



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

PACP • NUMBER 050 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, April 18, 2007

—
Chair

The Honourable Shawn Murphy

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Wednesday, April 18, 2007

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Shawn Murphy (Charlottetown, Lib.)): I'd like at this point in time to call the meeting to order. The first item, of course, is to ask the cameras to leave.

Okay, colleagues, witnesses, members of the public, on behalf of the committee I want to welcome everyone here. *Bienvenue à tous.*

There are a couple of comments I want to make first, colleagues and witnesses. Since the last meeting I guess I've given this whole issue some reflection, and I'm a little troubled about the nature of some of the questions, but perhaps more particularly some of the answers given by some of the witnesses in Monday's hearing. It seems to me that some people have used this committee to make personal insinuations against other witnesses, which I consider to be improper. I cautioned one witness, but on reflection I probably allowed too much latitude to go on, and that latitude will not continue today.

Having said that, I want to urge all members of the committee to exhibit the degree of professionalism in the questions that the Canadian public expects. Keep your questions short and to the point.

Again to the witnesses here, I want to thank you for appearing, but I want to remind you to stick to the facts only. The committee will not tolerate any gratuitous comments about other individuals who may be here or who may not be here. Keep your answers short and relevant to the issues and relevant to the questions at hand and relevant to the issues the committee is investigating.

Mr. Williams.

Mr. John Williams (Edmonton—St. Albert, CPC): We've had many documents tabled at this committee and offers of documents to be tabled. Is it possible for the clerk to prepare a summary of all documents that have been tabled and have that circulated so we know exactly what this committee has received and what we haven't received for the public record? Then we know exactly where we're at.

The Chair: Yes, that can be done, Mr. Williams. That's a good point.

Monsieur Lussier.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Lussier (Brossard—La Prairie, BQ): I would especially like the document concerning KPMG shown by my colleague Brian Fitzpatrick to be formally tabled.

[English]

The Chair: I believe it was Mr. Poilievre. Mr. Poilievre, you've tabled that. You gave that to the clerk?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC): KPMG did not prepare this audit in French. If the committee would oblige us by carrying out a translation, we'd be happy to provide the copy here, and then it can be distributed in both official languages.

The Chair: The clerk has indicated that he has a copy of that and he will have it translated. Once it is translated, it will be provided to all members. But you have to bear in mind that it may take—

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Lussier: I'd appreciate getting a copy of it in English.

[English]

Mr. John Williams: I understand my colleague's desire to have an English copy, and therefore I would move that the document be tabled, even though it is only in one language, and be distributed. If all members are agreeable to that, then I think we can proceed.

The Chair: If all members agree to that procedure, that is agreeable.

Monsieur Laforest.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, BQ): Nevertheless, it should be translated anyway.

Some hon. members: Yes.

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: Fine then.

[English]

The Chair: If I understand the resolution, the document has been tabled. It will immediately be circulated in English only. The committee clerk will proceed forthwith to have it translated. Once it's translated—and that probably will take a little bit of time—it will be circulated to all members of the committee also.

Okay, there are a couple of other housekeeping matters. I did read for the record before the last meeting a prepared statement on the issue of parliamentary privilege. That is available to anyone who wants it. You can see the clerk. I don't intend to read it again today. But again, I want to remind all members and witnesses that the law of parliamentary privilege applies to these proceedings.

Last, the steering committee of the committee did decide that all future hearings would be under oath, and I'm going to instruct the clerk now to administer the oath.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Georges Etoka): You state your name and then read this.

Ms. Rosalie Burton (Former Director General of Human Resources, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, As an Individual): I, Rosalie Burton, swear that the evidence I shall give on this examination shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help me God.

Deputy Commissioner Barbara George (Deputy Commissioner, Royal Canadian Mounted Police): I, Barbara George, swear that the evidence I shall give on this examination shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help me God.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Roy (Ottawa Police Service (Retired), As an Individual): I, Paul Roy, swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. So help me God.

[English]

Staff Sergeant Mike Frizzell (Staff Sergeant, Strategic and Operational Support, National Child Exploitation Coordination Centre, Royal Canadian Mounted Police): I, Mike Frizzell, swear that the evidence I shall give on this examination shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help me God.

Chief Superintendent Fraser Macaulay (Chief Superintendent, Royal Canadian Mounted Police): I, Fraser Macaulay, swear that the evidence I shall give on this examination shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help me God.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Members, we have before us today Deputy Commissioner Barbara George of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Rosalie Burton, former director general of human resources, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Fraser Macaulay, Chief Superintendent, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Staff Sergeant Mike Frizzell, strategic and operational support, National Child Exploitation Coordination Centre; and as an individual, Paul Roy, who is with the Ottawa Police Service.

I want to welcome each and every one of you.

It's not compulsory, but I understand that certain ones have an opening statement. We're just going to go by the list.

Deputy Commissioner George, I understand you have an opening statement. I turn the floor over to you now.

D/Commr Barbara George: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the committee for allowing me this opportunity to respond to the very serious allegation that has been made against me by the member for Etobicoke Centre.

As the member for York West said on Monday, "In this process, it is unfair for people to have accusations made against them and not to have sufficient time to be able to respond." I therefore welcome this opportunity to address the accusation directed against me, and to respond to any further questions committee members may have.

In the course of the committee's meeting on March 28, the member for Etobicoke Centre suggested that I had perjured myself during my initial testimony almost two months ago.

Given the severity of the allegation, which the member repeated publicly and to the media, I have been suspended from my duties by the Commissioner of the RCMP, pending a full disciplinary investigation. The utterance of the term "perjury" was the catalyst that changed my life forever.

I have proudly served as a member and officer of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for 29 years, and this is the first time in my entire career that my conduct and integrity have been called into question. Worse still, because of the confusion surrounding these hearings, some press reports have even suggested that I was somehow involved in the problems with the RCMP pension and insurance funds. I was not.

Further, I did not and have not resigned from the RCMP. On the evening of March 26, 2007, I was asked to step down from my position as deputy commissioner, human resources, at the urging of the commissioner, who told me that while she believed me and felt I had done nothing wrong, it would be in the best interest of the force in light of the increased pressure on the RCMP.

This was prior to any allegations having been made against me, two days before the hearings of March 28.

I made that very difficult decision in a state of disbelief and shock, and I do not yet know how I managed to drive myself home following that meeting.

The arrangement we had reached, which followed her private meetings with other witnesses, was that I would step down and take a combination of educational leave and pre-retirement leave.

The reasons for my suspension, which followed the hearings, relate exclusively to issues arising out of testimony before this committee, and in particular the allegation made by the member for Etobicoke Centre. Indeed, the main purpose for my appearance here today is to address the allegation of perjury, an allegation that is as unfair as it is unfounded.

Let me be perfectly clear. At no time did I either mislead this committee or provide false testimony. The evidence and answers that I gave in response to your questions were at all times honest and accurate.

When I testified on February 21, I was asked the following question: "Did you or Mr. Zaccardelli order that Staff Sergeant Frizzell be removed, and was it you or Mr. Zaccardelli who ordered that the investigation be shut down?"

My response was, and I quote: "I can state with absolute finality that it was neither Commissioner Zaccardelli nor me who had anything whatsoever to do with, as you say, the removal of Sergeant Frizzell."

Mr. Chairman, I stand by that answer. Moreover, I would refer the committee to the testimony given by Assistant Commissioner Gork, where he stated that the order to remove Sergeant Frizzell was made by him, in consultation with Inspector Paul Roy of the Ottawa Police Service. Inspector Roy is here today. More specifically, in response to repeated questions from committee members, Assistant Commissioner Gork further confirmed that I had never contacted him to have Sergeant Frizzell removed.

Notwithstanding these assurances, the member for Etobicoke Centre tabled a selection of e-mails that he claims show that I had ordered Sergeant Frizzell's removal. He then quoted for the record a short passage from an e-mail written by Chief Superintendent Doug Lang. It read, and I quote: "I have an electronic copy of the written order we served on Frizzell at the request of A/Commr Gork and D/Commr George..."

Mr. Chairman, I have since reviewed the e-mails that were tabled by the member for Etobicoke Centre, including the e-mail from which he quoted. The committee will note that the e-mail in question was part of an exchange of e-mails written between Chief Superintendent Lang and Assistant Commissioner Bruce Rogerson. Following the e-mail I have quoted, Assistant Commissioner Rogerson asked Chief Superintendent Lang to clarify my involvement, as my name had not appeared on the final order given to Frizzell.

•(1535)

Either deliberately or carelessly, the member from Etobicoke Centre failed to read the explanation and the clarification ultimately provided by Chief Superintendent Lang.

As Chief Superintendent Lang's explanation accurately details the events in question, I believe it should be quoted in its entirety. I quote:

I spoke with Deputy George on the phone during this period (before the order was prepared), who provided me further details of Sgt Frizzell's continuance of this investigation after he had been asked to stop, and what she had deemed as continued harassment of one of her employees by Sgt Frizzell.... I received no formal order from either A/Commr Gork nor Deputy George, just requests from both to ensure this situation was rectified, and A/Commr Gork's direction that it be served on Sgt Frizzell in the form of a written order. I advised both when it had been formally served.

These comments further confirm that I did not order the removal of Sergeant Frizzell and that my answer to the committee was accurate. I am deeply troubled by the fact that the member for Etobicoke Centre used a misleading quote, taken grossly out of context, as the basis for alleging that I had lied to this committee and the public.

Given the horrific consequences that my family and I have endured as a result of these false claims, it is my sincere hope that this will put to rest any suggestion that I have been dishonest.

These e-mails also reference an issue that has not been fully explained to the committee, the issue of Sergeant Frizzell's conduct during the Ottawa Police Service investigation. Although Inspector Roy is far better able to discuss the problems he had with Sergeant Frizzell during his investigation, I want to be clear about the concerns that I had expressed to others at the time.

In June 2005, Ms. Rosalie Burton told me that some members of her staff were being aggressively interrogated by Sergeant Frizzell. In fact, it was my understanding that at least two staff members were so upset after their interviews with Sergeant Frizzell that they had to be sent home. As a career RCMP officer, I can attest that this type of conduct by an investigating officer is neither acceptable nor productive.

Shortly thereafter, Sergeant Frizzell left a voice-mail message on Ms. Burton's telephone, which he played for the committee during

his appearance on March 28. In the message, Sergeant Frizzell indicated that "a criminal act is ongoing and seemingly condoned by senior management".

Ms. Burton and Deputy Commissioner Gauvin both assured me that Sergeant Frizzell had failed to understand the matters he was investigating with respect to the insurance outsourcing. Moreover, it was highly inappropriate for an officer involved in an investigation to leave such a message for someone he subsequently wished to interview.

In respect of both complaints, I telephoned Assistant Commissioner Darrell LaFosse and told him of what I had learned, and I asked that he speak with Sergeant Frizzell regarding his interviewing methods. Assistant Commissioner LaFosse, in turn, told me that I should express my concerns to Assistant Commissioner Rogerson, which I did shortly thereafter.

In the course of these calls I was informed that, unbeknownst to me, a decision had already been made by the Ottawa Police Service to terminate the probity investigation. Upon learning this, I spoke with Chief Superintendent Lang to see what now was being done with respect to Sergeant Frizzell. Chief Superintendent Lang later advised me that he had served Sergeant Frizzell with an order from Assistant Commissioner Gork instructing him to return to his regular duties. A copy of that order was provided to this committee by Commissioner Busson as an attachment to her letter of March 1, 2007.

