



House of Commons  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates**

---

OGGO • NUMBER 033 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, October 28, 2010**

—  
**Chair**

**The Honourable John McKay**



## Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates

Thursday, October 28, 2010

•(0845)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.)):** I'd like to call to order the 33rd meeting of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates. We have with us representatives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Canada Border Services Agency, and the OPP.

Each of you has been briefed on the allotted time you have for your opening statements. I assume that each and every one of you, being sophisticated police officers and security representatives, knows how this operation works.

Without further ado, I'll ask Royal Canadian Mounted Police Chief Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil to lead off with his opening statement, please.

Thank you.

**Chief Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil (Division Operations Commander 2010 of the G8 and G20, Integrated Security Unit, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** Thank you very much.

Good morning.

My name is Chief Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil. Since the fall of 2008, I have been the division operations commander for the G-8 and G-20 integrated security unit. With me today is Alain Séguin. Mr. Séguin is the RCMP's chief financial and administrative officer.

We would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to appear before you to discuss matters surrounding the security budget for the G-8 and G-20 summits.

The RCMP was the lead agency responsible for security for the G-8 and G-20. Guided by a number of acts and regulations, the RCMP was mandated to ensure the safety and security of all internationally protected persons during the summits. Additionally, we had primary responsibility to ensure the security for the proper functioning of the meetings.

Our security planners were faced with numerous challenges. Once we received confirmation that the G-20 would be held on the same weekend as the G-8, we had to drastically change our scope and budget. This was the first time that a G-8 and a G-20 occurred in the same country and at the same time.

The result was the largest domestic deployment of security personnel in Canadian history. More than 20,000 security personnel

were required to secure two separate events with two separate footprints—in Huntsville and Toronto. In addition, we were responsible for 24-hour personal protection of 92 internationally protected persons and assisting with delegations in the thousands, securing a site for thousands of media personnel, and clearing them to enter the secure sites, securing sites outside of the restricted zones, and handling air, land, marine, and subterranean security.

As I said, the RCMP and its security partners were responsible for securing a meeting of virtually all senior government leaders from around the world. As you can imagine, gathering that many influential people in one area creates vulnerabilities. It was essential that an appropriate level of security be provided for an event of this magnitude.

Based on a medium threat assessment, the RCMP and its partners created security plans that were scalable to ensure our clients were kept safe and that security was in place for the proper functioning of the meetings. The RCMP security budget for the summits was \$507.5 million.

The RCMP worked closely with key public safety and security partners to ensure that the security plans were comprehensive, integrated, and took into account the exceptional needs of hosting two separate major events over the same weekend with such a large number of world leaders and delegates.

The security plans for these two events were derived from a fiscally responsible vulnerability-based planning model. All security costs incurred were spent as per government policies and guidelines and in the most efficient and cost-effective way possible.

Where possible, the RCMP entered into joint procurement with other police services for shared assets. In addition, the RCMP used equipment from other major events, like the Olympics, and will be placing back into inventory any assets that we purchased. These assets will be used for future major events. Any equipment with a shorter shelf life is being distributed to areas where it can be used immediately on a cost-recovery basis.

Securing the G-8 and G-20 summits came with a price tag, but at the end of the day, the RCMP and its security partners delivered on our mandate of keeping everyone safe and secure and ensuring the world leaders were able to conduct their meetings. We were faced with incredible challenges and we were successful in meeting all of them.

I remain proud and confident in the role that the RCMP and the ISU played in this successful security operation.

Thank you.

• (0850)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Chief Superintendent.

From the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, Mr. Boisvert.

**Mr. Ray Boisvert (Assistant Director Intelligence, Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS)):** Good morning.

My name is Ray Boisvert. I'm the assistant director intelligence for the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, CSIS. I'm joined by the service's chief financial officer, Laura Danagher. We're pleased to join our colleagues from partner agencies here today to speak to the costs related to security for the G-8 and G-20 summits.

The mandate of CSIS, as spelled out in the Canadian Security Intelligence Service Act, is to collect and analyze threats to the security of Canada and to report on them to our various government partners so they may take appropriate action in accordance with their mandates and responsibilities.

In the context of the summits, the primary responsibility of the service was to assist the RCMP and Canada Border Services Agency to provide accreditation to those requiring access to secure sites linked to the summits. The service's main focus in this process was to ensure that only those with legitimate requirements to access these sites were accredited. This was done in adherence to the service's continued efforts to circumvent terrorists or foreign agents from entering Canada, or sensitive areas, under false pretenses. It is estimated that CSIS conducted security checks on up to 20,000 accreditation requests received in relation to the two summits.

[Translation]

CSIS was also called upon to support its partners, including the RCMP, in evaluating and monitoring threats before and during the event. CSIS contributed to summit updates prepared by the Integrated Threat Assessment Centre (ITAC) in the months and weeks leading up to the event, and to daily updates issued during the summits.

CSIS was also active on the ground as part of the Joint Intelligence Group (JIG), the multi-agency intelligence fusion centre that worked to ensure the safety of summit sites and participants.

[English]

As the CSIS director stated prior to the summits, the service's primary concern at the time was the threat posed by multi-issue extremists and violent anarchist organizations. Much of the intelligence that we provided to our government partners in the context of the summits related to our knowledge of possible violence being planned or contemplated by individuals associated with these groups.

[Translation]

In total, as of September 30, 2010, CSIS expenses related to our work in support of security at the two summits totalled just over \$2 million—\$2,009,000, to be exact.

[English]

We thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and, of course, we look forward to your questions.

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

From the Canada Border Services Agency, we have Sylvain St-Laurent.

[Translation]

**Mr. Sylvain St-Laurent (Vice-President, Comptrollership Branch, Canada Border Services Agency):** Good morning. My name is Sylvain St-Laurent, and I am Vice-President of the Comptrollership Branch and Senior Financial Officer at the Canada Border Services Agency.

[English]

I would first like to thank the committee for inviting the Canada Border Services Agency to participate in this important discussion regarding our role and expenditures related to the G-8 and G-20 summits.

Over the four-day period leading up to the summits, the CBSA processed over 604 heads of state, foreign ministers, royalty, and heads of world organizations, as well as approximately 2,000 people in their immediate entourages. In addition, the CBSA also processed over 250 individuals via ministerial level courtesy clearances for the over 90 preparatory visits in the six months preceding the summits. The agency is proud of its employees for their professional handling of such an unprecedented volume of diplomatic entourages without incident.

As this is of key interest to the committee, I would like to spend a moment discussing the expenses of the agency with regard to the summits.

The CBSA's expenses for the summits, both for the planning stages and their execution, were essentially associated with salary expenditures. The agency received \$1.13 million and spent \$1.26 million, a difference of about \$126,000, to support these summits for the following main activities: project coordination and planning; risk management; operational delivery; and post-event review.

The incremental salary costs were mainly a result of CBSA's participation in the joint intelligence group in Barrie, and mostly for border services officers processing delegates and media, both at the infield terminal and at airports across the country, as well as for officers assisting the RCMP with baggage screening and special clearance requests. Officers were brought in from nearby locations and regions for operational delivery, and these resources were then backfilled in their home organizations using overtime expenditures.

The summit management office determined that the summit participants' primary airport of arrival would be the infield terminal at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, which is not, for CBSA, a port of entry that is normally operational. The site was refurbished by Public Works and included CBSA satellite office space, equipment, and personnel necessary to receive and clear the delegations.

• (0855)

[Translation]

Resources were also invested to support marine operations officers, who provided assistance to Toronto Police Services with mandatory verifications of all pleasure craft during the summit period and a joint presence on the waterways to ensure security.

Money also went to the accreditation and risk assessment processes. Investments were made in the Emergency Preparedness Regional Operations Centre, as well as a 24/7 Joint Intelligence Group in Barrie. Lastly, money was spent on telecommunications equipment for our officers.

To support all of these activities, the CBSA received \$1.13 million dollars. Our final expenditures came to \$1.26 million, for a difference of \$126,000.

I thank the committee for the opportunity to make this presentation, and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. St-Laurent.

[English]

We now have Ontario Provincial Police Superintendent Tim Charlebois.

**Superintendent Tim Charlebois (Planning and Operations Lead, 2010 G8/G20 Summits, Field Support Bureau, Ontario Provincial Police):** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of Commissioner Lewis, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

By way of background, I was the OPP operations and planning lead for the G-8 and G-20 summits. It was my responsibility to develop and implement all aspects of security planning, along with related financial and budgetary expenditures. Ms. Davis, who is with me here today, was responsible for overseeing all aspects of summit-related finances and administration and reported to me within the OPP G-8 structure.

The 2010 G-8 and G-20 summits were extraordinary events in the history of Ontario and, in particular, the Ontario Provincial Police. This was the largest security operation ever undertaken in the 100-year history of the OPP. Having said that, the OPP has a great deal of experience in multi-agency operations and security events.

Events of the magnitude of the G-8 and G-20 summits occur infrequently in Canada and therefore create unique and challenging issues for security planners, as well as affording the opportunity to solidify best practices, develop new strategies, and build on existing relationships amongst our security partners. As well, the physical location of any summit will inherently create new challenges for planners that are unique to that event and need to be overcome. In each of the above areas, I believe we were successful.

In events of this nature, there are existing legislative responsibilities, both federally and provincially, as to the roles and responsibilities of security partners. For the G-8/G-20 summits, the RCMP had specific responsibilities for internationally protected persons under the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act. The OPP, as the police of jurisdiction for the G-8, were required to provide policing services consistent with the Police Services Act of Ontario. During the G-20 summit, the OPP provided additional resources to the Toronto Police Service as the police of jurisdiction and to the RCMP to support the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

During the G-8 planning process, the OPP were provided planning assumptions by the RCMP on which to base objectives and

strategies to meet the security needs of the summit. As well, the OPP were required to work within financial guidelines and policies provided by Public Safety Canada. A cost contribution agreement was successfully negotiated between Ontario and Canada.

