



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

---

SECU • NUMBER 029 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Monday, July 12, 2010**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz**



## Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Monday, July 12, 2010

•(1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, CPC)):** I'd like to bring this meeting to order.

This is the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, meeting 29. Today is July 12, and we are, according to Standing Order 106(4), meeting as requested by four members of the committee to discuss their request to undertake a study of the issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits. That is the beginning of our focus here, so we can discuss this and move on from there.

Mr. MacKenzie.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If I may, I want to take this opportunity to thank you personally for having returned to Ottawa. Every member of this committee had to cancel, or at the very least reschedule, important constituency work to be here today. But as we all know, the people of your riding have been devastated by severe flooding, and clearly you would much rather be home at this time attending to their needs.

We have a motion that we would like to submit, in both official languages, that we feel addresses this issue in the most productive, reasonable, and honest way possible.

I hereby move that the committee commend the efforts of front-line police officers who worked in exceptionally difficult circumstances to protect the safety of Canadians, delegates, and visitors to the city of Toronto and the town of Huntsville; and that the committee reject calls to promote the agendas of the violent mob made up of thugs and hooligans who set fire to police cars and damaged property during the G-20 in Toronto.

The Government of Canada has been open and transparent with—

**Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.):** Chair, I have a point of order, if I may.

**An hon. member:** There's a motion on the floor.

**The Chair:** Yes, there's a motion on the floor.

Mr. Holland, you have a point of order.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The committee has rules with respect to the production of a motion. Forty-eight hours are required. This is the first time I've heard this motion. We have a motion that's before us. If there was an amendment in order, then Mr. MacKenzie could move, once we have

the opportunity to begin debate of the motion, but a new motion would not be in order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Let's suspend for a moment.

•

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

•

**The Chair:** Let me first of all deal with the point of order from Mr. Holland.

Forty-eight hours is not necessary if the motion relates to the matter at hand. That is one of the rules of committee. So if this motion relates to the matters at hand, it could be moved. No other motion has been tabled at this point; we've got notice of them.

**An hon member:** *Monsieur le président, j'ai un rappel au Règlement.*

**The Chair:** Mr. Holland, you have...?

•(1535)

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Mr. Chair, if I could, the problem I'm having with what you're saying is that, first, the motion is substantive; and second, the motion would follow after this motion. So even if I were to accept your ruling, a motion introduced on the floor, out of the blue, would follow the motion that is already duly presented before committee.

One can't walk in and say, "Well, I've decided to bring a motion to the floor with no notice", and supplant a motion that's before us. There's clearly an order—even if I were to accept your ruling—in which the motions would need to be dealt with. That's the traditional practice of the committee.

So even if I were to accept your first logic, there's a problem with the order in which these are dealt with. This is not the appropriate time to be dealing with a motion off the floor.

**The Chair:** I'll hear the next point of order.

Mr. Dewar.

**Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP):** Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you for being here today as well.

I just want to underline the point that we had a motion in front of us to have a meeting and to deal with that motion. Another item that should be cited here in the point of order I'm making is not just that we have the motion we're debating right now, but that there was a subsequent motion following that, which was given 48 hours' notice, which would naturally follow in sequence after this motion was dealt with. I'm referring to the motion that all members have, I think, in both official languages, that we would have a witness immediately after if we decided to conduct meetings on the G-8 and G-20.

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers was here, and that motion was to follow this one.

In terms of sequence, I think there was the motion we had live on whether or not to have a meeting on the G-8 and G-20. Following that was the motion that was submitted by my colleague, with 48 hours' notice, to have a witness to follow up on our request for a meeting on the G-8 and G-20. So I respectfully submit to Mr. MacKenzie that it was fair enough if he read something into the record. I think he's done that, and if we can, let's move on now and actually vote on the motion in front of us.

**The Chair:** Mr. MacKenzie, you wanted to respond?

Oh, yes, Mr. Del Mastro, you are next in this, and then Ms. Mourani.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, on this issue of the point of order, I just wanted to make a couple of things clear. First of all, you as chair recognized Mr. MacKenzie. There is no motion before the committee. The committee was called together on this topic. That's the topic to which Mr. MacKenzie is speaking. He has been granted the floor, which gives him the opportunity to introduce a motion.

I don't believe there's any point of order here. You have clarified that he is speaking to the content and to the issue before the committee. I think it's only appropriate that Mr. MacKenzie be entitled to complete his statement. He has been given the floor, and others will be given the opportunity to have the floor as well. He's put a motion before committee. If members opposite don't wish to support that motion, at the correct time they can exercise their opinions on the motion. Mr. MacKenzie does have the floor. I think the point of order is invalid.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Ms. Mourani.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to point out that at the committee's last meeting, on July 5, 2010, which focused on CSIS and Mr. Fadden's allegations, I introduced a motion that called for Mr. Fadden's resignation and that he be held at fault for his actions. Mr. Préfontaine and Mr. Davies, who was replacing you that day, told me that 48 hours' notice was required.

We were talking about Mr. Fadden. The topic was CSIS and Mr. Fadden. I introduced a motion about him and was told that I had to give 48 hours' notice. So I believe that Mr. MacKenzie can give us

his notice of motion today. He needs 48 hours, the same as everyone else at this table.

Furthermore, a motion was also put forward by my NDP colleague. My motion was introduced on July 5, with 48 hours' notice. So I would like to debate the motion, which everyone has received and which states that the committee blames Richard Fadden and calls on the Prime Minister to ask for his resignation. I, too, have motions I want to move.

Today's meeting was called so we could make some real decisions and vote to determine whether we want to discuss the G-20 or not and hold meetings accordingly. There are a lot of witnesses I want to meet with, perhaps unlike my colleague, Mr. MacKenzie, who wants to commend people on their excellent work.

● (1540)

[English]

**The Chair:** Do you have another point of order?

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Just on that same point of order, Mr. Chair, I think Madame Mourani is correct about placing the motions in the order in which they are received. That is the practice and convention of this committee.

Secondly, I would suggest, Mr. Chair, that in the event we're going to break from the convention that you deal with motions in the order in which the committee receives them, in the order in which we have agreed to deal with them, then the most appropriate action would be to seek the committee's concurrence regarding which motions to deal with first.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. MacKenzie.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** With all due respect, Mr. Chair, Mr. Holland, of all people, knows that you can present motions in the committee. He's done it a number of times. Obviously his memory is a little bit short. He's done it with respect to committee agendas and other issues. There is no other motion on the floor. My motion is the only motion on the floor.

We're here. That's not a motion. We're here. That calls for the meeting, and we're here, Mr. Holland, with all due respect.

There are a number of motions that have been brought before this committee that haven't been dealt with because they haven't been brought to the floor, and they deal with a variety of interests. In this case, Mr. Chair, I was recognized by the chair. Nobody was before. They've introduced their motion and circulated it. That's fair, but it wasn't presented to the committee. My motion has been presented to the committee, and we should deal with it. That's parliamentary practice. It's what we should be doing here today.

Our presence means we've all agreed to be here, obviously. We've consented to that. But my motion is duly moved to the table, and we should deal with it.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. McColeman had his hand up to be recognized as well.

Mr. McColeman.

**Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC):** If we're talking about the order of motions, I recall that at the last committee meeting prior to the summer constituency break, there was a motion on the table that was being debated, so I'm not so sure there wasn't a motion presented by Mr. Wrzesnewskyj. If you're trying to make determinations on which motion should go first, that motion was on our agenda that day. It was not dealt with, and I'm just wondering, if you're talking about order of motions, where that would stand, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Kania.

**Mr. Andrew Kania (Brampton West, Lib.):** Briefly, and to address the point of my friend Mr. McColeman, this is a special meeting that has been constituted pursuant to this motion that was signed. I won't read the whole motion, but it was specifically with respect to the G-8 and G-20 summits. That's why we're here, so we would not be dealing with any other motions. It has to be topical to this.

