



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

---

PROC • NUMBER 013 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Tuesday, December 7, 2004**

—  
**Chair**

**The Honourable Don Boudria**

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Tuesday, December 7, 2004

•(1105)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.)):** Order, please.

We have two items on the agenda this morning. Of course, one is the order of reference to the question of privilege relating to the free movement of members within the parliamentary precinct.

On the second one, some might argue it is perhaps less important, but quite urgent. I shouldn't make a judgment call. It's the issue of the Miramichi and Acadie—Bathurst Electoral Boundaries Commission. I will take only a moment and refer to this.

[Translation]

As you know, the Miramichi and Acadie—Bathurst Electoral Boundaries Commission had to adjust the boundary between the two ridings following a court decision. The mayors of the Acadian Peninsula put forward some objections and won their case in court. Subsequently, the Government of Canada decided not to appeal the decision, but rather to take the necessary corrective action.

Last week, Minister Mauril Bélanger tabled the solution to this problem in the House. The boundary between the two ridings—namely the one represented by Mr. Godin, of the NDP, and the one represented by Mr. Hubbard, of the government side, will be changed. This means that one village, on one side of the boundary, will now be on the other side of it. That is all that is involved. I am assured that there has been no impact on the other electoral districts in the country.

That said, the minister has tabled his response. He asked our committee to make a recommendation so that he could then table a bill in the House.

You have the report of Minister Mauril Bélanger before you, colleagues, and we can vote on a motion to adopt it, if you wish. I know that Mr. Godin is not here, but, Mr. Comartin, you are apparently able to tell us that the member of Parliament in question is in favour of the report. Is that correct?

**Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP):** Yes.

**The Chair:** Do you wish to adopt this report?

Mr. Hill.

[English]

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, CPC):** I haven't had time to read the report, so we're taking a little of this on faith. If the

chair can assure all committee members that the situation is, as you described, limited to a minor change....

**The Chair:** It's strictly limited to a minor boundary adjustment between the two ridings, following a court decision. It's strictly limited. It does not affect any other constituencies.

Mr. Comartin.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** I only want to be clear with the committee. It's a substantial number of citizens, approximately 5,500 to 6,000, who were retained in this riding.

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

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** I don't want to minimize the significance of this. It's the first time this has ever happened in Canada, so it's a significant point.

Having said those two things, as I indicated, Monsieur Godin is certainly quite pleased with the result. It's what he wanted. Obviously, it had a lot of local support in the two communities that were specifically affected by both the court ruling and the report.

**The Chair:** I had a personal meeting this morning with Mr. Hubbard. He's the MP involved for the electors who will be removed from his riding and added to the other. He supports it, as well.

Mr. Hill.

•(1110)

**Mr. Jay Hill:** I notice that they have the population numbers in the report. Are the numbers what they will consist of once the 5,500 citizens are removed from one riding and transferred to the other, or is that the way they currently are?

**The Chair:** That's the proposal.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** It's what they will be afterwards.

**The Chair:** It's on page 16, in English.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** There will be quite a disparity between the two ridings, if I'm reading that correctly. One will be approximately 82,000 and the other one will be 56,000. Is that correct?

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

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** That will be the effect with the change. The 5,500 won't be added onto the 82,000.

**The Chair:** That's the final result.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** The final figures are the 80,000 figure and the 56,000 figure. Those are the final figures.

**The Chair:** Mr. Reid.

**Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC):** That doesn't pose a problem under the Elections Act because of the fact that you're allowed up to 25% in either direction; page 10 makes it clear that Acadie—Bathurst will be 13.7% over and Miramichi will be 22.7% under the quota for the province.

**The Chair:** It's within the accepted margin, of course.

Who wants to move the motion that the draft report be adopted?

**Hon. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** So moved.

**The Chair:** Seconded by Mr. Comartin.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Would someone move the second motion, that the chair, clerk, and researchers be authorized to make such grammatical and editorial changes as may be necessary without changing the substance of the report? This is the usual motion.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Seconded by Ms. Redman.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Finally, who will so move that the chair present its report to the House?

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, CPC):** So moved.

**The Chair:** Seconded by Madame Boivin.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** I will seek unanimous consent and try to table it this afternoon, if members will agree to that.

Having exhausted that issue, we will now go to the order of reference.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, in accordance with our order of reference of Wednesday, December 1, we are studying the question of privilege regarding the free movement of members of Parliament within the parliamentary precinct during the visit of President George W. Bush. You will recall that this question of privilege was raised in the House of Commons by one of our colleagues, Michel Guimond, who is a member of this committee. His complaint, if I may describe it in that way, has now been referred to this committee. It is our practice to hear the person who raised the question of privilege in Parliament as the first witness.

Would you like to present your case, Mr. Guimond?

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, colleagues, I do not like talking at length. I am very unhappy about the short length of time you have given me. I will try to keep my presentation within 10 minutes.

I think you have all seen the comments I made in support of my question of privilege. You therefore know that there were some major, serious problems during President Bush's visit last Tuesday involving the free movement of some of our colleagues and their access to the parliamentary precinct.

You will appreciate at the outset, as the chair did, that my question of privilege is not partisan in nature. This morning, I feel like I am appealing on behalf of colleagues from all parties. I want that to be clear. I have mentioned the colleagues from my own party, but I am sure that all of the other members of this committee, if they had the time to do the same thing, could also put forward some cases, some real gems. I want that to be clear from the outset.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, what happened last Tuesday is a little like inviting our neighbour for dinner and having him prevent us from using our own bathroom and forcing us to wait for him outside, on the patio.

I know you might think that my analogy is somewhat clumsy. Nevertheless, that is more or less what happened during the visit of our VIP guest, President George W. Bush. The reason I make this analogy is to point out that for us, the elected members, Parliament is like our home, the place we come to carry out our duties on behalf of the people who elected us. We did not simply decide on our own, without being elected, that we would go and sit in Parliament. It was the people who elected us as members of Parliament, in a democratic process, to speak for them in this place, this sacrosanct place, the cathedral of democracy in Canada—the House of Commons.

I am not renouncing my sovereigntist convictions, but I must acknowledge that the House of Commons is the cathedral of democracy. This is where people send their chosen representatives.

Being the spokespersons of the people means that we must be able to work without obstructions, without any pressure of any sort in a free and detached way. We are responsible for what we say. We are the masters of what we say. It is not up to anyone to impose certain things on us. The people present in this room could say that things have been all right until now. However, there is a corollary to the freedom of expression—namely the freedom of movement. If we have the right to speak anywhere, that means we have the right to move anywhere, both in the House and in committee, in any building, in any room and at any hour of the day or night.

•(1115)

Recently, I was returning from a trip to the United States with my wife, and our flight was delayed in Chicago. I came in here at 4:00 a.m. to show my wife my office, and I left here at 5:15 a.m. No security officer asked me any questions or made any comments. They wished me good night when I arrived and said goodbye when I left. That is freedom of movement, the right to come here to do one's work, regardless of the time of day.

I must mention some problems. As I said, I will not repeat information about specific incidents; everyone here knows how to read and has therefore been able to familiarize themselves with what appeared in *Hansard* on this. As far as I am concerned, all the problems have to do with communications. I would not want to be a victim of reprisals and wind up on a black list. Nor do I want to attack people; I am attacking a process, a structure.

I do not know whether this is an accident, but every time the RCMP is involved, there are communication problems. You need only look at earlier reports by the Auditor General: she has raised this issue many times. This was not my comment, but rather that of the Auditor General. She said, and I am summarizing her comments, that information is not transmitted between the various organizations involved in public security when the RCMP is involved.

I acknowledge that all kinds of officers and other people were mobilized for President Bush's visit. I am neither naive nor blind, so I can understand that President Bush's visit was more controversial than Nelson Mandela's farewell tour. I know which groups were involved: the U.S. Secret Service, the RCMP, the Ontario Provincial Police, the Quebec Police Force, the Ottawa and Gatineau Police Forces, as well as as the House of Commons and Senate Security Services.

I think it is completely unacceptable that officers assigned to strategic locations such as the access points to Parliament Hill are unable to recognize members of Parliament. We do not put ourselves above ordinary citizens. I am not trying to say that my role in society is more important than of the taxi driver or the person who washes the floors at the Gatineau Hospital. That is not part of my value system. However, if we accept that members of Parliament have a job to do, they must be given access to this place.

The bilingualism of RCMP officers is another problem I have raised many times. I hope the committee will decide to hear from Ms. Line Carbonneau. I think she is in charge of RCMP Protective Services. I would remind you that after the events of September 11, 2001, when the RCMP car wash was established at the corner of Bank Street, Ms. Carbonneau and the commissioner, who were seated right here, promised that there would always be bilingual RCMP officers on Parliament Hill to provide bilingual service.

