



From: Daniel Therrien
Sent: October 7, 2021 3:23 PM
To: Gregory Smolynec ; Tess Kim ; David Gamble
Cc: Dalbir Singh ; Laura Crestohl ; Lara Ives
Subject: RE: FPT meeting

I agree the sentence can be deleted (science evolves rapidly).
David, I would this with a minimum of fanfare. How about only changing the very last line (Date modified) to include the date when the sentence will be excised?

Information and Privacy (ATIP) Request* Reveals: Deletion of Key Information and Subsequent Cover-up on Government of Canada OPC Website

COVID-19 Vaccine Passports & Privacy (from the website *Joint Statement by Federal, Provincial and Territorial Privacy Commissioners May 19, 2021*)



*Access to Information Request A-2022-00030

Overview of Events

Organization: Office of the Privacy Commissioner—Daniel Therrien

Web Page: [Joint Statement by Federal, Provincial and Territorial Privacy Commissioners link](#)

Removal of sentence and multiple changes described can be verified here: [Waybackmachine](#)

May 19, 2021 Statement regarding privacy and COVID-19 vaccine passports includes the following sentence:

"So far we have not been presented with evidence of vaccines effectiveness to prevent transmission, although members of the scientific community have indicated that this may be forthcoming"

October 6, 2021 Federal Government implements their policy on COVID-19 vaccination for the core public administration:

"all employees ... must be fully vaccinated to protect themselves, colleagues, and clients from COVID-19."

October 7, 2021 Privacy Commissioner agrees to have the (May 19) sentence above deleted from the webpage.

Original emails can be viewed [HERE](#)



How Sentence Deletion Transpired

October 7, 2021 Email from Deputy Privacy Commissioner to Privacy

Commissioner draws attention to sentence in question:

- Sent with High Importance
- Makes reference to government vaccine mandates
- suggests sentence may be misused by anti-vaccination people
- Federal, Provincial, Territorial (FPT) consensus: delete sentence, add note that this is an “updated” statement
- Commissioner’s response: minimize the fanfare, make the deletion and change date modified to reflect date of deletion, done on October 8, 2021

Commissioner Requests Removal of “Date Modified”

October 22, 2021 Urgent Message from Privacy Commissioner to staff:

- Remove the date modified (October 8, 2021), as sentence deletion does not warrant announcement
- Revert date modified back to original date of posting (May 19, 2021)
- This was done in less than 1 hour from the time the request was made

Original emails can be viewed [HERE](#)



“Date modified” Changes Exposed

- November 8, 2021** Webpage changes are called into question by a sharp member of the public, who sent an info request form regarding the following discrepancies:
- Current date modified is May 19, 2021 but this is not true
 - Points out that the sentence was deleted in October (according to his use of the wayback machine), and “date modified” changed to October 8, 2021
 - He is wondering why the modified date no longer reflects the real date of modification

- November 9, 2021** Proposed response by OPC staff (seemingly a complete fabrication) for Commissioner’s approval:
- “... We encumbered [sic] a technical issue and we needed to revert to its original date of publication until the issue was fixed. We have now fixed the technical issue”...*

- November 10, 2021** Response to member of public is entirely disingenuous as the request for the change to the original “date modified” had been made by the Commissioner himself.

Original emails can be viewed [HERE](#)



So What?

- At levels as high as the Privacy Commissioner himself, there appears to be an attempt to 'memory hole' information.
- This information (lack of proof of vaccine effectiveness against transmission) had clearly been understood by the Commissioner and all the Offices of the Federal, Provincial and Territorial Privacy Commissioners.
- There were then subsequent attempts to remove evidence of the same deletion (modification date changes).
- How do these concerns play into justifying infringements of privacy via vaccine passports? How does adherence to the Privacy Act factor in?