should not be below the minimum funding packages currently offered at our Canadian research-intensive universities.

• (1110)

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Burshtyn. You are right on time.

Speaking of right on time, we'll go to the floor for questions from Dan Mazier for six minutes.

Mr. Mazier, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC):** Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

Mr. Chair, I'd like to move the following motion:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(i), the committee study the use of federal government research and development grants, funds, and contributions by Canadian universities and research institutions and partnerships with entities connected to the People's Republic of China, in areas including but not limited to: photonics, artificial intelligence, quantum theory, biopharmaceuticals, and aerospace; and including but not limited to, intellectual property transfers and developments with Huawei Technologies and the National University of Defense Technology; that the committee hear from the director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, department officials, top research officials from Canadian universities, the federal granting agencies, and any other witnesses deemed relevant to the study; that the committee allocate a minimum of ten meetings to the study; and that the committee report its findings to the House.

Mr. Chair, I know that this motion is interrupting today's study and I apologize to the witnesses. I was concerned that I would not be able to move this motion prior to Parliament rising for the summer, so I am doing so now.

I believe that it is an important motion that needs to be debated in public and not behind closed doors. Mr. Chair, this is a very serious matter, and it's a timely one that this committee needs to examine.

The motion that I moved is regarding a topic that has been gaining significant media attention over the last few years and in particular over the last few months.

This motion is not a partisan motion. It is not a political motion. It is a motion in the interest of research and development in Canada. Members of this committee may not be aware of the recent reports in the media, so I'll refer to them later in my remarks. I will also be reflecting on some of the testimony that was shared with this committee during our previous study on the support of commercialization of intellectual property, because it reaffirms the urgency of the study.

I will remind members of this committee of the mandate of the Standing Committee on Science and Research: As a committee, we are responsible for studying all matters related to science and research. I see no other committee better suited to studying this use of federal government research and development grants and contributions by Canadian universities and research institutions than the Standing Committee on Science and Research.

This committee has undertaken many studies that this motion would impact, including a study on support for commercialization of intellectual property; a study on successes, challenges and opportunities for science in Canada; and a study on top talent research and innovation.

Most of the time, we examine research and development. We only hear about the good things associated with partnerships and funding agreements, but the reality is that there are matters threatening the future of research and development in Canada. In order to have a future where research and development can prosper in Canada, we as members of the Standing Committee on Science and Research have to study the roadblocks preventing and threatening that future prosperity.

The Globe and Mail reported that the Canadian Security Intelligence Service "has publicly warned that Beijing is threatening Canada's national security in intellectual property in five sensitive areas of research and development including quantum theory, photonics, artificial intelligence, biopharmaceuticals and aerospace."

That is why my motion specifically lists these areas. These areas were not flagged by me; they were flagged by our country's top security officials.

We also know that Canadian universities are conducting joint research with Chinese military scientists. It was the Minister of Innovation who responded to the national security aspect of this matter, which is another reason that this matter should be studied at this committee.

I will remind members of the statement given by the member of the government's own cabinet. He said he was looking to impose "additional requirements when it comes to strengthening research security in Canada".

That statement was not from the Minister of Public Safety, it was not from the Minister of National Defence and it was not from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. That statement was given by the Minister of Innovation.

This further confirms that this motion is best suited to be studied at this committee and that it should be supported by the Liberal members of this committee.

It hasn't been only Liberal members who have highlighted this pressing issue. NDP Leader Jagmeet Singh commented on research that puts national security at risk too, as was also reported in *The Globe and Mail*:

• (1115)

“NDP Leader Jagmeet Singh said open and collaborative research is fine in principle, but not when it puts national security at risk. “Whenever there is a security concern and there is national security impact then we should make decisions to protect our national security and Canadian safety and security”.

That's what he told reporters. I trust that the NDP will support this motion as well.

I will remind members of this committee that a lot of information came to light during our last study on the support of commercialization of intellectual property regarding partnership with Huawei Technologies. Despite Huawei's being banned from Canada's 5G network for security reasons, we learned that Huawei has been very involved in research partnerships in Canadian universities.

When I brought a signed patent agreement between the University of British Columbia and Huawei Technologies to the attention of this committee on March 21, 2023, Dr. Gail Murphy, the vice-president of research and innovation at the University of British Columbia, tried to dismiss these concerns by stating the following: “I will say that as research security guidelines have evolved with the federal government, we have been changing our agreements in that respect and have moved to new standards.” When I asked her if the University of British Columbia is still working with Huawei in any form she stated, “Yes, we do.”

It is very clear that the current measures that the government has taken are not effective. This is another reason that we must study this issue as a committee and make recommendations to the government.

Furthermore, on the same day I asked the vice-president of research at the University of Calgary if they will continue to work with Huawei in any form, Mr. William Ghali responded, “We don't at this time because of the guidance that has come to us through the bodies I just mentioned”—

**The Chair:** I will interrupt at this point. How much longer are you going to take? I'm wondering whether we should be excusing our witnesses if this is going to take all night.

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** I have lots more. That's totally up to you.

**The Chair:** How much time do you think you need?

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** The rest of the meeting.

**The Chair:** If we're going to be using the rest of the meeting, and you have the floor, unfortunately to the witnesses and especially to Dr. Burshtyn, who has come from Saskatchewan, we're not going to be getting to questions. That's most unfortunate.

Thank you for preparing to come to the meeting.

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** You're still welcome to stay, though.

**The Chair:** You're welcome to leave. This will be going on, and I apologize for that.

Thank you again for preparing for the meeting.

We'll go back over to Mr. Mazier.

• (1120)

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** Furthermore, on the same date I asked the vice-president of research at the University of Calgary if they continued to work with Huawei in any form, Mr. William Ghali responded, “We don't at this time because of the guidance that has come to us through the bodies that I just mentioned.” However, the University of Calgary clearly misled this committee, because in an answer to my request for a written response on this matter, the University of Calgary noted that they have ongoing partnerships with Huawei.

**Mr. Gerald Soroka (Yellowhead, CPC):** On a point of order, our translation isn't working properly.

**The Chair:** They apologize. They're on the right channel now.

Thank you to our translators.

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** I'm just helping to stall.

Thank you.

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** The letter to this committee signed by William Ghali on May 9, 2023, says:

When asked by Mr. Mazier—Does UCalgary continue to work with Huawei at this time—my response was no, because we are not at present embarking on any new projects. What I overlooked in providing that answer was that there are three existing projects with Huawei established in prior years. Those three projects will not be interrupted by the university....

I am personally troubled to know that the University of Calgary failed to provide accurate information to this committee in their initial response. This situation is quite troubling and should be examined, because now we know the answer on whether they continue to work with Huawei is a not a no, but in fact a yes.

Furthermore, this committee received a written response from the University of British Columbia. This was to follow up on my question in a letter, and the reply says, “UBC's research agreements with Huawei Technologies Canada have evolved over time reflecting guidance from federal partners.”

However, the five-page letter mentions multiple partnerships with Huawei over the years.