The order states in part:

You have been previously advised by Inspector Paul Roy of the Ottawa Police Service to cease and desist any and all investigative activities relative to the project probity investigation. This investigative team has now been dismantled. We have now been made aware that despite the instructions you have already received, that you continue to conduct further inquiries relative to this investigation for which you have no mandate or authority.

In the weeks and months after the investigation ended, I came to learn that others had experienced similar problems with Sergeant Frizzell.

In support of this, I would like to table an e-mail exchange that took place between me and Assistant Commissioner Gork following my first appearance before this committee. The e-mail outlines a series of problems that the Ottawa Police Service and others had had with Sergeant Frizzell in the course of the investigation. Again, however, Inspector Roy will be better able to speak to these issues.

•(1540)

Mr. Chairman, let me say in closing that I continue to have a great respect for the important work of this committee. For 29 years I have been a career RCMP officer. My husband was a former RCMP member. Our eldest son is an RCMP member, and our two younger sons hope to join the RCMP after graduating university. We are proud of this force and proud of its members.

As difficult as these hearings have been for me personally, for my family, my friends, and my supporters, I recognize their role in restoring the public's trust and confidence in the RCMP. I support and applaud your continued efforts to understand what took place during this difficult period.

Unfortunately, given the limited time period we have for opening statements, I have not been able to address all of the issues that this committee has heard of. To that end, I would be pleased to take any questions you may have on the issues I have raised in my opening statement, or indeed any other issues as well.

Thank you. *Merci.*

● (1545)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Deputy Commissioner George.

The e-mails that you have to table, do you have them with you now? Thank you very much.

We're now going to hear from Rosalie Burton, former director general of human resources.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Mr. Chair and honourable members, thank you for the opportunity to appear before committee today.

I appear before you today as a public servant, having more than 20 years of experience in the federal public service, mostly in human resources management. Prior to joining the public service, I obtained an honours Bachelor of Commerce degree from the University of Ottawa, specializing in human resource management and management information systems. Later in my career, I obtained a master's certificate from Royal Roads University. I started my career up at Chalk River nuclear labs with Atomic Energy of Canada.

I'd like to start by sharing with you that it was a very proud time in my career when I joined the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. To have the opportunity to contribute to safe homes and safe communities, to know that in some small way I could contribute to the men and women on the front line who protect our citizens and be part of a proud tradition and a national icon, was a highlight in my career and a true honour.

My first day with the RCMP was August 27, 2001. I transferred from my position at Treasury Board Secretariat, chief information officer branch, to the RCMP's executive officer development and resourcing section. My role there was to design and implement a suite of leadership development programs, and I completed these tasks successfully.

In the late fall of 2003, I took on the role of acting director general of the organization renewal and effectiveness team, replacing Chief Superintendent Fraser Macaulay.

On or before September 11, 2003, and prior to my arrival in the acting director general role, 12 individuals had been identified to be declared surplus. One of these employees identified for surplus was Denise Revine, an individual for whom I had not had any line responsibility prior to taking on my new role. Due to funding pressures, the HR branch budget had a shortfall of \$1.3 million for the fiscal year 2004-05, and some programs would simply not be funded. I consulted the public service staff relations adviser at the RCMP and implemented these budget decisions, ensuring due process was followed.

I was appointed by the Public Service Commission as an EX-2, director general, effective April 1, 2004. Around this time, I also assumed responsibility for the National Compensation Policy

Centre, among other entities. This was as a result of a reorganization of the human resources team that was announced in February of 2004.

I understood my mandate concerning the National Compensation Policy Centre to be one of sustaining operations. The employees on this team were working very hard, but by the time I arrived, they had been without their director for several months. Part of my task was to restore morale and bring focus to their work.

While sustaining operations, I attended an insurance committee meeting that prompted me to ask several questions pertaining to the administration of the insurance program. I suspected a lack of management controls for our members' insurance program. On November 29, 2004, I requested an internal audit through our chief audit executive, with the concurrence of both the chair of the insurance committee and my superior, the chief human resources officer. Also, at the suggestion of the executive assistant to the chief human resources officer, I contacted an investigator on the criminal investigation, who, as I understood it, was working under the direction of an inspector of the Ottawa Police Service, to share my concerns about the insurance program.

In my role as director general, I created a management action plan that consisted of corrective actions to the insurance audit findings. The management action plan was supported by the RCMP audit committee, chaired by the commissioner. These corrective actions were implemented and subsequently reviewed by the Office of the Auditor General, as indicated in chapter 9 of the *Report of the Auditor General*, on RCMP pension and insurance administration, dated November 2006.

Also, as a result of the lessons learned from the audit and an A-base review, I created an organization design for the National Compensation Policy Centre based on current and future work requirements with increased management oversight and quality assurance elements.

● (1550)

While I do not presume to know the process or procedures that were undertaken in the criminal investigation and the subsequent RCMP internal investigation, I am confident that I exercised my responsibilities in the best interest of the Crown, underpinned by the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Service.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, honourable members.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Burton.

We're going to now hear from Paul Roy from the Ottawa Police Service. I understand, Mr. Roy, you're now retired. Is that correct?

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the investigation into the RCMP pension fund undertaken by the Ottawa Police Service between March 2004 and June 2005 was an independent, thorough, and complete criminal investigation. It was concluded with integrity and professionalism in accordance with the principles of major case management and in keeping with conventional practices in modern Canadian policing.

[Translation]

My name is Paul Roy and I was the officer in charge of this investigation. By way of background, I am a 32-year veteran of the Ottawa Police Service, having retired last January as an inspector. Over half my career has been spent in the field of criminal investigations. Of relevance to this committee is the fact that I spent five years with the Professional Standards Section conducting and managing investigations of other police officers.

For the last five years prior to retirement, I was a senior officer responsible, first, for directing the Major Crime Unit and subsequently, for directing the property and enterprise crime units, including the Organized Fraud Unit, the High Tech Crime Unit and Forensic Identification Services.

[English]

I wish to make the following comments about the investigation. The investigation took 15 months. There were 238 interviews, including an interview with the Commissioner of the RCMP. There were 75,000 documents researched. There was a provincial crown attorney assigned to the file from the onset. A number of significant investigative techniques were employed. Relevant documents were obtained, regardless of where they were held and in spite of the security classification surrounding them. The final report, including several binders, filled a banker's box. The executive summary was 51 pages long.

Why were no criminal charges laid? Gone are the days when police officers, in doubt over laying charges, can simply let the judge sort it out. Royal commissions and judicial inquiries have reiterated that in Canada the laying of criminal charges is an extremely serious exercise of public authority. In Ontario, charges will only proceed where there is a "reasonable prospect of conviction", considered to be a higher legal threshold to lay a charge than "reasonable and probable grounds", called for in the Criminal Code of Canada. In this case, there was no reasonable prospect of criminal conviction.

That does not mean, however, that no wrongdoing took place—to the contrary. The Ottawa Police investigation report identifies that 21 persons at different levels of the RCMP were alleged to have committed wrongdoings or improper actions, with 14 pages of specific allegations.

I would like to tell you how the investigation operated. I was in charge of this investigation. That meant that I made the investigative decisions. In doing so, I met regularly with Ottawa Police Chief Vince Bevan, alone or with Deputy Chief Sue O'Sullivan and Ottawa Police Superintendent Peter Crosby, my immediate supervisor. We discussed strategies and operational options, but the decisions were mine.

In making those decisions, I also met with Mr. Robert Wadden, the assigned provincial crown attorney, and Sergeant William Sullivan from the Ottawa Police Service, who worked with me, and I met regularly with Ottawa Police Service general counsel Vincent Westwick, who is also in charge of our professional standards section. I consulted regularly with the investigative team members to elicit their opinions and views. I encouraged each member of the team to be involved, to debate, to challenge operational theories and decisions. That is more than just good

management; it is a test against tunnel vision or rush to judgment, an essential part of the integrity of any investigation.

Now I wish to comment on the role of Assistant Commissioner David Gork and the independence of the investigation.

It's very difficult to conduct an investigation of this magnitude within a large institution without a contact or liaison person. During this investigation, I met with Assistant Commissioner Gork when I needed something from the RCMP, whether it be resources, facilities, specialized or technical operational support, or access to documents or persons. In each and every case Assistant Commissioner Gork provided full and complete support to my investigation. At no time did he attempt to interfere or influence me in any way. I did not report to Mr. Gork, nor did I take any direction from him. Indeed, in my opinion, Assistant Commissioner Gork and all the RCMP members assigned to the investigative team put the interest of the investigation ahead of their own interests and those of the RCMP.

• (1555)

[Translation]

While I accept the comments of the Auditor General and others about the perceived lack of independence, I invite the committee to consider the following:

This investigation was directed by the Ottawa Police Service.

I was the officer in charge and reported to the chief of the Ottawa Police Service.

It started out as a 3-month investigation, but lasted 15 months; the decision to increase the duration and magnitude was mine.

The crown assigned to the investigation was from the office of the provincial Crown Attorney and was involved throughout the investigation, not just at the end.

The Ottawa Police ordered and relied on an independent forensic audit.

The results of the investigation were announced publicly by the Ottawa Police in a media conference on June 27, 2005.

There was no influence attempted or exercised in relation to this investigation.

This investigation uncovered all the wrongdoing, mismanagement and unethical behaviour that existed and outlined detailed evidence as to who was accountable for such actions, regardless of their rank or position within the RCMP.

The report provided was a detailed and a complete review of all the findings.

I presented my final report to Chief Bevan who in turn delivered it directly to the Commissioner of the RCMP.

I am fully committed to cooperating with this committee and with the independent investigation called by the government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[English]

The Chair: *Merci beaucoup*, Mr. Roy.

We're going to now start the first round. Each member will have eight minutes.

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to thank all the witnesses for coming to the committee meeting today.

Staff Sergeant Frizzell, once again we heard Deputy Commissioner Barb George. In fact, she quoted her previous statement before committee: "I can state with absolute finality that it was neither Commissioner Zaccardelli nor me who had anything whatsoever to do with, as you say, the removal of Sergeant Frizzell."

On March 28 I tabled several e-mails that seemed to indicate quite the opposite.

Staff Sergeant Frizzell, has Assistant Commissioner Bruce Rogerson spoken with you since? What are his recollections? Would you know whether he's willing to appear before our committee?

The Chair: We're getting into situations here. We're dealing with people's reputations, and that question is direct hearsay. That's what it is. If it is important to bring Mr. Bruce Rogerson, then we'll have to do it, but we cannot get the statements of Bruce Rogerson through Mr. Frizzell.

I know it's not a judicial hearing. It's not a judicial proceeding, but we have to follow some process when we're involved in a matter this serious. Again, try to stick to the facts.

•(1600)

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Sure, with that sort of indication, I agree, and I'd like to request that this committee call Assistant Commissioner Bruce Rogerson before the committee.

The Chair: We're not going to deal with that now, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, but if you can lay the framework that's he's an important witness, we'll certainly consider it. Again, it's not my decision, of course; it's up to the steering committee.

Again, if there's anything factual that Mr. Frizzell can add, please continue.

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I kind of feel like cannon fodder here, especially after Ms. George complained to the committee about how she was treated, and then she sat here and made allegations against me that I've heard for the first time. I'm not sure how the chief human resources officer justifies saying I was such a bad person, and yet nobody ever sat down with me and explained to me all of these allegations. I would have liked the chance back then to deal with that.