Consistent with the assumptions provided, the OPP developed a concept of operations for the OPP planning team to begin to develop strategies and financial projections. The concepts and financial projections were reviewed by the OPP planning leads, and refined planning direction was given. All planning for the G-8 summit was conducted within a joint operational planning group comprised of the OPP, RCMP, and Canadian Forces. This ensured consistency in planning and operational objectives and within mandates.

With the addition of the G-20 summit, the OPP continually reviewed the related security impacts on the G-8 and, in consultation with security partners, refined strategies, objectives, and our financial projections. Where possible, joint procurement procedures were established to reduce costs.

On behalf of my organization, and as the OPP lead for the 2010 G-8/G-20 summits, I would like to extend to the committee and Canadians that OPP security planning and operations were prepared and implemented to meet the extensive security requirements of the G-8/G-20 summits and within established OPP and provincial policy, oversight, and close scrutiny.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today. I'd be pleased to answer your questions.

• (0900)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Superintendent Charlebois.

Thank you to all the witnesses. We'll now open it up to questioning by members.

The first person is Madam Coady for eight minutes, please.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady (St. John's South—Mount Pearl, Lib.):** Thank you very much.

Thank you to each of you for taking the time from your very hectic schedules to be here today. We certainly appreciate it.

This is all about the budget and all about the financial requirements for the G-8/G-20. As you can appreciate, it was such a large number. We have questions we need to ask you so that we can be assured of the correct spending procedures we have within the government.

I also want to thank you for all that you do for our country. Thank you very much for that.

My first question, I guess, is a general one and really only requires a yes or a no to begin with. If I see nodding heads, we'll move on to the next question.

Mr. Elcock, when he was here at the last meeting, said that there was a detailed plan, and I'm assured that there was a detailed plan. I think I heard it from a number of you. I'm seeing a general yes on that.

I want to go to that detailed plan, because when Mr. Elcock was here he said that you need to have your plan, and once you have your plan, you know precisely what the costs will be. That's what he said when he was here last week: once you have your plan, you know precisely what your costs will be.

I want to go to precisely what the costs will be. I think I'll start first, if I may, with Superintendent MacNeil.

I appreciate all you have done for this. Could you please elaborate on the \$507 million you were allocated for the G-8/G-20? Specifically, I was wondering about a breakdown of these expenditures. As you know, we only have a breakdown of about \$200 million. The other billion dollars, as we understand it—or close on a billion dollars—was allocated for security.

Knowing that you had a plan, knowing that you had a budget, and knowing that you had budget assumptions, could you please give us some detail on that?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes. Thank you.

Perhaps what I will do is explain how the plan worked, and then I would ask Mr. Séguin to touch on any of the actual budgetary issues you may have questions about.

I think it's very important for the committee and for everyone to understand how we come up with a number like \$507.5 million. I appreciate the question.

Basically, in the G-8/G-20, there were 40 different sites that had to have some form of security. To do that, what we would do is take every single site and do a vulnerability risk assessment, a VRA. We would send a group of subject-matter experts out to the site to assess the site for all aspects of potential vulnerability. They would come back to us with a plan.

Let's say it was for this room. I'll use this as an example. They might come back and say that they are going to need a guard on each door and people on the rooftop of these buildings. They'll need to cover these windows. They may have to cover the windows with bulletproof glass.

Whatever the case may be, they put all of that together and come back with a plan. We take that plan, we assess it, and then we scrutinize it: do they really need five people over there or can we do it with one or two...? Then they justify that.

• (0905)

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** I think that's where I'm going. As you can appreciate, I only have eight minutes, so I'm going to need to hear from more than you on this.

Specifically, I want to get to some of the questions. When we looked at the \$200 million, we saw things like money to rent a building in Barrie and retrofit it. I know that you've covered that in other committees. We look at a tremendous amount of money for bug spray and hand sanitizers. We know that you had to build some complex housing. We know that there were a lot of hotels and a lot of car rentals. I want to get to specifically how you budgeted for those.

There are concerns about the astronomical amount of money spent on those miscellaneous issues.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** All of the things that you've referred to, such as bug spray and the temporary accommodation facilities and everything, were done in a fashion where we planned.... We looked at the number of police officers coming, and we knew that we had to provide bug spray because they were working in the Huntsville area in a wooded area in June when there were bug problems. We would just basically determine how much we needed and then would contract for the supplies required.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** It seems like an astronomical amount. I don't want to get into too many of the details until I hear from your finance person, but \$334,000 seems like an awful lot. As you can appreciate, when we're going through these numbers, we're looking at the overall value. We have a number of police forces and others here today and we're trying to get some of the details on these numbers and how you put your assumptions through.

If we only know of this \$200 million at this point, and we still don't know about the \$1 billion, we're concerned that of course there was a lot of money spent that we don't know about at this point.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I think Mr. Séguin can cover off some more of the numbers, but I believe it's very, very important to understand that when I talked about that plan earlier, about how we go about determining how many people, then we go to the next phase of that plan, which is, how do we support those people? That's all of the equipment they need—cars and everything.

When you talk about vehicles, that's how we come up with the number. We look at all of the operations we have going on and assess how many vehicles we'll need for each operation. We don't say that "it looks like we're going to need 1,200 cars"; it's done by site, and when we add all those sites together, the number comes out to 1,200. Because of the massive operation, that's the number. Then we determine how we're going to find those cars. Some of them would have to be leased. Some of them we would already have in inventory. Those are the kinds of things....

If you have a specific question about something, we may be able to go right to that.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** We'll certainly be getting to that during the two hours we have here this morning.

I'd like to turn to your financial person, but before I do, I want to go to the issue of subcontracting. I believe that a security firm was hired by the RCMP. As you know, there have been a lot of concerns around this bid and the fact that this agency didn't have a licence to operate in Ontario. After the bid was awarded, they did get a licence to operate in Ontario.

Could you talk a bit about that? I'll come back to that in a future question, but I want you to first elaborate on how the bid process for the Contemporary Security firm was conducted and how they would have been able to get on the short list if they weren't registered in Ontario.

**The Chair:** Mr. Séguin, you have about a minute to answer that question, please.

**Mr. Alain Séguin (Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, Royal Canadian Mounted Police):** That's a good question. Because of the timelines we had, we went out to a request for proposal.

Part of the request required that any firm, before they could begin the process, would be required to obtain the necessary licences in Ontario. We went Canada-wide to allow for all companies across the country to bid on the process. Basically our requirement was that they meet the Ontario licensing requirements before they set up. That was the process.

• (0910)

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** So it was okay to get in on the pre-qualification as long as they had the licence after they were awarded the bid. That bidding process was only within seven days, right? I understood that the tenders for the bids were open for seven days.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** I'll get the exact timelines. It was actually open for a little longer than that. The RFP was issued on April 9, and the closing was April 30, so it was a little less than a month. The contract was awarded on May 19.

In between, we had to get Treasury Board's authority to sign the contact, so we were doing things in parallel. We received that on April 20 as we were going out on the RFP. Those are the timelines.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Séguin.

[Translation]

Ms. Bourgeois, you have eight minutes.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois (Terrebonne—Blainville, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for being here.

You each contributed, in your own way, in your respective fields, to security during the two summits. I would like to know who ensured the horizontal coordination of all those activities.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** My role as the commander of the integrated security unit was to be responsible for coordinating all activities among the security partners. That was my role in the security operation.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Very well. So you coordinated the activities; you were in charge of that? Were you the one responsible for authorizing purchase orders, expenditures? Was that your responsibility?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** No, I'm strictly responsible for the security side, not expenditures. For example, if Superintendent Charlebois were purchasing something on behalf of the OPP, we would have discussions to ensure that it was not something we were both purchasing. If one of us could do it, or we could do it jointly, then yes....

There would be some decisions on purchasing by the OPP that they would do on their own in terms of procurement, but it would be done in consultation with us to ensure that we weren't purchasing the same item.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** I will give you an example, Mr. MacNeil. A fence was purchased at a cost of \$4 million, but when the summit

was held in Montebello, the fence cost \$800,000. So it cost nearly four times more this time around. Who authorized the purchase of a \$4 million fence?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** In the case of the fence, that was a situation where we did our assessment of... We'll take Huntsville, for example. We did an assessment of what was required in fencing. Once we made that determination of what was required, we sent it to our fencing experts and they contracted that out. Just as an example, though, we used the fence from Montebello, the two kilometres—

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Forgive me for interrupting, but who are the fencing experts? You said you assessed what the needs were and then sent that assessment to the fencing experts, who took care of it. Who are they?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The RCMP has technical experts in fencing.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Oh, okay. So, if I understand correctly, it was the RCMP that purchased the \$4 million fence. Very well.

Was there an integrated plan in terms of your respective expenditures? Did you do an analysis prior to the summits to determine what the costs would be? Did you have a budget?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** My concentration was on the RCMP budget; however, I was aware of the budgets of the other integrated partners, to a degree, but I didn't have input into their purchasing or their procurement.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** That means that no one was coordinating all the expenditures related to the two summits. There was no cost estimate and no coordination of expenditures. That means that the Ontario Provincial Police had, I guess, set out a budget, as mentioned. CSIS had a budget, you had a budget, and no one was coordinating the four budgets to get an overall picture of expenditures.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I don't want to leave the impression there was no coordination, in the sense that we had joint procurement groups to determine that whatever we purchased, we didn't duplicate. So we did know what we were purchasing, but our RCMP finance people handled RCMP purchases, OPP people handled OPP purchases, CBSA people...and on and on.