It's not only the University of British Columbia and the University of Calgary that are actively working with Huawei. When Mr. Jim Hinton, an intellectual property lawyer, appeared at this committee, he said, “CSIS is actively monitoring Canadian research institutions for IP transfer and reviewing ties to the foreign government actors.” He also said, “There are at least 20 Canadian universities that have been working with Huawei.”

He went on to say:

Canadian universities are getting money. I think they have around \$3.34 billion in federal funding and Huawei would be one of the beneficiaries of this funding.

Huawei has been able to generate hundreds of patents out of Canadian universities over the years.

When I asked Mr. Hinton if the current government has done anything to guarantee that the government research funding is not being used to develop intellectual property for Huawei or for the entities that CSIS warned against, he stated:

No, it's the opposite. There are incentive programs through NSERC to encourage Canadian universities to partner with organizations like Huawei. There's nothing stopping a researcher or a university from continuing to work with those organizations. As we've seen, they'll continue to do that unless somebody steps up and says we need to reconsider this.

This is a very serious matter. I would argue that this is the most pressing matter for this committee. Our top intelligence agency is sounding the alarm on this. It appears that there is little being done to address this situation.

I asked Dr. Chad Gaffield, the executive officer of the U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities, how many of these universities that he represents continue to work with Huawei after receiving briefings and warnings from CSIS. He failed to provide a clear answer. He said he did not have this information on hand. He failed to commit to provide this information to the committee when I asked him.

I believe this committee deserves to know these answers. I believe that we should pursue these answers.

I will also draw the committee's attention to recent reports that the University of Waterloo advised researchers that they aren't obligated to speak to CSIS.

Why would the University of Waterloo advise researchers that they don't have to speak to our country's top security officials? This is a question that needs to be answered.

I also want to draw the committee's attention to the report that was tabled in the House of Commons two weeks ago by the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations. In the report, there was an important recommendation:

That the Government of Canada advise provincial governments, as well as Canadian universities and research institutions, about the threats from the People's Republic of China to national security and intellectual property. The advice should include explicit guidance against research partnerships and collaboration with universities, entities, and researchers from the People's Republic of China in the five sensitive areas identified by CSIS (artificial intelligence, quantum technology, 5G, biopharma, clean tech). The Government of Canada should also conduct ongoing [research] and provide resources to assist universities and research institutions in developing robust mechanisms to protect national security and intellectual property, while respecting academic freedom and institutional autonomy.

• (1125)

All MPs on this committee supported this recommendation.

Furthermore, I will draw the committee's attention to recommendation 6 in the same report. Recommendation 6 was the following:

That the Government of Canada, through a ministerial policy directive, ban the federal granting councils from funding research connected with universities, entities and researchers from the PRC in five sensitive areas identified by CSIS.

All MPs on the committee supported this too.

I think it's extremely important that this committee study this matter, hear from expert witnesses and report its findings to the House of Commons. It is timely, it is relevant and it's important. No other committee is better suited to examine this specific issue to an extensive degree. This specific issue deserves to be studied in detail.

As a member of this committee, I think it is extremely important that we hear from the director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. I think it is important that we hear from the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, along with his department officials. I think it's important that we hear from the top research officials from Canadian universities and the federal granting agencies, because this is a pressing matter impacting science and research in Canada.

I will remind this committee of Mr. Hinton's testimony on the importance of looking into this matter.

When he last appeared at the Standing Committee on Science and Research, on April 18, 2022, he stated the following on the matter:

If you look at the list of IP that's coming out of Canadian universities, it's being assigned to organizations like Huawei. It's artificial intelligence, it's photonics, and it's advanced processing. Somebody needs to understand this, and we need to get to the bottom of it.

There's a transparency issue here. We don't know who or what is being done with Canadian publicly funded research, and there are egregious examples that we need to make sure are not happening. There are policies in place, but the fox is in charge of the henhouse. The researcher who wants to get the money is the one checking the boxes to say that there is no issue here.

I don't know how much louder the alarm needs to sound before the government takes this issue seriously. This is an issue that has been relevant for many years, and the significance and the importance of the study are only becoming greater.

I am going to quote an article published by the Globe and Mail on October 30, 2018, entitled "Foreign espionage of Canadian research a risk to 'national interests,' CSIS warns". The article reads as follows, and I quote:

Canada's spy service is warning that Canadian research is "of interest to foreign states," whose exploitation of such work poses potential harm to "Canada's national interests."

The Canadian Security Intelligence Service...said on Tuesday that it routinely meets with universities to warn them of risks. The Globe and Mail reported this week that at least nine Canadian postsecondary institutions have conducted joint studies in recent years with researchers from Chinese military institutions, including the People's Liberation Army Information Engineering University, China's Air Defence College and the elite National University of Defense Technology. In general, Canadian university policies require joint research to be published openly.

The collaborations, however, have raised concern that Canada's academic establishment has become a target for Chinese intelligence-gathering, as Beijing conducts a sweeping technological modernization of its armed forces. Some Chinese defence scientists working with Canadian scholars have used the names of what appear to be non-existent civilian institutions rather than citing their military credentials in joint publications. Collaborative work with Canada has included advances in secure communications and satellite-image processing, technologies that have civilian and military value.

A report this week by the Australian Strategic Policy Institute found three Canadian universities among the global top 10 in publishing joint research with Chinese military scholars. The institute tabulated 687 academic papers co-authored by Canadian academics with Chinese defence researchers.

● (1130)

The article continues:

Universities said federal authorities determine which foreign researchers are allowed into Canada.

"We rely on the Government of Canada to evaluate security considerations in offering study permits," University of Calgary spokesman Drew Scherban said in a statement. The university "is committed to academic freedom and does not regulate the areas of research pursued by its faculty or graduate students," he said.

But the Canadian political establishment has had little to say about the issue—including Minister of Public Safety Ralph Goodale, who on Tuesday did not mention China or Canadian universities, saying in response to a question in Ottawa that he would not discuss what he called "operational details."

"We have organizations such as the RCMP and CSIS—our police and security organizations—that are very alert to every kind of risk that could threaten Canadians and they take all the necessary steps to investigate those risks and make sure that Canadians are kept safe," Mr. Goodale said.

Canada's spy agency, however, was more forthcoming.

Universities are among the institutions CSIS routinely meets "to advise them of potential threats to the security and interests of Canada, and to provide unclassified briefings regarding the nature of specific threats," spokesman John Townsend said in a statement.

"Canadian industry and academic institutions are world leaders in various economic, technological and research sectors that are of interest to foreign states. These states seek to acquire Canadian technology and expertise by utilizing a range of traditional and non-traditional intelligence collection tradecraft," he added.

Such "covert exploitation," he said, "may come at the expense of Canada's national interests, including lost jobs and revenues, and a diminished competitive global advantage."

In the United States, the Department of Justice on Tuesday warned that Chinese intelligence agents used hackers and "co-opted company insiders" to pilfer aerospace industrial technologies. Several people referred to as Chinese intelligence officers and their co-conspirators were charged.

"The threat posed by Chinese government-sponsored hacking activity is real and relentless," John Brown, FBI special agent in charge of the San Diego field office, said in a statement.