It is you Canadians who tell us Quebeckers that Canada is a wonderful bilingual country where people can speak the language of their choice wherever they are. You need to act on what you say. Given what happened, I am going to ask Ms. Carbonneau to come back and repeat the promise she made in 2002.

• (1120)

I am going to close by asking a few questions. We want to know whether the privilege of members of Parliament to move freely was discussed during the briefing sessions, and also how this information was passed on. Was it passed on from the top down? Who was in charge of ensuring that this information was conveyed and understood? Did anyone check that this had been done? If all the foregoing was done, why were members of Parliament denied access to the hill? Why was it that some officers required members of Parliament to show a so-called security pass, when there has never been any such pass?

If one of the eight to ten members of Parliament here has this type of pass, I would like to see it. I would go and get one made for myself. We have a pin for identification purposes. When the Sargeant-at-Arms gave me mine, he told me not to lose it, because it was my pass for the hill. We also have an identity card signed by the Speaker of the House, Peter Milliken. Does that not have some value for security officers, the RCMP or the other people in charge of security?

Mr. Chairman, it is not up to members of Parliament to adapt to security measures, but rather it is up to the security services to operate in a way that respects our parliamentary privileges. The privilege of some members of Parliament to have free access to Parliament Hill was violated. The people in charge may not realize this, but this is a case of contempt of Parliament, which is very serious. In a police state, the incident that occurred would probably be acceptable, but the situation is very different in a country where the rule of law prevails.

These arguments have already been presented in the House. It is now essential to hear from other witnesses to get answers to our questions, to understand what happened and to find solutions, so that this type of thing never happens again. I will close by telling you that I want to know what is going to happen. However, I also want to assure you that we are not going to sweep these events under the carpet. Before we talk about the future, I want to know what happened.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

• (1125)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Guimond. Before hearing from the witnesses available this morning, I am going to ask whether any colleagues have questions for Mr. Guimond. I see that Mr. Hill has already asked to speak.

Mr. Hill.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the difficulty here is to strike this balance. The security forces, whether it's the RCMP, the Hill security, or whoever, have a delicate balancing act in facing the challenge they face, especially when it's a guest of the stature of the President of the United States visiting our nation's capital. All of us are sufficiently students of history to know that presidents of the United States face constant threat, and probably no more so than this president at this particular time in history.

Therefore, while I recognize that all of us faced some inconvenience that day, some more than others, I'm not sure I go along with Mr. Guimond's statement when he says our work has to be completely unfettered at all times; that denying access is the ultimate contempt of Parliament, against our parliamentary privilege. I understand that we were inconvenienced; I understand that many of our colleagues in the Conservative Party, Bloc, NDP, and Liberals suffered some inconvenience on this particular day; but at the same time I respect the challenge that our security forces had on that particular day in trying to provide the necessary security for someone of the stature of President Bush.

Security, by its very definition, means we have to be secure. How can we do it? Can we make improvements? Yes, I think we can. I know there was some effort made to suggest to all the parties, for example, that we shut down Parliament—in the sense of the business of the day—as we did for Vicente Fox when we was here, so that if anything like this developed, it wouldn't constrain members from attending committee or attending debate in the House on that day. There were options presented and, for whatever reason, one or two of the parties didn't like those options.

I want to zero in on Mr. Guimond's statement right at the end. Yes, let's understand what clearly happened, but let's look forward to trying to prevent it in the future. I think that's the business that should be seizing the committee.

Another suggestion I would like to put out and get comment from Mr. Guimond on is, when we have a guest to our nation of the importance of President Bush, perhaps we should or could consider some other options. If it was going to inconvenience Parliament to the extent it did and there's no way to prevent that—I think there should be in the future—perhaps he didn't need to come onto Parliament Hill. He could have had his meetings, as he had most of them, at DFAIT or over in the Langevin Block or wherever, without actually coming here and creating part of the problem.

But I don't think all of the problem was because of his presence. I think part of the problem was because we had to secure Parliament Hill from protests and protesters. There are a lot of factors at play here, and I would like Mr. Guimond's comments on them.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** Very well.

I just want to remind colleagues that we have some guests we have specifically asked to hear today. I notice that a number of people want to intervene. I'm not against that, but when one o'clock comes, it will have come, regardless. I just remind us all of that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I would like to say to my colleague Jay that I do not mean to suggest that all the rights of all parliamentarians were violated throughout the entire visit. I presented some isolated cases. However, we must ask ourselves whether this is acceptable. Some of the events did not last very long. Is it reasonable and acceptable that Ms. Picard, the member of Parliament for Drummond, had a security officer walk in on her without knocking in the women's washroom to tell her that she was not allowed to walk around in the corridors? That is one example. The case of those who were behind the barricades is another. There are just too many such cases.

I agree with you, Jay, that we have to try to strike a balance between security and the free movement of parliamentarians. It is not obvious how to do that. In any case, we have been talking about that since September 11. You will remember the informal discussions we had here in this committee. However, we have to ensure that parliamentarians' rights are respected.

Your idea to hold the meeting somewhere other than the hill might be feasible. However, given what Parliament represents for this

institution, I imagine that if meetings were held in a different building, the significance for both the visitor and the host would not be the same. You mentioned the Department of Foreign Affairs. The significance of a meeting would not be the same if it were held in a room rented somewhere in the city. We have to appreciate the significance of this institution.

Personally, I have some ideas, and I will make a suggestion that could have been implemented. We could have told all members of Parliaments ahead of time that if they were outside the security perimeter and had to come onto the hill, the access point would be Bank Street. The RCMP car wash is on Bank. In this way, our colleagues who were at the Westin Hotel after a conference would not have had to go through 10 different security officers at 10 different locations, as Mr. Ménard did, only to be denied access to the hill. They would have known that the only place to get on to the hill was the entrance on Bank Street. That would have been much better.

**The Chair:** Mr. Guimond, you will have to move on to other issues. I will try to limit your comments to five minutes each, including both questions and answers.

Ms. Picard, go ahead.

**Ms. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** I will be brief. This is just a comment to support Michel's arguments. As far as the situation I experienced is concerned, I really had the impression that a visitor had arrived and I was no longer at home. I felt like I needed to skulk about.

There was already a security guard stationed at the entrance to the stairwell here, on the 6th floor. They went to the trouble of coming into the women's washroom to tell me that I could not move around in the hallway and that I should take the elevator and take the back way to leave.

Of course, we must provide security, but we must maintain some kind of balance. I am at home here. When a visitor arrives, he must not make me leave and creep along the hallway. I understand that we had to have a maximum level of security because of the individual involved, but that I should have to skulk stealthily about the corridors... That is going too far. My right to be alone in the washroom was violated.

They did not even knock on my office door. They burst in and looked at I don't know what. I could not even see what the guard was doing because I was behind him. The same thing happened to my colleague.

They went too far. They had to take steps to ensure our security and that of our guest, but without making me go through the back door. I am at home here.

• (1135)

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

Mr. Guimond, did you want to make a comment? If not, I will give the floor to the next speaker.

Mr. Comartin, go ahead.

[English]

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Perhaps we could have some direction, Mr. Chair, from you. I'm not clear whether other witnesses, such as Mr. Blaikie or Madam Guay, are going to be called as witnesses.

**The Chair:** For members who are perhaps not aware, we have Inspector Louis Lahaie in the room. He will testify immediately after we finish with the first witness—in other words, with Mr. Guimond. He's the officer in charge of majorevents, from the protective policing directorate.

[Translation]

We also have Sargeant-Major François Desfossés, who is in charge of the RCMP detachment on Parliament Hill. He is accompanied by members of his staff. These are the people we normally see, outside the building, but on the Hill. These witnesses are in the room and are waiting for us to finish questioning our first witnesses. Does that help?

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** No. Will Ms. Guay, Mr. Blaikie and Senator Grafstein come and testify? If not, I will put my questions to Mr. Guimond.

**The Chair:** They are not witnesses today, but they may be at another time if the committee feels it is appropriate.

[English]

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** To challenge Mr. Hill's comments, I take issue with the notion that this particular president was in any more danger than both President Roosevelts were during their particular periods of time as presidents of the United States, given the incidents of the Second World War and the anarchists in the first period of President Teddy Roosevelt's reign. To argue that the balance somehow shifts because of this particular president doesn't stand up to historical analysis.

From my perspective, the risk is that the balance always ends up being weighted on the side of security rather than on the side of the privileges we have as members of this House. In particular, take the incident with Mr. Blaikie. What happened in that incident was that he and Senator Grafstein weren't allowed up on the Hill, and in fact there were protesters on the Hill. Where was the balance there? Where was the security?

What this is really about is the question of competency of our security forces on the Hill. That's what these hearings are about.