We were integrated in determining what we were going to get, but I couldn't buy something for the OPP, and they couldn't buy it for me. We had our own procurement processes in place.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** No, no, but what I am understanding is that there was no financial planning. No one said that  $x$  million or billion dollars would be spent on the summits, first of all. So, without such a plan, we, as a committee, cannot say whether you stuck to the budget or not. You spent money as needed at the time. That is what I am understanding. So far—

• (0915)

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Perhaps I could just mention.... I was not mistaken, but it's just come to my attention that it is correct that Mr. Elcock, in his role, would have been overseeing all of the budgets. I apologize, because I'm thinking strictly from a security standpoint and our level at the integrated security unit, but if I'm going to speak at a higher level, Mr. Elcock would have been aware of the budgets for all units.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Earlier, you said that holding the G8 and G20 summits at the same time gave rise to additional security challenges. Who decided to hold both summits at the same time? Did you, as the people responsible for security in Canada—because that is what you all are—have the opportunity to say that such an event would create additional security challenges? Did you have an opportunity to voice your opinion on the additional challenges related to holding two summits in Canada?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The role of the police and my role as the commander of the integrated security unit is to provide the security wherever the summit is. If they had told us it was Kananaskis or Vancouver or wherever, we would provide security for it.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** So you had no say.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** It's not our role to choose a site.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Very well.

My next question is for the officials from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service. Mr. Boisvert and Ms. Danagher, what was your assessment of the threat level? Earlier, you said it was a medium threat assessment. What does that mean exactly?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Mr. Chair, to answer the honourable member's question, I would say the service's role was twofold. First of all, it was to provide information and analysis for the accreditation process.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** We know that. I simply want you to answer the question specifically. I do not have much time.

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Fine. In terms of threat assessment, CSIS's role was to support the Integrated Threat Assessment Centre, or ITAC, which would look at information provided by CSIS, as well as a number of other partner agencies in the country and around the world. We also provided a series of assessments based on the circumstances and the nature of the threat. As for assessing the threat

level—low, medium or very high—the overall risk for potential terrorism was low.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** The risk for terrorism was low, but what did the medium threat assessment refer to?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** It refers to terrorist groups that are here, in Canada, but who are different from a typical group like Al Qaeda.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bourgeois, your time is up. Thank you.

[English]

Mr. Warkentin, for eight minutes.

Just before Mr. Warkentin begins, I'll remind witnesses that we have people here to turn the microphones on and off.

**A voice:** It's magic.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC):** And usually they work.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

We do appreciate each one of you coming in this morning. Your testimony is helpful for us to understand the full scope of what you were asked to do.

We do appreciate the work you undertook. It should be said that while we scrutinize these things, we do appreciate what you do. We do thank you for your service and your continued efforts to provide security and safety to Canadians in general and to every person who attended the G-8 and G-20 summits. Thank you.

Chief Superintendent, I'm wondering if you could just give some additional clarification to a number of things. We've been working to try to get the facts as far as the expenditures are concerned for the G-8 and G-20, with limited help from the opposition. The Liberals have continued to put out press releases that call into question pretty much every aspect of the spending.

There was an interesting press release that I'm looking for some additional clarification on. A press release left the Liberal headquarters with the assertion that the integrated security effort had drained the quarry in order to do some type of thing or to build a structure. I wonder if you are aware of that press release or if you can provide us with some additional clarification as to what exactly went on there and maybe what the facts are with regard to that allegation.

• (0920)

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes. I think the reference is to where we built what we referred to the TAF, the temporary accommodation facility for the police officers who were policing the Huntsville area. What happened in Huntsville is that there wasn't enough commercial accommodation available to house all of the security people who were coming to secure the G-8.



It required that we had to build an accommodation facility, and this was basically, for lack of a better way of describing it, a very large trailer park that would house up to 4,500 security officers. Finding a piece of property in the Huntsville area is not that easy, because you're going to have to flatten the land and make it appropriate for this type of construction.

We did find what I guess you would consider a gravel pit. We were able to flatten the gravel pit. It was not draining a lake or a pond; that's not what we did. As we were doing the construction to build the trailer park, we hit an underground spring when we were digging to level the ground. The underground spring of course would have flooded our area that we had under construction, so we had to divert the water through the use of culverts into a small pond that was nearby. That construction cost us about \$144,000 to do.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** So it's not the \$2 million that the press release claimed was needed to drain a quarry?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** It was \$144,000.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** Okay.

Well, that's not the first thing.... I mean, in another meeting we had a discussion about a fake lake that the opposition had some consternation about. We found out that the cost was only about 10% of what the opposition claimed it to be, so we appreciate additional clarification on this.

On the scope of the project that you undertook and the responsibilities that you had, it's important for Canadians and members of Parliament to fully understand the timeframe of the work that you undertook. My understanding—and I thank the different witnesses for their testimony—is that preparatory meetings were happening. People were coming for months beforehand, and 90 different preparatory meetings were undertaken.

Could you first explain to us the scope in terms of the timeframe of your planning process and your accommodation of guests?

Second, could you tell us about the integration of the different security forces? Could you give us some idea of how many different local police forces or private security firms were integrated to undertake the responsibility on the security side and tell us as well about the integration of some of the military personnel?

On those two points, could you give us an understanding of the scope and the breadth of your project?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Thank you.

With reference to how long the planning process took, in the fall of 2008, Superintendent Charlebois and I, along with the Canadian Forces, started planning the G-8. Almost two years of planning went into the G-8—and of course the G-20 at the same time, once we found out about it. As I'm sure you've already heard from many people, it was the largest deployment of security personnel in Canadian history. The actual number was 20,974, so close to 21,000 security personnel were deployed.

The biggest challenge we have in this country, even as opposed to other countries, is the size of our country. We have a massive country from which to draw security forces, which creates logistical challenges. As you can imagine, we all—the OPP, the RCMP, the Toronto Police Service—needed assistance. None of us is big

enough to take care of this with the people we have stationed here in Ontario, so we had to draw on people from all over the country. That means airplanes, buses, accommodations, and meals.

Even though the summits themselves took place only over Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, in some cases we had people on the ground a month in advance to start the clearing processes and the sweeping processes. A lot of our people, the majority of them, were there at least 10 days in advance. We had to house and feed and take care of those people for all that period of time.

Those were just some of the challenges. We've never been faced with anything like this before. Two summits at the same time generated a security force that was unprecedented. I could get into specific numbers about specific agencies and those kinds of things. I have all of that, but it's safe to say that we put forward an operation of a size that we may never see again.

● (0925)

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** This is important, because some of the claims of the opposition or of skeptics about the spending have been that a lot of it happened in just 72 hours. My understanding is that the headquarters in Barrie was rented space that was retrofitted for the purpose of the integrated security efforts. There is an allegation that the headquarters building was only operational for 72 hours. Could you give us the timeframe that the headquarters was operational?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes. That headquarters actually started to be operational in February 2009, so it was open for a year and several months before the actual summits.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** So the costs allocated to that headquarters were for the duration and not just for 72 hours.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** That headquarters was for planning, for our unified command centre, and for our joint intelligence group. It's a 55,000-square-foot building that had to be retrofitted to allow for the security requirements of all the agencies that came in. You can't, for example, have an agency such as CSIS or CSE, or any other agency, just come in and work in an environment that is not properly outfitted for them. It was the same for all the other partners, and we had many partners. That had a lot to do with the cost of that building.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Superintendent MacNeil.

Go ahead, Mr. Davies, for eight minutes, please.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** I'd also like to thank all the witnesses for appearing and taking time out of your busy lives.

From a security point of view, I think we all can agree that the G-8/G-20 meetings can fairly be described as and considered a successful event. All attendees were protected. The meetings were conducted without disruption. There were no acts of violence against any of the attendees. I think all of us want to congratulate you for accomplishing that.

What I do think that Canadians are concerned about, though, are the costs of achieving that security, and those costs I think are measured in two aspects. One is in monetary terms and the second is in terms of what I think is pretty much established now as widespread violations of many Canadians' constitutional rights, civil liberties, and democratic expectations.

I think that's what we have to measure this against: we had great success, but there were costs. I think that it's naive and that people are playing politics if they claim there were no costs that were sacrificed to achieve that security. I'd like to delve into some of those costs.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer did a study before the summits. I want to quote from the report he published. He said, "In an attempt to assess the reasonableness of security costs, the PBO identified unit costs of security personnel deployed as a unit of comparability." What he did was that he compared, and I'll go on quoting him. He said, "Our analysis compared the unit costs of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, as well as the Canadian Forces, for the 2010 G-8 and G-20 Summits and the 2002 G-8 Summit". I think the reason was that he tried to get two Canadian comparators.

He found that, in his estimate, the unit cost for the RCMP in 2010 was \$101,000 per RCMP officer. That compared to \$25,000 for the RCMP unit cost in 2002 in Kananaskis. That's an increase of four times. The same thing happened for the armed forces, but I don't think there's anybody here from there, so I won't ask about it. Those numbers are inflation adjusted. So what he ended up saying in his conclusion was, "The unit cost allocation for the RCMP for Huntsville has increased by a factor of 4"—

• (0930)

**The Chair:** Excuse me, Mr. Davies. There is a general din to my right.

Could we dim the din, please? I know that you're all interested in Mr. Davies' questions. If there is conversation, could it be taken outside?

Thank you.

Mr. Davies, please proceed.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To continue the quote, he said: "...while the same unit cost...for the Canadian Forces has increased by a factor of 3".

His conclusion was, "These are significant unexplained variances, and a more detailed breakdown of how the allocated funds are to be spent might help explain these variances".

I'd ask for your explanation for that unit cost escalation.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** I'll attempt that.

I won't comment on the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, on their analysis. I can't comment on how they derived the information and on looking back to Kananaskis.

But I can tell you a few things about the cost. As Chief Superintendent MacNeil pointed out, there is a cost of doing these events in this country: deploying large numbers of people, housing them, feeding them, etc. Those are costs that are attached to the

salary costs. In our case, the salary costs were only the additional overtime costs and additional incremental costs that were incurred. We weren't charging members who would normally be in a normal operational situation to the summits. I can't comment on how he derived those, but I can—

**Mr. Don Davies:** I can tell you, Mr. Séguin, because he explains it. He says, "Unit costs are estimates due to the fact that total spending of the department was attributed to units...". So when he contacted the units to ask how spending was attributed, he was told that it was broken down by unit.