That's the end of article. These are not my words. These are words of experts.

I would also like to draw to the committee's attention an article published by The Globe and Mail on August 6, 2020, entitled "CSIS warns about China's efforts to recruit Canadian scientists". The article reads as follows, and I quote:

The Canadian Security Intelligence Service has warned the country's universities and research institutions that Beijing is using academic recruitment programs such as its Thousand Talents Plan to attract scientists to China in hopes of obtaining cutting-edge science and technology for economic and military advantage.

The federal spy agency says the Thousand Talents Plan (TTP), which Beijing created in 2008 to identify and recruit leading scientific experts around the globe, is an example of the way China is attempting to get academics to share—either willingly or by coercion—the results of work conducted and financed in

Canada so that China doesn't have to rely only on traditional intelligence-gathering.

John Townsend, the head of CSIS's media relations, said in a statement to The Globe and Mail that some countries looking to acquire sensitive Canadian technologies and expertise use this non-traditional method of intelligence-collection: recruiting academics who will provide what a hostile state wants, or could be compelled to do so through offers of reward or threat of punishment.

"Academic talent plans are one way to incentivize academics to participate in such activities. While the Thousand Talents Plan is one example, academic talent plans are used by multiple hostile states by other names."

I want to repeat that article again, because it is a pretty important part of the whole motion.

● (1135)

John Townsend, the head of CSIS's media relations, said in a statement to The Globe and Mail that some countries looking to acquire sensitive Canadian technologies and expertise use this non-traditional method of intelligence-collection: recruiting academics who will provide what a hostile state wants, or could be compelled to do so through offers of reward or threat of punishment.

I don't know if anybody got that. I'll read it again just in case no one got that:

John Townsend, the head of CSIS's media relations, said in a statement to The Globe and Mail that some countries looking to acquire sensitive Canadian technologies and expertise use this non-traditional method of intelligence-collection: recruiting academics who will provide what a hostile state wants, or could be compelled to do so through offers of reward or threat of punishment.

"Academic talent plans are one way to incentivize academics to participate in such activities. While the Thousand Talents Plan is one example, academic talent plans are used by multiple hostile states by other names."

I'll read that again:

"Academic talent plans are one way to incentivize academics to participate in such activities. While the Thousand Talents Plan is one example, academic talent plans are used by multiple hostile states by other names."

Mr. Townsend was replying to a question from The Globe about whether CSIS has national security concerns over the Thousand Talents Plan, which recently has become the focus of scrutiny for U.S. law enforcement and Congress.

He said CSIS has spoken to universities and other research institutions about its concerns over this and other foreign recruitment programs after evidence of technology transfer emerged in recent years.

The Globe has found at least 15 Canadian academics who have participated in the Chinese program, including experts in quantum computing, advanced electronics and engineering, vaccines, chemistry and artificial intelligence. All the scholars contacted by The Globe defended the program as mutually beneficial for Canada and China, and said they did not encounter any untoward conduct during their involvement.

The Chinese program provides salaries, research funds, lab space at universities in China and other incentives. A 2016 report by the Conference Board of Canada said TTP funding can be as high as \$335,000 for start-up, plus up to \$168,000 remuneration per annum. International professors also receive "preferential treatment in terms of medical care, housing, and for foreign nationals, permanent residency and multi-entry visas," the report said.

China stopped publishing the names of people who have participated in the program in September, 2018, after the U.S. Justice Department began investigating allegations that some scientists illicitly provided China with technology and high-level research funded by U.S. federal agencies.

I think that is probably the most alarming thing about this, Mr. Chair, and I'll repeat this so that everybody hears this.

China stopped publishing the names of people who have participated in the program in September, 2018, after the U.S. Justice Department began investigating allegations that some scientists illicitly provided China with technology and high-level research funded by U.S. federal agencies.

In November, 2019, a U.S. Senate report, "Threats to the U.S. Research Enterprise: China's Talent Recruitment Plans", described the Chinese programs as a campaign to recruit talent and foreign experts to benefit China's economic and military development.

The Senate report says participants in the Thousand Talents Plan are asked to sign contracts that require them not to disclose that Chinese institutions will retain the rights to at least some of the intellectual property created by the U.S. researchers.

This is what everybody's not talking about.

"The contracts can incentivize members to lie [about their participation in TTP] on grant applications to U.S. grant-making agencies, set up 'shadow labs' in China working on research identical to their U.S. research, and, in some cases, transfer U.S. scientists' hard-earned intellectual capital," the Senate report said.

● (1140)

The report estimated that China has more than 200 academic recruitment programs. CSIS's Mr. Townsend said underhanded efforts to acquire sensitive Canadian technologies and expertise hurt Canada.

"These corrosive tactics, which are done to advance the economic and strategic objectives of hostile states, come at the expense of Canada's national interest, including lost jobs, revenue for public services and a diminished competitive global advantage," Mr. Townsend said. "While I cannot discuss specific investigations, I can say that CSIS actively investigates all threats of foreign interference and espionage."

Canada's spy agency warned in May that Canadian academics and corporations are at increased risk of espionage or intellectual property theft as agents of China and Russia target research related to COVID-19.

Canadian academics say their Thousand Talents work in China can benefit Canada, helping them identify top Chinese graduate students who can be recruited to come here—at the expense of their own government—and contribute to scientific research.

Andreas Mandelis, professor and researcher at the University of Toronto's department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, enlisted as a Thousand Talents scholar with the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China in Chengdu from 2013 to 2018. He helped build a laboratory there that mirrored facilities at the University of Toronto. He still visits—accommodation and travel expenses paid—to meet and collaborate with scholars.

Prof. Mandelis said academics are treated exceptionally well in China.

I will now pass the floor over to my fellow MP.

**Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC):** All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Mazier.

Fellow colleagues—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I'll just recognize that Mr. Tochor had his hand up. Are you wanting to interrupt proceedings? Is it a point of order? What would you like to suggest?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It's not a point of order. He handed the floor over to me.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** This is a very pressing study, but we also have some very pressing studies that we're working on right now. I'd like to amend the motion to make it not 10 meetings but six

meetings, and for it to start in the June 20 meeting, which is the Tuesday of the last week of session.

I move that this amendment to Mr. Mazier's motion now be debated.

**The Chair:** Do we have a motion on the floor?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** We have a motion on the floor to amend Mr. Mazier's proposed study to now start on June 20—not immediately, but on June 20—and for six meetings.

**The Chair:** Is there debate?

Go ahead, Richard.

**Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP):** I haven't looked at the number of meetings, the number of hours we have, and what we have on our plate, but I would like to make sure that the studies we now have under way—there's this one that we're dealing with today, and I think there are two that we have reports written for, the French one and the citizen science one—are all done and dusted before we jump into this.

There may well be enough time to do that with the calendar. I don't know if I need to put forward an amendment to that effect, but that's what I would like to see happen. I don't want to start this one before those have been finished and presented to the House.

● (1145)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I'll view that as a friendly amendment. The other studies will be completed before this starts on June 20.