[Translation]

Mr. Guimond, I would like to ask you a question. I read somewhere about what had happened to Ms. Guay. Was there another incident? Were there two incidents or just one?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** There were two incidents concerning Ms. Picard. There was the washroom incident and the incident where they went into her office without knocking. As for Ms. Guay, the same thing probably happened: they entered her 6th floor office in the Centre Block without knocking.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Do you know if Ms. Picard and Ms. Guay will come and testify?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I support what the chair said earlier. We are going to lay the groundwork and hear from a number of witnesses. The committee is master of its own internal proceedings. I

am talking like the ministers who come and appear before us. Our colleagues will decide if we need to hear from others members of Parliament. I am not in a position to tell you that today.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** That's all, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I would like to add something to enlighten the committee. I do not want to become too involved in the debate. However, it is important to remember that certain events unfolded not within the perimeter of Parliament Hill, but in the street. People were denied access to the Hill. This is perhaps a point Mr. Lahaie will address later on. If I understand correctly, there were people who were stopped as far away as the Westin. Therefore, people who work on the Hill were not here. At any rate, we will get back to that.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I want to bring up your case, during the taxi drivers' strike here, in Ottawa...

● (1140)

**The Chair:** That is not the right case; it is another matter.

Mr. Johnston.

[English]

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** I'll reserve my comments until after hearing the other witnesses.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Reid.

[Translation]

Pardon me, I had not heard anyone say they wished to speak on this side.

Ms. Boivin, go ahead. Then we will have Mr. Reid. I am sorry, Mr. Reid.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, Lib.):** We also spoke about this privilege in another context. I learned of the importance that this has for us, as parliamentarians, and I agree entirely with what you have said on the subject. We are talking about striking a balance, but I believe that we should go somewhat further and state that there should be no exceptions, unless one is in a position to prove that it is justified, almost beyond all reasonable doubt.

I will explain myself and ask a question at the same time. Are you aware of any situations that would justify taking away our right to freedom of movement? Is President Bush's visit such a case? Were there threats hanging over the Hill? Was there a mention of bomb threats, in which case, being as intelligent as the next person, I would understand that certain privileges would have to be set aside. The issue is how we analyze the situation. The fact remains that on this occasion, I had the impression that we had become second-class citizens. We would have been better off staying at home because in the end, we had nothing to do here.

I ask you, as an eminent jurist, this question. We all know that you did not get your diploma in a box of Cracker Jacks. Mr. Guimond, do you feel that there are situations where freedom of movement, which is essential to freedom of expression in terms of the work of a parliamentarian, may be set aside?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Yes, in the case of a pressing emergency. Let us presume, for example, that there is a fire in the building and that I insist, by virtue of my parliamentary privilege, on trying to recover some documents, under the pretext that I have free access to my office. Of course, the firefighters could not be faulted for having wanted to protect my life against my will. To my way of thinking, this is a case where the parliamentarian's life is at risk. A bomb threat would be another such example.

We could ask ourselves why we have to leave our offices during fire drills. As whip, I have already had to discuss the issue, given that during a fire drill, one member did not want to leave his office. This is a situation where the life and health of a member of Parliament could be threatened. We could make this type of exception to the rule.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Do you have any further questions, Ms. Boivin?

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** No, that's fine.

**The Chair:** Mr. Reid.

[English]

**Mr. Scott Reid:** This is just an observation that comes up on account of the reference to the two Roosevelt presidents. We have to think about what the purpose of the security is here.

Theodore Roosevelt became President of the United States because his predecessor was assassinated, and he himself suffered an assassination attempt when he was running for re-election. Bearing that in mind, the purpose here is to ensure that we don't have an assassination on our soil. There is a long history of assassinations occurring against heads of state when they are visiting countries in which security is at a lesser level. I think here historically of—in the era of Theodore Roosevelt—the assassination attempt in Belgium against King Edward VII, and the successful assassination of Empress Elizabeth of Austria in Geneva. I think you can see my point, that we need to be very careful about this, and I don't think we can compromise on it.

That may mean there are further changes we have to make to our security. It may mean we have to suspend the sittings of Parliament. It might mean we have to make sure that if we have heads of state we don't bring them to Parliament Hill if we can't handle the situation. There are a variety of things we have to consider.

But I think ultimately, if we're going to invite a foreign head of state, be it the President of the United States or the head of state of any other country, their security is *sine qua non* insofar as they are our guests. And if we can't accept them as our guests because we aren't up to the task of guaranteeing their safety without intruding upon the privileges of parliamentarians and the operations of this place, then we would need to make that assessment at that time. Perhaps that's what didn't happen here. I just want to stress that nothing can come in the way of ensuring the security of our state visitors here to Canada.

• (1145)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I wonder if I should comment on this. I can't help saying that Mr. Reid's initial comments sounded like a good thesis topic for a doctoral student studying at Carleton or Ottawa University and interested in security threats against President Roosevelt as compared to those against President Bush. The historical context of my concerns is much more recent, however, because I am talking about last Tuesday's events.

I was being ironic.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We haven't finished, Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I thought the torture was over. You know I don't like this.

**The Chair:** Ms. Longfield, you have the floor.

[English]

**Hon. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Oshawa, Lib.):** Mr. Guimond, I think we have two issues here. Would you agree that the two issues we need to address are first, access to the parliamentary precinct—just general access—and second, how we address temporary mobility problems or detours, as it were, within the precinct? They are two totally different areas. While they may, in your opinion, fall under our parliamentary privilege, there are two.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Let's just say that this is one broad problem that can be divided up into smaller problems. I forgot to mention that Mr. Ménard was deprived of his right to vote at the 3:00 p.m. vote. The green shuttle buses had been stopped at the Confederation Building at 1:50 p.m., just before question period. I agree on the point that you added, Ms. Longfield. We should probably consider that for a report. I agree with you.

**The Chair:** I have one last comment to make before the next witness arrives. I would like to remind colleagues that the allegations made in the House were not generally about security itself, but rather about contradictions.

In his testimony, Mr. Blaikie told us that he had done everything in his power to get into Parliament but that access had been refused on the grounds of security considerations. Mr. Blaikie is the most senior member of Parliament and he was not able to enter. Access was refused because of security considerations when he arrived on the Hill; there were already hundreds of protesters there.

What I want to know is whether Mr. Blaikie represented a greater threat for Mr. Bush than the protesters who were already on the Hill in significant numbers. Of course the answer is no. I think that we need to take these things into account when we speak about this issue. This isn't just a security issue. It's about contradictions.



I was not the victim of this type of event. My office is in the West Block, and the protesters were mainly in front of the Centre Block, the Château Laurier and the Westin Hotel. I left Parliament in the morning through the West Block and went to a parliamentary committee meeting in the Wellington Building, and I came back just about when the President was arriving. The only difference was that there was no traffic on Wellington and therefore it was easier to cross the street. From where I was, I could have gotten to my office much faster than I usually do. It is important to keep these contradictions in mind.

Here is another contradiction. One member of Parliament was accompanied by a reporter. The reporter had permission to proceed to the Hill whereas the member of Parliament was prevented from doing so.

[English]

“I’m from Toronto. You don’t go by here.”

[Translation]

That is what I was told. The reporter had access to the Hill. Is the member a greater security threat than the reporter? I don’t know who the reporter was but that is what happened.

I don’t know if you want to comment on this. Then we will listen to our next witness.

• (1150)

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** No, I have nothing to add. I agree with you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Guimond.

Perhaps we could ask all of our witnesses to come to the table. We have with us Inspector Louis Lahaie, the Officer in Charge of Major Events, Protective Policing Directorate, and Sergeant-Major François Desfossés, NCO in charge of the RCMP detachment, Parliament Hill. Both are from the RCMP. I would like to thank them for being here.

I would like to tell committee members that we have invited Ms. Carbonneau to discuss the matter raised by Mr. Guimond, as requested, but she is out of the country at this time. At the end of the meeting, we could perhaps discuss the possibility of inviting her to meet with us at a later date.

Inspector Lahaie, do you have a presentation to make?

**Insp Louis Lahaie (Officer in charge of Major Events, Protective Policing Directorate, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** Yes, if I may. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would first like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain how we provide security during a major event.

I am Inspector Louis Lahaie, the Officer in Charge of Major Events. For major events such as the visit of the U.S. President, the RCMP has primary jurisdiction for security planning. We always liaise with foreign security officers, in this case, the U.S. Secret Service.