**The Chair:** And I made the ruling already that it was.

Mr. Dewar.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Chair, I just have to say, by Mr. Del Mastro's logic... I agree with him: we are here for a special meeting. There is actually no subject on the floor. By Mr. Del Mastro's own logic, though, you wouldn't be able to introduce a motion, because it's not related to anything, because there's nothing on the floor yet. That was the logic of his pronouncement. So I think you can't have it both ways. We're here. We've called a special meeting. I'm glad to see everyone here. That's it. Let's get on with that business and save the parlour tricks for later. We are here to discuss whether we're going to have the meeting. After that, we'll look at motions, and hopefully they'll be tabled in an appropriate fashion.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** With all due respect, that's not correct. We have an agenda here. We have something we need to discuss, and I've heard all the points of order. I'm going to now suspend again for a moment to sort these all out with the clerk, to decide how we're going to move forward here, because it is obviously taking a lot more time than I thought it would to simply proceed.

• \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_  
•

**The Chair:** Okay. This meeting has been called to discuss whether we're going to undertake a study of the issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits. That's what we're going to talk about first. Then I will entertain motions in the order in which I receive them.

Mr. MacKenzie has the floor. We will now let him continue.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Thank you, Chair.

The motion I move is that the committee commend the efforts of front-line police officers who worked in exceptionally difficult circumstances to protect the safety of Canadians, delegates, and visitors to the city of Toronto and the town of Huntsville; and that the committee reject calls to promote the agenda of the violent mob

made up of thugs and hooligans who set fire to police cars and damaged property during the G-20 in Toronto.

In support of that, Mr. Chair, the Government of Canada has been open and transparent with every aspect of the G-8 and G-20 summits. Overall security cost estimates for the G-8 and G-20 summits were made available through the normal estimates and supply tabling process in Parliament, and this government welcomed a review of all the security expenditures by the Auditor General of Canada.

What we're tasked with today is the issue of how the police conducted themselves under extremely difficult circumstances. We know that Toronto Police Chief Bill Blair was quoted as saying that the officers were there to facilitate peaceful protests. He even went so far as to say that it was the police's responsibility in a democracy to protect the rights of peaceful demonstrators. Clearly this was the expectation of the security teams on the ground, and to the credit of our hard-working public officers, those peaceful protests were allowed to convene and did take place.

Free speech is a principle of our democracy, but the violent mob made up of thugs, hooligans, and anarchists who set fire to police cars and damaged property during the G-20 in Toronto in no way, shape, or form represents a democracy or the Canadian way of life. Mr. Chair, freedom of expression is not a right to destruction. There is no excuse for resorting to violence to express political dissent, but I suspect that violence was the only thing they had in mind to begin with. The unfortunate reality at these summits is that they do attract a certain criminal element.

What we witnessed in Toronto has been seen around the world all too often since the early 1980s, first in European capitals and then later in places like Seattle, Pittsburgh, and closer to home in Montebello. Obviously the damage done and the violence inflicted was viewed as disturbing and deplorable to all Canadians who watched it unfold.

We should be commending the police who acted to protect delegates, residents, and visitors in what were, as we saw from the live media reports from the ground, very difficult circumstances. At no time was the safety of summit participants compromised, nor was there ever any breach of the security perimeter. When the mob of thugs, hooligans, and anarchists was stopped from breaching the perimeter, they set fire to police cars and damaged property. They came to Toronto determined to create mayhem, with one thing and one thing only on their minds: violence. These individuals purposely dressed in black clothing to intimidate. These cowards masked their faces. They came packed with weapons.

When members of the press attempted to film or photograph them, they turned on those same journalists. They taunted the police, they victimized shop owners, and worst of all they terrorized the hard-working, honest citizens of Toronto who worked in those shops and lived in those neighbourhoods.

On that point, let me add one additional point. Guidelines have been prepared to address situations where the Government of Canada considers payments to commercial businesses, non-profit organizations—

●(1550)

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** A point of order, Chair.

You just ruled that no motions are allowed to be presented at this point, until we have dealt with the order of the day. Is that correct, Chair?

**The Chair:** I made it quite clear that we have an order of the day that we have to discuss. I explained this already.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Correct. Thank you.

**The Chair:** That's what the discussion is about.

We will proceed.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Sorry. With due respect, Chair—and I mean that—we're now having Mr. MacKenzie talk about his motion. Is that not what you're hearing? I mean, I'm hearing him introduce his motion. You just said his motions are not allowed to be introduced until we've discussed the order of the day. So I'm just trying to check in here as to what's going on.

**The Chair:** That's not what I said.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Okay, what did you say?

**The Chair:** Please listen carefully.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** I will.

**The Chair:** We are going to discuss this and then I will take the motions in order.

Mr. Davies is not here. He's the one who pressed for this, but he's not here. I presume you're taking his place?

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** That's correct.

**The Chair:** Okay.

You will have an opportunity when we're done discussing this, and we've made the decision to move your motion. Your motion is not on the floor yet.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** But he is moving and speaking to a motion.

Is that not what you're doing, Mr. MacKenzie?

**The Chair:** If you listen very carefully, Mr. Dewar, you will see that he is relating to the topic at hand.

Go ahead, Mr. MacKenzie.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** But he's moving a motion, Chair. He just said it. I'm just trying to clarify.

If you could clarify, Chair, if he's moving a motion.... I can't do that directly to him; you can do that.

**The Chair:** I made the point that everybody needs to discuss this issue that is before us.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Then he moved a motion.

**The Chair:** I'm giving an opportunity. I have five people on my speaking list on this issue: Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. Del Mastro, Mr. Calandra, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Dechert.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Could you just clarify, Mr. Chair, whether he's moving a motion or not? That's all I'm asking. I think it's a fair question: yes or no?

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

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Am I to answer his question? I don't think I answer his question, Chair.

**The Chair:** No, you continue.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** No, the question is whether you are moving a motion. Can he answer that? Are you moving a motion, David, yes or no? Come on.

**The Chair:** Mr. Dewar, he has moved a motion, and I have ruled that it will come—

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** He is. It's out of order then, according to your own order. What's going on here? You said not to move a motion until after this was dealt with. Now you're saying he can move a motion. I'm just asking what's going on. This is by your own—

**The Chair:** Okay, we're going to suspend for a minute.

●

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

●

**The Chair:** Let me repeat what I said before: we are discussing the orders of the day, whether this committee will undertake a study. A motion has been moved, but we will discuss motion one and motion two. Mr. MacKenzie has the right to and is relating his remarks to the agenda that is before us.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** So, Mr. Chair, just one last time, he is not moving a motion then.

**The Chair:** I have not recognized you yet, Mr. Dewar. I realize that you probably have not been at this committee previously, but we respect the rules of the committee. We ask that you be recognized by the chair before you start talking. You're turning your microphone on. You're talking whenever you please. That's not how you conduct things in the House of Commons. Please respect the chair and wait for the chair to recognize you. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. Dewar.

●(1555)

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Would it be too much to ask right now whether or not Mr. MacKenzie is continuing to speak to a motion that he has tabled, yes or no?

**The Chair:** He has indicated that he is relating his remarks to the topic we have at hand here.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Mr. Chair, with due respect, he said—and it's in the record—that he was moving his motion. Mr. Del Mastro agreed with that, so I think there's some communication breakdown.

**The Chair:** Okay. I've ruled on that. I think there's no point in going over this again.

Please finish your remarks, Mr. MacKenzie, and then we're going to go to Mr. Del Mastro, then Mr. Calandra, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Dechert.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Thank you, Chair.

Guidelines have been prepared to address situations where the Government of Canada considers payments to commercial businesses, non-profit organizations, and individuals to compensate for consequences as a result of extraordinary security measures implemented at international meetings such as the G-8 and G-20. The guidelines in place are fair and have been effective in the past. These are the same guidelines that were in place for the summit of the Americas in Quebec City and the Kananaskis summit before that.

As we all know, these summits attracted delegations from over 20 countries. In addition to the member nations, international agencies and outreach nations were in attendance. In total more than 10,000 delegates participated. Coverage of the summits also drew a media contingent of approximately 5,000 people.

Canada had an obligation to protect the heads of state who participated at these summits, as well as Canadians and international visitors. The RCMP led an integrated security unit, and its security partners spent a great deal of time planning for this complex security operation. As a result of these efforts, a comprehensive approach was developed to ensure a safe and secure environment for all involved.

Our government has been clear from the start: hosting two major international summits would generate significant security demands. Planning involved input from all security partners. What unfolded in Toronto serves as proof that our vigilance was warranted and our security planning justified. I am proud of how well our security partners conducted themselves under exceptionally difficult circumstances.