**Mr. Gerald Soroka:** The information is on the report.

**Mr. Chad Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.):** I thought we already had a motion on the books that the next study was going to on pay equity.

**The Chair:** That's correct. We do have a motion on the table that has been adopted that the pay equity study is our next study.

Bradford.

**Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.):** I believe witnesses have already been contacted and lined up for that.

**The Chair:** Clerk, I believe we do have witnesses.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Hilary Smyth):** Yes. Invitations have been sent for the next meeting, which is next week.

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** It was to start next week. Is that correct?

**The Clerk:** It was due to start next week, based on the calendar that was distributed.

**The Chair:** The calendar came to us through the subcommittee was adopted by the committee as the calendar that we would be working under so that the clerk could do her work.

Go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** That being said, the pressing nature of the involvement of Beijing in our universities I think takes precedence. I believe that we should be studying this on the 20th.

The urgent nature of this involvement is the reason we're debating this today. I would call a vote on the amended motion that I put forward, with Mr. Cannings' caveat that we wrap up the studies that are waiting for reports.

**The Chair:** We can't call the vote until we finish the discussion. If there isn't any further discussion, we could ask for a vote.

Go ahead, Mr. Cannings.

**Mr. Richard Cannings:** The other consideration here is that we have developed this procedure of rotating studies through the parties, and I'm aware that Ms. Bradford's study was to be the next.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Richard Cannings:** If we do this, I just want to make sure that it's reflected in how we time the next study and that the Conservatives would not have their next one. Since I think it's a bit early to.... If we have already started the proceedings of inviting witnesses and all that for the next meeting, we should get that going. I don't want to waste a meeting in that regard, but again....

I must admit, I didn't think of Ms. Bradford's study when I was talking with Mr. Tochor about that, so I would rather we at least get that started. Again, I want to make sure we finish the other ones, and I don't want to end up wasting time. I think Ms. Bradford's study is just as pressing as this one, and I frankly don't see the emergency nature of this study. I think it's something that we should take on, but.... Under the threat of filibustering until the end of June, I'm happy to negotiate, but that's.... I just want to make sure that things are set down in a fair way after this so that the tradition is kept up.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have a speaking list starting here. We have Ms. Metlege Diab with her hand up online. Then we'll go to Mr. Tochor.

I may need to consult the clerk, once we've had a little bit of discussion here, in terms of what our options may be going forward.

**Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm not exactly sure what the options are or what's happening, but I want to say the following. I was obviously involved, as were other members of the committee, when the topic of pay equity came up the last time before we decided to put another one in front of it, although we thought it was supposed to go before the other

one. I, in no uncertain terms, would be willing to let that go. I just want that on the record. I think we had all agreed on this committee that it would be the next.

Failing any catastrophe.... Forgive me, folks; I am in my riding of Halifax West, where we are dealing with wildfires that are still running and are not under control. I have thousands of people evacuated and I have thousands of others who have been put on a 30-minute notice to be evacuated. I'm emotional and things are a bit tense, but with respect to the motion and to the study that is supposed to come next, I will not agree to let another one go before that one.

That's all I'm going to say.

• (1150)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

It's over to Mr. Tochor, please.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I think there's a solution here. It's that the study, with the amendments we've made, start on June 20, but we do both studies at the same time.

The pay equity study does not get pushed back. The other reports get finished up before June 20. We don't change the witnesses we've invited for next week. Witnesses won't be wasting their time. We can do two studies at the same time.

I would like to amend my motion even further to say that on June 20, both studies continue—the Beijing influence and the pay equity.

**The Chair:** Because we're doing this on the fly, I'd like to consult with the clerk for a few minutes. If you need to, you can talk among yourselves.

Let's take five minutes to see where we are in terms of our schedule going forward. Again, as a reminder, we had a schedule that we were working under. If there's a change that needs to be made, let's see how we go about that.

Let's suspend for five minutes. We'll see you back at 12.

• (1150)

(Pause)

• (1200)

**The Chair:** Welcome back.

There are lots of conversations, but if we could pull them back to the table now, I have a couple of points that I've discussed with the clerk on where we're at. I thank the clerk for her support.

We have an amendment on the floor that we need to reintroduce, because the mover of a motion can't amend their own motion. We'll come back to that.

We do have witnesses scheduled for next week. That's just for information. This motion would give us some freedom around that.

We've lost at least one hour today. We may be able to get some testimony in, depending on how the rest of this meeting goes. We might be able to get our witnesses to give us testimony today. We haven't been able to get questions to our first panel. We could ask our first panel questions. They've actually offered to answer any questions that we want to give them in writing. They will respond to us in writing.

We have two hours on the 13th scheduled to wrap up this study. We'll have to see; if we're able to recover at least the witness testimony for today, then we may be able to wrap up this study on the 13th, depending on how this meeting goes.

I have a couple of hands up. I think there was a question, right as I was suspending, about the speaking order. The speaking order for the first round was leading off with Dan Mazier, Chad Collins, Maxime Blanchette-Joncas and Richard Cannings. We could maintain that speaking order, since we didn't get to it. Mr. Mazier wanted to be first up—

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** —or the next one; we can deal with that.

The second round was going to be led by Mr. Lobb. If we get to the second round, just before we get started we'll talk about where we want to pick up our speaking order.

With all of those things on the table, is there an amendment?

First of all, Mr. Lobb had his hand up. Then we had Mr. Collins on the speaking list so far.

Mr. Lobb, what did you want to tell us or ask us?

**Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC):** Mr. Chair, there's a lot I want to tell you, but I think I'll just keep it to this for now.

This is an amendment on Mr. Tochor's motion. I hope the committee finds this well. The amendment reads as follows: That the future meeting be split between pay equity and the Beijing interference, with Beijing interference taking the first hour of each meeting and pay equity the subsequent hour to conclude each meeting.

That's the amendment.

**The Chair:** Is that starting on the 20th? Does the rest of the motion stay as is, and you're just adding that to the motion?

**Mr. Ben Lobb:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion, Mr. Collins?

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Yes. I was going to amend it so that we get the first hour and that the second hour be dedicated to the study that's been put.

I'd also like the motion with the amendment in writing, if I could have that.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Well, it doesn't sound like that's going to be accepted, so we're going to have to start doing some debate on the amendment. We'll follow the procedure on amendments.

The amendment that Mr. Lobb just put forward is the first one up for discussion.

I think you were just starting that discussion. Have you made your comments? Is there any—

• (1205)

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** Can we get everybody back at the table first?

**The Chair:** While there's a discussion going on with Mr. Cannings and Mr. Tochor, let's start.

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** Don't you want to talk about the amendment?

**The Chair:** First let's go to the motion, and then the amendment.

**The Clerk:** It should be the other way around.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It's the other way around. You have to—

**The Chair:** I was going to read the motion and then the amendment—

**The Clerk:** Okay.

**The Chair:** —and then we can start going on the amendment.

What do we have for the motion?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** The main motion is on the first page you're at.