But that aside, Ms. George contacted me on the Thursday before I was removed—her office did—asking to see me. I said yes, and then I started thinking about it and called back and asked why. To make a long story short, I was told it was about a phone call I had made. Obviously it's the phone call I made to Ms. Burton, but at the time I

believed it was a phone call I had made to Great-West Life when I'd learned about half a million dollars being taken out of the insurance fund.

Now, Ms. George has been nice enough to say that I failed to understand the intricacies of that investigation. No one has ever pointed that out to me. In fact, I made a presentation directly to Ms. George in February of this year, where Ms. George would have had plenty of opportunity to set me straight or to realize I was pretty serious and have somebody else set me straight. Instead, out of that meeting, Mr. Gork sent me an e-mail telling me:

I want to thank both of you, especially Mike, not only for all the work you've done, but for your ability to put it together in a package that someone as untrained as myself can understand. You did a great job this a.m. with the CHRO, Mike. You bring credit, not only to the investigation, but to yourself. Good on you.

That was February 2005.

So I thought it had to do with this money, but I found out otherwise, and was told that Ms. George was gunning for me. You've heard about her trip to see Mr. LaFosse.

Anyway, that aside, come Monday morning, when I was supposed to go to see her, I hadn't heard back from her on why she wanted to see me. I felt that was important, because I felt she was involved in removing this money from the insurance plans. So I sent her an e-mail that morning:

I would like to meet with you to discuss further moneys that had been removed from the members' insurance plans, but if the topic is something else, then, as per my last e-mail, I would appreciate knowing what it is so that I might properly prepare.

That e-mail was sent at 10:22. I was supposed to see Ms. George in her office at 10:30. Within 40 to 45 minutes of that, Mr. Lang and Mr. Newman showed up at my door to give me the famous order you've all heard about. There was no mention of anything to do with Ottawa, other than the line that Ms. George mentioned. When I challenged it, Mr. Lang didn't know anything about it, but Mr. Newman was extremely preoccupied with the fact that I should have been at the CHRO's office and I wasn't, and how dare I not show up at the CHRO's office as demanded.

All I said to him was that there were an awful lot of ranks, as he could clearly see, between me and the chief human resources officer of the RCMP; that it was not appropriate for her to be calling me there, and certainly not appropriate for her to be calling me there without my knowing why. There was absolutely no question in my mind, due to the conversation with Mr. Newman, due to the e-mails, due to the fact I was supposed to be in her office at the time, that I was being removed from the investigation because of Ms. George and the money taken out of the insurance plans.

That's a long answer.

•(1605)

The Chair: Before we proceed to the next question, you referred to a number of e-mails. Have those e-mails been tabled? If they have not, could you table them, please.

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: No, they've not been tabled.

The Chair: And will you table them?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: If I am permitted to, I will, yes.

The Chair: Well, you are permitted.

Mr. John Williams: You're instructed to.

The Chair: Yes, "instructed" would be a better word.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: Chief Superintendent Macaulay, are you aware of any other details or conversations with any of the assistant commissioners, or any other detail that you can provide us on this particular removal?

C/Supt Fraser Macaulay: I had a conversation in mid-June, just prior to Mr. Frizzell's removal, with my boss, Assistant Commissioner LaFosse. He had come in one morning and asked me to see him. I sat in his office and he advised me that he had just had a phone call from Deputy Commissioner George looking for him to remove Mike Frizzell from the investigation, and that he had directed her to Bruce Rogerson.

The only other time I had a conversation since, or the next time I had a conversation, was shortly after February 21. Mr. LaFosse was able at one point to see the blues, and his exact quote to me was: "Why did she lie? She knows she called me."

So we've had a couple of conversations since then around that same subject.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: Thank you.

Chair, I'd like to table a document from January 5, 2004, a request for investigation from Mr. Ron Lewis to Deputy Commissioner Barb George, which, in its original form, had a 16-page attachment of violations. My question relates to this document, and it's to Ms. George.

Ms. George, what did you do with this document?

The Chair: Go ahead.

D/Commr Barbara George: Mr. Chair, I'm not aware of the document. Could I see the document, please?

Mr. Chair, I don't recall seeing this document. But what it is is Ron Lewis asking me to go forward with unsolicited complaints from senior officers concerning the conduct of the former CHRO, Jim Ewanovich. It outlines a couple of the issues and it outlines consequences of inaction, etc.

Now, when Ron Lewis testified on Monday of this week, he talked of the fact that he and I had met extensively in my office, at which time I agreed with Ron Lewis that I could not carry out the functions as CHRO if the RCMP did not call for a criminal investigation. The next morning I told him that I would go in to speak with the commissioner and say exactly that, that we needed to have a criminal investigation called.

If this document were in my hands, it might have gone forward. I'm not in my office at the moment so I can't track it. But as Ron Lewis attested to himself, I did go back to the commissioner after our long meeting—with Ron Lewis—and say to the commissioner that I could not continue to function, and in fact it would be getting nowhere, if he didn't call a criminal investigation into this situation that was still bubbling up.

Mr. Chair, may I respond to both Mr. Frizzell's and Mr. Macaulay's comments, please?

The Chair: Sure.

D/Commr Barbara George: Thank you.

Mr. John Williams: On a point of order, we're talking about an e-mail and we're talking about a criminal investigation. What's the date of that e-mail, and what—

The Chair: It's all going to be tabled, Mr. Williams.

Mr. John Williams: Yes, but I want to know the date. Is this part of that two-day criminal investigation or not?

D/Commr Barbara George: It's January 5, 2004. When Ron Lewis was testifying on Monday, he was talking about a conversation that he and I had had. He said November. In my mind, as I'm listening to his conversation, that meeting between us took place in early January and he was laying out all of the noise around it. At the end of it, I said, "Ron, I agree, we need to have a criminal investigation called into this matter; otherwise it's useless, no CHRO can move forward."

•(1610)

The Chair: All those documents will be tabled.

D/Commr Barbara George: With regard to Mr. Frizzell's comments about Doug Lang, etc., and Mr. Macaulay's comments, I'll put it all in together.

When Rosalie Burton came into my office and talked about the sad state that the witnesses were in following interviews by Sergeant Frizzell, we talked about the fact that NCPC was being decimated and that these people were witnesses.

What I did was I immediately picked up the phone and spoke with Assistant Commissioner LaFosse, and I asked him if somebody could speak with Sergeant Frizzell to ask him to tone down his interviewing methodology. For people to run screaming out of the office after a witness interview is simply not productive and not normal. So Assistant Commissioner LaFosse asked me to speak with Bruce Rogerson, and I told him the same thing.

At about the same time, Rosalie Burton forwarded me an e-mail, it was a voice mail that she had put to paper, from Staff Sergeant Frizzell to her, outlining serious wrongdoing going on with the insurance. I don't have a background in insurance, but I knew that Rosalie had been heavily involved in correcting the gaps in the insurance file for the RCMP and that she had been working closely with corporate, and in particular Deputy Commissioner Paul Gauvin.

Upon receipt of this e-mail, I took it forward to Paul Gauvin, and I said, "This looks like there are still continuing wrongdoings or crimes being committed within the insurance." Paul said, "Barb, I'm telling you right now there is nothing there. Everything that needs to be done to correct the insurance is done." He said, "You can rest assured that your members are covered with life and disability. Every other insurance is covered." The problem is that the RCMP never did, and still doesn't, have the authority to administer insurance programs for our members.

I asked him about the premiums. I said, "Our members are thinking that the premium costs are going to double or triple." He said, "A little, but really, it's only 2.5% for administrative fees, because that's how the insurance is paid."

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. George.

I'm going to move now to Monsieur Laforest, *pour huit minutes*.

Monsieur Laforest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Macaulay, when you testified before us on March 28, you stated that after gathering certain bits of information connected with the problems that we are reviewing at this time, problems that you had observed and that Ms. Revine had also reported to you, you advised both Mr. Zaccardelli and Ms. George of the situation. Ms. George clearly advised you at the time that you were an island by yourself and that nobody was going to tell the truth. That's what you told us last time. You said that you had lengthy conversations on the issues and that she called you naive to think that anyone was going to stand beside you in this type of situation and tell the truth.

Is that in fact what you told us last time?

[*English*]

C/Supt Fraser Macaulay: That's correct, yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: Ms. George, do you agree with Mr. Macaulay's testimony?

[*English*]

D/Commr Barbara George: Absolutely not.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: You disagree with that statement?

[*English*]

D/Commr Barbara George: No, I am not.

If I may elaborate, following Commissioner Zaccardelli's severe disappointment with Chief Superintendent Macaulay's failure to come forward in a timely manner with the knowledge he had concerning the alleged wrongdoings in the HR and corporate areas, he had a meeting with him. My recollection of that meeting—because I was there too; the commissioner was there speaking with Fraser Macaulay, and I was there too. There were three of us in that room.

I should tell this committee that Chief Superintendent Macaulay had no intention whatsoever of coming in to see the commissioner and relaying to him exactly what it was he knew, listed as “noise”, around the outsourcing and other issues. I made that appointment early that morning. I asked the commissioner if I could come over to see him, and I said, “Commissioner, I would like to bring Fraser Macaulay. Will you listen?” He said, “Yes, bring him in.”

I went across the street to the Hampton Inn, where there was a meeting in place—an HRMT meeting. I looked at Mr. Macaulay and said, “Fraser, you're coming with me. We are going to see the commissioner.” He was not happy about that.

We went in. We sat down, the three of us, and I introduced it. I said, “Commissioner, Fraser has some information here. I've heard little bits of it, but I think there is a lot of information that you need to hear with regard to what's going on in the HR sector and possibly in corporate.”

Fraser sat down and started to relate to the commissioner, face to face, all of the alleged wrongdoings, from contract splitting to

nepotism to harassment of employees to overpayment, and on and on it went.

At the end of that conversation the commissioner, to my recollection, asked Fraser two questions.

He said: “Fraser, how long have you known about this?” Mr. Macaulay answered: “A year, maybe longer.”

The next question from the commissioner: “Fraser, when were you going to come to tell me about this?” Fraser's answer: “I wasn't. I report to Jim Ewanovich. He's my boss; he'll kill you. I have to look out for my career.”

The commissioner said: “Fraser, you should let me look out for your career.”

Following this, the commissioner said he had to be held accountable, that we had to look at giving him an opportunity—he is young, with 22 years' service, and he had a chief superintendent's rank—

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: Mr. Chairman, once again, just like at the last meeting, we're faced with a very difficult situation. We have here people who have sworn an oath and who are presenting contradictory testimony to the committee. Again, this highlights the importance of the motion adopted at our last meeting which calls on the committee to request a public inquiry from the Minister of Public Security, in order to get to the bottom of this matter. Twice now we've heard this testimony. I'd like us to continue making use of the time available to us, but it's very important that we move in the direction of a public inquiry.

Ms. Burton, Ms. Revine presented us with some documents showing that after she was laid off, you apparently signed a contract worth in excess of \$700,000 with the firm of Deloitte & Touche to review staffing services.

Did you in fact contract the services of a private firm for a job that Ms. Revine could have carried out herself?

[*English*]

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Mr. Chair, without seeing the actual document, it's difficult for me to answer. I don't know the timeframe, I don't know the contract in question, and I don't know the dollar amount. If it's available, I'll—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: I'm not sure exactly when you arrived, but that's what Ms. Revine told us in her submission. Between 2003 and 2005, you were opposed to her returning to work. Your office agreed to put her name on a priority list. In the interim, you allegedly signed a contract worth over \$700,000 with Insignis Consulting to implement a strategic leadership initiative. Ms. Revine had already been involved in two such initiatives and could very well have handled the job herself, thereby sparing the RCMP from having to award a \$700,000 contract.