In the context of the visit of the U.S. President, my role was that of federal security coordinator. In that capacity, my responsibilities included the oversight of all aspects of the federal planning and

implementation phases of the major event, the establishment of and participation in an inter-directorate working group made up of representatives from the federal and divisional sectors involved in the visit, for example, the Border Services Agency, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Transport Canada, NAV CANADA, and CSIS; the establishment of and participation in an interdepartmental working group made up of representatives from the RCMP and outside partner agencies, namely, other police forces; the identification, in consultation with the operations and accreditation commanders, of the level of accreditation required for the visit; the monitoring of negotiations between federal, provincial and municipal authorities and the preparation of contractual agreements in the form of Memoranda of Understanding; the co-ordination with Transport Canada of the issuance of a “Notice to Airmen” for airspace closure over venues; the liaison with the U.S. security group and the dissemination of appropriate security information to them.

I would also like to explain the role of the RCMP as it relates to that of the Ottawa Police. Our primary role, as you will see in the documentation that you have before you, is the safety of those persons to whom international protection must be provided. In this case, the RCMP played the lead role in providing security to the President of the United States. The Ottawa Police was responsible for public order, namely crowd control. These are two very different roles. Each police force had its own responsibility. The Ontario Provincial Police as well as the Toronto Police served as back-up for the Ottawa Police services. It was the Ottawa Police who asked for help to be provided by these other police forces. In the case of the city of Gatineau, they asked the Sûreté du Québec to provide back-up.

As to road closures for the motorcade, we have the responsibility for federal roadways such as Colonel by Drive and the Airport Parkway. The city of Ottawa is responsible for city roads. For motorcade security, we had the mandate for road closures in coordination with the Ottawa Police. The Ottawa Police were to keep an eye on the demonstrators and install barricades for crowd control.

As you know, security is everyone’s responsibility, no matter where they work. Everyone needs to cooperate. As you know, the RCMP uses intelligence: that’s how we plan our security. At this point in time, the President of the United States is one of the people for whom there is the highest threat level in the world. His country is also at war with Irak. According to the information that we have, we must take extraordinary measures to ensure his safety. No one here would want anything to happen to such a high-profile guest while he is visiting our country.

In terms of communications, we don’t want to cause any hardship or force you to do anything in particular. However, communication is a two-way street. Take, for example, Mr. Harper’s meeting with the U.S. President.

•(1155)

I was personally involved in this case. The RCMP escorted him from Parliament Hill to the Conference Centre. At first, Mr. Harper wanted to walk and take the tunnel from the Château Laurier. This was impossible because we knew there were already protesters there. We had to take into consideration the safety of the protesters, of the police and of Mr. Harper. We took another route and used a detour to get to the Conference Centre. I am telling you this because it is easy to make arrangements and to make life easier for you in many respects when we are well informed. We can discuss how we proceed in the future.

I absolutely agree with Mr. Guimond. You should have been informed of the routes that were being used. This was in the media, especially in the newspapers, etc. I wonder if in the future we should hold an information session for all members of Parliament in order to let them know which security measures will be used. I don't know. You can decide how best to improve the situation.

As you know, the RCMP has no authority within and outside the House of Commons. I am happy to answer your questions; I am in the hot seat.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I am told that Sgt. Maj. Desfossés also wants to make a statement.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés (Non-commissioned Officer in charge of RCMP Detachment, Parliament Hill, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** Yes.

•(1200)

**The Chair:** We will hear both statements, followed by a period of questions.

Sargeant-Major, you have the floor.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rather than make a statement I will add a clarification so that everyone understands my role and my responsibilities.

I am Sargeant-Major François Desfossés, in charge of the RCMP Detachment on Parliament Hill.

During Mr. Bush's visit, my role, in addition to my daily responsibilities, consisted in ensuring the security of areas on Parliament Hill during the visit in question.

On Parliament Hill, security is shared between three partners whose roles are very clearly defined. Within the buildings, security is the responsibility of the House of Commons protective staff and the Senate protective service, whereas the RCMP is responsible for security outside the buildings and on the surrounding land.

On a daily basis, my general mandate on Parliament Hill is to ensure the safety and security of the users and the buildings of the Parliament of Canada. That involves, for example, monitoring vehicle access on the Hill; facilitating access by members of Parliament, employees and visitors; facilitating the use of the Hill for all types of events both on the land and within Parliament buildings, while ensuring the safety of all users; intervening when there is a security breach or when public safety is at stake; acting when there are disturbances or people who, by their actions, may be breaking

Parliamentary laws or preventing Canadians from enjoying these areas.

When there is a special event, then we have, if you will, a special mandate. The RCMP usually assists bodies such as Public Works Canada and the National Capital Commission in preparing for an orderly event and for the safety of those who will attend, while also ensuring that the daily business on Parliament Hill can take place.

Exceptionally, for example during large demonstrations, important visits and major events—in other words events that involve a significant number of people—our main objectives are to make security concerns a priority at the very outset of the planning and organization of the event, to have the other organizations involved participate in the planning, to communicate with them, to find the right balance between the right guaranteed under the Charter to demonstrate and the security measures that we need to use, and to minimize as much as possible any effect on the daily business that takes place on Parliament Hill.

Those are, in general, my responsibilities as sargeant-major in charge of the RCMP Detachment on Parliament Hill.

**The Chair:** I would like to thank our two witnesses. We will now move on to questions.

Mr. Johnston, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for appearing today.

We've heard a lot about individual inconveniences. Some would say that there were breaches of parliamentary privilege. I was inconvenienced a little bit too, but I think we should be careful not to make our slight inconveniences the issue.

What is, in my opinion, the issue here is providing security that would prevent an international incident. Apparently that's what happened this time, but I'm wondering what kind of preparation was made for this visit, what kinds of exercises or scenarios were gone through in the past to prepare for this sort of visit, what kind of cooperation and integration you had from all the services. We had a great long list of different forces, for lack of a better word. We had the secret service and the Toronto police and Ottawa-Carleton—on and on it goes. We had many groups here providing security. What was done to coordinate that security, and what types of exercises have been done in the past to prepare for such an incident?

This is not an isolated thing; it's happened before, and it's going to happen again. In my opinion, the only thing that inconvenienced me, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that there was an unruly mob out in front of Parliament. To the credit of the security people, they managed to keep it contained. I was slightly inconvenienced in that I had to go around through the West Block to get here, but it was a matter of ten minutes more of my time, which I was perfectly willing to sacrifice to make sure the area was secure for the people who were here.

I'd like some comments on those questions I raised. What kind of integration and preparation was there? Were the groups all briefed together? Did the left hand know what the right hand was doing in this exercise, and what preparations did you make to make sure that this was the case?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Lahaie.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Thank you.

Would you like me to answer in English or in French?

**The Chair:** That's up to you.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Fine, thank you.

As soon as the visit was announced, we held a meeting with all our regional police partners, including those from Ottawa, Gatineau, the Sûreté du Québec and so on, as well as with other federal departments.

We told them about the level of threat which was involved, of the intelligence we had at our disposal and of the way security procedures operated. We talked about motorcades, the issue of how to secure an area and we also talked about demonstrations. Then, we established the rules and responsibilities of each police force. The RCMP was in charge of protecting the President and his entourage, including Mrs. Bush, Mr. Card and Mr. Powell. As for the municipal police forces, they were in charge of keeping the public order. This was established at the beginning. Given the information they had on the demonstrations which were going to take place here, in Ottawa, the municipal police forces were in charge of crowd control.

We then addressed the issue of the various places the President was supposed to go and we put someone in charge of each area, in order to establish an operational security plan. This plan, which would help determine the resources we had at our disposal, was then presented. We did this for each area where the President was supposed to show up and for the places which required security measures.

We had an organizational chart, and a memorandum of understanding signed by every police force. This protocol set out the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Your time is up, but you will have another opportunity later.

Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Thank you.

Mr. Lahaie, you were in charge of federal security. Does this mean that you were in charge of the multi-departmental committee, or the multi-party committee, and related matters?

• (1205)

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Mr. Guimond, I was in charge of putting the security system in place. But Chief Superintendent Carbonneau was in charge of implementing the system.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** What would you say if I asked you who made the decisions?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Ms. Carbonneau.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I would also like to clarify or correct some of my comments. I was probably upset when I made them. Going back to your preliminary remarks, I would like to say that I never wanted to know the President's itinerary. Moreover, I had read about it in the newspapers. I do not know where you got that information. You should read the committee "blues" carefully; I could even send

them to you. My concern pertains exclusively to the access of members to Parliament Hill.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Thank you.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** You made a comment about two-way communications. What did you mean by that? In your opinion, which other party should have had better communications with your service?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** You said at one point that there were communication problems. If there are any problems, they need to be resolved; we need to change the way that we work or take steps to facilitate your job. For instance, I was totally unaware of the fact that there was a meeting at the Westin Hotel.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Had you known that five of our members were participating in a round table the Westin Hotel, would you have let them through when they wanted to get in?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** No. What I mean is that we could have made arrangements to facilitate everything, overall.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Mr. Lahaie, with all due respect, your presentation has not shed any new light on the communication problems. I will therefore ask you a question and then I will also put it directly to Ms. Carbonneau

During your meetings, Ms. Carbonneau was there but you were there too. Did you discuss freedom of movement, which is a member's privilege? When you were planning events, you probably knew that in the Centre Block, or in the East Block and the West Block of the House of Commons, some members would want to go to their offices, would want to attend question period at 2:00 p.m. and would want to vote at 3:00 p.m.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I will ask Sargeant-Major Desfossés to answer that question.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Sargeant-Major Desfossés, I do not want to get angry with you, but do not answer me by talking about your role. We know full well what your role is. I would like a specific answer to my question: was there any discussion about the free access of members of Parliament to Parliament Hill?