What I would ask is, do you dispute the PBO's conclusion that unit costs went up four times or do you just not know?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Well, I guess I see a couple of factors. One, I assume he was basing his information on the budget numbers, and I think the report came out this summer, in June, and we now have more accurate information on the actual costs, which are considerably less than the \$507 million. So the budget information is one piece of information, which includes contingency amounts. Our current estimates are in the \$330 million from the \$507 million.... So then, I guess, we'd have to compare the actual costs to his analysis.

**Mr. Don Davies:** All right.

A lot has focused on the fact two sites were chosen for this. From a security point of view, am I correct in assuming that security costs would have been lower if you had held both meetings on one site?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I didn't do a study on the final assessment of holding the summit at the MTCC, the costs surrounding that, and then what it would be like to hold everything there. But I think it's safe and logical to say that if you do an event in one place as opposed to two places the cost would be less.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer also points out in his report this summer that.... Again, I'll quote him so that I don't put words in his mouth. About community disruption, he said:

Security operations can cause considerable disruptions to the community and surrounding businesses. The opportunity loss in some cases deserves compensation, which in turn drives up the cost.

He talks about road closures, traffic obstructions, etc., and we've heard that a number of businesses were disrupted. Is there anything in any of the budgets you've seen that would be allocated to compensate any businesses or communities for any disruption as a result of the summits? Has that been budgeted for?

• (0935)

**The Chair:** Mr. Séguin, for less than a minute, please.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** In some instances.... For the fencing, we negotiated some lease arrangements with businesses or proprietors where the fence would be located, so we compensated basically on a lease arrangement for—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Do you know how much that was, sir?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** I'd have to get that.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Can you get that, please?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Off the top, I don't have it with me, but I can get back to you on that.

**The Chair:** We'll take that as an undertaking, Mr. Séguin, to respond to Mr. Davies' questions.

Thank you, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Regan.

**Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In response to Mr. Warkentin's comment, I have the government's response to an order paper question from the Liberal Party. A line here says, "temporary accommodations facilities, quarry site; Fowler Construction". That's who it was rented from, I presume. It says, "License for use of location; "\$4,082,000" etc., so \$4.1 million.

The news release to which my colleague refers says, "Order paper documents obtained by the Liberals reveal that the Conservatives spent \$4.1 million to rent a quarry near the site of the G8 summit". The point is that my colleague is inaccurate in what he's said.

**The Chair:** As enthusiastic as one might be to engage Mr. Warkentin, the witnesses are at that end of the table.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** I'm anxious to talk to them about this.

Mr. Chair, I am going to ask the witnesses about this question.

**The Chair:** Okay, and I will hope that...

Is there a point of order, Mr. Warkentin, or are you just interrupting?

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** I just want to clarify that it was a different press release and I'll be happy to get it for the honourable member.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Between the two of you, you can have your undertakings between each other.

Mr. Regan.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chief Superintendent MacNeil, am I correct in understanding that it would cost about \$4.1 million to rent this and that the government or the RCMP added value to this property and gave it back?

Perhaps Mr. Séguin would answer that.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** The actual lease arrangement would have been handled by Public Works and Government Services Canada. I don't have the details on that.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** All right.

How long did you have officers there?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** From about June 15 until June 27.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** I suppose you would have had different numbers there during that period. The biggest number obviously would have been on the weekend of the G-8?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes. We may have had them in a little earlier than the 15th as well, but I know we started feeding them on the 18th.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** And that's important.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** I feel bad for them those first three days, my goodness. I'm a little concerned.

But as I understand it, the \$4.1 million was just to lease the site, right? You must have had other costs. Your costs for trailers, etc., were in addition to that?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes, for certain.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Because when I look at that, if there were 4,500 officers around that area, as you've talked about, using this, it is about \$1,000 per person. Again, it seems like a lot when most of them were there for a fairly short period—\$4 million—and there are other costs we'd like to know about.

But let me move on for a second here. Other summits—for instance, the Francophonie and others we've heard about from the House of Commons in the last few days—have achieved security at 2% of the cost of this summit. Some are often around \$30 million. Of course, our costs were due to a number of things, including the decision to have two sites. What other decisions caused this high cost and who made those decisions?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Well, I guess I would go back to my first answer, when I was asked how we planned. We take what we're given, the sites we're given that we know are going to be utilized, and we plan our security packages around that. The total cost was what it cost us to plan that security.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** But besides the decision to go with two different sites, were there other decisions that caused the cost to escalate?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I'm not sure. I'm sure that in two years there were many, many decisions taken over where meetings would be held and things of that nature, but I can't comment on that.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you.

Let me turn to Superintendent Charlebois of the OPP. Perhaps you or Ms. Davis can answer this. What was your budget number agreed upon in advance of the event? Let's start with that.

● (0940)

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Thank you very much. We negotiated a budget ahead of time of approximately \$84 million for the event.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Have all your bills come in in terms of suppliers or subcontractors that you had in relation to that?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** No, they have not. Going back to having heard some of the testimony at some of the previous meetings, we are still in the process of obtaining all the costs that we incurred through vendors, contracts, other police forces, and various ministries.

We are still collating all those costs to date to ensure that those costs came in within budgetary expenditures—an auditing process. Up until this week we've processed approximately 5,000 invoices over the last few months. We're still collating that. We hope to have those to the federal government within the timelines that were agreed upon. It should be within the next month.

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

[Translation]

Mr. Vincent, you have five minutes.

**Mr. Robert Vincent (Shefford, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Boisvert, you said earlier that the threat level was low in terms of terrorists but medium in terms of citizens. Surely, you must have known that there might be some arrests during the G8 and G20 summits. Did you initially anticipate a certain number of arrests?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** I could explain the service's mandate, but as for an estimate, we are not—

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** No, no. Let me give you an example. On June 27, 2010, you arrested 105 people, including 90 Quebeckers. Police officers woke those people up in the morning, and they ended up spending 60 hours in jail, in conditions that were inhumane. Up to 40 people were crammed into each cage, which had a single toilet without a door and a concrete floor. Given the scope of your security plans, the number of police officers who were called upon, the \$130 million spent on security and the \$55 million spent on a police village, I would think that you were not there simply for show. You anticipated that you would be arresting people, that something would happen during the G8 and G20 summits. Am I mistaken?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I can answer that. There's no question that when the Toronto Police Service built the prisoner processing centre they built it with the intention that they would likely have to use it at some point, because we were aware that large groups of people were coming and if there were a necessity for arrest they would have to use that centre. So I would agree, yes, that there was some anticipation that arrests might happen in Toronto or in Huntsville during the summits.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** Did you estimate an overall number of arrests, in order to determine where people would be sent and whether there would be enough room for everyone, in the event of mass arrests? Did you have a plan in place? If so, how much money did you spend on it? You had protection plans in place, but did you have a budget for arrests? Did you have a planned location, and did you make certain that it would be accessible and safe for everyone? Did you have a plan to ensure the well-being of the people in custody, or was your only concern the safety of the twenty G20 leaders and eight G8 leaders?

Those events are still costing taxpayers money, because there are still court cases pending. Those costs may not be clear today, but they certainly will be at some point in the future.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Thank you.

I can't answer that question myself because I wasn't involved directly in the planning of the prisoner processing centre in Toronto. I think that question would be best placed with the people who designed and built that centre and eventually managed it during the event.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** Fine. That answers my question.

I will focus my questions on areas that you are more familiar with.

Let's talk about the \$334,000 spent on outdoor kits containing sunscreen, insect repellent and hand sanitizer. I also want to talk about the \$60,000 spent on binoculars. Why did \$334,000 go to the purchase of outdoor kits?

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I can comment on the bug spray to explain how that works. We made personal kits for each of the security people in Huntsville and Toronto.

For the Huntsville kit, we had the contractor company provide a high-end bug spray. As you can imagine, if you're standing for 12 hours in the bush in June, you're going to be in bad shape. We had to get the best bug spray we could. We had to have a high-quality sunblock. We had to have wet wipes, the ones you tear out. The whole package, with the bag it came in and everything, was approximately \$40 per person. There was also a medication in there. In case you were bitten by the bugs, you could apply it to reduce the swelling and the itch.

In the Toronto kit, we eliminated the bug spray and the itch medication.

•(0945)

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** Forgive me for interrupting, but I understand the rationale. I want to know how many police officers and people from National Defence were stationed in Huntsville. I believe the documents talk about 5,000 RCMP officers and 3,000 members of the Canadian Forces.

I understand that people stationed in the woods may need a kit, but I do not think the conditions were the same in Toronto. I can understand that a \$40 kit might be a great thing, but to spend \$100,000 a day—

[English]

**The Chair:** *Monsieur Vincent, c'est terminé.*

Unfortunately, Mr. MacNeil, Mr. Vincent has left you with no time to answer that question.

Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder (London West, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank our guests for attending today.

I think you've heard from a couple of references here that your job was admirable. You served with distinction and I think you all served Canada proud. Whatever way we define it—and I'm going to go back to what my colleague from the NDP said—from a security point of view, the security was a success. I think all of us around this table would concur and thank you for your commitment to ensuring that it happened.

It's rather interesting when you get to speak at this point in the process, because you've heard comments from both sides. I think about the kits. Personally I believe that \$40 a kit is good value. I can't imagine that any member opposite, or on any side of this table, would want to take bug spray out of a member's kit when he has to serve in the woods. That would be absurd. I hope that's the last time we're ever going to hear about this, in the House or at this table. I think it's really bizarre that we would pursue that.

I want to ask a question from a budget standpoint, which is really within your area of expertise. Perhaps I could ask Superintendents MacNeil and Charlebois and anyone else who wants to respond. I think this is a key question for this panel. Was there any political influence from the government in terms of your operation and security planning, any type of meddling or involvement or telling you how to run your security?