If you can't answer the question at this time, I would appreciate your sending us an answer at a later date.

[English]

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Yes, thank you.

As a result of the management action plan, where I put corrective actions in against the insurance audit findings, part of the corrective action was to conduct an A-base of the National Compensation Policy Centre, not the entire HR directorate or branch or team. I have no knowledge of the A-base and have not seen the A-base that Ms. Revine was doing or had done.

I know that I was directed, endorsed by the audit committee, to do an A-base review only on what we call NCPC, the National Compensation Policy Centre. That was a part of the corrective measures we put in in response to the RCMP internal audit, and it was subsequently reviewed by the Office of the Auditor General. My best recollection is that it was not to that amount.

• (1620)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Burton, can you give us, in writing to the committee, the full and complete details of the contract that Monsieur Laforest was referring to: when it was signed, your involvement, and the details—all details?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: *Merci beaucoup, monsieur Laforest.*

Mr. Williams, you have eight minutes.

Mr. John Williams: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. George, you have reviewed the testimony, and I presume you read the chair's opening remarks the other day, when he said that witnesses are required to give fulsome answers to the committee. This is not a court of law where you're in defence. You are protected by parliamentary privilege; therefore, fulsome answers are what we expect and will require.

I'll go back to your testimony on February 21 where, first of all, you talk about an e-mail from Bruce Rogerson to Fraser Macaulay prior to Mr. Macaulay's appearing before the committee. He said, "Barb George called Darrell LaFosse, then me and, then, Dave Gork, surrounding Mike Frizzell's harassing behaviour and he needed to be dealt with swiftly. ... As we are aware of the calls that were made, Dave and Barb were consulted and, they were both advised of the order served whereby Frizzell was removed from his office..."

I believe in your opening statement you also mentioned that you were advised when the thing was formally served. I think you acknowledged that.

Now, on February 21, you said, "I can state with absolute finality that it was neither Commissioner Zaccardelli nor me who had anything whatsoever to do with, as you say, the removal of Sergeant Frizzell." And I acknowledge that you did not give the order, but you acknowledge that you were aware it was all happening.

Mr. Wrzesnewszky says, "Can you tell us who it was?" You say, "No, I'm not aware of who it was. The best I can state is that when

Sergeant Frizzell left, I understood he returned to his home division..."

Now, you were aware of the circumstances regarding the removal of Mr. Frizzell. I'm not asking whether you gave the order, I'm not asking if you made the decision; I'm just saying you were aware. Am I correct?

D/Commr Barbara George: The question was—

Mr. John Williams: No, I said the question was about who removed Sergeant Frizzell.

Let me give the quotation again. You stated, "I can state with absolute finality that it was neither Commissioner Zaccardelli nor me who had anything whatsoever to do with, as you say, the removal of Sergeant Frizzell."

D/Commr Barbara George: Right.

Mr. John Williams: I said and I acknowledge that you didn't give the order.

Mr. Wrzesnewszky then asked you, "Can you tell us who it was?" You replied, "No, I'm not aware of who it was. The best I can state is that when Sergeant Frizzell left, I understood he returned to his home division..."

Now, remember, you're required to give fulsome answers here. You were aware of the circumstances regarding Mr. Frizzell's removal from that position.

D/Commr Barbara George: I was aware that Sergeant Frizzell had been ordered back to his home base. I could not and I did not have any document before me to tell you who had signed off on that document.

Further along, when you asked me, "Well, are you aware? Do you know who signed off on the document?" and—

Mr. John Williams: No, I—

D/Commr Barbara George: No, I'm answering you, sir.

Mr. John Williams: You're trying to get too legal here, because Mr. Rogerson said, "We are aware of the calls that were made to Dave Gork and Barb George, who were consulted, and they were both advised of the order served whereby Frizzell was to be removed from his office." There were telephone calls.

D/Commr Barbara George: Yes, there was a document.

Mr. John Williams: And you were aware of the circumstances.

D/Commr Barbara George: I was aware that this gentleman was being removed that day, because Doug Lang called me. I did not know, sir—I did not know who signed off on that and who took that decision. The chair asked me not to speculate. I knew it would either have been Inspector Roy or Dave Gork, because obviously these were the two that were leading.... Well, Inspector Roy was leading the investigation, but Dave Gork was more or less managing RCMP members.

I did not know who gave that order, sir.

Mr. John Williams: I think, Madam George, that your answers are more legal than fulsome. That's my opinion, and I'm going to stick to it.

Now, moving on, on the same issue, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj again asked you, "Was it Mr. Gork who made the decision to have Mr. Frizzell removed?" You responded, "I can speculate, if you wish me to speculate. I wasn't involved in this criminal investigation."

I can appreciate that you weren't involved in the criminal investigation, but at no point in time did you divulge to this committee that you had telephone calls with Mr. Gork and others regarding the removal of Mr. Frizzell.

• (1625)

D/Commr Barbara George: I think what is very important to do here, the reason I made my phone calls on Mr. Frizzell—who, by the way, is quite right when he says he was never approached by anybody regarding his interviewing techniques. Nobody ever did speak with him. I know that now.

I had a director general coming to me telling me that MPCC—

Mr. John Williams: No, I don't want—

D/Commr Barbara George: No, sir, this is—

Mr. John Williams: I just want an answer to my question, Ms. George.

D/Commr Barbara George: This is critical. There are two issues here. You're asking me if I knew who took the order or gave the order. I did not, sir.

The reason I didn't bring in—

Mr. John Williams: My question was this. I said you were aware because of phone calls, and you didn't volunteer that information to this committee. Did you—

D/Commr Barbara George: I was not aware who made the decision to remove Sergeant Frizzell.

Mr. John Williams: You're missing my point, Ms. George. I said you were aware of the phone calls that you had regarding the decision to dismiss or remove Mr. Frizzell and the fact that he was going to be removed and the fact that he had been removed, and you did not volunteer that information to the committee. Am I correct?

D/Commr Barbara George: You didn't ask me, was I aware of whether he was going to go?

Mr. John Williams: No, no, but you're here to—

D/Commr Barbara George: No, sir, I'm being very fair with you. I made those phone calls to address an HR issue, an HR issue of possible abuse or harassment of employees. I'm sure you understand the Treasury Board guidelines, which also rule the RCMP. I had to take action there.

Mr. John Williams: Madam George, I have to interrupt. You're trying to obfuscate the issue.

D/Commr Barbara George: I'm not, sir.

Mr. John Williams: I asked you, why did you not volunteer the information that you had discussions with people who were involved in the decision to remove with Mr. Frizzell? Why did you not volunteer that information to this committee?

D/Commr Barbara George: Sir, when I answered the question, I answered it honestly. You asked me who made the decision, and did I know. I did not know whether it was Assistant Commissioner Gork or—

Mr. John Williams: You're missing my point. I said, why did you not volunteer the information that you had discussions with these people?

D/Commr Barbara George: Because it had nothing to do with who took the decision.

Mr. John Williams: Okay, let me move on.

Mr. Chairman, again, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj stated, "...and nobody seems to know who gave that order." And you replied, Ms. George, "I never was and am not now in charge of the sergeant we are speaking about right now."

A true statement, but a misleading statement. You were asked who gave the order, and you changed the subject entirely to state that you weren't in charge of the sergeant. Why did you make a misleading statement to the committee?

D/Commr Barbara George: It's not misleading to say I was not in charge of the sergeant, and I have repeated three times by now that I did not know which of the two gentlemen, either Inspector Roy or Assistant Commissioner Gork, would have given the order to have him removed.

Mr. John Williams: I go back to the point that you're expected to give fulsome answers to the questions at this committee, and when you knew it was one of two people and you go off on a different tangent to avoid answering the question, to me, that's a misleading statement.

But let me go on, Mr. Chairman.

D/Commr Barbara George: Mr. Chair, if I may make a point, I offered to speculate. When Dave Gork gave me the e-mail and told me who it was, he said, "Barb, who would you have said?"—because you said don't speculate. I would have said that it was Assistant Commissioner Gork who gave it. He said, "Well, I did, but through Paul Roy."

Mr. John Williams: Okay, let me continue on.

This is later on, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: You have two seconds, Mr. Williams.

Mr. John Williams: This is my last question.

It was asked that you submit a letter to this committee: "I suggest that the commissioner, assisted by Ms. George, undertake to provide us in writing the circumstances surrounding the so-called alleged dismissal of Sergeant Frizzell."

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj said, "I would assume that if someone is being removed, there would be an actual document that would have to be served." Your response, Ms. George, was, "If such a document exists, we will get that and provide it to you."

You were aware that a document existed. You were told that he had been served formally, weren't you?

D/Commr Barbara George: This was years ago, and I didn't know whether or not I could get my hands on that document. We went back—

Mr. John Williams: I didn't ask you if you could get your hands on it. I asked if you were aware of it.

D/Commr Barbara George: I had been told that there was a document. It came to me by e-mail.

Mr. Williams, whether or not I could have gotten my hands on that document remains to be seen. In fact, it was retrieved, and it was also attached to the letter. Do you know what wasn't attached to the letter, Mr. Williams? It's very unfortunate.

I went to Assistant Commissioner Gork, who was still in Lyons, and I asked him four questions: Who took the decision to remove him? What were the circumstances around it? How was it effected? What effect did it have, if any, on Sergeant Frizzell's career? He wrote me a very fulsome e-mail, which I presented to the commissioner. I said, you know what, here are the answers that the committee is looking for regarding the dismissal or removal of Sergeant Frizzell.

By the way, Inspector Roy says he wasn't removed, he was simply turned back, because the whole team was dismantled. It's a point, Mr. Williams. It's an important point.

I asked that the e-mail be given to the—

• (1630)

Mr. John Williams: I think this letter was a removal. It wasn't a dismantling of the investigation.

D/Commr Barbara George: Well, I could let Inspector Roy speak to that.

But that e-mail gave everything that we needed, and I asked that the e-mail be attached to the letter going back to this committee.

Mr. John Williams: Why wasn't it?

D/Commr Barbara George: The decision was taken—

Mr. John Williams: By?

D/Commr Barbara George: By the commissioner, I believe, and DOJ—

Mr. John Williams: Who is DOJ?

D/Commr Barbara George: —the Department of Justice, which worked with the RCMP—to keep it to a minimum. The reason they kept it—

Mr. John Williams: We asked for a fulsome report, Mr. Chairman. Since when do the Department of Justice and the RCMP decide on their own that they are not going to tell us the information that we asked for?

The Chair: Don't ask me, Mr. Williams.

Mr. John Williams: I think we should be asking them.

The Chair: It's the first I've heard of it.

D/Commr Barbara George: The logic that was put forward, committee members, was that since Assistant Commissioner Gork was being flown in from Lyons and would be here in person, it would be better to hear from him in person, live and fresh, to give you all of the details. That is the decision that was taken, and I wasn't part of it.

Mr. John Williams: I have to take severe exception to these decisions, Mr. Chairman. This committee, a parliamentary committee, asked for a full explanation. All we got was a simple letter of the dismissal of Sergeant Frizzell. Now we find out there were

discussions between the Department of Justice and the senior RCMP to keep this committee in the dark. That cannot be allowed to stand.

The Chair: To follow up on that point—and we're going to move on, Mr. Williams—I want to get this absolutely clearly.

Are you telling us that since you testified at the last hearing and were to provide a report, there were meetings with the Department of Justice, and they decided not to provide the information?