• (1210)

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** It is because of the job that I do every day on the Hill that I was a member of the team responsible for providing security during this visit. I am quite aware of the privileges of members of Parliament; that is part and parcel of my daily reality. It is because of this fact, to some degree, that all of the officers under my responsibility during this event were clearly advised that members and all government employees who showed their card or their lapel pin were entitled to have access to the Hill. I was responsible for the area located within the parliamentary precinct, and not the area on Wellington.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Fine.

**The Chair:** Ms. Longfield.

[English]

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** Thank you.

Quite frankly, I'm not concerned or upset about someone being inconvenienced. When something like this is happening, I think we have a responsibility as members of Parliament. For example, I was involved in a federal-provincial-territorial ministers meeting on housing on that day. It was in Gatineau. I knew in advance that I had a vote at three o'clock. I knew in advance that there would be road closures. I knew in advance that there would be road restrictions. I knew that getting to the Hill was going to be a little more difficult under the circumstances. It's not unlike when I come here for the police memorial service: I know that I can't access the Hill from certain areas because it's just going to be blocked off.

Part of my responsibility is in advance to indicate that I'm going to have to leave myself a little more time and do some of those things. So I did leave the housing forum an hour in advance. I didn't come across the bridge I normally would have come across. I drove farther, and I came across Champlain, and I came through.

There was a bit of disruption at the access point in front of the Supreme Court for a very brief period of time. I appreciated that the first person I came in contact with had absolutely no idea who I was and couldn't care less. He had a job to do, and I appreciate that. I don't think my rights ever supercede the security of someone else. I did want to get to the House to vote, so I waited and decided that I probably should come through the car wash, and I did, and I got through here, and I got here in time.

I do think, though, in many cases we could have done things better. I think what we need to do is to access a single point. It may be an inconvenience. I may say, if you access the one over by East Block, that I'm inconvenienced, but at least I know where it is. And I don't think we should make any exceptions. If there's one access point, anyone who shows appropriate identification, anyone who has a right to be here, should be able to get through here, and if it's the car wash, it's the car wash. We need to decide that in advance.

Part of the problem is where you locate the access point if you're trying to cross a picket line or get through a group of people who are demonstrating. The access point shouldn't be out on Wellington Street. It should be someplace closer to the precinct where there's a better chance that people will understand who we are.

I would like to see a designated access point, only one, that is communicated well in advance and never changes under any circumstances, regardless of what is happening or who you are. We need to communicate the appropriate identification that we have to have and identify in advance the road closures, so we know there's going to be a significant problem. If you're at a meeting at the Westin Hotel and all the gathering is going to be there, you shouldn't expect to be able to access at any point from that area; you may have to take a longer route around and come in the back way.

Those are some of the things I think need to be addressed. I also believe we need to look at—and again, you're not responsible for this—how we address the mobility once we get inside the precinct. I think there were some problems there.

**The Chair:** Perhaps we should leave a little bit of time for the witnesses to answer, because there's not going to be any.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the honourable member's comments here. Again, I don't

want to point a finger at anybody here, I just want to explain. When I say "I", I mean the Mounted Police with the House of Commons security and with the Senate, the people who were involved inside the fence.

We had planned for exactly what you have said, Madam, in that the main point of access to Centre Block—because the information we had received said there would be protestors, and at one point the estimate was upwards of 20,000 people coming to demonstrate—the main point of access to Centre Block was going to be through the tunnel system of the West Block, or from walking behind the West Block to access the Hill. This was explained to and agreed to by the House of Commons security personnel, Mr. Pelletier and company.

I met with the Senate security personnel also and explained to them where the barricades with the blockages were on Parliament Hill, and that if honourable members of Parliament want to walk through 6,000 people to go up the front steps of Parliament, I'm not going to stop them, but 6,000 other people will stop them from accessing the Hill from that point.

We did make those access points available to the honourable members for that day, as we do on any day that we have some unusual activities on the Hill.

• (1215)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Monsieur Comartin.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Let me start with a statement to both of you. I've planned these events before from the other side of the table, quite frankly, to provide security for protestors. My problem with it, in terms of what I've seen happen here, is I really question whether we provided the best security on the negative side.

You certainly seem to be able to provide security to prevent certain members of our membership to get on the Hill, and I have to question whether you did anything of a corresponding nature to prevent people from getting on the Hill who shouldn't have been on. I start with that bias.

Let me ask first to both of you, Inspector Lahaie and Sergeant Major Desfossés, who do you report to? Inspector Lahaie, I understand you report to Madam Carbonneau. Who does she report to?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** To Assistant Commissioner McCallum.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** All right. And Sergeant Major?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** The same thing, but I have one more level to report to below that. At that time it would have been Superintendent Teolis. That was possibly his last function in that particular position. He has now moved on, but I would have reported to Mr. Teolis, to Madam Carbonneau, and ultimately to Assistant Commissioner McCallum.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** All right.

It's pretty widely known about some of the incidents involving Mr. Blaikie, Madam Guay, Madam Picard, Senator Grafstein, and Monsieur Ménard. Has there been any investigation conducted by either of you or your offices? Is there one in the process, or is one planned, on any of these incidents?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** For my part, none of the incidents happened on Parliament Hill within the purview of my responsibility on Parliament Hill, so they are not within my realm of responsibility; it would be somebody else's. The only matter I'm looking into a little further is another statement from Monsieur Guimond regarding the bilingualism of the members.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Let me stop you.

The information that's out in the public is that Madam Guay had an RCMP officer, male, come into the washroom.

**The Chair:** It's in the building.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** All right, but it was an RCMP officer. Is that information incorrect?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I don't know anything of that information, sir. All I know is that if it happened inside the building, I do not have—and I've been told many times over—any authority in this building. That would have to be addressed through the Sergeant-at-Arms and the people under him.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** So that should not have been an RCMP officer? If it was an RCMP officer—

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying that this is not my responsibility. It's the responsibility of the Sergeant-at-Arms and the people under him to investigate what may have happened here in the building. I don't know if it was an RCMP member or not, sir.

**The Chair:** The information that I have, even preliminary, is that it was not.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Even if it was, it's still the Sergeant-at-Arms who must answer, no matter who it was.

**The Chair:** Yes.

Mr. Comartin.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Right at the edge of the Hill, the Blaikie-Grafstein incident, who was preventing them from coming on the Hill? Which police force was it?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** My understanding of the plan is that on Wellington Street, it's an Ottawa street, and it was managed and controlled by the Ottawa City Police, with the assistance, I believe, of some OPP members and some members of the Toronto police force who were called in to reinforce their numbers. So what happened on Wellington Street or on Elgin Street or by the Château Laurier or by the Conference Centre was under the purview of the Ottawa Police Service.

• (1220)

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Sergeant Major, when Mr. Blaikie was confronted he was confronted at the gate at the east end of Parliament Hill, the east side of East Block. He was standing on parliamentary property at that point, as was Senator Grafstein. Two other officers, not RCMP, were on Parliament Hill at that time. So what I suggest you do is you go back and you do conduct an investigation into this, because the officer who did let them on the Hill eventually was an RCMP officer. So I recommend to you, today, to go back and do an investigation and to take this seriously.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Do you want to answer that? No? We will therefore continue.

Ms. Boivin.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** First of all, I would like to make a comment intended for the sergeant-major.

When you described your mandate, I found it interesting that you used the words contained in the document distributed to us, with the exception of one specific sentence, the one which talks about facilitating the access of parliamentarians, employees and visitors. Perhaps you did this inadvertently. You described everything else. Nevertheless, I know that this task is part of your mandate.

That being said, Sergeant-Major Desfossés, you confirmed that as part of your special mandate, during activities such as the President's visit, your job is to strike a balance between the right to protest, as guaranteed by the Charter, and the security measures that you try to enforce. RCMP regulations state that you must do a risk assessment. Could you tell us about the threat assessment done for this visit? How did you assess it?