Superintendent MacNeil, on the issue of interference, I'd appreciate any comment you would have on that.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The way it worked for us was that the summit management office would communicate to us planning assumptions. We've referred to them; in other words, where the meetings were going to be held, what day people were arriving, and what day they were leaving. They were things of that nature that we needed to know to plan security. That would be it. After that—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** From a technical standpoint?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes, from a technical standpoint. After that, as I described earlier, we would send people out to the sites and plan the security around the site.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** So at that point, sir, it was your show?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** It was our show, including where we put the fences, where we put our police officers, and how many cars we used. Whatever we have talked about already was our responsibility.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Superintendent Charlebois, would you agree?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Yes, I would. I can only speak for the Province of Ontario and state that the OPP has a reporting relationship to the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services on a regular basis. However, there was no decision-making process in there at all as far as policing operations were concerned. It was a matter of our daily business reporting relationships and our financial relationships through the Ontario Ministry of Finance and the provincial treasury board.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Séguin, you indicated that for the additional security firm that was required, you had actually provided an RFP with almost a month's notification, and that some weeks afterwards it was awarded. Do you feel that was sufficient time for you to be able to adequately assess the needs of adding a security firm for that purpose?

• (0950)

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Thank you.

I guess for part of the rationale, I think Chief Superintendent MacNeil can speak to that, to why we went to a private security firm. It was a question of capacity there. As we were going forward and

planning for the summits—I won't steal the show here—there was a question of capacity or just the number of police officers available across the country.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** So then may I ask you, Mr. Séguin, or Chief Superintendent MacNeil, was that firm qualified? Did you hire them on the basis of their ability to perform their tasks?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Oh, absolutely. We also had in the process a fairness monitor who reviewed the process.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I want to come back to a comment. I've heard some quotes from the Parliamentary Budget Officer. I'd like to put them into the record to be clear that all information, according to the record, is there, and that our Parliamentary Budget Officer, Kevin Page, did report from his standpoint that "The Government of Canada has been relatively transparent" about the price tag, as he said, "when compared to other countries" and their silence in revealing their total costs. He also said further, "Hosting these international summits has typically been a very costly undertaking".

I say that because this is about disclosure, and it really comes back now, if I might say, to the budgeting items. We have certainly heard in the House and as a government generally a lot of negatives that as a government we have been irresponsible in some fashion for not knowing precisely all the costs in place at this time. I heard Superintendent Charlebois say that all of his costs were not yet in. I'm not sure about the RCMP or other forces, but if the government is being attacked somehow for not having these costs in, I am not sure whether the forces, who are not in a position to provide that information, are in fact then being castigated or blamed somewhat. I would hope not.

**The Chair:** Mr. Holder—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Oh, I'm sorry, I thought I had one minute.

**The Chair:** No, no, your speech has been going a little—

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Eloquent?

**The Chair:** You are always eloquent, Mr. Holder, and more frequently than not, lengthy.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Duly noted, Chair, thank you.

**The Chair:** Madam Coady, please.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** It is very, very difficult, I appreciate, to keep to only the five minutes that we have in these rounds.

I want to go back. I have three main questions that I want to go to, and some of them I've seeded in the first round. I want to go to something Superintendent MacNeil just said. I think I have the quote right: that if you do an event in one place instead of two, costs would be lower

That raises a question, because we did see dramatic increases in costs due to the two locations. Did you have an opportunity to advise the Privy Council Office, Mr. Elcock, or the minister of the concerns about the costs of these two locations? Was there any role played by the RCMP in an advisory capacity about the locations?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** One of the opportunities I had related to where the summit site was in Toronto: between the Allstream Centre and the MTCC. I did advise the PCO and the government that if we tried to secure both the downtown area, where the hotels were, and the Allstream Centre and the roads in between the two, it was going to be so resource intensive that I didn't think we could do it, and that we would have to collapse one of the summits.

That was my recommendation, because I didn't think it was possible to handle them both, if that was the plan. But eventually the plan came back to just doing it in the downtown and because of that we were able to handle both.

I've heard a lot of discussion over to why was it downtown and not at the Allstream Centre. Well, that was partly to do with me, because I made that recommendation in terms of security that it was so resource intensive that we wouldn't be able to handle it.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Did you have any role in discussing whether this should be in Muskoka or in Toronto or whether you should coordinate both in another location? Did you have any input into that besides what you've just alluded to?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** No. The original site, as you know, was Muskoka. We planned our security for Muskoka. Once we were advised that the G-20 would be held in Toronto, we started trying to seek a location as quickly as we could.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** So you didn't know that the G-20 was going to be in Toronto until...?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Not until December, actually. In September we found out it would be in Canada and in December we found out it would be in Toronto—where in Toronto, actually.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Yes. Did you indicate at that point what the additional cost would be to have these two different sites? If you were only told in December, obviously you had to plan again for additional costs. Did you advise the PCO of these additional costs so that more resources or different resources could be allocated?

• (0955)

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** At that time we did not, but in October of 2009 we were asked to provide an analysis of the three options, and we provided it at that time.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Could you give us a little more detail on what that analysis showed?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Certainly. What I can say is that in the analysis, having the G-8 in Huntsville and the G-20 in Toronto was one option. Both the G-8 and the G-20 in Huntsville was an option, and both G-8 and G-20 in Toronto was an option. Those were the three options that we referred to.

It's not really valid now, because at the time that we put those options together, we were doing options in Toronto for the Allstream Centre, not the MTCC. The numbers wouldn't be accurate or in concurrence with what actually occurred at the end of the day, but we did put those options forward in October of 2009.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Can you provide that analysis to the committee, please, so that we can get an understanding of those costs? Thank you very much.

I'm running out of time, but I have a question for the superintendent from the Ontario Provincial Police. You talked about a budget of \$84 million and I can appreciate that. If we could get more details on what was included in that budget, that would be great. More importantly, was there a separate budget for the Toronto police force, or was that part of your budget?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** No. The Toronto Police Service was responsible for entering their own budget with Public Safety Canada.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Do you happen to know what that was? We're trying to get a total cost.

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** I have no idea at all. I cannot speak to...

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Okay. We will have to ask the Toronto Police Service, but what you're telling me clearly is that it was a separate cost.

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** It was.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** When we add all this up now, we're way above the total amount that we've been advised.

Could you talk a little bit about what was included in your \$84 million? I know you don't have the final bills as yet, but we established up front that from a planning perspective you would have had budget assumptions. Could you at least elaborate on those?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Yes. I would be happy to.

As Chief Superintendent MacNeil said, as part of the planning process in Barrie where we established our offices, we had over 100 officers working on the planning process strictly on behalf of the OPP during the two years leading up to the event. That was part of our costs in working within the integrated security unit.

As in most operations, one of the biggest expenditures is for salaries and overtime. In infrastructure costs for the G-8, particularly because of the location, there were extra expenditures around telecommunications. It was one of our larger expenditures that had to be implemented.

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

Go ahead, Mr. Calandra.

**Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC):** Thank you for being here.

I love talking about the G-8 and G-20. I'm a member from the GTA and I think security was spectacular. The ability of York Regional Police to be involved was also a dramatic benefit, and everything that came out of it was a huge benefit to my region and my part of the country.

As I was doing some research into this, I noted that a lot of comparisons have been made with other countries and how much their costs are and so on. I was at the G-8 in Italy, which was the G-35 when you have all the countries that were invited.

I think Italy fits into Ontario 32 times and France fits into Ontario 18 times. Italy has close to 400,000 people in their police forces, in their security services. I know that Germany has a policing to population...they're 18th; France is 33rd; the U.K. is 34th; and Japan is 40th.

I also read today that Korea is having their G-20. The Korean ambassador mentioned that it'll probably be cheaper for them because, in his words:

South Korea will avoid these costs entirely. The police in Seoul will come from the ranks of the country's compulsory two-year military or police service.

They're paid very little and they bring their own tents.

He was asked further about the fact that the United States has 30,000 men and women on the ground there and will be providing a great deal of other intelligence and other security for that. If that was factored in, he was asked, would the costs be over \$1 billion? The ambassador said, well of course it would be, but they don't have to factor that in because the United States is paying for that.

Here's what I'm wondering about. You've mentioned it, but does the sheer size of this country, the sheer fact that we had to bring police in from all over the country, from Vancouver, Quebec, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia and house them here...? And we didn't ask them to bring their own tents: we treated them with respect. I have to assume that you accepted... I know that in my force, when I spoke to my chief in York region, he said that you respected their contracts and overtime was paid when it was required. Does that not factor into making this summit perhaps more expensive than others?

I'll make this final point and then I'll let you answer. When research was done into the cost of this summit in comparison to others, I know that the Munk Centre reported that the G-8 component of it is comparable to any other summit, including Kananaskis, and the G-20 portion is also comparable to any other summit being held in any other part of the world.

So how does the sheer size of this country and the fact that we don't have the infrastructure like other countries do...? In Italy, with 400,000 people, within an hour they can have police. They're not paying overtime for their 400,000 people they can pull from.

•(1000)

**The Chair:** Mr. Calandra, I thank you for the world tour, but did you direct that question to anyone?

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** The superintendent.

**The Chair:** Chief Superintendent MacNeil, you have a little over a minute and a half to respond.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The answer is yes: having to bring in police officers from all over Canada is extremely expensive.

Before the G-20s started taking place, the G-8 alone was known as the largest annual global security event. Now, I guess, the G-20 is challenging that. But if you put the two together, and Canada was... This was unique. It had never happened before. To supply security for the two largest annual global security events at the same time is a massive undertaking. There's nothing in the world to compare it to. I've had colleagues around the world who've said that we don't have anything to compare it to. They've called me and I've talked to them a lot. They want to know how to do it.

You're right. A lot of other countries do have more police officers, and the police officers we do have are coming in from coast to coast. We brought them from British Columbia and we brought them from

Newfoundland and we didn't have a place for them to stay, so we had to bring them into temporary accommodation—

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** To take care of them.