Final figures and evaluations are currently being compiled by the integrated security unit. An independent civilian review is being undertaken by the Toronto Police Services Board. Ontario's ombudsman has announced that he'll be looking into the role the province played. As I've already mentioned, the Auditor General will be conducting a review.

Are we saying no to this committee studying the matter, as some in the press have suggested? Absolutely not. As we have said from the start, we will remain open and transparent, but we will serve Canadians better by waiting until the integrated security unit has had a chance to complete its work. We on the government side believe we owe it to the victims of those thugs, hooligans, and anarchists to do this properly. This means waiting to study the issue once all the facts are available.

Mr. Chair, those would be my comments relative to the orders of the day that have been presented to this committee. This whole day here today is costing Canadians a lot of money needlessly. It's premature. There are other bodies looking into this that at this point are more appropriate.

This simply comes down to trying to justify to those people who went to Toronto to break the law, to disrupt everyday lives in Toronto, that it's okay. We're saying it's not okay. More importantly, we do believe there are other bodies in place that are currently looking at this situation. We need to wait until they've finished their work before we start on some sort of campaign here to demoralize the police and other people who did a great job for Canadians.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

I've had indications from four more members that they want to speak. I've added them to the list.

Mr. Del Mastro, you're next.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address this.

Just to expand a little bit on Mr. MacKenzie's point initially, I do think the order of things is really out of whack here. We have a number of independent bodies that have indicated they are going to be addressing this situation. I'm left drawing the conclusion that this is frankly a partisan or politically motivated emergency meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Safety, and as Mr. MacKenzie indicated, we should allow these independent bodies to complete their reporting of the facts before this committee undertakes any study at all in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, my own impression is that Canadians were very proud to host the G-8 and G-20 meetings and to have those international leaders here. There were a lot of successes at these meetings, and Canadians are proud of those successes.

We know that under the leadership of the Prime Minister, the G-8 discussed a wide range of global challenges, including nuclear proliferation, issues with Iran, governance, stability in the Middle East, and climate change, just to name a few.

The Muskoka initiative was also a great example of leadership shown by Canada. Over \$7 billion was committed for new spending on maternal, newborn, and child health. The summit was a great success due to the leadership shown by Canada.

Mr. Chairman, in Toronto the leaders of the G-20 met for the first time since it took on its new primary role as the forum for international economic collaboration and cooperation. It happened at a critical juncture in the global economic recovery, and Canada and the other G-20 countries reaffirmed our collective resolve to safeguard and strengthen recovery and to foster strong sustainable and balanced growth.

In my constituency, Mr. Chairman, the main concern I hear about from everyday people is the economy. In this global economy, we must continue to work with our international partners to ensure a coordinated approach in light of the global recession we are just emerging from. But that's not what today's meeting is about. The opposition has decided to call a meeting to examine all issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits. We all know that there are elements within our society that want to disrupt these important meetings. Mr. MacKenzie has rightly referred to them as thugs, hooligans, and anarchists. The simple fact is that increased security has become a necessity in order to ensure the safety of leaders, delegates, and the public. That's the world we live in, Mr. Chair.

In this regard, the security operations, in my view, were a resounding success. The meetings were not interrupted, and the injuries were minor.

In Canada we uphold freedom of expression. We are a democracy. Free expression is not merely tolerated, it is a constitutional right. That being said, no one has the right to break the law, inflict violence, or commit vandalism. And frankly, Mr. Chairman, I grew up respecting public institutions, and I look at the police as an extension of society. I saw an awful lot of public disrespect of police officers, which saddened me greatly.

What I saw transpire on the streets of Toronto was disappointing. The way individuals acted and anarchist movements flouted the law and attempted to bring mayhem to Toronto was disgraceful, Mr. Chairman. It's unfortunate that these groups attempted to disrupt the important discussions being held by world leaders.

Today, Mr. Chair, we see that the opposition coalition is alive and well, and that's why we're here today. This is another example of the opposition playing partisan politics at this committee. This time they're giving credence to the complaints of these anarchist groups. To recall this committee on an emergency basis is nothing more than a cheap political stunt designed for maximum political benefit.

As my colleague Mr. MacKenzie has already stated, independent processes are under way to determine if these allegations are unfounded or if they are legitimate. Unlike the coalition led by the NDP, we stand for our front-line police officers and for the safety of Canadians. We do not stand for the thugs who sought to threaten public safety at the G-20 summit in Toronto.

• (1600)

If the opposition is serious about doing a thorough and complete study instead of merely advancing a political agenda, then they'll stop this political charade and agree to wait for the final review before studying any of this at this committee. That would be the prudent and responsible thing to do.

I think it's important to clarify that law enforcement officials are responsible for making decisions on security. The government does not interfere in law enforcement determinations. There has been no political interference and no allegations of political interference.

Now, I might add, Mr. Chair, that this is in stark contrast to the international summits held when the Liberals were in power. We all remember the Prime Minister's Office trying to influence security decisions at the APEC summit in Vancouver in 1997. We all remember what happened...when you don't have security, Mr. Chairman.

Our security partners were able to protect the safety of Canadians, delegates, and visitors in the city of Toronto and the town of Huntsville, working in what were exceptionally difficult circumstances. In light of this, I do not agree with the NDP coalition's cause for even pulling this committee together today. I definitely don't agree with the NDP motions that we're going to hear later, and I don't agree with the NDP in the fact that it seems to be lining itself up with anarchist groups that went to Toronto and caused damage.

This committee meeting needs to have a thoughtful and balanced reflection on security matters. This can only happen once the ISU,

the Toronto police, and appropriate bodies have had the chance to review and report on their findings. They have the expertise, and we should trust them to make their findings. Then we will be in a position to examine the issue properly.

This meeting, at this time, is not only premature but also completely unwarranted, Mr. Chairman. I don't see the public clamouring to uphold the violent and destructive actions of these thugs. In fact, I hear people commending the work of our police forces.

I'd just refer briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I could, to a poll done in Peterborough just last week by *The Peterborough Examiner*. The question was with regard to the Toronto summit: "Do you think the police at the G-20 summit used force reasonably to quell the protests?" Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that they approved of the actions of police. If that's the public clamouring for this committee getting out ahead of the appropriate bodies, I'm not seeing that in my community.

This committee should be clearly condemning the actions of the anarchists, not giving them a public forum to defend their criminal deeds, and I believe the motion that Mr. MacKenzie has discussed in fact does do this. This is not only the view of the members on this side of the table; it's also the view of the overwhelming majority of Canadians.

Mr. Chair, I agree with what my colleague said. I urge this committee, and in particular the opposition, to put aside political motivations and instead stand with our police, stand with the appropriate bodies already examining this issue, condemn the violence by these thugs and hooligans, and agree to hold these meetings when all the facts can be properly presented.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1605)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Del Mastro.

I'll just remind the committee of the speaking order here, as some of you have been asking me: Mr. Calandra, Mr. Holland, Mr. Dechert, Mr. Kania, Mr. McColeman, Mr. Dewar, and Mr. Wrzesnewskyj.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Mr. Chair, I asked for the floor a while ago.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Mourani, are you indicating that you want to be on the speaking order?

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Yes—I hope.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'll add Ms. Mourani to that order.

Mr. Calandra, please.

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



Mr. Chair, let me just start by saying how disappointing it is to be here to actually seemingly promote the agenda of the thugs and hooligans who sought to disrupt the G-20 protests, or the good work of the G-20. Some people seem to think that freedom of expression and the right to protest is somehow also a licence for destruction. It's shameful that this is what we're here for and that we're not here to discuss the extraordinary work done by the Prime Minister and the other G-20 leaders to help improve our global economic recovery, and in fact the extraordinary work done by the people of Toronto in welcoming world leaders from 20 of the most populous nations in the world, and the extraordinary work done by all of the police forces that were on hand.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to remind members that not only did Canada have a moral obligation to protect the visiting heads of state who were in attendance at the G-8 and G-20 summits, but we were also obligated, under a United Nations convention that was adopted in 1973, to protect internationally protected persons, which include the participants of these summits. The 30-plus world leaders and their delegations that came to Canada for the summits were all covered under this convention. Their security was critical to the success of the summits, which advanced several significant global initiatives and will ultimately have an impact on the citizens of all nations. As *The Globe and Mail* stated in its editorial of June 27, 2010, and I quote, "...G-20 security accomplished its most critical task. Summit work was conducted without disruption of the participants."