**The Chair:** Mr. Desfossés, before you answer the question, I would like to warn you about one thing. If there are matters that are more secret in nature and you would prefer to speak to us in camera at some other point, because of requirements, please tell us, we will understand.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I would ask Insp. Lahaie to answer that question, because he is in a better position to do so.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I do not think that this is the place to discuss police operations and the way that we assess threats.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Would you like to answer in camera?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Before answering you in camera, I would need to seek advice from our legal services on the matter, because we are discussing threat assessment and the way that we receive intelligence from secret sources, and so on and so forth.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Mr. Chairman, what is the point of doing this analysis if we cannot be told how threat assessments are done? It seems to me that the security measures we take are the results of the threat assessment that is established. We may ascertain that these measures are justified.

Ms. Longfield explained that she had normal expectations. We expect some turbulence when there is a visit like that. Does this justify the actions taken?

It seems to me that we need to have an overall picture. Otherwise, we are going to be missing a fundamental aspect.

**The Chair:** Perhaps, Ms. Boivin, but even if everything that you have said is true, the fact remains that reporters and demonstrators had access to the Hill, whereas parliamentarians were denied such access.

In my opinion, no security level justifies this contradiction. Regardless of the security level, this contradiction remains, right?

[English]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Unless there's a huge threat, I suppose...

[Translation]

We will all agree...

**The Chair:** At any rate, if you can answer our question in camera, we will be able to decide later on whether or not we want to have you testify in camera.

Ms. Boivin, please go on.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** I will ask another question.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** How do you explain the incidents we observed on that day? Parliamentarians were prevented from having access to the Hill and security officers walked in to the washrooms. How do you explain these incidents?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I am sorry, but we need to make sure that everyone understands the roles and responsibilities of every police department on the premises.

We were responsible for providing the security of the President and his entourage, not public order. The Ottawa Police Department decided where to set up the barricades and where it would allow the demonstrators to have access outside, on the street.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Is there not some synergy in that, Mr. Lahaie?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I agree, there is some synergy. We do meet. Nevertheless, it is their decision.

We provided for President Bush's security and we made the decisions pertaining to that matter. But they were the ones who decided to set up barricades at a given location and to block off certain streets for so many hours. It was their decision.

We provided them with the schedule. We told them that we would be at such and such a place at a certain time and that we would be using such and such a route.

Do you understand what I mean? It was up to them to maintain public order and control the demonstrators.

•(1225)

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** But you did have meetings with all of the various participants. I would imagine that you synchronized your roles to ensure that everything would go smoothly. Regardless of whether we are talking about the right to protest, the right of parliamentarians to have access or the security of the President, technically speaking, there had to be some type of uniformity from top to bottom, to ensure that the rights of everyone were protected.

I almost have the impression that you did your job on your side and that the others did their job on their side, and that at one point, it became a bit chaotic.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** No. We worked together, but we each had our own role and responsibilities. That is why there was an agreement...

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** There was always...

[English]

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** MOU, memorandum of understanding.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** We will listen to our witnesses.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** It was always possible to have access to Parliament Hill at all times from Bank Street. There were some restrictions at certain points because of certain events, such as the presidential motorcade, which was supposed to pass in front of the East Block. The Elgin Street corner was closed to all vehicles. Once Mr. Bush had left Parliament Hill, at approximately 12:10 p. m., we had to try to minimize the impact of this visit, not only with respect to the Parliamentary precinct but also the city of Ottawa, which has a population of 800,000. We had to think about these people as well. The Ottawa Police Department opened Wellington Street where it could, right up to the Canadian War Memorial Monument. There was still one place that had to remain secure.

Let's talk about the circulation of people within and outside the security zones. It was agreed with all our partners that, for anyone working on Parliament Hill—whether it be a senator, member of Parliament, minister or employee—the ID card or the lapel pin authorized the person to circulate within the various buildings of Parliament. However, in all other security sectors, for instance, the area in front of the Château Laurier or the Foreign Affairs Building, you needed to have an ID card that was specially designed for the event. If you didn't have this card, you could not pass.

**The Chair:** The next question will be asked by Mr. Casey.

[English]

**Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC):** Thank you very much.

I just listened to this, and from my own experience too on that day, obviously there were some glitches, I think, more in communication than anything.

I wonder, you just mentioned special ID cards. Are you satisfied with the identification that we have? Should we do something different on our side?

I'd like to know, if President Bush were to come back tomorrow, what would you do differently?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** When it comes to the cards, I'll give you a very real example that I experienced with the Honourable Mr. MacAulay. I can recognize Mr. MacAulay—he was my political boss at one time not so very long ago—and he was walking by the rear of the West Block with no pin, with no identification card on him whatsoever.

I said, “Good morning, Mr. MacAulay. How are you today?” We shook hands. I asked him if he had his green card with him, and said it might not be a bad idea today—because there were members from other areas of the city and the province and some people from C Division in the Montreal area in and around Parliament Hill not familiar with the processes and so on and so forth—if he could wear his card in a visible fashion so that way he would not be stopped again and asked for ID, and so on and so forth. It turns out that Mr. MacAulay did not have his card with him, so I made sure one of the constables who were not too far away escorted him right up to Centre Block to make sure he wasn't going to be stopped again.

From my perspective, if all users of Parliament Hill who have that card had it prominently displayed at all times, it would save everybody a whole lot of.... It's a lot easier and faster to recognize than the pin that is also given to Senate members and House of Commons members. That's from a visual recognition aspect. Obviously this green card is much better for faster recognition of the holder than any other means.

• (1230)

**Mr. Bill Casey:** What would you do differently?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** For tomorrow?

**Mr. Bill Casey:** What would you do if President Bush came back tomorrow?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** For tomorrow's event, as far as recognition of people, I think people have to recognize the areas where their identification cards would allow them to go.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** No. How would you communicate that to us? We were not told anything; we were not told a thing.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I don't want to point a finger at anybody. I had discussions with House of Commons and Senate security. These things were discussed with them. From conversations that you've already had with a member of that personnel last week, when this committee was put together, I believe that the request or the information was sent through channels to the Speaker, and then to the whip, to be sent out to all members of Parliament, indicating what was going to happen.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** Are you saying that you wouldn't do anything differently? Is that what you're saying? Would you do anything differently?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** The only thing I would do differently would be to go over it again to make sure that it had been done and had been clearly communicated. I believe the identification system that was put in place was clear for everybody concerned, in the areas where they were charged to protect, if you will, or control access for authorized people only.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** Weren't some MPs denied access, even though they were identified as MPs, but the media got through because they had cards or something? I'm not sure of the details.

**The Chair:** Definitely.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** How did that happen?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Well, we are human, sir. Errors will slip in all the time.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** Absolutely. But what will we do differently?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Again, I would try to reiterate to the people under my command on that day, and perhaps re-explain it, hoping it would be clear in their minds, that people with these types of ID are allowed in these areas.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** We only want to make sure it doesn't happen again. That's all. If we've done something wrong, we should fix it.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I agree with you, sir. It would save your time and my time in being here. Absolutely.

**Mr. Bill Casey:** Yes, absolutely. We don't want to do it again.

[*Translation*]

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I would like to add something.

**The Chair:** Could you be brief, please.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** It's also important to point out that the Ottawa Police Service has a role to play. Given your recommendations, we will need to make adjustments in the future. We will do this with pleasure so that this does not occur again. Where there are other access points on Parliament Hill, which area should be freely accessible by all routes? Should you also have access outside, regardless of any considerations? Those are the types of decisions we will have to make.

I am sure your committee will be very useful to us in the planning of the next visit. We will have an opportunity to discuss these issues with our partners, including the Ottawa Police Service. If something happens, who will be responsible for telling you to use a specific route in order to have access to the House of Commons? That is what we will have to review.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We will now move on to Ms. Redman.

[*English*]

**Hon. Karen Redman:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I apologize for not being able to be here to hear all of the interventions.

I want to pick up on what Mr. Casey was saying, because Ms. Longfield also raised it. I think the biggest kink in all of this has been the lack of good communication.

I actually have three short questions. Who decides on the protocol for communication? Who decides who says it? Who was responsible?

I think I can speak at least for myself, if not for my fellow whips here. I had a piece of some of this information. For instance, I knew there was going to be a bridge closure. I didn't get the fact that there was some special identification needed for some staff members, and I know that the staff weren't informed. I think that kind of communication process is absolutely key.

My other question goes along with what Mr. Comartin was saying. How is an investigation triggered? If somebody has a true concern, vis-à-vis how he or she was dealt with by a specific arm of one of the partners making sure this event went off without a glitch, how does one trigger an investigation, other than clearly raising it in the House around parliamentary privilege, which is how we ended up discussing it in this venue? If one wanted to trigger another kind of investigation, how would one do it?