**Mr. Dan Mazier:** If you want, I can read it again. Ready?

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(i), the committee study the use of federal government research and development grants, funds, and contributions by the Canadian universities and research institutions in partnerships with entities connected to the People's Republic of China, in areas including, but not limited to: photonics, artificial intelligence, quantum theory, biopharmaceuticals and aerospace; and including but not limited to, intellectual property transfers and developments with Huawei Technologies and the National University of Defense Technology; that the committee hear from the director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, department officials, top research officials from Canadian universities, the federal granting agencies, and any other witnesses deemed relevant to the study; that the committee allocate a minimum of ten meetings to this study; and that the committee report its findings to the House.

Do you want me to repeat it again?

**The Chair:** No, that's great. Thank you.

Mr. Lobb, what's your addition to that, please?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I think it was my amendment that was first to that motion, and then Ben.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. That's why I'm doing this. It's to try to get it sorted out.

Go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Mine is to amend the motion to six meetings instead of 10, and that the study would start on June 20.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Lobb.

**Mr. Ben Lobb:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Would you like me to read the subamendment to the amendment to the motion now?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Ben Lobb:** I'd be pleased to do that. It's that the future meetings be split between pay equity and Beijing interference, with Beijing interference taking the first hour of each meeting.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** If I could, on that point, we're making a lot of concessions here to what the anticipated calendar was supposed to be for this committee. I certainly respect the right of the members opposite to put the motion that they've put today, but I think it's important to understand where we are, in terms of process, in what the committee has already decided, so just based on Mr. Lobb's last subamendment, I would again reiterate that my position is that we dedicate the first hour to pay equity. We'll start with that, and I have other amendments to put to the other amendments and to the main motion at a later time.

**The Chair:** We'll have to deal with this first and then take another amendment.

If we can get these amendments in writing so that the clerk has them, it would be appreciated.

Mr. Lobb, if you have that subamendment in writing....

**Mr. Ben Lobb:** Sure.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Just for ease of use, could we ask the analysts to quickly type that up? They have their Surface Pros open and they're able to print. It probably would be the most efficient way, if that's acceptable to the clerk.

**The Chair:** Actually, it's on the clerk, but I'm just trying to get.... Because we are doing this on the fly....

We started with a motion that we did have a notice of motion for. Therefore, it is in order to discuss it, because we did have 48 hours' notice. Now we are going to the amendments to that motion. Those amendments we don't have in writing yet.

We'll suspend for a couple of minutes so that the clerk can get up to speed with what we just read into the record. We'll make sure that we have those in writing.

We'll get back together at quarter after 12.

• (1210) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1240)

**The Chair:** I'll call us back to order.

We're still waiting for the written translation to come back, which we submitted mid-meeting. The services are trying to keep up. In the meantime, I'll read the amendment and the subamendment into the record—I have them in writing in front of me—and then we can go back to the debate on the subamendment.

The amendment that we have that we've submitted to translation reads:

that the committee allocate a minimum of six full meetings to this study; that the committee begin the study on June 20;

The subamendment says:

the committee split the meetings for this study with the study of Long-term Impacts of Pay Gaps Experienced by Different Genders and Equity-seeking Groups Among Faculty at Canadian Universities, with this study being dedicated in the first hour

That's what I have in writing in front of me now. We've kind of sorted through the clouds.

Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

• (1245)

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I am just going to start with.... We have a little bit of a trust issue with what happened here today. I certainly understand the jockeying in terms of whose study is first on the agenda for whatever day we're talking about. I just used this morning's meeting as an example. I think it's the first time it's happened here at this committee. It certainly has happened elsewhere. Unfortunately, it's not unique to this place, but it is unique at our committee. I'm having a little bit of an issue with what's been presented, knowing that that hasn't happened on this side of the table. I think this committee has worked very well through all studies. I think we've done a fairly good job in terms of respecting the order of studies, the length of studies, even the debate. I don't think the debate, at any point in time, has necessitated the chair's intervening and calling some order to the meeting.

I understand the motivation behind the amendment that's been moved. However, I think that if we look at the history of where this committee has been with decorum, if you want to call it that, we will see that we've been in a good place almost from our inception. That's why I'm feeling some consternation in terms of moving ahead with the first hour for the other study and the second hour for our study, knowing what transpired here today.

I also feel like moving a motion that we apologize to the witnesses who were supposed to appear today. I think one of the witnesses travelled almost halfway across the country to be here today. While I can certainly reach out with my own personal communication and send my messages to them, what happened here this morning, again, is not unique to this place, unfortunately, as I've learned in my year and a half here. It's unfortunate.

That's what's causing me some consternation, and that's why I was going to move an amendment to the subamendment that ours continue with having some precedence on the order of the agenda, in light of the fact that we already have our study on the books.

Today's motion is certainly trying to take priority, I think, in the study order. This isn't the normal course of business that we're accustomed to. With the precedent that was set today and with some of the actions that were taken to interfere with the ongoing study, I have great trouble supporting what's been put in front of the committee right now.

I don't know, formally, from a procedural perspective.... I can turn to you or the clerk, Mr. Chair, to understand whether, if we'd like to see something different from what's been presented, we defeat that and in lieu of that then create a motion, or do I subamend the amendment that's already been put to the committee?

**The Chair:** We're not able to subamend the subamendment. We would have to defeat the subamendment and then introduce a new subamendment.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Thank you very much.

Those are my comments on that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tochor is next.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Just for clarification, my colleague Gerald could amend the motion. That's still allowed.

I'll defer to the clerk for an explanation on the amendment.

**The Chair:** Let's have the clerk give us the technical explanation.

**The Clerk:** Just one moment.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** As she prepares that, Chad, we can find ways....

**The Clerk:** I apologize; I did make a mistake. We do need to defeat this first in order to move another subamendment on this. We cannot amend the subamendment at the....

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I would propose that we approve it and then amend the motion after it's passed. That would get us to the same spot. The amended motion would help Mr. Collins—

• (1250)

**The Chair:** Once you've approved the subamendment, it's approved. You can't go back and defeat it again. It would have to be—

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** We're not defeating it. We're just amending it. Following the vote, we'll put the motion forward.

We'll even allow.... If Chad moves a motion that satisfies his caucus so that there's not going to be any filibustering and games in future meetings, we'll vote for that motion.

**The Chair:** I'll wait for the clerk to weigh in on that.

My understanding is that once a subamendment is on the floor, it has to be dealt with. The committee could accept the subamendment or could reject the subamendment. If the committee rejects the subamendment, knowing that another one is coming—or it could be withdrawn—then you could—

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, I just confirmed that if it does pass, you can amend. It will then become one amendment and you can amend it further. You can have a new subamendment, if it passes.

Either way, the question needs to be put—

**The Chair:** Okay, we still have the main motion that could be amended.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Then you have the second—

**The Clerk:** Another option is that with unanimous consent, you can withdraw the subamendment and move another.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I would ask for a vote on the subamendment.

Once that subamendment passes, we will, on debate on the main motion, put forward an amendment that would satisfy the Liberals' concerns about the order of meetings. We would, as a gesture, reduce it from six meetings to five, as discussed off-line.