I add that this was done despite the best efforts of a band of hooligans and thugs, whose only task was to somehow disrupt this very valuable work.

Mr. Chair, if I may, what was accomplished? I think it's best we consider the summary declaration of the G-20.

Number one, the G-20 leaders met in Toronto under its new role as the premier forum for international economic cooperation at a critical juncture in the global economic recovery. We reaffirmed our collective resolve to safeguard and strengthen recovery, and foster strong, sustainable, and balanced growth.

Number two, our decisive actions over the past two years have helped protect our citizens from the global recession and have fuelled economic growth, yet the global economic recovery, Mr. Chair, remains fragile, and the unbalanced nature of the expansion now poses risks to that growth.

We agreed to the urgency to sustain and strengthen the global recovery, and will use the framework for strong, sustainable, and balanced growth as a key to our economic cooperation going forward.

We agreed to complete our planned fiscal stimulus, and that advanced members will at least halve their deficit by 2013 and stabilize government debt-to-GDP ratios, or put them on a downward path by 2016, Mr. Chair.

Emerging market members will strengthen social safety nets, enhance corporate governance reform, deepen financial markets, raise infrastructure spending, and increase exchange rate flexibility, and all members will pursue structural reforms to increase our individual and collective growth prospects.

We welcome the actions taken and commitments made by a number of G-20 countries to boost demand and rebalance and strengthen our public finances and make our financial systems stronger and more transparent.

These measures represent substantial contributions to our collective well-being, build on previous actions, and represent a down payment on the next phase of our mutual assessment process, which will be conducted at the country level.

A strong financial system is critical to achieving sustainable global economic recovery, and we have already made considerable progress. However, more work remains. We agreed that the amount and quality of capital will be significantly higher. We also agreed that higher standards must complement strengthened supervision.

•(1610)

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Mr. Chair, can we please remain on topic here? We are all really engrossed with the talking points of the government, but we're really hearing about economic forecasting, as opposed to the issue of security at the G-20.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'll ask all members to...

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Without the talking points this time.

**Mr. Paul Calandra:** I'll go back a bit.

We also agreed that higher standards must be complemented with strength and supervision.

We committed to ensure that we have all the powers and tools to resolve all types of financial institutions in crisis and have adopted principles to guide implementation.

We committed to principles of financial sector responsibility to protect taxpayers from the cost of crises where they occur.

We accelerated the schedule of the implementation of measures to improve supervision and the transparency of hedge funds, credit rating agencies, and OTC derivative markets.

In addressing the development imbalances and helping those most vulnerable bear the brunt of economic crisis, we launched the SME finance challenge.

We also increased the capacity of international financial institutions to help those most vulnerable by doubling the lending capacity of the regional development banks.

We completed the voice and representation reforms of the World Bank and agreed to accelerate our work to complete the IMF quota reform by the Seoul summit.

We stand united with Haiti, and we are providing much needed construction assistance, including the full cancellation of all of Haiti's debt.

Recognizing that global trade is a driver for global growth, we extended our standstill agreement to resist protectionism for an additional three years, and we will continue our efforts in support of a conclusion to the WTO Doha Round of negotiations.

We will meet again in Seoul in November and then annually thereafter, beginning with France in 2011 and Mexico in 2012.

The perpetrators of the violence we all witnessed are thugs. They are hooligans and anarchists; they are not social activists.

I agree with my colleagues that free speech is at the very heart of our democracy. But freedom of expression is not a right to destruction. And let's be clear: the violent and destructive acts of those thugs and hooligans did not contribute to democracy. The anarchists who set fire to the police cars and attacked storefronts and shop employees do not represent democratic action, peaceful protest, or freedom of expression.

Mr. Chair, freedom of expression gives no one the right to destroy and intimidate. There is no excuse for resorting to violence to express political dissent. But clearly violence was the only thing these thugs, hooligans, and anarchists had in mind. It is an unfortunate reality that when world leaders come together to address the challenges we collectively share, those with nothing to contribute use it as an excuse to go on a destructive rampage.

The responsibility that came with hosting events of this magnitude and the corresponding risks cannot simply be dismissed. Our security partners were able to protect the safety of Canadians, delegates, and visitors to the city of Toronto and the town of Huntsville, working in what were exceptionally difficult circumstances.

Mr. Chair, security is not a negotiable endeavour. The government's approach to security prevented what would have undoubtedly been a much larger cost to Canadians and to world partners. I can say that I was extraordinarily proud of the men and women of the York Region police force who also participated in helping secure the G-20 site and the G-8, and I remain extraordinarily proud, not only of them but of the Toronto police services and all of the police forces who came here to protect us. If there's one thing we've shown in both Vancouver and now at the G-8 and the G-20, it's that Canada is a world-class country capable of handling world-class events. We have world-class cities with world-class police, and we shouldn't be ashamed of showing that off to the rest of the world, and we should never be ashamed of showing leadership when leadership is required.

With that, Mr. Chair, I will conclude my remarks.

•(1615)

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

I want to remind the committee of the motion that was brought forward to me to call this meeting. I will read it to you again. I was listening very carefully to see if the remarks pertained to the issue, and they did.

I will read the motion again so that you know: that this standing committee be convened in order to examine all issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits, including but not limited to the conduct of security personnel.

Mr. Holland.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Perhaps I can help expedite things. Despite the talking points and the very lengthy prepared statements that were just read by government members, actually I support this motion, because it has absolutely nothing to do with what we're here today to talk about.

Let's go through the motion. First is to reject the call to promote the agenda of a violent mob. Let me be very clear. I think everybody condemns the violence that we saw in Toronto—

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark Holland:** I'm speaking for myself. If there are some who don't feel that way, they can speak alternately.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Holland, we have a point of order that I have to recognize.

Ms. Mourani.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Mr. Chair, I want to check something with you. We are indeed talking about the motion you just read, correct? If I understand correctly, Mr. Holland is referring to another motion that is not on the table.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark Holland:** No. My point, if I understand....

Sorry, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Ms. Mourani, to answer your question, you have before you the agenda. On that agenda it clearly states that we are here to discuss whether we're going to undertake a study of the issues surrounding the G-8 and G-20 summits. That's what we're talking about.

Go ahead, Mr. Holland.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Mr. Chair, I have my issues with the process. We've had a debate. I'm anxious to move on. I disagree with the way the process has been conducted, but that's another issue.

The point here, as I understand it, is that we have no motion on the floor so we're talking in a general sense. What I'm offering to committee is an opportunity to expedite matters. Perhaps government members are under a confused impression about why we're here today.

Let me take the motion that is being proposed by Mr. MacKenzie in two parts. The first has to do with the actions of a number of individuals that were unforgivable, that attacked the city, and that I think all of us condemn in every possible way. I have no problem with that.

The second part of the motion is to commend front-line officers who were working in an exceptionally difficult circumstance. Well, I don't have a problem with that.

But the issue isn't front-line officers. The issue is a Prime Minister who put them there. The issue is with a Prime Minister who made a decision to put the G-20 in downtown Toronto. The issue is with a Prime Minister who decided to not even consult the City of Toronto on placing that summit in the heart of the city. The issue is with a Prime Minister who didn't bother to have a conversation with even the mayor until five minutes before this thing happened. The issue is that this was turned into a security nightmare. All of this was predictable; all of this we knew would happen.

That's the issue, folks. The issue is that the government spent \$2 billion, the number might now reach, for security and other goodies related to this, and it became an absolute farce. The issue is that now the government is trying to use officers and the word "security" as a shield, as a way to avoid the word "accountability". You can't just raise the spectre of our military or police and avoid accountability—avoid accountability for the decisions that were made and the consequences that happened.

I've lived in the greater Toronto region my entire life. I have never seen anything like what happened to our city. As I walked into that city and through its empty streets at the height of tourist season, as I looked at the entirely predictable outcomes unfold...I think no one could help but be disgusted at the way this was handled.