D/Commr Barbara George: Mr. Chair, we have our own internal legal people who were sitting with us when we were looking at this letter. Besides the document that had been retrieved in relation to Sergeant Frizzell, there was also the e-mail that came in from Assistant Commissioner Gork. It outlined, in paragraph form, exactly what led up to the removal. I presented that at a meeting. Our legal people were there and the commissioner was there.

I said this was it right there, and that it would explain to the committee exactly how this occurred. It was decided that, to keep it simple, just the memorandum to Sergeant Frizzell would be attached, and then David Gork would be here in person to respond to any and every question the committee would put before him.

The Chair: But David Gork was here the day you were here.

D/Commr Barbara George: No, David Gork came after I did. I was here on the 21st of—

The Chair: Did he table that e-mail?

D/Commr Barbara George: I don't believe he did, but that's why I brought the e-mail today.

The Chair: You're going to table it today.

D/Commr Barbara George: Yes, and it is translated as well.

The Chair: We're going to move on. I'm sure somebody will want to come back to that, but we do have rules.

Mr. Christopherson, for eight minutes.

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Thank you very much, Chair.

And thank you all for your attendance here today.

Let me just say at the outset that I appreciate Mr. Williams' feeling of outrage. And the more we dig, the more we realize that there's more to find.

I would just point out that the investigation that has been called into this could get no closer to this issue Mr. Williams just raised than we did—in fact, less so. We at least have put people under oath. The investigator can't do that. The investigator can't command documents. Even if they do, there's nothing to require them to make those documents part of the final submission, and that's the problem.

It would help a lot—and I say this very sincerely—if the Conservative members moved from abstention to lending their considerable weight to the call for a proper judicial inquiry so that these witnesses can have the protection they need and ultimately we'll get to the truth, because we're not here. We're going to keep going in circles. We're going to keep doing this because it's better than that investigation, but this is far from perfect.

Every time we go around the table, to me it just reinforces that much more that what the RCMP deserves, what the officers of the RCMP deserve, and what the Canadian public deserve is a proper, full public inquiry, and we're not going to stop hammering away at that until we bloody well get one.

Deputy, I'd like to return to some of your comments.

By the way, I have a great deal of sympathy for the concerns you raised at the beginning. We're no closer to getting to the truth than we were at the beginning. I have no idea, at the end of the day, who is going to be held responsible, but I really worry about people being wronged in this process. So I appreciate what you said, Deputy, but as you know, we have to persevere, we have to do the best we can, and hopefully the minister will step in and give us tools to do a better job.

When you met with us the last time, you said, "It was felt at that time by the then commissioner that Chief Superintendent Macaulay would benefit from a secondment. He was actually given a short secondment with the military."

Can I ask you to give us your recollection of that discussion you had with the commissioner, given that—I'm going from memory, so I stand to be corrected—the former commissioner's testimony stated that he thought Chief Superintendent Macaulay had made some kind of mistake and that by going off to DND he could reclaim his reputation and get his career back on track? That didn't sound to me like it was only about furthering Chief Superintendent Macaulay's career, and he has given direct testimony that he believes he was removed for other reasons—meaning, bringing forward these issues.

Could you tell us what that conversation was, as you recall it, with the former commissioner about how this was going to be a benefit to Chief Superintendent Macaulay's career?

• (1635)

D/Commr Barbara George: Yes, I can.

There was a lot of conversation following what the commissioner saw as a grave disappointment in the fact that Chief Superintendent Macaulay had not come forward on a timely basis to tell him about the issues that were running rampant in NCPC, HR, and corporate. Remember, as I said, according to the commissioner, he heard Macaulay say, "Well, I knew about it for a year and a half." I heard, "I knew about it for a year, maybe more."

So to the commissioner, he was gravely disappointed. Had he come forward sooner, a year ago maybe, we could have gotten our teeth into this situation, and whatever wrongdoing was ongoing, whatever was happening with the pension plan, whatever was happening with the insurances, and God knows what else could have been seen to much sooner and probably wouldn't have gotten to the state that it did.

That said, the commissioner said, "You know, this person was promoted early, 22 years of service, to chief superintendent. What he needs is to go somewhere to learn some courage and some leadership. Look at some places where he can go." That's what he said. There was a little bit of talk about returning him to E Division for a while, because I think that's the operational division whence he came.

Finally, we settled on DND. They have a marvellous military ethos. They are famous for their leadership. So that's where that came in. It was a two-year secondment, and Macaulay spent seven months there.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you.

I'd be interested, Chief Superintendent Macaulay...and I accept that you may have already given testimony to this, but nonetheless, when did you hear about this? Was it in writing? Was it personal? Who did you hear it from, and exactly what did they say was the reason for the secondment?

C/Supt Fraser Macaulay: The first time was on August 21, as I was leaving. That was at 5 p.m. in Deputy Commissioner Barb George's office. At that time, she was still assistant commissioner. I was being removed because of the fact that I had not delivered on HRMIS and the way I handled the complaint against Dominic Crupi. Then-Assistant Commissioner George advised me that I should not have taken it to the level that I had, and then she added that I sat on the information too long.

This "sat on the information too long" has haunted me for three and a half years. Monday, Commissioner Zaccardelli said it was a year and a half. I have my employment record, to table with you today. It will show you that if I knew for a year and a half, I knew the day I arrived into my new job in HR as the chief superintendent. I arrived there exactly seventeen months before I was in his office. On the year and a half, even now that the whole investigation is all done and we are now in 2007, there is nobody who can tell me or demonstrate to me how it's even possible that I knew ahead of that time.

I knew on May 28, and even then I didn't really know on May 28. On May 28, I received a phone call from Jim Ewanovich, who had been visited by Assistant Commissioner Spice and Ron Lewis in regard to his behaviour. He was upset that they had accused him of some things, and Jim felt I was one of the officers who was informing Ron as to his behaviour. It just doesn't make any sense.

From there, I came back and I spoke to Denise Revine, who was doing the A-base. If you look at the allegations on June 17, they are written by Denise Revine, in consultation with me. I knew nothing before that time.

Nobody has put forward any evidence that I knew before that time. During my conversations with these folks to try to even correct it once it was told to me, I explained and then started to find out things, such as the fact that it had come to the attention of the RCMP in 2002, and that the HR folks had actually built a form on which you had to tick off whether or not the person you were now hiring was in your family. They built an HR form in 2002. That is not where I was, and it was unbeknownst to me.

• (1640)

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you.

My concern about this, Deputy, is that the answer you gave certainly left the impression that, far from being a punishment, it was some kind of a career favour. That could be just because the answer wasn't as complete as it could have been, but that was the concern there.

If I can, I'm going to read another quotation, Deputy. This is you speaking :“I'm being careful with regard to the privacy concerns here, but I understood [Sergeant Frizzell left] for health reasons.” Do you still stand by the statement that this happened because of health reasons, Deputy?

D/Commr Barbara George: When I had a conversation with Chief Superintendent Doug Lang, I asked him if Sergeant Frizzell was all right. He said, “Well, Barb, I believe he's going to be off sick for a while. He's not feeling very good.” That's what I heard, and that's all I can say to that.

If I can make a point, please, Mr. Macaulay was talking about when he knew what. Vern White, who is about to become the new chief for the Ottawa Police Service, has had a conversation with me. He recalls a conversation that I believe Chief Superintendent Macaulay referred to—

The Chair: We're not going to get into the conversations with Mr. White.

We'll move on to Mr. Wrzesnewskyj.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Thank you, Chair.

Ms. George, before the end of the previous round, I had spoken to you about this letter from Mr. Lewis, dated January 5, 2004. Could you provide us with any documentation, e-mails, or anything you might have on file that would show action on this? The record up to this point shows that nothing transpired for another three months, until such time as Mr. Lewis went to Treasury Board and Minister McLellan. A couple of days afterwards, the Ottawa Police Service then began their investigation.

I'd like to move on to another part of your testimony, Ms. George, dealing with Mr. Crupi and his rampant nepotism. I asked you on February 21 whether Mr. Crupi got 18 months leave with pay. Your answer was short and succinct: “Mr. Crupi was suspended.” I asked, “With pay?” You said, “Yes.”

Now, before the committee, Mr. Zaccardelli said—and this is a quote: “I can only repeat again that the day I received the report...I appointed Barb George as the new chief human resources officer, with the instructions to remove Crupi from his position.” He then went on to say: “If that was not immediate action...”

When Mr. Williams was questioning you just now, you referenced your knowledge of Treasury Board guidelines. The public service staff regulation act states, under point (h)(1)(e): “if the alleged misconduct so warrants, suspend the employee from duty immediately”—that's Mr. Zaccardelli underlined that he did—“and obtain approval without delay”—well, he instructed you to do that—“tell the employee that he/she is suspended from duty without pay pending an investigation of his/her alleged misconduct, and that it will be confirmed in writing.”

You quite clearly said you suspended him, and you suspended him with pay. Your guidelines say that should not have happened. Why?

D/Commr Barbara George: With Dom Crupi, I spoke with him after Jim Ewanovich resigned. I said he was going to have to go home because his presence was upsetting people. He protested. He said he had only done what Jim Ewanovich asked him to do, and he

asked what kind of leave he would be on. I told him to go home on administrative leave and said I would check with Treasury Board—

● (1645)

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Ms. George, Mr. Zaccardelli was absolutely clear. When he saw the audit report, there was a concern about grave misconduct, and he instructed you to have him removed immediately.

D/Commr Barbara George: And I did.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: You referenced guidelines, and the guidelines don't provide any wiggle room. They clearly state “without pay”. He received pay for 18 months. How did you make that decision?

D/Commr Barbara George: I called the Treasury Board, at a very high level, and I told them the situation. The CHRO had resigned and had gone home. I now had the director of NCPC, and I asked if I had the grounds to suspend the CHRO without pay. I was asked what the circumstances were, and I said it was a criminal investigation.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Do you have a document that can verify that it wasn't you who made that decision?

D/Commr Barbara George: I have a witness who can confirm that he told me. He said that if there were no criminal charges pending on this individual, I was quite within the my rights to send him home with pay.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: But the guidelines are quite clear—

The Chair: Let her continue on, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Sure.

The Chair: Please answer the question.

D/Commr Barbara George: I phoned the Treasury Board and I gave them the circumstances. I asked if I could take away this man's livelihood. I indicated that there were no criminal charges, but that there was a lot of noise at the time and things would be investigated. The answer was that I was well within my rights to send him home with pay until such time as there would be charges or it looked like we were about to lay charges. That did happen later on.

At this point, Mr. Crupi refused to accept it because he was on ODS, off-duty sick. Shortly thereafter, he resigned.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Ms. Burton, do you think you were a suspect in a criminal investigation?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Do I think I was a suspect?

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Yes.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: No.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Do you think you were a person of interest? Let me put it that way.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I've read that in the transcript, but that is the first I saw of that.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Mr. Frizzell, would you like to comment on this?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: First off, I just want to set the record straight here, since credibility is such a huge issue here. I just went back through my notebook. Before I came here today—earlier in the week—I asked for documents from the investigation so that I could refresh my memory. I was denied those, but I do have my notebook.

The last person I interviewed who was an employee of these folks here was interviewed just over three weeks before this panicked set of phone calls to get rid of me. That person was a middle-aged man whom I distinctly remember not running, yelling and screaming, from the interview room.