I would ask to call the vote.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on the subamendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Lauzon.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.):** If we suspended the meeting earlier, it was because we wanted to have the motion and amendments in writing.

I ask my colleagues to imagine having that whole conversation in French. It's true that we have interpretation, but even the interpreters told us it's not easy to follow the discussion when they don't have the text available. All we asked was to have the text and its translation, as well as time to review it before making any decisions. Everything that happened from the start of the meeting destroyed the harmony the committee always had before, when we maintained order and turns to speak.

I'm not necessarily happy with the initial processes we put in place. Often, I'd like to speak at committee, but I can't. Indeed, in addition to rotating between the Conservatives, the Liberals, the NDP and the Bloc Québécois, I have to give my colleagues a chance to speak between the Conservatives' comments. The NDP and the Bloc Québécois pipe up every time, and I only have one chance in four to speak at each discussion. That said, I respected it from the start, as did we all.

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas and I already had a good conversation on the fact that we proceed this way and we don't want to change the committee's routine. However, what we experienced today turned everything upside down.

I can understand that it comes from the whip's order. I can understand that we're going to play the filibuster game. I can understand that today's motion is slowing down a study we had very good chances of finishing. But on top of that, there's a lack of respect for the witnesses who came here today, and I'm shocked. I never thought I'd see this in our committee: sending a witness home after they crossed half of Canada to come talk to us.

Today's study is very important. What's going on is jeopardizing the conclusion of our study of the report on research in French. That really gets to me, because some members already committed to filibustering if they don't get their way. It's a direct attack on French, just as we almost made it to the end of our study.

On top of not respecting the witnesses, trust between committee members is broken. As long as we can't look at the motion and all the amendments tabled today, we can't go any further. We're already up to three amendments and there's talk of a fourth. For today, what I'd prefer is to take a step back and read the motion. The Conservatives, other opposition parties and we ourselves can discuss a strategy, but we have to come back to the foundation we had before at committee.

Mr. Chair, I know you haven't been here very long, but you adapted so well to the committee. What's happening today is a surprise to us all. I therefore move to adjourn the meeting, distribute the motion in English and French, then return in force next Tuesday, after each party has given it some serious thought.

• (1255)

[*English*]

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** We have a dilatory motion on the table. He's just moved to adjourn. There is no discussion on that.

We'll go to the vote on the dilatory motion.

Do you want a recorded vote?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I have point of order.

Before that motion to adjourn was put forward, I would ask you, through to the clerk, that we sit not just until 1:30 today. I would ask that because we were suspended for over 50 minutes, we would sit until 1:50 and ask for additional services.

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, that's part of the—

**Ms. Lena Metlege Diab:** No. We have a motion on the floor.

**The Chair:** Lena, please. It's up to the Chair.

No, it's a dilatory motion that's on the table, so either we have a recorded vote or we have unanimous consent. Should we go to a recorded vote?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** You need unanimous support to adjourn.

**The Chair:** No, you don't, not on a motion to adjourn.

It's a recorded vote.

Let's go to the clerk.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** The meeting continues.

Go ahead, Mr. Lobb.

**Mr. Ben Lobb:** The only thing I will say to Mr. Lauzon.... I have full respect for him. There's no question about it. There are two points I will make, though.

The first one—and maybe we can have our clerk and analysts go back and look at this—is that with regard to the past practice on an amendment at a committee on a motion, I don't believe it had to be translated and put onto paper or into a digital format. I believe reading it aloud, if the chair reads it, would be perfectly acceptable. Going above and beyond is fine, but I believe that is past practice.

The other point I will make is I brought up an issue a few meetings ago—in public, so I'm not saying anything out of order here—about my displeasure with the way the committee had gone on the format of the subcommittee. I didn't feel that it was inclusive to all. That's my opinion. It's nothing against Mr. Lauzon; he basically said, “Too bad. If you want to do it, go to the subcommittee.” I'm not invited to the subcommittee anyway.

I'm not saying that spoiled the feeling in the committee, because I didn't take offence to it. It was his point, which is fine. That's all I'm going to say.

There is give-and-take. It is June. I'm not always in favour of all this stuff myself, but it is what it is and that's the way Parliament works, so I guess we will keep going.

• (1300)

**The Chair:** This is a quick comment from the chair that we have standing orders of the committee that the committee adopted at the very beginning of the committee session to say that if people are requesting things in writing, they are able to do that. The standard procedures of the committee were agreed on at the beginning of the committee, and they also included subcommittees.

Go ahead, Ms. Bradford.

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a lot of concern and disappointment with what has happened at our committee today. The agenda was to devote two hours to our study on Canada's graduate scholarship and post-doctoral fellowship programs.

Two panels of witnesses were called, and before one question was asked of the first panel—one witness travelled all the way from Saskatchewan to testify—our meeting was hijacked by Conservative members, who proceeded to filibuster the meeting, bringing forward a motion regarding a subject that has been studied and is currently being studied at other parliamentary committees.

The Conservatives wish to push back the already agreed-to study on the impacts of the gender and diversity pay gap for faculty at Canadian universities. We fought hard to get the committee to agree to this study, this next important topic, and the witnesses have been lined up to commence next Thursday.

Tuesday is dedicated in our calendar to deal with finishing up reports on the French language in research and citizen science.

I would like to point out that the composition of our inaugural science and research parliamentary committee consists of 12 members, only two of whom are female.

Not only are the Conservatives insisting on ending the agreed-to order of studies; they are suggesting splitting the time of the meetings, with their study occupying the first hour and the pay equity study going second. Given the pattern of filibustering that was demonstrated by the Conservative opposition members at today's meeting and the disrespect shown to the witnesses, I have no assurances that they will not exhibit similar behaviour going forward and filibuster the second hour of the pay equity study, which then, in fact, would not occur, and those witnesses would be disrespected and dismissed as well.

This is not how our committee is supposed to work. We are sent here by our constituents to accomplish things and do important work. We rely on witnesses to provide expert testimony in order to help us arrive at logical, agreed-upon conclusions and recommendations. The tactics exhibited by the Conservatives today precluded that from being accomplished today. Member Tochor has already indicated that if we do not accede to their wishes, the entire month of June, until we rise, will proceed in this fashion. That was actually said.

These conditions are not conducive to compromise.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bradford.

We have other comments.

Next is Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Chair, just as a clarification, we are now debating the amendment to the motion, correct?

**The Chair:** It's the subamendment.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It's the subamendment, so once we're done with debate, we'll have a vote on that subamendment.

**The Chair:** That's correct.

Is there any further debate on the subamendment?

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** Can we hear it again?

**The Chair:** Yes. The subamendment is that:

the committee split the meetings for this study with the study of Long-term impacts of Pay Gaps Experienced by Different Genders and Equity-Seeking Groups Among Faculty at Canadian Universities, with this study being dedicated in the first hour

Is it a recorded vote? I see nods around the table.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

**The Chair:** The subamendment has passed and now we go to the amendment. Then we'll go to the main motion.

The amendment has been circulated in both languages, and it is:

that the committee allocate a minimum of six full meetings to this study; that the committee begin the study on June 20;

Is there any discussion on the amendment?