Let me just ask you two really quick questions. Who made the policing decisions on the ground in the city of Toronto? Was it you or was it the Toronto Police Service?

The extra glow sticks that everybody likes to talk about: what happened to them afterwards?

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, Mr. Calandra has left you with no time to answer questions about glow sticks.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Bourgeois, your turn.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am trying to wrap my head around this. A political decision was made to hold two summits at the same time. One of those summits was held in a remote riding, which led to a lot of extra spending. We know that the Ontario Provincial Police had to have special communication towers built. You had to assume certain costs, such as the \$5 million for rental vehicles for the RCMP. I want you to explain what that amount was for. Initially, the decision came down from politicians, but there was no financial planning.

As members, we cannot be accountable to the public because we do not know what the budget was to start with. We cannot estimate and check whether the money spent on the two summits was in line with operational budgets.

This is for you, Mr. Boisvert. Earlier, you told me that the threat assessment in terms of participants was medium. What was the threat assessment for the Olympic Games in Vancouver?

•(1005)

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Mr. Chair, I cannot answer questions about the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver. I am not comfortable comparing the two events without accurate information.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Very well. I will continue with Mr. MacNeil.

Mr. MacNeil, the security budget for the two summits, which lasted a total of 72 hours, was twice that of the Olympic Games, which lasted 12 days. Can you explain that?

[*English*]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I can't really compare it to the Olympics, but what I can say is that, as I mentioned earlier, some of our people were on the ground for a month. The majority of them were on the ground for 10 days—at least 10 days—in advance of the summits in order to properly secure the areas.

Maybe I can explain that for just one moment. Let's consider Huntsville, for example, the G-8 site. The Deerhurst Lodge has many buildings around the area. We would have to go in. Our bomb dogs would search every building. Then, once it's searched, someone has to stay with it so they can prove no one has been in that building since. That's why it takes so long. It takes days and days to do that.

The other thing, and I think more importantly is—

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Did you not do the same for the Olympic Games? Did you not have to check all the Olympic facilities and surrounding villages? I find it odd. The cost of security for 72 hours was \$1 billion. It was not that much for the 12 days of the Olympic Games; in fact, it was two times less.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Absolutely. I agree that it was done for the Olympic Games as well, but there's a second point I was going to make. I just wanted to explain that we hear three days all the time, but it's much longer than that, and the more important point is that we're securing a conference or a summit here for the world leaders, all the leaders of the world, high-level-security people requiring high-level packages of security, as opposed to the Olympic Games, which is athletes in a sporting event. For us, this was a pure security event that had the highest level of vulnerability.

With the Olympics, if you think back now, do you remember who came? Do you remember what leaders came? Do you remember what day they came on? Do you remember when they left?

But for the G-20 and the G-8, everyone in the world that has an Internet site or a newspaper knows when the leaders are coming, who is coming, how long they're staying, where they're staying, and where the meetings are. The vulnerability on that is extreme because it's open to everyone. That's why it is so much harder to secure and why, even though it's a shorter period of time—and I totally agree with you on what you said—the concentration for that shorter period of time is what drives up the cost.

**The Chair:** Mr. Davies, please.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you. Can you tell me if in the budgeting process there was ever a figure allocated that estimated the number of people who might be arrested during the summit?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I wasn't directly involved in the planning—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Sure. That's to anybody. I'm sorry.

Does anybody know—

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Maybe I can ask Superintendent Charlebois to comment on the OPP, for example.

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Again, I can't speak for the Toronto G-20, where there were a number of arrests made. I can only speak for the G-8. We did an assessment of past events, what we thought the risks were associated with those events, and on what we might expect during the G-8. When the G-20 came along and all of a sudden we went from a rural area to an urban area, the vulnerabilities changed. We established a process of what we thought...

Again, going back to the infrastructure of Huntsville, there is only one OPP detachment there with 22 officers. We built an assessment on that, on potential risks to that and to the arrest process, and what we could expect. We put that process in place. I can't speak for Toronto.

**Mr. Don Davies:** I'm taking that as an answer that yes, there was an estimate before the summits of how many people would be arrested. That has to be part of the budgeting and the planning process.

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** I can say that we did that for the G-8. Again, I can't speak for the G-20 in Toronto.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Thank you.

What was that number, sir, that was used? How many people were expected to be arrested during that summit in preparation for the summit?

• (1010)

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Again, only speaking for the G-8 in the Huntsville area, and given the fact that the OPP is the police service of jurisdiction and had one detachment and two cells, and looking at past events in Germany and Italy, we put a process in place and estimated that we would probably have to process a maximum of 250 people at any given time.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay. As that process took place in Huntsville, of course, it took place in Toronto. Are any of you aware of what the number of anticipated arrests in Toronto would have been?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I think it's important to say that it's not that we're anticipating a certain number of arrests. We're planning for the likelihood of the necessity for people to be incarcerated for a period of time. It might be only an hour, a day, or two days. I don't know the exact number in Toronto. I can't—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Was there ever any discussion about it that any of you were aware of?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I'm sure there was some discussion, but I can't recall it right now. I know that the Toronto Police Service would have had that in their planning.

**Mr. Don Davies:** If you know that there were discussions, can you get back to us? Can you check your notes or any information and let us know how many people may have been anticipated to be detained?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I would tell you that the Toronto Police Service will be able to tell you that exactly.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Do any of you have the cost for the detention centre, and in fact, what the estimated cost of the entire detention process would be, for constructing the detention centre and all of the costs associated with that?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Again, it's the Toronto Police Service.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Toronto would know that...? Okay. Thanks.

I'll go back to the Olympics. I'm from Vancouver. As the public safety critic, I was involved in some of the security briefings leading up to that. I think it's fair to say that all of the considerations are identical. I understand that with the G-8/G-20 it was three days of meetings, but of course there was preparatory work before that.

It's the same thing for the Olympics: preparatory work happened for months and months. There were bomb squad dogs checking and securing sites, and of course we had an ocean, two sites, mountains, the U.S. border, and thousands of participants. Of course, there were heads of state there. The Vice-President of the United States came. The wife of the President of Taiwan was at the Olympics. There were heads of state who came.



I would put it to you that I think Canadians have a legitimate question. The billion dollars for the Vancouver Olympics was for establishing security over periods of months for an event that took not just 12 days, because there were the Paralympics that went on after that as well. I'm just wondering if you can give us some explanation for why we spent a billion dollars for an event in Toronto that I think everybody agrees was much smaller and of much shorter duration. There really aren't any significant distinguishing factors for the two events, both being major international events that could not tolerate any kind of security breach.

**The Chair:** Superintendent, you have less than 20 seconds.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I would apologize, but I would have to go back to my previous answer on the concentration of the internationally protected persons in a known area, in known hotels, in known sites. The vulnerability on that is very high.

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

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I'm certainly glad to hear that the wife of the President of Taiwan was at the Olympics. He didn't mention that to me when I met with him, but I'm not sure she would have had the same level of protection that the 35 leaders representing 95% of the world's population did when they came to the Greater Toronto Area during that time.

Who made the actual policing decisions on the ground in the city of Toronto on the days of the actual G-20? Did they come from you or did they come from the Toronto Police Service?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** It's not an easy question to answer. I have to explain the structure of the command and the structure of how the city was set up in quadrants in order to explain that.

I'll start with the way the city was set up. As you heard earlier, the RCMP had responsibility for the internationally protected persons and the venues. That's the simplest way I can explain it.

If you think about the MTCC and draw a circle around it, inside that circle was RCMP responsibility. If you draw another circle all the way around the hotels in downtown Toronto, that was RCMP responsibility, so even though it was within the city of Toronto, the RCMP had jurisdiction for that period of time, and Toronto had given us the authority to go ahead and look after it. Everything outside that circle—the interdiction zones and everything else in the city of Toronto—was Toronto Police Service jurisdiction, and they were responsible for command decisions on the ground at that level.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I asked you this earlier, and you weren't able to answer, and I apologize. If the glow sticks that were purchased were not used, what happens to them or to any other things that were purchased and not used? Are they just thrown into the garbage or are they put back into an inventory of some sort? What happens to them?

•(1015)

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The glow sticks themselves were purchased by the Canadian armed forces.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** So presumably the Canadian armed forces will put them back into their inventory.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** They will have them to use at a later date. In the case of equipment that we purchased, we will put the equipment that has a longer shelf life into storage for future major

events. We will get anything with a short shelf life out to people who need it, on a cost recovery basis, so we will recover some of those costs for purchases we've made.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** Could you explain a bit more about the international convention you have with respect to protecting VIPs? What is the international convention that you work under?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** There are several conventions, but there's a Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act as well. Basically that act vests responsibility in the RCMP to ensure the safety of the IPPs who are coming to these conferences and also to ensure that the meetings can proceed. That's our focus, in addition to the focus on protecting the community during the course of the event. We're also concerned about the people in the community in and around those events as well.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** How much time do I have left, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** You have a little under two minutes.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** With respect to the marshalling of the resources from the other police forces across the country, I think we've also started looking at lessons learned in this area. This was an unqualified security success. I think nobody could suggest otherwise. For the OPP, CSIS, Border Services, and the RCMP, our first G-20 was an absolute unqualified success. I've talked to my own police chief, and they have nothing but positive things to say.

How was the cooperation? Is there something we could learn for future events of this size?

Because I'll probably run out of time, I'm also wondering if the OPP could answer this next question first. I was told that in Toronto about \$140,000 of infrastructure investment was put into the Toronto Police Service. Is that true and does it stay with them?

Again, to the superintendent, with respect to the marshalling of the forces, is there anything we can learn so that we can maybe do better in the future?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Unfortunately, I can't speak for the Toronto Police Service about their negotiations with Public Safety Canada on their infrastructure. I could only speak to infrastructure and processes in regard to the G-8 and the OPP, unfortunately.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** We really have to get the chief of police in.