This isn't about front-line officers; it's about the terrible decisions that were made that led up to the complete mess that was the summit. You can put all of the talking points in the world around whatever you want to say, but the reality is that the legacy of this summit is one of waste and one of, frankly, displaying a city, a great city, in the most negative light I've ever seen it.

What I really have a problem with, and it is something that is done consistently, Mr. Chair, is the intellectual dishonesty with which the arguments are framed. Let me take the most recent example. It was just before this House rose, when we dealt with the issue of pardons. In the House of Commons, a member of this committee stood and said that I supported the notion that Karla Homolka should get a pardon. This was five minutes—

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** A point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** —before I was to meet with the ministry.

• (1620)

**The Chair:** Let's wait.

Mr. MacKenzie, you had a point of order.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Mr. Holland is on a bit of a rant here, but I don't know what the rant has to do with the issue before the committee.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Mr. Chairman, we were just talking about Haiti, from Mr. Calandra.

**The Chair:** Are you finished, Mr. MacKenzie?

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** My point is that we've all agreed that we're supposed to deal with the issue on the order of the day. Whatever his issue is with respect to before the House rose, it has nothing to do with the matter here.

**The Chair:** Mr. Holland, I'm sure you'll explain how this relates to what we're talking about.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Let me be extremely clear on how it relates: it is absolutely no different from what has transpired today. Government members are coming forward and saying that somehow those who are in the opposition support violent mobs. Give me a break. They're saying that somehow we don't support front-line officers. Give me a break.

Shame on you. Shame on you for going that low when you know full well that we came here today to talk about the debacle that this whole summit thing became, to talk about what transpired in Toronto. That's what we're here to discuss. And clearly, because you spent nearly half an hour discussing it, you've got a great deal to hide and worry about.

Well, let's make a favour for everyone. Let's get to actually the business of setting the agenda. If you want to vote on this motion, which has nothing to do, frankly, with the reason we're here today, let's do it. I'll vote for it. Then let's get on to the real questions and let's have a real debate. But let's not waste all of our time with these silly talking points.

**The Chair:** Mr. Dechert and then Mr. Kania.

**Mr. Bob Dechert (Mississauga—Erindale, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As a member of Parliament from the Toronto area, I have to say that I was also very saddened watching the footage of the violent protests in Toronto during the G-20 summit. Along with most Canadians and most residents of the Toronto area, I was shocked to see the violence taking place in what I consider to be a magnificent and typically peaceful city of Toronto. I join with the vast majority of Canadians in condemning these senseless acts of violence and the wanton destruction of property.

I'm also grateful that the injuries to all parties were minor. As Toronto City Council recently did, I also want to commend the outstanding work of our security forces leading up to and during the G-20 summit.

The security plan was developed by Canada's best experts in the field. The integrated security unit and its partners, such as the Toronto Police Service, had a comprehensive approach to security planning. In light of the violent mob made up of thugs, hooligans, and anarchists, this approach proved to be both necessary and essential.

The antics employed by such groups as these thugs, hooligans, and anarchists are, in my view, deplorable. These thugs, hooligans, and anarchists are obviously not representative of Canadian society, and I know that the citizens of Toronto and Canadians alike are appalled by their criminal actions.

There have been unsubstantiated allegations—and I stress that these are allegations—of problems surrounding the security at the G-8 and G-20 summits. I find it concerning that the opposition is willing to bypass the processes and bodies already in place to determine if these allegations are grounded in fact or on baseless accusations. Giving voice and prominence to groups such as these thugs, hooligans, and anarchists will circumvent the processes that are in place to determine if allegations actually have a basis in fact.

We know that the Ontario ombudsman, the Toronto police review board, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director, and the special investigative unit of Ontario are all involved in different capacities in reviewing the actions of police.

All Canadians were shocked to see the violence that was perpetrated by these thugs, and we must all consider how giving these extremists a public forum to defend their violent deeds could impact the police investigations and other independent investigations that are currently under way.

Mr. Chair, we stand up for our front-line police officers and for the safety of Canadians. We do not stand up for thugs who sought to threaten public safety and destroy property during the G-20 summit in Toronto, which was an opportunity for our country to showcase the Toronto area and our nation before the world. I think we did that. For those reasons, I think we're doing Canadians a disservice here today.

Thank you.

• (1625)

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

Mr. Kania, please.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to address this through a practical analysis. I have four main points.

One, I support the Conservative Party's motion to commend front-line police officers and reject calls to promote the agendas of violent mobs. We can vote on it at any time you want, and I will support it. But that's not why we're here today. We're here today to decide whether we're going to undertake a study to examine all issues with respect to the G-8 and the G-20.

When I speak to my constituents, there are two main things they say to me. They ask why we spent \$1.2 billion or more on this summit. We could have done so many different things with this money. We could have, for example, put the money into further economic incentives. Everybody knows that the April numbers came out, and GDP is zero, and that we're not out of this recession, despite what's been done so far by the government. With regard to EI changes, they tacked on some additional weeks for "good workers". We could have done something else. Day care, tax cuts, education, health care—there are so many different things we could have done with \$1.2 billion. Why did we not do those things instead?

The London, England, 2009 G-20 cost \$30 million. Why did this cost \$1.2 billion? It's a good question.

Next they ask me why, if you spent \$1.2 billion at a minimum, it was such a mess. They want to find out exactly why this took place. Why was it in downtown Toronto? There had been a suggestion to use the CNE grounds. Why was that not accepted? The G-8 and the G-20 were divided between Huntsville and Toronto, which made no logical sense and drove up the costs. Why was that decision made?

You had a lot of waste. There were washrooms built in towns very far from the centre of Huntsville, for example, that nobody would ever use for the summit. That's not even logical. So they say let's examine this to determine why so much money was spent. Second,

even under the circumstance that so much money was spent, why was it such a mess?

Now, I'm going to end there after this one brief point, because I don't want to go on and on. I don't have talking points that I'm going to read through.

We've had the experience in this committee of Conservative members filibustering, in essence, so that we wouldn't get to a vote, and we wouldn't get to make a decision. We have an hour left today. This is a special meeting. Canadians need to know. I would ask, please, that we get to a vote, that we make a decision as to whether we are having a study, and we start putting a nature to this rather than just reading talking points. If we don't get to a vote, and we don't make that decision, Canadians need to know. This has happened before, and there's been a continual Conservative filibuster to avoid making these decisions and getting to the actual crux of the matter.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I've listened to the arguments, and in light of the arguments presented the one thing that's very clear is that our side, the government, has been accused of reading talking points here today. I can't imagine some of the things that have been said on the other side that aren't exactly that, time after time after time. In light of the arguments proposed, I think most of us on this committee would agree to hold a meeting, and we'd agree as soon as practical after the House convenes, because that would allow the independent work that's going on right now not to be duplicated by this committee.

I think it would be relevant for this committee to undertake that when the House convenes, because it would mean we would be here in Ottawa. It would mean no expense to the taxpayer to fly someone from the west—or in the case of the person who didn't show up here today and who proposed this motion, flying in from Vancouver—and the costs that are entailed to hold a committee meeting like this. Canadians should know that.

I don't think there's any disagreement that we should not be looking into and being accountable for all of the issues around the G-8 and do that analysis and submit our thoughts as we normally would as a committee. But this interruption of our constituency work, which most of us are heavily involved with and have responsibilities to do, is absolutely unnecessary, because there are studies going on currently in the Toronto police.

Do I think Canadians were happy with the results to host the G-8 and G-20? The feedback I'm getting is yes, they were very happy. I also think they were horrified by the actions of the thugs. So I think we can all agree on that. Polls would indicate that the support of the public for the police is exceptionally high, in the very difficult situations they had to deal with.

On a personal level, I live in the neighbourhood of the police chief locally and a member of the OPP, who were involved in the security of these summits. When I talk personally with them on the street, I tell you there were some extenuating circumstances that were very difficult to deal with. They should be commended. We commend them. Toronto City Council commended them, and we should do the same.

We hosted the world's most influential leaders, and we are morally and legally obligated to protect them. During summits we advanced our positions, and that's what's been articulated here, what Canada articulated. Canada went in and set the goals to do. We came out on every one with top marks, and we're looked at by our international partners to be, if not the leading country in the world on economic policy, real close to being the leader.