•(1235)

[*Translation*]

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I will start by answering your first question on communication. We hoped that the information provided at the first meeting with all our partners would be circulated. I see that this has not been the case. That is the reason for a general meeting. We want everyone to feel involved. In the future, we will have to monitor whether or not the information reaches everybody.

I didn't quite understand your second question. Were you asking who will begin the investigation?

**The Chair:** Could you repeat your question, Ms. Redman?

[*English*]

I wasn't clear on that, either.

**Hon. Karen Redman:** Okay.

To me, the way Mr. Comartin is putting forth his question seems to say this. If somebody has a problem with an Ottawa Police person or an RCMP person specifically, how would they trigger an investigation that may be aside from us dealing with parliamentary privilege here? I'm assuming there's a protocol.

[*Translation*]

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** From what I understand, this would be communicated to your security staff who would in turn convey the complaint to the RCMP. We make sure we obtain those answers, but I believe the protocol involves communicating directly with your security staff who then contact us.

[*English*]

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Perhaps I may add to that.

That would be the preferred process if it is a complaint of process, as opposed to if you have a complaint personally, that this member was rude and that sort of thing. Then it's a public complaint. That is a totally different process at that point. You personally would make a complaint to the RCMP about Constable Smith or Constable Jones.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Desfossés.

[*English*]

Mr. Hill.

I'm sorry, you still have a bit of time. Go ahead.

**Hon. Karen Redman:** The nub of my first question is there must be things within the purview of protecting a head of state like President Bush that are not for public consumption. Somewhere in your large meeting there must be a protocol for informing people, whether it is a protestor on Wellington Street, whether it's a staff person who works on the Hill, whether it's a senator or member of Parliament. My real question is this. Who decides on what that protocol is—not that we have to know it? Then, whose responsibility is it to communicate it? Because it seems quite clear to me that this is an area we could improve in.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** The communication of any information regarding Parliament Hill for the employees and the users of Parliament Hill is made through the security agencies of both houses. In my view, it's their responsibility to advise whoever of

whichever house they work for that this will be the security up to this point here, which is the front door of Parliament, and this is how it's going to be done, and this is at what time this thing is going to happen.

For instance—and, again, I don't want to elaborate too much on the same things—knowing the business of Parliament, try to minimize disruption as much as possible; try to have the green buses run as long and as often as possible.

I told the House of Commons security that for obvious security reasons, 15 to 20 minutes before the motorcade arrived on the Hill and until the motorcade left, I could not permit the circulation of the buses on the Hill. I understood that this made the access a little more difficult, because instead of driving, somebody had to walk, but as soon as the motorcade was gone the buses started running again.

•(1240)

**The Chair:** Mr. Hill.

**Hon. Karen Redman:** The question is, can we have such a role?

**The Chair:** We'll get to that again later if there is more time.

Mr. Hill.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're dealing with a lot of things here, but I think the most serious affront, if I can call it that, is the inconsistent application of security measures.

One of the questions I would have also follows up on Madam Redman's intervention. Don't you realize and wasn't it apparent to the RCMP and the Ottawa Police and the Ontario Police and whoever else was involved in this that there was more than a potential, a likelihood, for a serious problem with the parliamentarians if the people responsible for communicating what the security measures were going to be, i.e., Parliament Hill security—House of Commons on one side and Senate on the other side—were not the same people who were imposing the security?

In other words, did anybody check to see that the measures the RCMP were imposing at the various entrance points were communicated to parliamentarians, other than for you to say, well, it's not my responsibility, that's someone else's responsibility, that's the Hill security? Nobody checked to see that it had been done.

I'm one of the whips, and I could not communicate to my members that they needed to have their little green badge visible, that there was a single access point where there was more likelihood that there was going to be an officer there who actually knew what the hell was going on, versus somebody at the east entrance, where even if they identified themselves as an MP, they still wouldn't let them in. All those things should have been communicated to the whips, at a minimum, so that they had the task to disseminate that information to all of the members.



**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I think, Mr. Hill, that goes right to what Mr. Casey mentioned when he asked me what I would do better the next time. That's exactly what I would try to do better the next time, to ensure this information is being brought to the parties regardless—although it's not my responsibility.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Can you the answer the question of how it is possible that protesters would get on the Hill and MPs be denied? Was it because of the timeframe you were talking about earlier that they would have been allowed on, I'm presuming, through the Bank Street entrance?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** No, sir. Protesters, or the MPs off the Hill, were allowed the same routes; there was nothing different. Some of the examples brought forward by the honourable members were of members of Parliament wanting to go through a secure area where the protesters were not allowed either.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** What I'm trying to figure out is the case of Mr. Blaikie. He was trying to access the Hill from the east entrance, to my understanding, and was denied access. Yet at that same time, there were a lot of protesters—I don't know if there were thousands—who were on the lawn in front of the Peace Tower.

Is that because of the timeline? In other words, the protesters were cleared through a security point earlier on and given access to that area, which ultimately Mr. Blaikie was denied access to. It seems indefensible.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** I would need to know exactly where he was trying to get in to Parliament Hill, because on the east side, at a certain time, there was no access for anyone in that particular area, for security reasons.

**Mr. Jay Hill:** Madam Longfield made the point earlier that perhaps one way of at least solving some of the problems is to have a single access point for parliamentarians and staff—in other words, for people who have legitimate business on Parliament Hill, during that timeframe, and especially, as you point out, during the time the motorcade is present on the Hill. Obviously, security is going to be even higher during that brief period.

Would that be a change you would implement if it were to happen tomorrow, as Mr. Casey said earlier? Would it be communicated to all parliamentarians and their staff that if we need access, we have to go to Bank Street, and would you personally guarantee that there would be officers present at all times there who would know what the proper process was to screen people through?

• (1245)

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** When there is a demonstration of this magnitude, if you will, for the safety of the people coming to the Hill, I try to make the Hill as accessible as possible. If it is that accessible, and something goes wrong, there are that many more routes for them to vacate the premises as well.

I would only identify more clearly, if you will, to the members of Parliament how they could get behind the barricades. You can get onto the Hill and up to the barricades by 17 different routes—maybe not by car, but definitely on foot. By car, it's always through the Bank Street entrance.

To get into this building here when there is a demonstration, it has been decided or suggested by the House of Commons security that

we get everybody through West Block tunnel. Obviously, that may not have been communicated as well as it could have.

**The Chair:** Before we start the second round, I have an observation I'd like to make and possibly get you to react to.

[*Translation*]

In terms of information for members of Parliament, you have just told us that you informed the House of Commons authorities on the best way to proceed in order to facilitate circulation for members of Parliament. That is understood. However, obviously the whips were not aware of this because there is a group of whips sitting around this table who were never informed.

On another communications-related issue, was there someone who told the fellows from Toronto to give one answer to reporters and another to members of Parliament? Was there someone who said that, outside, to the other police services who were assisting?

I have never had very many problems with people working for Sargeant-Major Desfossés. I am a member from the National Capital Region and a large number of these people, and two or three of the witnesses appearing before us this morning, are my constituents. They recognize me. It's not usually complicated. All the people I have seen on the Hill have been bilingual and recognize us. I don't see this as being the problem, at least not at first blush.

However, were the officers from Toronto and elsewhere who came to provide assistance told that they were responsible for security, and had to deny everyone access to the Hill, except members of Parliament, who work there and who have to have access? Did someone forget to say “except members of Parliament”?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Mr. Chairman, I think this is similar to the question Mr. Lahaie asked earlier. The simple answer to your question is no. The Toronto Police officer was not told that the parliamentary ID card allows general access, because in our eyes, the parliamentary ID card was only valid for Parliament.

**The Chair:** No, I am not talking about going everywhere. That is not what I asked. Let's say that we have a member, whether it be Mr. Blaikie or someone else, on Wellington Street. He is on his way to Parliament Hill; he isn't trying to enter the Foreign Affairs Building to force his way into the meeting room. That isn't what he is doing. It is clear that he wants access to Parliament Hill. Sgt. Maj. Desfossés' officers are inside the perimeter, and they know us, at least they recognized me. However, 10 feet away, outside the perimeter, there were guys from Toronto and Ottawa and elsewhere who, it would appear, were clearly out of the loop. They stopped a parliamentarian from entering but told a reporter that he could proceed.

Who should have told these people that members of Parliament, without being given access to the Foreign Affairs Building, were entitled to access Parliament Hill? Why was that information not given?

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** Once again, that is what Mr. Lahaie asked. Let's take the concrete example of some members who, when leaving the Westin Hotel, were not able to reach Parliament Hill by walking past the Conference Centre and the Château Laurier because this zone was under the control of the Ottawa police.

• (1250)

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** The member was not allowed to enter that area because the Ottawa police had been told that if the member showed his green card he should be given access to Parliament Hill. This was not the parliamentary precinct. I think that the question we should be asking and answering is the following: Does the right to access Parliament Hill mean that a member can have access to Parliament, or does it mean that he can get there by any route he chooses?