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

Go ahead, Mr. Regan.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's our responsibility as parliamentarians to examine the spending decisions made by government on behalf of the taxpayers, to try to protect the taxpayers, and to do so in a timely way. In view of the fact that we're four months after the summits and we have very little detail in terms of the various expenses, it's difficult to do that, and it's somewhat frustrating.

Could we ask each of the four organizations here to provide us with a detailed budget breakdown? You must have given breakdowns in advance of the summits to government and to PCO. Could you provide them to the committee? I'd ask each of you to do that. I think everyone is nodding. Does everyone agree or is there a problem with that request?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Again, I'll speak for the OPP and the Province of Ontario. Based on all of our assessments, we put a budget proposal in at approximately \$84 million for the OPP and the Province of Ontario. Quite frankly, our anticipated projections are that we will come in under budget—

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** I'm sorry to interrupt. I appreciate that, but all I'm asking for is.... Obviously your budget didn't just say "\$84 million"; it had cost assumptions. Mainly, what were the costs in advance that you foresaw? You must have submitted it saying "here is the total and here is what that total is made up of". That's all I'm asking for, so if you can provide us with that, I'd appreciate it.

Let me ask you this, sir. You've indicated that you're processing 5,000 invoices, but all the invoices are not in. You would think that the subcontractors you've dealt with would have their invoices in, four months after the fact. How many invoices are you waiting for? Do you know?

• (1020)

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Actually, I'll ask Ms. Davis to provide more accurate information on that.

**Ms. Janet Davis (Financial and Administration Lead, 2010 G8/G20 Summits, Field Support Bureau, Ontario Provincial Police):** Thank you.

In fact, most of our private subcontractors have submitted their invoices to us. I have to say that we received the majority of the outstanding claims just in the past two weeks. We've issued a deadline for the end of this week to have all of our invoices and claims submitted. The outstanding claims primarily relate to our security partners. We had partners in other ministries and the provincial government and we're just finalizing our claims with them at this time.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you.

Have you submitted any bill to the Government of Canada in relation to all those invoices and your costs?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** Again, I'll defer that to Ms. Davis. She'll have more accurate information than I have.

**Ms. Janet Davis:** Given the length of time for planning for this event, we actually had an opportunity to submit claims in advance of the operation. We have, to date, submitted three claims to the Government of Canada, to Public Safety Canada. As has been stated in previous committee hearings, our final claim is due on December 1, and we are on target to meet that timeline.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Can you provide us, perhaps later, with the details of when those three claims were submitted?

**Ms. Janet Davis:** I can provide that, yes.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you very much.

Can you tell me approximately how much your force spent on equipment for this event? What are you doing with that equipment now—if you still have it?

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** On a broad scope, again, the biggest majority of it went to communications infrastructure for the Huntsville area. Again, we're speaking of an OPP detachment with one operational tower and 22 officers. We had to put communications infrastructure in place for 3,000 people. There were significant costs associated with that. Wherever possible, we leased the equipment.

Because of the outstanding agreements that the province already had with vendors for our communications infrastructure, we worked in partnership with them to provide that. We also worked with the RCMP, because they also had to develop infrastructure. We worked jointly wherever possible. We put joint infrastructure in place to meet some of those needs and communications was our largest single infrastructure cost.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Thank you.

I think that you weren't really active in Toronto, as I understand it, as much as the RCMP and the Toronto Police Service, so I had better turn my next question to you, Superintendent MacNeil.

Did it cost more to operate around Deerpark or Toronto?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** I'm not sure we have that broken down. I'm just going to ask Mr. Séguin.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Yes, we do have some distinction on the budget cycle, but many of our costs were blended, so we had a blended cost structure for both G-8 and G-20. I don't have that breakdown. I can supply it, though.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** What I can tell you is that the RCMP alone invested 1,852 resources in Huntsville and over 3,000 in Toronto, so I guess that answers the question.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** Were you ever asked what the additional costs—

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** My time is up.

**The Chair:** Mr. Calkins, please.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins (Wetaskiwin, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have several questions. Probably the best thing I can do is just ask everyone and then have each of you, respectively, answer them. Hopefully there will be enough time.

When it comes to the Canada Border Services Agency—and maybe CSIS was involved in this as well—was there any budget allocated? Obviously a budget was allocated for dealing with dignitaries who were coming in, as we knew that there was going to be a surge there.

Was there any budget allocated for a surge in international protestors, international organizations that were coming in, or known protestors coming to Canada to participate in any of the protests that would have been seen as a potential security threat? Were there any budget allocations given to CBSA to deal with that, or through CSIS to deal with that, or was that just part of normal procedures?

My question for the chief superintendent is, were any non-Canadians or internationals arrested or detained in any part of the proceedings or during any of the disruptions?

Finally, we have heard that the police officers who were assigned to tasks at the G-8, in Muskoka or Huntsville or wherever it was, were housed in a temporary facility. After the G-8 concluded, were those police officers then moved to provide security detail for the G-20? If you were a security officer assigned to just one element, did you just stay and work at that particular element?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** If you like, I could perhaps begin and simply describe our role, going back to your first set of questions.

The service's role was in two parts. There was the validation issue with respect to accreditation: preventing persons from either entering the country or accessing sites. The second part, which dealt with threat assessments, reflects perfectly our mandate, which is to collect information, do some analysis, and provide advice to government, in this case, at all levels, but more particularly for the summits, to police and first responders, for them then to take whatever action they felt was necessary to deal with the threat.

Perhaps I could just delineate our role in terms of investigating and perhaps taking any action. The service's role is to bring to the table what it knows about issues, about persons, or about groups and tell law enforcement perhaps what's at issue, why it's happening, and perhaps even where and when, with some specificity, which would allow them to make tactical decisions. That's where our role finishes.

• (1025)

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Was that was all just part of normal budgeting for CSIS? Was there no additional budget required for it?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Well, there was a \$2 million budget placemat —

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** And you were within that and everything was fine?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Sylvain St-Laurent:** Of the million dollars that we received, basically most of the resources we had were basically for the processing of people at the Toronto airport. We budgeted for a small group, though, for intelligence, making sure that we could do the screening and everything from an advance perspective. But there were no additional resources placed at the border itself to prevent.... It was a normal operation from a border perspective.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** My last question is to Mr. MacNeil, then, on whether or not there were any foreign nationals picked up or who were part of any of the activities that were causing the disruptions.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes, there were, but I can't comment as to who they were or where they were from. That would be something for the Toronto Police Service to comment on when they're available.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Okay.

**The Chair:** You still have a minute and a half.

**Mr. Blaine Calkins:** Oh, good. Let's keep going. I'll give my time to my colleague Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Thanks very much.

Sometimes one of the challenges you get is that we always interject and don't give you the opportunity to respond fully.

Superintendent MacNeil, one of the things you had an opportunity to start talking about was the fencing. You said you'd received some of the fencing from Montebello. I got the sense you were reusing it. I guess what I'm asking is, what has been recyclable and what is the status of it now, please?

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** The Montebello fence was available to us and we retained it so we can use it in future major events. The other fencing we utilized was on a leased basis, so we're not going to have that available to us later on. We leased it mainly because just the cost of storage of something like all those kilometres of fence would be huge and we may never need that much again. But the Montebello fence has been very useful to us, and it proved itself in this case, in that we were able to use two kilometres of it again in Huntsville.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** So while at one level you had to purchase new fencing, you certainly recycle for the needs that you have. I'm not sure that people appreciate that in fact there are a number of items you have that you recycle or ensure that you get dollars back by returning, or in whatever fashion—

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** We have a major event storage area where we will store any equipment that, as I said earlier, has a long shelf life and that we can keep and store. It can be utilized again in future major events.

**The Chair:** Madam Coady.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Thank you very much.

I understand that this is the last round, so I'd be happy to share my time with my colleagues. I'll take a couple of minutes and then I'll share with my opposition colleagues.

I want to go back to what my colleague Geoff Regan was asking you about the budget assumptions. We all established at the very beginning of our morning that there was a plan and that there were budget assumptions with that plan, and each of you has undertaken to provide this committee with your budget assumptions. I know that we will ask the Toronto police to also give us that information.

Just based on the OPP, for example, concerning your \$84 million, you were able to tell us that there was a lot there for human resources and infrastructure and those kinds of costs. What we're looking for basically is what the breakdown was.

I want to turn to a question that Mr. Holder just asked about the disposal of assets. You talked about having a storage facility holding a lot of these assets. I noted, when we got the breakdown of the \$200 million—and, of course, that was only one very small portion of the \$1.2 billion that was spent—that there were a lot of computers, a lot of smaller assets that were purchased. You said you have some in storage. Of course, you wouldn't put all your computers in storage.

Did you dispose of any of these assets? If so, how?

• (1030)

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Thank you.

For those types of assets that have a limited shelf life, we would put those into operations and credit back the cost to the event.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Do you know how much credit back you're going to be giving?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** We're in the process of doing that; I don't have that right now. We're in the process of factoring—

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** So you credit back the cost of computers, the things you will normally use in the course of business.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** That's right. We credit back to the G-8.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** Thank you for that. We'll look for that credit.

I know we've established that having those two sites was very expensive.

**The Chair:** Your two minutes have gone already.

**Ms. Siobhan Coady:** My two minutes are gone?

Thank you. I will hand it over to Mr. Vincent.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** It is now over to Ms. Bourgeois and Mr. Vincent.

Mr. Vincent, you have the floor.

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I saw that Aramark got the contract. I wondered why I was seeing a bill for \$55 million and the name Aramark. Eventually, I realized that an American company had been awarded the contract, worth more than \$55 million, to house and feed 4,500 officers. The contract was awarded without a proper bidding process.

Did other companies bid on the contract?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Yes, a bidding process was held, and a few companies submitted bids. As I mentioned, it started on December 3. We—

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** I understand that.