To me, today is all about the politics and the optics that the opposition has wanted to present to the public on this, unnecessarily. We need to get back to work on this issue when we get back to Parliament. We need to have the facts in front of us that are brought together by the independent parties that are studying them now. We do not need to duplicate their work. We do not need to cost Canadian taxpayers more money with these committee meetings, having to travel to Ottawa, having to take the time and the resources of Parliament to do this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1630)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Just to remind the committee, we are hopefully going to come to the point where we're going to make a decision on whether to undertake a study. I see there's support on both sides. So that's just to make that clear.

Mr. Dewar.

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** Thank you for the reminder, Mr. Chair.

Obviously we want to get to that matter. We have a witness here. I would follow in the same line as Mr. McColeman, in that we're here, and we can hear witnesses. So I guess he would be happy to hear witnesses today, in that light.

Mr. Chair, I have to say, though, that I didn't know that Amnesty International was an anarchist group. I was entirely unaware of the civil liberties union of Canada as being supporters of thugs. These are the people who want to have an inquiry, and by the government's logic, those who want to have an inquiry are somehow associated with anarchy.

That's a doozer, Mr. Chair. They were burning the midnight oil a little too late last night, I think, putting out the talking points, because that's not believable. What is believable... And in fact they should talk to their good friend Randy Hillier. I don't know if they read the article today, but I think most people have. Their friend Randy Hillier thinks there should be accountability.

Mr. Chair, when you have a thousand people arrested, the biggest mass arrest in Canadian history, someone has to be accountable. I think the accountability is with those who decided to have the G-8

and G-20. It wasn't the mayor. It wasn't Mr. Blair. It wasn't you. It was your government. That's who's accountable.

This is a committee of Parliament. Our job is to hold government to account. The G-8 and G-20 was an initiative of the federal government. Over \$1.5 billion to date has been spent, and they don't want to be held accountable. But everyone else should be held accountable.

The whole G-8 and G-20 was what, Mr. Chair...? You remember; you remember your talking points: it was the accountability meetings where we were going to be accountable to the world. Well, isn't that just great—accountable to the world but not accountable to Canadians. And that's what this motion is about.

So please, you know...“thugs”, “anarchists”, the rhetoric, associating that with people who stand up for civil liberties, associating that with Amnesty International and with people who went out to demonstrate peacefully and who want to know what happened, what went wrong.

This cost \$1.5 billion. I can quote you from Hansard every one of those members who said we had to spend this money so that we could have a secure meeting.

Well, it didn't happen, guys. It didn't. No: a thousand people were arrested, and they don't know why. A gentleman with a prosthesis had his leg taken away. Something went desperately wrong, and we have to find out what went wrong.

That's what this motion is about. It's not about what you're hearing from the other side, Mr. Chair. It's about accountability. It's about civil liberties in this country. It's about who has them and when we have them.

On June 24 it was reported that police had special powers to stop, search, and arrest anyone without proper ID within five metres of the summit fence. On June 25 police realized they had misinterpreted the rule, which only applies to five metres within the fence. That same day, the supposed new police powers were widely reported to the media. On June 29, only after the summit was over, Chief Blair clarified that the rule never existed. On July 9, the ombudsman, André Marin, announced that his office was investigating the origin of the communications.

Who's accountable here, Mr. Chair? No one, I guess, from the government's side. Hey, it's always someone else. Well, today it's this committee. We need to vote on this motion. We need to hear from our witness.

Thank you.

• (1635)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I've just been advised that the translators are having a difficult time keeping up with some of the remarks that are being made. Maybe we could slow down a little bit so that they can keep up. Thank you very much.

I have five people left: Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, Ms. Mourani, Mr. Del Mastro, Mr. Calandra, and Mr. MacKenzie.

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

We've had quite a bit of discussion about commending the front-line police officers. I'd like to take a moment to also express my respect and support for Chief of Police Bill Blair, who also worked under extremely difficult circumstances, including a chain of command that it appears was terribly unclear at points in time. That added to the confusion and perhaps the mistakes that occurred around security issues during the summit. In fact there are allegations surfacing that there was second-guessing. So we need to clearly establish who the decision-makers were in that chain of command. Who was ultimately responsible? Was it in fact the head of the ISU, the integrated security unit, Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil? Was someone directing him out of the PCO? Who was making those decisions? Obviously there were terrible lapses—lapses in security and lapses in terms of Canadian civil rights being impinged upon.

Secondly, I want to add my voice to denouncing the so-called “Black Bloc”. I actually called them a mob of miscreants and misfits. Not only did they damage, as is mentioned in this particular motion, police cars, they damaged public and private property. Owners of individual small businesses were victimized by these people—as were all taxpayers of Toronto—when they destroyed public property. That needs to be addressed. They also hijacked legitimate protesters' abilities to speak out, assemble peacefully, and have their issues and voices heard. They drowned out the legitimate ability of Canadians to have their voices heard.

Finally, unfortunately, they have become the useful dupes for providing cover to what is a \$1.2 billion and possibly a \$2 billion security boondoggle and photo op for the Prime Minister.

I have to say as a person who was born and raised and who lives in and has lived in Toronto all my life, I was shocked, as were so many Torontonians, by what happened. We've never seen “Toronto the good”, as we like to call ourselves, being portrayed that way on the front pages of papers.

A million Torontonians lost their freedom of movement. We saw vibrant streets turn into empty canyons. Someone should have realized that the core of the city being devoid of its life, of its citizenry, would provide a perfect opportunity, with all the cameras rolling, for this mob.

That needs to be addressed. How was the decision made to put this in the city core, which would not only be a \$1.2 billion boondoggle but also restrict the rights of the citizenry of Toronto and leave the streets open and empty of citizens for this particular mob?

As will my colleagues, I'll be supporting this particular motion, and I look forward to supporting the motion that brought us here today. It's important so that we can look into all of the related issues surrounding this debacle.

• (1640)

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

Ms. Mourani, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am listening to my colleagues in the government, and I realize, yet again, that when we stand up for human rights, they always pull out their famous line where they claim we are here to protect the rights of anarchists, criminals and terrorists. Furthermore, a certain member, whom I will not name because it is not worth the trouble and who is on this House of Commons public safety committee, actually said that the committee is in place to promote the agenda of hooligans. I have to tell you that I am not familiar with that agenda. He will have to explain to me what that famous hooligan agenda is.

That said, as soon as any NGO, group or member stands up for human rights that conflict ever so slightly with the government's party line, the story is they are either supporting criminals, as we have frequently heard in the House of Commons, or defending hooligans, as is the case right now, or terrorists, of course. Take your pick.

I want to give some context, if I may. I will be reading, as they so like to do. I am going to read you a few excerpts taken from the media. This one is from *Le Devoir*:

The controversy surrounding police actions during the G-20 demonstrations [...] Toronto police also admitted that it lied to the public on two occasions.

The article actually says “lied”. It goes on to say:

Although a number of videos on YouTube draw shaky comparisons between the violent actions of some demonstrators and the alleged actions of the police, other images recorded by members of the public appear to be quite telling. One such video, which is just over a minute long, shows undercover police officers disguised as demonstrators, some wielding riot batons and billy sticks, hiding behind police cordons. One of them is donning all black attire and wearing a hood, similar to the radical supporters of the Black Bloc, who attend demonstrations to create mayhem.

Further on, the article says:

Toronto police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) did not return *Le Devoir*'s telephone calls [...]

Amnesty International and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA), which had more than 50 observers on site, called for [...] an investigation at the beginning of the week.

While I do not consider the people at Amnesty International to be hooligans or terrorists, you might, but you will have to be clear about that. Then you could ban them, too; you could take it quite far. As for the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, I am not sure whether it, too, represents terrorist groups, but you never know.

Another quote:

Furthermore, the Toronto police force [itself] admitted that certain objects allegedly seized from demonstrators—which the chief of police, Bill Blair, described as “weapons”—and presented to the media on Monday in fact never belonged to demonstrators.

Look at that! I will continue:

That is the case with the chainsaw, the crossbow and the props (batons and shields) belonging to a passerby on his way to a medieval-themed role-playing game in the park when he was arrested by police.

[...] Mr. Blair admitted that the order secretly passed by the Ontario government never gave him the authority to arrest anyone found within five metres of the security perimeter, as he had claimed. The order applied only to the inside of the perimeter.