• (1305)

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I would ask for a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I don't see any hands.

Oh, I see Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Again, I think this issue is being studied at several committees. I'm not aware of all the studies, but as I understand it, either it has been studied elsewhere or it is in the process of being studied elsewhere. I'm not certain whether we have that information in hand. Is it possible to understand where...? It doesn't look like the clerk knows.

Look, what I've learned here in a year and a half is that we spin our wheels a lot instead of moving on to studies that will yield some benefit. We did this with the small modular reactors, right? We had a precedent there, and we've done that with two other studies since. I'd rather move on to new and different things to learn how to move legislation forward and look at financial investments that can be made in subject areas that are new to the committee and may possibly be new to the government.

With the recommendation we have in front of us in terms of the six meetings, I would certainly like to suggest, in light of the fact that there's some overlap with what's being studied here and what's being studied elsewhere, that we look at a different number in terms of number of meetings, and I would suggest four meetings, maybe as a compromise, Mr. Chair, if you would entertain that.

**The Chair:** We have a motion to subamend the amendment to four meetings instead of six meetings.

Is there discussion on the subamendment?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** I will agree to a further reduction to four, but I would like Mr. Collins to withdraw his subamendment. We'll vote on the main motion and then amend it down to four after it's passed. If Mr. Collins is in agreement, he'll remove his motion, or we can vote on it.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** I don't know the procedure there. I don't know how that happens.

**An hon. member:** He can't remove his motion...?

**The Clerk:** He can remove his motion, but once the motion is adopted, that's the adopted motion.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Then we can amend that motion.

**The Chair:** The main motion would then be discussed, and at the point of a main motion being discussed, you could suggest further amendments.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** For ease of time, if this.... I'm sorry.

**The Clerk:** At that point, it's the will of the committee if the final motion is adopted.

**The Chair:** Once a motion has been adopted.... What you're suggesting is to get rid of subamendments and then go to the main motion. Am I understanding you correctly?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** No, I'll just clarify. With unanimous support, we can amend a motion after it has passed, so that can happen, but to get this committee, which I think has been functioning well, back to a place of respect, I will take it further down to four meetings on the amendment, as long as we have a vote on the main motion shortly. After the adoption of this motion, I would expect that we would proceed with the other votes with recorded votes.

**The Chair:** Where we want to go is up to the will of the committee.

Is there further discussion on the subamendment?

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Just a gentlemen's agreement....

**The Chair:** We have Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** I'm going to use Mr. Tochor's words in terms of getting the committee back on track.

I'm going to reiterate what I said earlier. There is a big trust issue now that we have here. This morning's proceedings were interrupted with the filibuster. We had four witnesses planned. Obviously this meeting is off track, to use that term, because of what happened earlier. There's a trust issue here.

There's this "trust us" issue, and yet we're dealing, in this political environment here, with an element of political blackmail, in that they're going to keep filibustering, they're going to interrupt all proceedings, they're going to interrupt the report that was coming from our Bloc friends and they're going to interrupt the report that's been done on citizen science from our NDP member.

The filibuster we had earlier threatened to bring everything to a grinding halt unless we agree with everything they say. Then they'll stop. I just find it absurd.

Again, I'm not new to this place but I'm new to this committee. There's a trust issue here in terms of letting this pass and then things will proceed as one party around the table wants, instead of having a collective decision-making process that has worked very well for this committee since its inception.

I'm a little bit disturbed, because if we acquiesce here on this one, I guess the question would be what is next. Will something come again next week? If somebody puts forward a motion or we have an established rule of order of business, will they say, "Well, we're not happy, so we're going to run the clock out"?

Again, it goes back to witnesses, who come in from different parts of the country. It's one thing for people to attend virtually and to say, "Hey, look, we're going to have to interrupt your day. Go back to what you were doing. Sorry for the prep work you did for this committee, but we'll call you when you're needed again." It might be a couple of days or it could be a couple of weeks, depending on what's happened.

It gives me some consternation in terms of this whole "trust me" line that's been presented to the committee, when in fact we've had a very good working relationship up until today's meeting.

What's changed? I certainly understand the whole Chinese interference issue that's been raised in the House and at several committees. If that's the one-trick pony political debate that's going to happen for several months from one party, so be it. That's their prerog-

ative. I guess the issue that I would have, again, is that it interferes with all the good work that this committee has done to date and has continued to do, up until this morning.

I have some doubts in terms of what comes next if I agree to what has been suggested here. I would much prefer, Mr. Chair, that the committee have some discussion about coming to a compromise, rather than being politically blackmailed into a decision or a position that we're uncomfortable with.

• (1310)

**The Chair:** As the chair, I'm disappointed that the trust has been broken within the committee. I hope the committee can find a way to regain that trust. It was working very well. As a chair, I'll say that it made life move along, because we were able to get some reports done and studied. We have one we'll be tabling in the House of Commons on Tuesday. I was hoping we would see some more committee reports tabled in the House of Commons. Getting reports done has been a hallmark of this committee. I'm hoping we can get to the point where we can see reports being completed again.

However, it is the will of the committee to see where we go on the next steps. I've now heard "four weeks" on both sides, in talking about the subamendment. I wonder whether we can vote on the subamendment to see whether we have some common ground on that. We can then go back to the main amendment and see where we're at on that one.

I'm looking around the room. If there is no further discussion on the subamendment the way it sits now, let's go to the vote.

**A voice:** I'd like a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** It's a recorded vote. This is on Mr. Collins' subamendment. What we're voting on is the four weeks. That's what we have on the table. Then we'll go back to the amendment. We're voting on four weeks as the study period.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We're back to where we were at with this. It's good to have these things in writing. Now the subamendment reads, "that the committee allocate a minimum of four full meetings to the study; that the committee begin the study on June 20".

Can we vote on that full amendment or discuss it?

• (1315)

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Chair, can I ask that we break for a minute?

**The Chair:** If we don't have a discussion on this, I think we're in the process of starting a vote. Let's keep going with the vote, then.

Just to be clear, this will take us back to the main motion. If there is more discussion on the main motion.... This is the amendment "that the committee allocate a minimum of four full meetings to the study; that the committee begin the study on June 20".

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** I have a point of order. I think someone indicated that we wanted—

**Mr. Chad Collins:** That's what I asked earlier, on the wording.

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** Okay.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** I raise a point of order, Mr. Chair. We are in the middle of a vote, and there can be no points of order during a vote. We must therefore proceed with the vote.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We're in the midst of doing a vote right now.

Let's go to the recorded vote.

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That passes, and it takes us back to the main motion.

Do we have the main motion that we can read out with those amendments? I'm being a stickler just because it's important to get this one right.

Could the clerk read us the motion the way it is now, with the amendments that include the four-week study that was just passed and splitting the committee meetings to one hour for each?