Why is it that the other companies did not get the contract and an American one did?

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** Under free-trade agreements, we cannot take American companies out of the running. A process was held.

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** That company ended up winning the contract.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** It won, yes. The process was open, and someone oversaw it to—

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** That is fine.

Mr. MacNeil, you were in charge of renting the accommodations for the police village. You were in charge of the police village. When you found out that trailers were being sent in from Alberta—760 trailers left Alberta to come here—did you see whether it was possible to cut costs by bringing in the trailers from somewhere closer, such as Ontario, Quebec or some other large municipality that was closer? Did anyone call Aramark to say that the cost of doing that would be huge? Was there a phone call?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Monsieur Séguin, you have about half a minute.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** It is not for us to tell them where to get their resources—

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** But you are footing the bill.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** We pay, but the company put in an excellent bid. We had tried something else the summer before, and it ended up costing twice as much. We got permission from Treasury Board directly, and we went with a different bid, and the cost dropped by half. In light of that, we did not need to know where they were pulling their resources from.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Séguin and Mr. Vincent.

[*English*]

Mr. Holder, you have the final five minutes.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Thank you very much to our guests.

I want to clarify the record. Earlier, my Liberal friend referenced some \$1.2 billion. I want to say clearly that what we have here in terms of security costs for the 2010 G-8 and G-20 is just over \$900 million. I want to clarify that for the record.

I've heard from our friends at the OPP that you want your invoices settled by December 1.

What's your timing? I need to ask this of the CBSA, please, and also of the RCMP. I want to get a sense of timing. You have your deadline of December 1 to have all of your invoices in. Then you'll put your final invoices together and present them to the government for payment.

How long will that take? I need to ask so that we have a sense of timing, so that we get the full sense of what all the costs are from a final accounting perspective.

First, the OPP.

• (1035)

**Ms. Janet Davis:** Thank you.

As I mentioned before, our deadline is December 1 to present our final claim to the Government of Canada. Following that, there will be an intensive audit of all eligible costs. I can't speak to the timeframe of Public Safety Canada, but under our cost contribution agreement, we have agreed to have the matter reconciled by March 31, 2011.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Thank you very much.

Mr. St-Laurent of CBSA.

**Mr. Sylvain St-Laurent:** Given the size of the expense we have, we pretty much have all the invoices. We expect one more, probably, from CRA. This should be done within the next few weeks after that.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Upon receipt, you'll send it in forthwith to the federal government?

**Mr. Sylvain St-Laurent:** Yes.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** The RCMP, please.

**Mr. Alain Séguin:** That's a difficult question, given the volume. We'll have most of our expenditures in over the next few months. That's about as much as I can confirm. We have a good portion of them in now. Certainly by the end of the fiscal year, we'll have all our costs in. We have to deal with MOUs with other police agencies, etc., so I figure that in the next few months we'll be in good shape.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Mr. Séguin, you see why this is important. One thing we have heard repeatedly from members opposite in the House is about having our final numbers delayed, not knowing what our costs are at this point. Respectfully, if we don't have all of our numbers from all of our participants, it's hard to know precisely what those numbers are. It's not a question whether or not the Government of Canada would pay its bills; it's obviously a function.... I respect that you need to ensure that you have all your costs in, but I'd like to point out, for the purpose of this dialogue, that until we have your final numbers in—and you are key players in all of this—it's very hard for us to say definitively what precisely those are.

I'm not here to tell you to do it forthwith; obviously you understand that as well as I do. But I'd say that's the difference here: when we get all of your numbers in.... I would also say that for the Metro Toronto Police and any other players who were involved in the security and any other aspects of this as well.

Ultimately, if I may ask, do you believe that this undertaking was, from the standpoint of security, a success? I know we all say in general terms that you did a great job, but if you deemed that it was a success, on what basis would you define that it is a success?

Perhaps we could start with you, Chief Superintendent MacNeil.

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** Yes, I definitely would say it was a success. As I've said in the past and will say again, I'm very proud of the integrated security unit and the job that was done in securing both of these summits. If you look from the outside looking in, from the standpoint of people who are involved in security around the world, they saw it as a monumental task. We saw it the same way, but we broke it down into small pieces, as I described earlier, and I think everyone was very efficient in doing their job.

We go into this with the objectives I spoke to this morning. The mandates we have are to protect the IPPs, to protect the public, and to protect the conference itself so that it can continue. Not one meeting was late and not one IPP was threatened or felt uncomfortable. When you're housing something like this in a huge city with a large population, with thousands of people who came to express their right to free speech, which we expected and which went as expected—many people came—I feel it was a definite success.

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Perhaps I could speak for a moment from a CSIS perspective, with a security intelligence view. We had a very much smaller role to play than did our law enforcement colleagues, but I think it's due to their great planning, their fortitude, their presence of mind on the ground, and their abilities, tactically and strategically, to deliver these very secure gains. I think the credit goes to them particularly, because in our view it was wholly successful.

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

Thank you, Mr. Holder.

I'm going suspend for a moment while I give our witnesses a moment to leave. We have committee business to the end of the time.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Mr. Chair, is it possible to continue asking the witnesses questions? We still have some questions.

**The Chair:** You want to do it now?

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Yes.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Are you posing that as a motion to continue in the questioning now?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Yes, we would like to continue the questioning. We still have a lot of questions. I had some questions for the Ontario Provincial Police that I was not able to ask.

● (1040)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** First of all, I would ask the witnesses to remain for the moment.

The request on the part of the Bloc is to extend the period of time for questioning. That is largely in the hands of the committee. Please don't ask your chair.

We also have another committee coming in here at 11 o'clock, and usually they ask for fifteen minutes to do the cleanup.

So...? We'll just debate out the time, then.

Mr. Warkentin.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** I know they need time to get the room ready. We also have to get to other meetings and different things. If there is a single question that someone would like to ask, I think there would be concurrence on this side to see that question asked. I wouldn't support going all the way to 11 o'clock. I think it's just a logistical impossibility for many around the table as well as the people coming in here.

**The Chair:** Is there any other comment?

Then I'll ask the question: do you wish to extend the time to 11 o'clock?

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** Not till 11 o'clock....

**The Chair:** To what, then?

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** Just five minutes. Let's have one more question.

**The Chair:** All right, five minutes.

Are you prepared to do one question? Okay. We'll have one question *pour combien de minutes?* Five minutes, two minutes...?

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Can I have five minutes, ten minutes? I still have questions.

If you give me five minutes, I will use the time to ask questions.

[English]

**The Chair:** Are you content with that? The Bloc gets an extra question for five minutes?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** Well, what are you agreeing to, then?

**Mr. Chris Warkentin:** Yes, let's go with it. We're going to talk it out for five minutes otherwise.

**The Chair:** Okay. Am I understanding that it's five minutes for the Bloc?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Great, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my colleagues.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay. I apologize to the witnesses. You can book overtime.

You have five minutes, starting now.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Great. Thank you very much.

I have two main questions. First of all, the unit cost for the RCMP in Huntsville was four times more than it was for the previous summit in Kananaskis. It turned out that the RCMP's unit cost was significantly higher than the Canadian Forces'.

Why were the Canadian Forces members not used more? They were used, but not very much. Why is that? They have all the equipment necessary; they are very well equipped in terms of communications and telecommunications. Please explain that, if you would.

[English]

**C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil:** It's very difficult for me to answer on behalf of the Canadian Forces. I really can't do that. What I can say is that the Canadian Forces brings a very unique capability to all of these events. They cannot replace police officers in domestic situations. It's not the role of the Canadian Forces to be dealing with the public in that environment we're talking about.

I'd have to leave it at that because I can't go into detail on it. But it really is not a role for the Canadian Forces to replace a police officer in a policing function within Canada.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** My next question is for the CSIS officials.

You assessed the threat level to be medium. In your opinion, did that justify the arrest and confinement of 105 people, 90 of whom were Quebeckers?

Now that all the charges against those people have been dropped, what is your take on how the situation was handled, and do you feel that the threat was accurately assessed?

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** Mr. Chair, in answer to the question, I would say that I am very satisfied with how the threat was assessed with regard to distinct groups. The commanding officers on the ground made decisions based on what has happened at the time; those decisions were based partly on our information, but also on information pulled from a much larger network.

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** So you are saying that it was the Ontario Provincial Police that decided, further to the assessed threat level, to put those people in jail.

**Mr. Ray Boisvert:** No, madam. I am saying that police tactics were the decisions of commanding officers in each sector, Huntsville and Toronto. Our information was simply to help guide them in their decision making.

• (1045)

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Mr. Charlebois, what is your take on this?

I would remind you that 90 Quebeckers were arrested, although the charges were dropped. They did not really pose a threat.

What is your opinion on that?

[English]

**Supt Tim Charlebois:** I appreciate the opportunity to reply, but again, I cannot speak for what occurred on the streets of the G-20. It was within the jurisdiction of the Toronto police service and the events as they unfolded on the streets of Toronto. I can only speak for the G-8, particularly on what occurred there in the arresting process. Those who were arrested were taken before the courts and are being dealt with.

However, again, I cannot speak for the Toronto Police Service and what occurred with those arrests.

[Translation]

**Ms. Diane Bourgeois:** Very well.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I want to thank my colleagues, as well.

**The Chair:** Good.

[English]

On behalf of the committee, thank you, witnesses, for your testimony.

Again, I'm going to suspend for just a moment while the witnesses leave the table. I'd ask members to stay in proximity to the table.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to just resume this meeting for one minute, please. Members, would you please take your seats?

We have two budget items to deal with. You all have your budget items. I'm looking for a motion in favour of passing those budget items.

**Hon. Geoff Regan:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Mr. Regan is seconded by Mr. Calandra on both budget items.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** With respect to the other item that we discussed last Tuesday, a summons has been issued. That's as far as we can go.

Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

---







**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

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

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

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

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and  
Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the  
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

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

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

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les  
Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à  
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>