And it goes on, Mr. Chair; the allegations and statements do not stop there. There is one I really want to read to you because people called my office about it. The allegation that was reported is as follows:

The head of the Fédération des femmes du Québec [Quebec federation of women], Alexa Conradi, indicated that women, in particular, were the victims of ill-treatment by police.

"We heard that sexist and sexual remarks were made about women when they went to the washroom. Others were reportedly threatened with mass rape or rape by law enforcement officials" [...]

That kind of allegation is very serious. She was also reported to have said, "that her organization was calling for a public inquiry, among others, to determine 'whether there was a serious problem with how law enforcement officials treated women'".

● (1645)

*Le Devoir* also said:

A number of people were there, in particular, to band together in calling for a public inquiry [...]

There is more, and I will go over a few details. It says:

Yesterday, Toronto police confirmed that just over 900 people were arrested on Saturday and Sunday. Without providing any exact figures [...]

Now, however, those figures are starting to come out.

[...] police indicated that the majority were released without any charges being laid [against them].

Amnesty International called for an inquiry. The public has the right to demonstrate. There is another example. You could argue that it was demonstrators, hooligans. But reporters were arrested. I am not sure whether their cards helped move things along, but it also says:

No fewer than seven reporters or photographers were arrested on the weekend, and some of them had their yellow G-20 and G-8 Summit press cards clearly displayed.

Independent photographer François Pesant, who works for a number of media outlets [...] witnessed the "strange" conduct of police officers. He has covered numerous demonstrations throughout his career.

This is what that photographer said:

Everything went well on Friday. Police conducted themselves perfectly. They were in control, but on Saturday morning, riots broke out downtown for two hours without a single police officer around. I have never seen that.

He said that. I am just repeating what he said. He went on to say:

And then, all of a sudden, there they were, arresting everybody, and the rioters had already fled several minutes before.

That was what the photographer said. Surely, you must have heard that a reporter, some cameramen and so forth had been arrested.

Mr. Chair, I want to tell you this: I received emails and telephone calls from people in Quebec who are not hooligans, criminals, murderers or terrorists; they are parents, young people and students in Quebec who say they were the victims of various forms of ill-treatment. They told me—and these are allegations—that they were strip-searched. They said they were crammed into cages—with 25 to 40 people—in some sort of area where movies were filmed and that the cages had been equipped for the situation. There was a toilet bowl where people had to do their business in front of everyone. A number of them said they were not allowed to call their... They were not permitted to call their family. Parents called my office trying to find out how to locate their children who were there. To you, they might be hooligans and terrorists.

They also told me about other kinds of allegations, which need to be verified. It seems that guys—not the girls—boys and men were

reportedly given shots against their will and told it was for tuberculosis. Those are things people have told me, and they are serious. For seven to ten hours, people were given 100 ml of water and a slice of bread. They were cold, scared and humiliated. No one spoke French, of course. They were not spoken to in French. They said that when they spoke French, it was worse: they endured racism and harassment. All of these allegations are serious, Mr. Chair. They tarnish Canada's reputation in the world. I heard about complaints being made to the UN. That is a disgrace! These allegations need to be verified.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, we are calling for an independent public inquiry. As soon as the committee reconvenes in the fall, immediately after the chair is elected, we want the committee to begin looking into what happened with respect to the G-20 Summit and security, as well as finances, for those who want to discuss it. It involves not only Canada's reputation around the world, but also the reputation of the Toronto police force, the OPP, and all the security agencies who provided their services during the G-20 Summit.

● (1650)

That is key. It is their reputation on the line. My colleagues in the government are saying that the police did a wonderful job and should be commended, but we need to get to the bottom of the situation. Frankly, it surprises me that the government itself has not called for an inquiry, if not simply to restore the reputation of the law enforcement officials involved with the G-20 Summit. That is key. I cannot understand why the government is not calling for the inquiry itself. If there was no wrongdoing and they are not afraid of the truth, why not hold a public inquiry? Why are they so against holding several sessions on the issue?

I would like to hear from a number of witnesses: Mr. Toews, the Minister of Public Safety; the Canadian Civil Liberties Association; Amnesty International; Toronto police chief Bill Blair; the famous G-8–G-20 Integrated Security Unit; the Ontario Provincial Police; and the RCMP. I would also like Toronto firefighters to appear. Why? Because they have something to say. I would invite the Ontario ombudsman, who is also investigating the situation, as well as Ms. Fraser.

Furthermore, if this famous committee that is meeting has completed its report, we should know that. Finally, I would ask the 15 people who contacted my office to appear, as well. Who are they? University students who have their whole lives ahead of them. They believed in Canada and had no idea they could be treated the way they were. They say they were the victims of various forms of abuse by police when they took part in demonstrations in Toronto. Not only are these young people traumatized, but they are also totally disillusioned with Canadian democracy. We need to restore the faith of all those people who demonstrated and who no longer believe in their democratic right to demonstrate.

So what should we do? We should help these people realize that the system works. When mistakes are made, there needs to be a public inquiry. We need to determine whether mistakes were really made and make recommendations so they do not happen again. We need to figure out whether there was abuse and whether people's rights and physical safety were compromised. People were reportedly vaccinated against their will. That is pretty mind-blowing.

Once all the allegations have been either proven or rejected, we can restore the reputation of those involved. You can go ahead and move your motion of congratulations, but that does not change what average citizens had to deal with or the parents... Remember that these young people are not hooligan anarchists who live on the streets. They have parents who pay taxes and who want to know why their children were treated the way they were by Canada's democratic system. They want to know what happened. Those people are entitled to answers. The way I see it, holding a public inquiry or even having the committee study the issue starting in the fall, as soon as possible, can only restore Toronto's reputation, and that of law enforcement. That is key.

I think the committee should hold several meetings beginning in the fall, and hear from a number of witnesses, in order to get to the bottom of this. Once we have completed that study, only then will we, the Bloc Québécois, decide whether or not to commend the security agencies involved in the G-20 Toronto Summit. We will not tell people what a great job they did in this manner. We will not give you a green light to commend everyone. That is what the Liberals are doing, which really surprises me, but that is another story.

• (1655)

So long as we have not gotten to the bottom of what happened, we will not be commending anyone. If we are wrong, all the better. If those hundreds of people were all anarchists, in your opinion, we will have been wrong, but at least we will have gotten to the bottom of the events that took place and proven that Canada's democratic system works on all levels—national, local and international.

We will vote against Mr. MacKenzie's motion if we debate it. Obviously, we will not be discussing it just yet; as you pointed out, Mr. Chair, we are trying to decide whether we want to undertake a study on all the issues surrounding the G-8 and G-20.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for giving me this time.

[English]

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

You have a point of order, Mr. Dewar?

**Mr. Paul Dewar:** I was just wondering if we thought we'd be getting to a vote. We do have a witness here from out of town. I'm wondering, since everyone's pretty much had a chance to speak, if we could deal with the motion. We have a guest here from out of town.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, you can't force a vote on a point of order.

I have five more speakers.

Do you have a point of order, Mr. MacKenzie?

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Mr. Chair, I would appreciate if you would explain to Mr. Dewar, who obviously doesn't know the rules,

that if he has something he wishes to say he should make it as a point of order to the chair, as opposed to simply interrupting the chair.

• (1700)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Del Mastro, please.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, we have the opposition members, frankly, all over the board, all hitting different issues, all coming at it from a different perspective, but ultimately, this is a case of ready, fire, aim. That's what we're discussing here. They're way out ahead of themselves. They don't have any of the facts. Madame Mourani is throwing around unsubstantiated allegations and asserting them, at least in part, as truth.

Mr. Holland, in his comments, indicated that the whole problem is that you shouldn't hold anything in Toronto. That's what I heard. Maybe we should move the Maple Leafs out of downtown Toronto—

**Mr. Mark Holland:** That's a mischaracterization of what I said.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:**—so that when the eventuality of them winning the cup happens, we won't have to worry about anybody congregating down there. I mean, for goodness' sake, this is ridiculous.