The last person I interviewed before that from the HR shop was interviewed months before that, because I had turned my attention to contractors. So I would really like to know who these people are who have made these allegations. I would also like to know, Ms. George being a police officer, why there wasn't an investigation and why we didn't get both sides of the story there.

As far as “person of interest” goes, it's semantics. Ms. Burton was part of the insurance committee; she led that meeting that ended up with a discrepancy between people who were there. The minutes say that the money was authorized; the people who were there who I spoke to said that didn't happen at all. So she most definitely would have been spoken to, had there ever been an investigation.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Mr. Frizzell, in your tape recording that you played into our record, you stated that over half a million dollars had been improperly taken out of the rank and file's insurance fund. Who is the person who gave that order?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I believe it was Ms. George.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: I'd like to table a document. It's dated March 16, 2005, three months after Mr. Lewis requested that a criminal investigation begin. It's referenced in the previous document. It's a letter from Deputy Commissioner Barb George to Peter Foley, regional director, group marketing, Great-West Life Assurance Company. It'll be on the record so that people can read the full text.

It references an amount of \$540,327.36. There's direction here to Mr. Foley for it to be charged to the insurance plans: “We would appreciate this refund no later than March 25, 2005 so that we can adjust our books for the fiscal year end, March 31, 2005.”

•(1650)

The Chair: Okay, then. You're going to table that, and it will be translated and circulated to all the members forthwith.

Mr. Poilievre, you have eight minutes.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Ms. George, are you saying the first time you learned of the reason for Mr. Frizzell's removal from the investigation was in this e-mail that you received just a couple of months ago; that before that, you had no idea why he was removed?

D/Commr Barbara George: When I got the call talking about his interviewing techniques, I had to—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: No, answer my question.

D/Commr Barbara George: I need to put it in context for you.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Before we start, I'm going to be very clear: I'm not going to tolerate any ragging of the puck.

D/Commr Barbara George: I'm sorry?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: I'm not going to tolerate any ragging of the puck here. I have a very clear question. Was February 25, 2007, really the first time you learned of the reason for Mr. Frizzell's dismissal?

It is very simple: either you knew before, or you did not know before.

D/Commr Barbara George: I had known that they had had difficulty with him, that there was difficulty with him. That was very nebulous.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: When did you know that?

D/Commr Barbara George: That would have been when Doug Lang sent me—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: When, roughly? The date, ballpark—2006?

D/Commr Barbara George: I don't have that date. I don't have any of my records. It was at the same time he sent me that memorandum.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: What era are we discussing?

D/Commr Barbara George: June 2005—whenever the investigation was closed down.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: When you were asked on February 21 before this committee the following question, “Can you tell us who it was who removed Mr. Frizzell?”, you said, “No, I'm not aware of who it was. The best I can state is that when Sergeant Frizzell left, I understood he returned to his home division, which was “A” division. I'm being careful with regard to the privacy concerns here, but I understood it was for health reasons.”

So you said before this committee only a month and a half ago that you understood Mr. Frizzell had been removed for health reasons. But now you have produced this spectacular e-mail basically illustrating a monster from whom people went screaming, who caused people to flee in terror, and who was impossible to work with.

So which is it? You said here, before this committee on February 21, that it was for health reasons that he'd been removed, but today you tell a story of his misconduct. Was it his misconduct that led to his removal or was it health reasons, as you said last time?

D/Commr Barbara George: When I spoke to you on February 21, I understood that Frizzell had had many problems, leading with obsessiveness, regarding the investigation, and finally he had gone off-duty sick. The e-mail that's being passed around now—is that David Gork's e-mail? Because I don't see it.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Yes.

D/Commr Barbara George: Okay, look at the date when David Gork responded back to me and gave me that information. That was information I did not have at that time.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: I'm sorry, but I find that very difficult to believe, because you were head of human resources, and if someone in Mr. Frizzell's position had been removed for such spectacular cause as is described in this e-mail, I find it very difficult to believe that you would not have been informed about that before an e-mail.

D/Commr Barbara George: I would not have been informed of that except via Dave Gork at the time, if he so felt, because the decision would have been taken by the operating officer in charge of that investigation.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: But you indicate now that you had found out—

D/Commr Barbara George: Paul Roy had every right to remove any investigator that he deemed fit. He wouldn't have come and asked me. Don't forget, sir, there are 25,000 people in the RCMP. Many of them go off on sick leave or other leave. I'm not informed.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Yes, I know. Well, this wasn't just any one of 25,000 people.

D/Commr Barbara George: No, it wasn't.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: This was someone doing an investigation into misappropriation of funds.

Mr. Frizzell, do you believe that your removal was related to the possibility that you would find Ms. George had illegally directed funds out of the insurance fund?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Yes.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Today Ms. George has given a different story from what she did on February 21 before this committee to explain your removal. She said health reasons on February 21, and today she has an e-mail describing you as someone of great misconduct—

D/Commr Barbara George: Which I just received after my testimony on February 21. I could not have given that information on February 21, as I did not have it, sir.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Yes, I know the date of the e-mail indicates you did not have it, but I find it very hard to believe that if someone in your organization was removed because he sent people running out of meetings, because he was a borderline abusive, you would not have had any idea of that—

• (1655)

D/Commr Barbara George: No.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: —until an e-mail that you suddenly and miraculously received after you testified in this committee, years after the event occurred.

D/Commr Barbara George: I had no business to know this. This was an OPS investigation, and he could have removed or kept on anybody as he so wished.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: How much time do I have?

The Chair: You have two and a half minutes.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Okay.

That I find very interesting and very difficult to believe. I think you will allow me to be skeptical.

I'd like to talk about some of the contracting that went on in the compensation policy centre. Last meeting I brought with me this

KPMG report, Mr. Frizzell, which demonstrates that in one case we have an individual, Mr. Crupi, who gave a contract to Consulting and Audit Canada, which then gave a contract to Abotech, another company, in order to give the contract to a Mr. Onischuk to write policies on contracting. In other words, every one of these people I've just described took a cut of the cake as they went down the line. It's like I take the contract here and I take a piece of the pie and I pass it to my friend, who then takes a piece of the pie; he passes it to his friend, and it gets down to the very end, where Mr. Williams has it. And now he has my document, and he won't want to be touching that document because it's a contract for which you've just been paid, even though you've done absolutely nothing in the way of work. That's what this audit reveals.

Were you finding these kinds of practices in that branch?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Yes, and more. There was also a matter of hiring your wife's friends and paying the contractor, using rough figures, \$400 a day for that person, and they would pay that person \$100 a day. So these were the things that we did not follow up on that—again, I was being obsessive—to me were pretty big deals, when you're giving your buddy contacts for \$400 a day and they're only paying the employee a fraction of that.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: In this case, Consulting and Audit Canada's official, Mr. Brazeau, was actually giving this contract for work of little or no value to his cousin, Mr. David Smith. Were you aware that was going on?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I didn't know they were related, but there was no question it was being directed there, simply so Abotech could make some money.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: And they did no work in exchange for that money.

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: No.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: I guess it's the old saying, where you get by with a little help from your friends. A cousin gives a contract to a cousin to pass the contract off to another individual to write policies on contracting.

I'll conclude by saying somebody up here is not giving the full picture. I want to thank Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Frizzell for being here and answering some of these tough questions, because they brought a lot of light to this situation. That's why we need this independent investigator to do his work swiftly and, if necessary, to pursue an eventual public inquiry.

So thank you very much for being here.

The Chair: Mr. Williams.

Mr. John Williams: On a point of order, I would ask that you again remind the witnesses that they are required to give fulsome answers, to tell all that they know to questions, to a parliamentary committee.

The Chair: Well, Mr. Williams, I think I have advised them of that already, and I think they all are aware of that and don't need to be advised again.

Colleagues, I understand that the bells will be ringing at 5:30. We can go five minutes into the bells. I have a couple of questions myself, but then we have seven more people on the list. I'll probably go three and a half minutes. I will use the gavel, and I apologize for that, but this is going to be very firm.

I have a question for you, Mr. Roy. In my understanding, there's a lot of talk about the situation of the removal of Staff Sergeant Frizzell from this investigation. You said you were shutting the thing down that day or the day after, but the evidence is that you instructed Mr. Gork to have him removed. Is that correct?

• (1700)

Mr. Paul Roy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to address that issue.

The investigation took 15 months. When we got to the month of May, we had four interviews to do in order to complete the criminal part of the investigation. Throughout the investigation there were several consultations with the provincial crown attorney as to the direction in which we should be going and what we needed. At that point I was satisfied that we had the information that was required for the provincial crown attorney to address.

From that point on, investigators were allowed to return to their home unit, at different dates, once they were finished with the tasking that I had given to them. Mr. Frizzell stayed until the end of the investigation. Basically we were vacating the location the last week of June. We were finished with the report. The brief to the Crown had been fully given to the Crown. Meetings were ongoing between the Crown, myself, and Staff Sergeant Stephen St. Jacques. Also, we were in the process of writing the report. There were no interviews to be done. The investigation was basically over.

On June 20, I informed Superintendent Doug Lang, who was my liaison officer in the absence of Assistant Commissioner Gork when he was in Lyons, France, that it was time for Mike to go back. However, there were tasks to be done before he left, which was basically to package his notebooks and e-mails, which is what we were doing to vacate, basically.

The Chair: You were the investigator in charge.

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, I was.

The Chair: You've heard testimony from Ms. George that this gentleman was removed because of all the offensive behaviour, which I will not go into now. Do you agree with that, or do you disagree with it?

Mr. Paul Roy: There were some conflicts during the course of the investigation that Staff Sergeant Frizzell was involved with. However, they were manageable, from my perspective, and it was reported to me that we could go along right to the end. He had a report to produce. He was a valuable member in the sense that he had a lot of information to offer, and I needed his input for the final report.

Once that was done, that was when I informed Superintendent Doug Lang, and I also informed Assistant Commissioner Gork. I spoke to him on the phone that week because he was returning to Ottawa from Lyons in order to attend a meeting the last week of June or the first week of July. Assistant Commissioner Gork was aware because I had briefed him on ongoing resource issues, which

included comportsment of RCMP members, because I did not have jurisdiction over the comportsment of these officers.

The Chair: This suggestion that Staff Sergeant Frizzell was removed from this investigation based upon your instructions is not a correct suggestion?

Mr. Paul Roy: I don't agree with the term "removed". He was not removed. He was returned to his own unit once the criminal investigation was over.

The Chair: With respect to all this evidence we heard about the order being served on Staff Sergeant Mike Frizzell having to deal with the way he was interviewing, etc., you, as the chief investigator of this very extensive file, do not agree with that evidence?

Mr. Paul Roy: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but I have not seen that document that you're talking about.

The Chair: You've heard of it. The evidence—

• (1705)

Mr. Paul Roy: I've heard about it.

The Chair: You've heard it here—

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes.

The Chair:—that the evidence was clear that because of the way he was interviewing and the way he was conducting himself, the decision was made at the highest levels of the RCMP to have him taken off this investigation. There was the suggestion that this was done at your behest, and you're saying it wasn't at your behest.

Now, my secondary question is: the evidence that they used to serve the order—I know you haven't seen the order—you don't agree with?

Mr. Paul Roy: No, I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify this. It was done on my behalf. Certainly it was done on my behalf that he was to return to his own unit, and there were some situations over the course of the investigation, yes.

The Chair: Did you ask—and I know you didn't have jurisdiction over this gentleman—the senior officials, the people you had liaison with, that Staff Sergeant Frizzell be removed from this investigation because of his behaviour?