**The Clerk:** I will now read the motion as amended:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(i), the committee study the use of the federal government research and development grants, funds, and contributions by the Canadian universities and research institutions in partnerships with entities connected to the People's Republic of China in areas including, but not limited to: photonics, artificial intelligence, quantum theory, biopharmaceuticals and aerospace; and including but not limited to, intellectual property transfers and developments with Huawei Technologies and the National University of Defense Technology; that the committee hear from the director of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, department officials, top research officials from Canadian universities, the federal granting agencies and any other witnesses deemed relevant to the study; the committee allocate a minimum of four full meetings to this study; that the committee begin the study on June 20; that the committee split the meetings for this study with the study of Long-term Impacts of Pay Gaps Experienced by Different Genders and Equity-seeking Groups Among Faculty at Canadian Universities, with this study being dedicated in the first hour; and that the committee report its findings to the House.

• (1320)

**The Chair:** Now we have an amended motion.

Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

One thing we haven't talked about as part of the motion is the scope that has been presented as part of the original motion that was presented to the committee.

As I am reading through this, I look at the photonics, the artificial intelligence and the quantum theory. Again, I'm going to go back to what I talked about earlier: Many of these issues are being studied at other committees. I am wondering whether there is an opportunity to take out or to add language to the study to get at that overlap that I've referenced several times here today.

I know this issue isn't new to the members opposite. I think some of them have even participated in other committees on the same issue.

I just wonder if there is an opportunity—and I'll start with maybe amending it by removing Huawei, if I could—to start to narrow it down and make it very generic instead of specific. I think that may help us in terms of choosing witnesses and then coming up with recommendations in the end that will serve to help us with either government legislation or investments.

At this point in time, I would, as a start, remove Huawei from the recommendation that's been put forward, unless there is unanimous consent and we can all agree upon that. It doesn't mean that someone can't ask a witness to come in and speak to those issues—

**The Chair:** Now we have a new amendment to the main motion, which is to remove Huawei from the main motion.

Is there some discussion on the amendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Just quickly, why are we hiding the truth of what Huawei is doing to our universities? Removing one of the state sponsors of Beijing's influence in the tech frontier is a cover-up, not just in a democracy but in our institutions. I think it is insulting that we would not investigate what Huawei is doing in our universities.

The Conservatives will be voting against this amendment.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Chair, I don't think it's hiding anything. I just think you're limiting the scope of the study by narrowing it down to one. There may be other companies that we may want to study as part of this, so to suggest that it is one, understanding that questions have already been presented to other witnesses in other studies on Huawei, which no one has disputed in terms of the recommendations or the advice that has come from the witnesses.... They have been included in the reports.

If you recall, I think even prior to your time, Mr. Chair, there have been reports that have included some of the questions.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Specifically, the member opposite, Mr. Mazier, has always raised that company's university and college relationships in terms of government funding. I would say that we're limiting the study by narrowing it down to one company. I would say that we can expand that language if you have other suggestions to provide that build upon that theme of foreign interference, or whatever you want to call it. I think we need to be a little bit more inclusive rather than exclusive. That's why I made that recommendation today.

**The Chair:** Is there more discussion on this amendment? If not, we will call the vote on it.

We are getting close to 1:30. If we need more time, we're going to have to go to a deviation or we'll have to see whether the committee wants to adjourn at 1:30. I haven't made that request yet, but I'm also trying to manage a meeting that's bouncing in different areas right now.

Let's go to the vote on the amendment. In the meantime, I'll have a quick discussion with the clerk when I can.

• (1325)

**The Clerk:** This is on Mr. Collins' amendment to remove Huawei from the motion.

Shall the amendment to the motion of Mr. Mazier carry?

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Is there further discussion on the main motion?

Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest that the next amendment would be that we add, "and that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request that a comprehensive response to the report". I think that's standard language that we've seen in other motions that have been put to the committee and unanimously approved by the committee.

**The Chair:** Right, sure.

Mr. Tochor, you have the floor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** It's apparent that the cover-up continues as amendment after amendment gets added that has no merit.

The Conservatives will vote against any amendment that slows the down the process to get to the answers on Beijing's influence at our post-secondary institutions.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Collins.

**Mr. Chad Collins:** There seems to be a conspiracy theory here in terms of the.... That's all we've heard through almost every study from the other side of the table. I'm not discounting the fact that we need to study some of these things, and it's certainly their right to put it forward. The concern I have is that this theme of.... You just heard the comments here in terms of a cover-up, conspiracy theory. We can use different words for it.

I would say that this committee has worked very well from its inception in terms of looking at subject matters that help us move legislation forward and make strategic investments. The motion today, which was preceded by the filibuster, stands in the way of our moving forward on—I can count—three or four different studies that we have in the works, including the one by my colleague MP Bradford that was already approved.

When we talk about slowing the process, this meeting started with a filibuster. This meeting started with interrupting and advising the witnesses who came from.... We had one witness who came from halfway around the country to be here today to provide her testimony. She probably prepared for several hours in terms of coming up with recommendations in her opening statement, as almost all witnesses do at all committees, so to talk about slowing down the process is, I think, a bit rich to hear from the other side of the table.

To go back to the amendment that I just moved in terms of asking for a response, it is standard common language that we see in almost every study recommendation that's come to this committee and all others where I've appeared.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Bradford.

**Ms. Valerie Bradford:** I'm absolutely astounded that the opposition would not want a comprehensive response. Why would the opposition, if they really want to get to the bottom of something, not want to hear a government response?

It just makes sense. If you're doing an objective investigation of any topic, I think you need to hear from all sides, not just witnesses you line up who are going to perhaps support your already pre-concluded position. I think we would definitely need to hear a government response on this.

We've had government witnesses on many of our other topics, and I think it would be very appropriate that we get a government response on this one. Otherwise, it's clear that you're predetermining the outcome before we even start the study, which is not a good way to enter a study.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I was hoping to get to a vote on this, but go ahead, Mr. Tochor.

**Mr. Corey Tochor:** Chair, it's become very apparent to this side of the table that there is something here. There is something they are hiding, as this meeting confirmed, when we put forward a motion.

The Liberals have filibustered this study. There are issues at our universities, where we need to look at the foreign influence, and in this whole meeting, we've suspended for over 50 minutes, which means that we should be sitting until 1:50, not 1:30. I suspect we are going to get shut down.

We are looking for answers. We will not stop asking these questions about the involvement of Beijing at our universities. This will continue past this meeting; it will continue to the next. We are not done trying to get to the bottom of how integrated Beijing is with our institutes across Canada.

I think it's a shame that we never got to a vote on the main motion because of amendment after amendment being added by the Liberals. If we would like to go down this road, then this is what is going to happen at this committee until we get the answers on this influence that is taking place in our country from a foreign state actor. This is wrong.

I hope we can extend this meeting to 1:50 to make up for the time that we were suspended, Chair.

• (1330)

**Mr. Chad Collins:** Mr. Chair, just to set the record straight, if I could—

**The Chair:** No, I'm actually going to adjourn the meeting at this point.

I haven't asked for additional resources. I wanted to see whether we were going to get to the main motion and get to a vote. Evidently that isn't going to happen today.

We're at 1:30. I'll now adjourn the meeting. We'll resume next week.

The meeting is adjourned.

---





Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>