The demonstrators were all allowed onto Parliament Hill. They were not prevented from being on the Hill. However, their access was limited to certain areas. That is the question that we are grappling with today. Were a member's rights denied because he was at the Westin and he wasn't allowed access by a certain route? That is the question.

There is more than one way to get to the Hill.

**The Chair:** No offence, but I don't think that is what we are discussing. That is not what the members were told. They were clearly told that some people could enter and others could not. The police from Toronto prevented them from taking that route. That's what people were told.

They were not told that, for reasons of security, they would have to make a detour and enter by another street, because they were not aware that parliamentarians could enter that way. I don't think they were told that. They were clearly told that the reporter and the demonstrator could enter, but not the parliamentarian. That's what they were told. I think that is what my colleagues feel is unacceptable.

I suggest that it be clearly stated in the future. Of course, you don't want to let a member walk past a crowd of angry demonstrators. That is not what we are asking, for our own safety. But parliamentarians should at least have to have the same rights as the journalists and the demonstrators. That is what I mean.

Go ahead, Mr. Lahaie.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Mr. Chairman, I understand what you are saying. I think that in the future, a few of your representatives and some of ours should form a committee, and we should also include representatives from the House of Commons' security service, as well as the Ottawa police. This committee would recommend what type of security measures should be provided whenever there is a major event.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Inspector Lahaie.

Mr. Guimond, I would like to take two minutes at the end of the meeting to decide on our witnesses for Thursday. That is very important. We will have to decide whether or not we will hear representatives from the Ottawa Police Services.

Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I have three comments and one question.

Mr. Lahaie and Mr. Desfossés, I would like to tell you that your testimony is ending on a very bad note. I would first like to know if you have read the speech that I made in the House of Commons relating to this question of privilege. Among other things, I said that the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve had been barred from

Parliament Hill for 18 hours, which prevented him from exercising his right to vote at 3:00 p.m.

I would like you to know that the member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve had to negotiate or speak with at least 50 security officers from various police forces and that he tried to reach Centre Block to exercise his right to vote from at least 10 different points of entry.

I want you to know that, as this meeting draws to a close, I am left wanting. I have nothing against you, personally. Nevertheless, when I began my presentation, I mentioned that the communications problems began when the RCMP became involved and that the Auditor General herself had more than once made reference to that fact. Your appearance today is a clear demonstration of that.

First, Mr. Desfossés, when Mr. Casey asked what should be done to improve the situation, you said that there should be communication among all members of the Hill detachment. Let's take as an example the entrance at the intersection of Metcalfe and Wellington. I go that way in the morning, but on five occasions I was stopped by one of your officers. He told me that entrance was reserved for senators. I can tell you that he picked on the wrong guy: I told him to stop his spiel because this entrance was reserved for parliamentarians, which includes both members of Parliament and senators. I advised the Sargeant-at-Arms, and the message was supposed to have been communicated. There has been no re-occurrence in the past few days. The fact remains that information is not being passed along in your detachment.

Here is another example. Mr. Lahaie, you said that the city police officers were tasked with maintaining public order on the street. However, there were RCMP officers posted around the perimeter. You could see the GRC/RCMP logo on the back of their coats. So stop telling us these were people from the Ottawa police services and the OPP. Why not humbly admit that there might have been a little sand gumming up the works?

I will end with my question. When I was a law student, our professors told us that, in order to avoid any surprises, we should only ask a question if we already knew the answer. I already know the answer to this question. Can you give us the assurance that all of the RCMP officers who were stationed on the Hill were able to address parliamentarians in both languages?

● (1255)

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** On that day?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Yes, along the entire perimeter.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** On that day, on Parliament Hill, I had 70 RCMP officers from all over. I know that six of them were unilingual.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I am asking about the perimeter.

**Sgt Maj François Desfossés:** That was on the Hill, sir.

**The Chair:** We have time for one quick question from Ms. Longfield. We will then take two minutes to determine who will be the witnesses on Thursday.

Ms. Longfield.

[English]

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** I'm beginning to believe that within every little group or organization they had a wonderful communications plan and followed things the way they should have. The breakdown was in communicating what was necessary to members of Parliament and to people who should have access to this building; that's where the breakdown was.

When we do this again, we have to ensure.... There are some things I shouldn't know; there are some things I don't need to know; but there are some things that need to be communicated. I think that's where the breakdown was—not in the way it was being exercised outside, but in the way it was communicated to us.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Lahaie, do you wish to make a comment?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** Mr. Guimond said that there were not only members from the Ottawa Police Service, but also from the RCMP, and that is correct. I spoke about the respective responsibilities of the Ottawa police and that of the RCMP. On that day, 90 officers were assigned to road closures for the presidential motorcade, 45 from the RCMP and 45 from the Ottawa police. As soon as the motorcade had passed and they had finished covering a given location, the RCMP members moved elsewhere. So, we were involved in road closures and in covering the motorcade, but not in crowd control. I simply wanted to make that clear.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I would like to know if you want to hear witnesses on Thursday morning. First, would you like Mr. Blaikie to come and speak to us for a few minutes? Then, would you like to invite the Ottawa Police Service? You might have other witnesses to suggest. I don't want to impose my own exhaustive list on you, but it seems to me that this morning questions were raised that could be addressed to those two groups.

Incidentally, Ms. Carbonneau will not be back in the country until next week. So she cannot appear on Thursday. However, she could make herself available next Tuesday, if you wish.

Mr. Guimond.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Will we hear the commissioner at the same time as we hear Ms. Carbonneau?

**The Chair:** Next Tuesday?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Yes.

**The Chair:** If that is the wish of the committee, we can indeed invite the commissioner and Ms. Carbonneau.

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Yes.

• (1300)

**The Chair:** Agreed.

Now, with respect to this Thursday...

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** I suggest that we invite Mr. Ménard.

With respect to what happened at the Westin, I am not sure if we are satisfied. There were members of all parties present. Five of them took part in the round table. Of course, I would like to hear from our Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Cloutier.

**The Chair:** Did we not say that we wanted to keep him for the end, since we heard him at the beginning?

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Now, what have you decided about the people from the Ottawa Police Service? Would you like to hear them or not?

Mr. Comartin.

[English]

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** Obviously, after what little we got today, we're going to need to talk to them. Maybe we'll get some communication flowing that way.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do you want me to invite them on Thursday—the Ottawa Police?

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** If I can, Mr. Chair, I just want to add to this. It's obvious, again, from what we heard today that there were other police forces, at least from Toronto, who were here. I assume the OPP were involved as well.

I assume we're going to get the same kind of "We don't know about that. It was them." So we may have to bring in the OPP and whoever came in from the Toronto police force.

**The Chair:** That may be, Mr. Comartin, but the information given to us, I believe, is that they were under the command of the Ottawa Police, and presumably they received their orders from them.

Anyway, after we hear from the Ottawa Police, maybe we could decide that.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** You're more optimistic than I am.

**The Chair:** I'm not saying I'll like the testimony of the Ottawa Police; I'm saying we might want to hear that—

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** We have to hear from the Ottawa Police first, obviously.

I want to make another point, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Just a second. We're going to run out of time in one minute. I'm trying to establish the witnesses for Thursday; otherwise we'll have no agenda.

**Mr. Joe Comartin:** That's what I want to speak to.

I don't want to commit Mr. Blaikie until I speak to him.

**The Chair:** That's fine. We'll await that one.

[Translation]

Are you sure that Mr. Ménard will be available? If Mr. Blaikie is available and would like to appear, would you like us to invite him as well?

Agreed, and we will invite the Ottawa Police Service.

Mr. Johnston.

[English]

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** This should be obvious to me, but it isn't. Who was the one person in charge of this whole exercise to whom everybody else answered?

**The Chair:** Monsieur Lahaie, do you know the answer to that?

Say it again, please.

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** I didn't hear the question.

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** The question is, who was the one person in charge of this whole event, the one person to whom all the superior officers of the various police forces reported? Who was in charge?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** For the RCMP, the ultimate person was Assistant Commissioner McCallum.

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** Was there anybody in charge of the pyramid?

**Insp Louis Lahaie:** At the top was Assistant Commissioner McCallum for the RCMP.

**Mr. Dale Johnston:** If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, I would say that Assistant Commissioner McCallum would be an obvious witness.

**The Chair:** Okay, do you want to put for next Tuesday Madam Carbonneau with Mr. McCallum, rather than Mr. Zaccardelli? Does that sound more logical? Okay, we'll reserve that then, and we'll be on our way in that regard.

It is past one o'clock. If I hear a motion, I'll adjourn.

So moved.

Merci.

---







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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**