Mr. Paul Roy: I asked that he be returned to his own unit once the investigation was over, the criminal investigation.

The Chair: Of course. I guess we're not going to get to the bottom of this.

Again, colleagues, it's three minutes. These are going to be short snappers. I'd ask that you conduct yourself accordingly.

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, you have three minutes, and the gavel comes down.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Sure.

Mr. Roy, you used to work for the Ottawa Police. Did you ever work for or were you seconded to work for the RCMP?

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, I was, for one year, in 2001.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Who did you work for?

Mr. Paul Roy: I worked for.... I understand—

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Did you work under Ms. George?

Mr. Paul Roy: I did.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: I see. Who did you work next—

Mr. Paul Roy: I worked for Chief Superintendent Cal Corley, and following that Ms. George came in the picture.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Okay. You worked under Ms. George previous to this criminal investigation.

Who did you work next to? Do you work near Ms. Rosalie Burton, next to her?

Mr. Paul Roy: I worked mostly with Mr. Fraser Macaulay, I worked with Dennis Fodor, and Ms. Burton came in the picture about half way through my secondment with the RCMP, yes.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: I see.

Mr. Ewanovich was appointed by former commissioner Zaccardelli. A criminal investigation begins two days into it. When he hears about it, he shuts it down. After the efforts of a number of whistleblowers, finally the inquiry comes to a conclusion. Mr. Zaccardelli quite clearly instructs Ms. George to.... He removes Mr. Ewanovich. She removes Mr. Crupi. The guidelines of the Public Service Staff Relations Act says that he's to leave without pay; however, he continues to receive pay. It's quite an amazing tale.

Ms. Burton, you were a person of interest. We've just heard of minutes of meetings that don't reflect what took place in those meetings. Ms. Burton, I'm curious, because there are so many interconnecting relationships here. When did you first meet Mr. Ewanovich?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I met Jim Ewanovich several years ago when I was a student at the University of Ottawa and I had a panel of guest speakers in. I was the vice-president of the human resources committee and I invited speakers in from the public and private sectors to share career—

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Thank you.

Did you previously work with him also at Treasury Board, or subsequently?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I worked for him at the Treasury Board Secretariat, yes.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Did Mr. Ewanovich in fact recruit you to come over to the RCMP? I think you stated that previously.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: No, I did not state that previously.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Did he?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: No, he did not.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Did he have anything to do with having you regularized as a public service employee?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: Regularized as a public service employee?

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Yes.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: That's 20-odd years ago you're asking me to recall.

No, actually it was Larry McCloskey, director of the Public Service Commission.

The Chair: Mr. Sweet, you have three minutes.

Mr. David Sweet (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, CPC): Thank you, Chairman.

Very quickly, Mr. Roy, did Sergeant Frizzell understand the intricacies of the investigation? He worked with you for quite some time on this.

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, he did.

Mr. David Sweet: He did clearly? There was no doubt in your mind he understood it clearly?

Mr. Paul Roy: He understood.

Mr. David Sweet: I have a real problem, Madam George. Assistant Commissioner Gork is moved to France. Sergeant Frizzell is removed from the investigation. Superintendent Macaulay is seconded to DND. As for Denise Revine, after 33 years her job is dissolved. Jim Ewanovich and Dominic Crupi are suspended with pay. A junior officer actually initiates an investigation insubordinately with an A Division commander and is not disciplined for it. John Spice, the integrity officer, is gone. There's no doubt in my mind that the circumstances seem out of control here when everybody who was involved in the investigation seemingly is absent without leave.

Sergeant Frizzell, you mentioned in your testimony earlier that you felt that Barbara George was involved in misappropriation of funds. Is that correct?

● (1710)

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Yes.

Mr. David Sweet: Could you please expand on that for me? What were the indications that this was the case?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I explained to Ms. George in person and in great detail, and apparently, according to Mr. Gork, quite simply, the whole insurance deal, why the money was being taken out of the members' insurance plans without authorization and without any legislative support. So she very well knew, even not taking into account that she's in charge of that unit. Actually, I was told that it was orders from her as to why the almost \$600,000 was taken out of the insurance funds in March 2005.

Mr. David Sweet: Okay.

Quickly, Mr. Roy, is it uncommon for an investigative officer to use a baited voice mail message in order to extract truthful testimony from a witness? Is that uncommon or inappropriate?

Mr. Paul Roy: I'm not saying it's inappropriate.

Mr. David Sweet: Thank you very much.

So you're saying, Mr. Frizzell, that these issues with the pension and the insurance fund continued after Mr. Ewanovich was gone.

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Yes.

Mr. David Sweet: Okay.

In the voice mail you tabled in the committee, you referred to a meeting with Paul Gauvin. What was said at that meeting?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: That's up for debate. What I heard at that meeting was that the commissioner had asserted that it was indeed the RCMP's responsibility to administer the insurance funds. This was less than two weeks after four of our members were gunned down at Mayerthorpe, so it was a very sensitive issue. He asserted that of course the RCMP was responsible for the administration, they would take over it right away, the money would no longer be drained from the members' accounts, but they would have to go to Treasury Board to see if they could get authorization to pay back all the money that had been drained over the years.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Sweet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lussier, for three minutes.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: In your opening remarks, Mr. Roy, you referred to your service record and also spoke about the Property & Enterprise Crime Units.

Was the Ottawa Police Service your last employer?

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: And you had been assigned to this special unit.

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Are you familiar with IMET, the Integrated Market Enforcement Team?

Mr. Paul Roy: No, I can't say that I am. Are you referring to an RCMP unit?

Mr. Marcel Lussier: The unit is operated jointly by the RCMP and the Ottawa Police Service.

Mr. Paul Roy: I believe you're referring to the investigations unit. We call it the Hi-Tech Crime Unit.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: I see.

Are you familiar with the Joint Securities Intelligence Unit?

Mr. Paul Roy: We may refer to these units by slightly different names.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: This unit investigates property crimes.

Have you ever worked with Mr. David Braun?

Mr. Paul Roy: No, I have not.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Do you know the man?

Mr. Paul Roy: No, I do not.

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Thank you.

According to one of these documents, when you were relieved of your duties, you were removed fairly quickly from your office and the data on your computer was destroyed.

Is that correct?

[*English*]

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I was not removed from the office. I was given the order that basically said, get out, but only after you've cleaned up. After thinking about it for a short time, I decided that I would just get out. I left my computer behind since it belongs to the

RCMP, not to me. But yes, it was wiped, and I find that highly unusual.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Did you lose any data?

[*English*]

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I lost all the data.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Is this data stored somewhere?

[*English*]

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Some of it was on the jump drive, but it went missing from my desk in August 2005, so there are no more backups.

• (1715)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lussier: Thank you.

Mr. Roy, has the money that was taken from the pension fund been returned? Did your investigation shed light on who returned the money to the fund?

Mr. Paul Roy: We identified certain losses or certain sums that were directed to programs other than the pension fund. At one point, we were advised that certain sums of money had been returned to the pension fund.

[*English*]

The Chair: *Merci beaucoup.*

Mr. Lake, you have three minutes.

Mr. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Mill Woods—Beaumont, CPC): Ms. George, this is baffling to me as I go through this. I go back to yesterday and Mr. Zaccardelli. It seems that every time anybody got close to anything, they were removed. Obviously this was one of the most important things going on in the RCMP at the time, at least in the long term.

So Macaulay comes forward, and not for any good reason, not because he was wrong or did anything illegal. It sounds as though he was removed for his own benefit. He was removed from any access to any of the information. Then shortly afterwards, Denise Ravine was gone, and she was removed from access to any kind of information. Later, Assistant Commissioner Gork was removed and sent to France.

As you can imagine, it doesn't look so good. We're sitting here faced with three members in uniform, at least one of whom isn't telling the truth, based on testimony we heard. This is hard. I'm sure it's very difficult for people watching this to believe what is going on in this great institution.

First, I want to go back to this privacy concern with Staff Sergeant Frizzell. Are you all right with your privacy now, if she tells us what those health reasons were that she couldn't reveal before, for privacy reasons?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: I believe what Ms. George said is that any health reasons that I may or may not have had occurred after I was given the order—not before.

Mr. Mike Lake: Ms. George, what were the health reasons? You clearly said that there was a reason you couldn't tell the full story last time, but you definitely understood that it was for health reasons.

D/Commr Barbara George: I believe those were stress related at the time.

Mr. Mike Lake: Okay. But now we find out that there were all sorts of issues here regarding members of the RCMP in tears and people running out of offices screaming.

You were the chief human resources officer at the time. Would someone running out of an office in tears be considered a human resources issue? Would that be normal? Is this not something that would be brought to your department's attention—that there's a monster on the loose and people are running away from him in tears?

D/Commr Barbara George: Nobody used the words “monster on the loose”, sir. When my DG, Rosalie Burton, came and said, “Barb, people are running out of the office in tears, upset, and their units are seeing them; they're chasing them out of the office”, that's when we spoke of potential harassment behaviour.

I did my due diligence. I called and asked that Sergeant Frizzell be spoken with and asked to temper his—

Mr. Mike Lake: You were aware of people running out in tears?

D/Commr Barbara George: From my DG, yes.

Mr. Mike Lake: So this information that was sent to you on February 25 isn't new; you were actually aware of those things at the time.

D/Commr Barbara George: That's why I made the call to Assistant Commissioner LaFosse.

Whether this is the same information I don't know, since there were other instances in which, according to what Dave Gork wrote, interviews were lost because Sergeant Frizzell became overly emotional.

The Chair: Okay, we have to move on now, Mike. I'm sorry.

It's Mr. Christopherson, for three minutes.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you very much, Chair.

And Chair, just to advise, at the end of the meeting I'd like the opportunity to place a motion that would have us return this panel of witnesses for a further meeting.

Ms. Burton, in your opening statement you said that one of the employees identified for surplus was Denise Revine. This would be as a result of the restructuring. Is that the reason that she no longer had a job: because you restructured, and she was just...the music stopped and there was no chair for her to sit down on?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: No, prior to my arrival there was a decision taken, and 12 individuals were identified to be declared surplus. Denise Revine was one of the 12, and the file indicated that this was on or before September 11, 2003.

• (1720)

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you.

The deputy commissioner gave testimony at an earlier meeting that—for the third time—Sergeant Frizzell left for health reasons. The deputy testified that Mr. Crupi left for health reasons. And you

should know that the deputy testified that Ms. Revine had health issues.

I'm having trouble with this. Was it because it was restructured, or were there health reasons? Which was it, in your opinion?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I implemented the budget decisions that were made prior to my arrival. That was the only information I had at that time, as I recall.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you.

Ms. Revine states that her position was cut. She said that under oath.

Here is a further quote: “...I was the only one who did not have a position...[identified]. In April, they gave me a letter saying that my position...[was being] abolished.”

And the deputy commissioner said, “I believe that on her doctor's orders she has been precluded from working within the office, and I believe there are issues there. We have accommodated her, and as I said, she has been working from home.”

Again, the testimony leads one to believe that this great favour was being done for Ms. Revine, who had problems, but you're suggesting to us that it was for structural reasons. Do you stand by this?

Let me ask you this question. Did anybody at all ever have any discussions with you in any regard at all with respect to Ms. Revine's position within the organization, or about her? Did anybody ever talk to you about her in any way, shape, or form—about her work, her job, her future, anything ever—anyone you can recall?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I can recall having a conversation. She was declared surplus. She received her letter in April, and that was based on a budget decision. That's the information I had at that time.

I can recall a conversation down the road that I had with a peer of mine, a director general in human resources, Assistant Commissioner Kevin Mole, and I asked him if he had meaningful work for Denise Revine—she was a PE-6, director level—and if he did, would he please contact her directly and make arrangements as soon as possible. And he did, to the best of my knowledge, do that.

So I did have that conversation with him, but it was a couple of months later.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, you have three minutes.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Ms. Revine whistle-blows on potential serious criminality involving Mr. Ewanovich. She goes to her superior, Mr. Macaulay. Mr. Ewanovich, whom you've known since your university days, invited him to university to a panel, and soon afterwards Ms. Revine is deemed surplus, Mr. Macaulay is moved off by Mr. Zaccardelli to DND, and Mr. Ewanovich selects you, Ms. Burton, to replace Mr. Macaulay in his position. Is that correct?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: My understanding is that it was not Mr. Ewanovich who selected me to replace Chief Superintendent Fraser Macaulay.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: Mr. Macaulay, would you like to clarify that?

C/Supt Fraser Macaulay: There would be a selection board run by, at that time, I believe...well, it would have been Barb George, who was the Assistant Commissioner of EODR at that point. That would be her role, along with the senior executive committee that makes that decision.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: Thank you.

Deputy Commissioner George, on December 17, 2003, you received a formal complaint alleging fraudulent activity in the accrual, usage, and cash-out of leave for Mr. Ewanovich. In your response to the complaint, you indicated that you were satisfied that Assistant Commissioner Gork had conducted a very in-depth and professional investigation and that the conclusions were sound.

Chair, I'll be tabling some additional documents today. I've already tabled leave documents recording that on January 6, 2004, two weeks after you received the complaint and the investigation had already been initiated, the leave file was significantly altered.

Deputy Commissioner George, is that not obstruction of justice?

D/Commr Barbara George: That leave file was not in my hands, and I don't believe Jim Ewanovich had it in his hands either.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: Is that not obstruction of justice?

• (1725)

D/Commr Barbara George: I'd have to look at the file. This was turned over to Dave Gork, who undertook that investigation.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: If it's correct that it was adjusted two weeks afterwards, is that not obstruction of justice?

D/Commr Barbara George: Mr. Wrzesnewskij, with all due respect, I'd have to ask you a question, as an investigator. Was the leave file updated? Had it been left un-updated? I don't know what happened there, so I can't answer that.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij: So we have heard allegations of the destruction of evidence and now of alteration of documents, alteration of minutes. We have also heard that there were communications with the government, with the Ministry of Justice, about deciding what evidence will be brought forward before us.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Do you have a response, Ms. George?

D/Commr Barbara George: I don't know exactly which one to address. But I'll talk about the leave document. Oftentimes, people have leave documents—anybody can have a leave document—and they have taken leave, but they have not updated.

Now, I cannot speak for Mr. Ewanovich; he's not here. I don't know whether his staff updated his document to show that the time had been taken. This should have been looked at by Assistant Commissioner Gork, when he undertook the whole investigation into Mr. Ewanovich's leave file.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, you have three minutes.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick (Prince Albert, CPC): Ms. Burton, you were in charge of the insurance end of the operation, and you must

have been questioned by Sergeant Frizzell. Did you find his kind of questioning personally harassing to you?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: I want to be very clear here—

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Just answer my question, please.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: The insurance—

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Yes or no.

Ms. Rosalie Burton: The insurance program is chaired by a deputy commissioner of central region, and I am not in charge of the insurance program.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Did you find the investigation harassing when he was questioning you?

Ms. Rosalie Burton: He did not interview me as a witness, sir.

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Obviously I didn't make much of an impression.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: A point, Mr. Frizzell, let's get it out there. When you're under suspicion of wrongdoing and you're being investigated, is it not unusual for the wrongdoer to believe that he's being harassed a bit?

S/Sgt Mike Frizzell: Normally you're informed of these allegations as well.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Right, especially if you're involved with the RCMP, I would think you would jump to that conclusion.

I want to get to the outsourcing thing.

Mr. Roy, this is very important. I want you to give a clearcut answer on this and not beat around the bush. Did this investigation try to pursue all of these multiple contracts for little or no value with the outsourcing scheme? Did this investigation go down that avenue and thoroughly investigate this area? Yes or no.

Mr. Paul Roy: We investigated all the outsourcing contracts.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: So you investigated Mr. Smith, Abotech, and all these groups?

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, the specific contract you're referring to was packaged as a result of discussion with the Crown. It was put on its own and is being investigated by RCMP's A Division.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Okay.

This is very careful too. Did Ms. Burton ever contact you and indicate that Sergeant Frizzell was being abusive and harassing in the way he was carrying on things? Think carefully about the answer.

Mr. Paul Roy: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Did Ms. Burton ever contact you during the investigation and suggest that Sergeant Frizzell was being a bit too aggressive and abusive in his investigation?

Mr. Paul Roy: Yes, she did.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Okay.

Did you have any discussions afterwards about that with Assistant Commissioner Gork?

Mr. Paul Roy: No.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick: Okay.

Mr. Poilievre has an area he wants to pursue.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Yes, did you say that the Abotech contract is under investigation? Did you say that it is under investigation now?

Mr. Paul Roy: I don't know if it is under investigation now, but it was handed off to A Division.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: It was handed off to A Division, and we don't know what happened.

Mr. Paul Roy: That's right, for further investigation, criminal investigation.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Ms. George, can you tell me, has the investigation through A Division gone anywhere?

D/Commr Barbara George: I'm not in charge of A Division. I'm sorry, I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: To conclude, can we get a copy of the tape that is mentioned in this famous e-mail, which we received, the third point from David Gork? He described this spectacular moment, with Mr. Frizzell's becoming emotional and ending the interview unprofessionally. It says here, "This is on tape."

Can you have that tape tabled for this committee?

• (1730)

D/Commr Barbara George: I have no access to my office, but I will certainly make that request for you.

By the way—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: You're obviously in contact with Mr. Gork, because you've got this e-mail here, so....

D/Commr Barbara George: Read the date of that e-mail, please.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: I'd just like to hear this tape. It sounds fascinating.

The Chair: Is that tape not the tape that we're talking about, that was played here, and we transcribed it?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: No, it's not.

The Chair: Perhaps if I can get from you, Deputy Commissioner—

Mr. John Williams: We can just send a request to the commissioner directly. We'll get the clerk to do it.

The Chair: Okay.

I have one question again, and I'm just going to spend a minute on it. I'm going to go back to you, Inspector Roy.

It's an interesting point here about Staff Sergeant Frizzell's removal. You were—and I'm going to come back—the chief investigator. This was supposedly an independent investigation. It was your decision as to who was doing what. If there were any impropriety, wrong reviews, aggressiveness, harassment, it was your problem, and it was your problem to deal with it. Now, I know you answered the question before. You said that because the investigation was over, you wanted everyone returned to their previous positions. Did you ask Barbara George or Gork or anyone else to have Staff Sergeant Frizzell removed because of improper behaviour?

Mr. Paul Roy: I asked David Gork to have him removed because of improper behaviour and also because the investigation was over.

The Chair: What was the nature of this improper behaviour?

Mr. Paul Roy: There were several incidents during the course of the investigation.

The Chair: What were these incidents?

Mr. Paul Roy: I would have to go back and get the details of this, Mr. Chair. I do not have my—

The Chair: Okay, I'm going to get an undertaking from you to do that—get the details as to why you went to Mr. Gork with this—and provide that to the committee in writing.

Mr. John Williams: Mr. Chairman, I just have to say again, you questioned Mr. Roy about this particular issue, and he mentioned that he had had problems and that there had been problems with Staff Sergeant Frizzell, but he did not give us the information, and he practically circled and went all the way around and avoided giving us the information that he had talked to Assistant Commissioner Gork.

They are required, Mr. Chairman, to give fulsome answers to this committee—no beating around the bush, no evasiveness, no half truths, bit of truths, or some of the truth. We are entitled to fulsome answers. I want to know why police officers at this committee are finding that they have to evade giving decent and fulsome answers when they're asked simple and direct questions.

The Chair: Mr. Williams, you're quite correct. I asked the question before, and he said there were issues, but they were quite manageable. Now we're getting a different story, so it's disturbing. I know that.

The bells are ringing.

Mr. Christopherson, you have a motion. There is a meeting of the steering committee on Monday. Would you prefer...?

Mr. David Christopherson: No, Chair. I think I have enough votes now, so I'd like to proceed.

The Chair: You have enough votes now...I see.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: That's reassuring. That's democracy in action.

This will only take a minute, if witnesses would just remain where they are. Mr. Christopherson has a motion, and I'm going to ask him to read it or put it on the record.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you very much, Chair.

I move that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts hold another meeting with the same witnesses who appeared on April 18, 2007, and that Ms. Denise Revine be invited back to this meeting also.

The Chair: Before that goes any further, Mr. Christopherson, as he knows, needs unanimous consent to take it any further. Does Mr. Christopherson have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay, then I'm going to proceed right to the question, because the bells are ringing.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Now we have another motion from Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, but again I will just take that as notice and put it in the next—

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: I could read the motion, Chair, and we'll see whether or not there's unanimous consent on this. If not, then we'll have to wait until the next meeting:

That retired RCMP Sergeant Keith Esterbrooks appear before the Public Accounts Committee and that he should bring along all relevant documents and files which indicate the suppression of access to information requested by Mr. Gauvin, and that retired Sergeant Keith Esterbrooks bring along with him the files with the following ATIP number involving pension fund investigation:

and I list off the numbers.

• (1735)

The Chair: You don't have to read them.

Before this goes any further, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj needs unanimous consent to table or discuss the motion.

Does Mr. Wrzesnewskyj have unanimous consent?

Mr. John Williams: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to say no, and I'll tell you why. We're talking about boxes of documents that are not translated, 99% chance. You can't come in here with boxes of documents and quote from them ad hoc when other committee members can't even have access to them.

If the steering committee wants to bring this gentleman forward, I don't have a problem, but let's translate all the documents before they come here so that everybody has access to them. Let's do it properly through the steering committee.

The Chair: Okay, Mr. Williams, you've made your point.

Mr. Wrzesnewskyj—

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I'm not going to go to debate. You do not have unanimous consent.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: On a point of order, actually, I don't think we have a problem with Mr. Wrzesnewskyj's motion, if I've heard right. The only stipulation is that—

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: It be translated.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: —the relevant documents be translated. So if we can just add that, is that a friendly amendment?

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: It's a friendly amendment.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Okay, there we go.

Mr. John Williams: Before he comes.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Yes. It's a friendly amendment, Chair.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: It's a friendly amendment, accepted.

The Chair: Well, it's not what Mr. Williams said, but I mean—

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: That's the way I understood it, Chair.

The Chair: Well, he said no. I asked whether there was unanimous consent, and he said no.

Mr. John Williams: I have no problem with the witness coming forward, Mr. Chairman, provided the documents are translated and distributed before he gets here.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Wonderful.

The Chair: Is it a friendly amendment?

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj: Absolutely.

Mr. Pierre Poilievre: Okay, there we go.

The Chair: Okay, does Mr. Wrzesnewskyj have unanimous consent to put the motion, with the amendment?

Okay, all are in agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest: That's with the translated documents? Agreed.

[*English*]

The Chair: I'll call the vote on the motion.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: In closing, I want to thank the witnesses again. I know it has been a quick ending and I know this is a difficult issue for a lot of people, so I want to thank you for your appearance here.

The meeting is adjourned.

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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada 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.