The bottom line is that in Ontario, under the Police Services Act of Ontario, given individuals are empowered to oversee this. In Toronto, it's the Police Services Board. So that members are aware, how is a police services board put together? Half of the board is nominated by the municipality, half by the province. That's the way it is in Peterborough. And this board is an independent, civilian oversight body of the police. They've indicated they're going to look into this. That is their job. It's not the job of the public safety committee of the House of Commons to determine if these allegations have merit or not. It is their job, the Toronto Police Services Board. That's what they're empowered for.

The Ontario ombudsman has indicated that he has received some complaints, or some applications that he is going to review. That is their job. I just wonder why it is that members of this committee feel that they need to get out in advance.

Paul, I do understand... Mr. Dewar, since you're speaking, I do understand a thing or two about federal jurisdiction, and in this case, policing in the province of Ontario is not a federal jurisdiction, but that's what you want to review.

I think that primarily what this committee should be doing, if you want to be responsible, if you want Canadians to respect the committee process in this Parliament—because I see a constant shift toward committees being nothing but gong shows to try to push out a partisan political wedge, which is nonsense... If you want this process to be respected, then you allow the bodies that are empowered in the province of Ontario to undertake their reviews and to report. And if there are issues with that report, then you can undertake to review that, to see if in the future maybe we should change how we approach something, how we plan something if we're having a major international event.



We hosted the Olympics in Vancouver. There were protesters at that as well. I would argue that in some ways, the big difference was that they didn't get all the attention.

I agree with somebody on the other side—and I can't remember who it was, Mr. Chairman—who indicated that legitimate protesters... There were tens of thousands of people who attended rallies in Toronto. The overwhelming majority of them went, they had their rally, and then they went home. And the police were there. They protected their safety. They enabled those individuals to go there, to make whatever their point was. There were various groups and they had different points of interest. But then they went home.

There were some who went with an entirely different intent, Mr. Chairman. That is our point. And we will allow these bodies to undertake their reviews. That is the government approach to it. You don't just decide that this committee's the only appropriate place, apparently, to review this. That's nonsense. That's why we put people in these positions in the first place. You either have confidence in the people who are in these positions and you trust them or you don't.

For the Liberal Party, several of you have indicated that you support Chief Bill Blair, that you support the Toronto police, that you support the motion Mr. MacKenzie proposed, which is not yet for a vote.

• (1705)

If that is the case, then you'll allow the process to take place. Then, if there is an issue and it is befitting of this committee to undertake a study on this issue, that's when you do it. You don't do it before the groups charged with this responsibility actually have the opportunity to do their work. That's nonsense.

The fact that we're here... Madam Mourani indicated she'd like to have the hearings in the fall. What in the world are we here for? What are we here for?

Mr. Chairman, I implore all members of the opposition to allow the individuals charged with the responsibility of oversight in issues related to the G-20 to do their job. Let them do that.

This is not a good issue. Frankly, this is very thinly veiled, Mr. Chairman. This is purely partisan politics playing out on an issue where there are responsible individuals who will deal with this. If there is a reason, a cause, that members would like to have the opportunity to undertake a review, once those reports are completed, once all the facts are known, then I think that would be a responsible thing for the committee to do. It is certainly not responsible right now.

Thank you.

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

My list now has Mr. Calandra, Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. McColeman, Mr. Dechert, Mr. Desnoyers, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, and Mr. Dewar.

Mr. Calandra, please.

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

I want to comment, because as a GTA member and as somebody whose riding borders on Toronto, and whose businesses were certainly improved by the G-20, it strikes me that what we're hearing

a lot from the opposition is, why Toronto? It goes without saying that Toronto obviously had the capacity to handle such an event. It goes without saying that Toronto is the financial hub of the province of Ontario, if not all of Canada.

It also goes without saying that Ontario manufacturers have been hurt by the global economic downturn, and bringing 30 world leaders representing 95% of the world's population to the city of Toronto, with the media and all of the delegates that attend such an event, not just for the G-20 but for the time leading up to the G-20, can only be viewed as a positive thing for all of these individuals.

I actually have a visitor expressing his way into my riding on some point during the week. I wonder what his message is going to be to the people of the GTA when he expresses himself into my area. His message obviously, if I judge the members opposite, is going to be that Toronto, the GTA, is simply not a world-class city. His message is going to be that the GTA is simply not mature enough to handle such an event. His message is going to be that Canada, under the opposition coalition, will once again be a follower and not a leader.

I say with the greatest of respect to this visitor that that's simply not a message that Canadians are telling me. That's not what the people in my riding are telling me. The businesses in my riding who were able to make connections and were able to talk to the people that they actually export their products to, who mentioned... "Wow, we saw Toronto; we saw a lot of things, and we're getting to know your country a little bit better"; it was because of all of the work that led up to the G-20, all of the work that led up to the G-8, and all of those connections. They are ecstatic about what happened. The manufacturers in my area, particularly those in Markham, which is one of the hubs of manufacturing in all of the GTA, could not have been happier about this.

I simply cannot understand why it is that the members opposite simply cannot understand that Toronto and the GTA are areas that are capable of having these types of events. I guess it should be no surprise that under their watch we lost the 2008 Olympic bid. They simply have no vision. They simply do not have the same level of respect for the police forces in Toronto, they do not have the same level of respect for all of the businesses, they do not have the same level of respect for the people of the city of Toronto, in fact the entire GTA, so that they can actually host an event of this magnitude.

Let's talk about what we did here at the G-20. We saw, through the leadership of the Prime Minister, that we were able to make sure there was no banking tax. At the G-8 in Huntsville we finally made some advances on millennium goals 4 and 5.

We brought 30 of the world's most powerful leaders, as I said earlier, representing 90% of the population of this planet to the city of Toronto, with their delegates and their delegations, who visited, not only during the weekend but before that, who were in our hotels.

I believe it was the head of the Ontario Restaurant Hotel & Motel Association who said this was the biggest stimulus to hit the city of Toronto ever. What an absolutely incredible opportunity. What do the members opposite say? They put their hands up and simply say, well, it can never happen again. Under a coalition of the opposition, Toronto and the GTA will never ever have the opportunity to host such an event again.

It is simply absolutely staggering to me that after all of these years they still do not believe that Toronto is a world-class city. They do not believe that the people of Ontario, that the people of the city of Toronto, the entire GTA, the most powerful region in the entire country, I would submit, once the economic engine of this country and again moving towards that distinction, can hold events like this.

I can tell you I'm extraordinarily proud of what we accomplished. I'm extraordinarily proud, as I said earlier, of all the police forces. But more importantly, too, I'm excited by the connections that were made because of the G-20. I'm excited by what the business people and the manufacturers and exporters in my riding are saying are the benefits of the G-20.

• (1710)

I guess I would just hope that the opposition would reflect on those things. If someone asks why we are talking about thugs and hooligans, it's because those are the people who ruined or tried to ruin the G-20. Those are the people who broke the law. Those are the people who threw bricks, who put themselves in the path of peaceful protesters, of people who had a legitimate voice, of people who actually wanted to accomplish something. They insinuated themselves into that.

We discussed how many people there were. The reality is those aren't people we should be defending. We should be defending those who have a legitimate reason to demonstrate, those who have a legitimate voice. We should be condemning the thugs and the hooligans. You want to talk about thugs and hooligans? We're talking about the person we all saw throwing a brick at a Starbucks or who had a club and was trying to break windows. That's who we're talking about when we're talking about thugs and hooligans.

Again, I just have to say as a GTA member, as somebody whose riding borders on Toronto, it would certainly be refreshing in all of this if just for a moment the opposition reflected on all of the benefits, if they just for a moment congratulated the city of Toronto for what it accomplished and how it used the results of the G-20 to improve the lives of the manufacturers, of the businesses, of the people of the city of Toronto and all of the GTA, so that as we come out of this global downturn, strong as we are, we will continue to grow.

Somebody talked about economic growth. You know, I look at this and I see 95,000 jobs created. That's extraordinary. It's extraordinary, but there's a lot of work to be done still. As I said in my remarks, our recovery is fragile. Bringing all of these people to Canada, to Toronto, to make sure that global recovery continues on I don't see as a bad thing. I see that as a good thing. I can tell you that all the people of my riding certainly share that view.

I guess my message to the people of Toronto is this. At least on this side of the table, they have people who appreciate what they

accomplished, who will always fight to make sure that Toronto is a place that will continue to lead not only in Canada but in the world. We will never be ashamed of what it accomplishes and what our people accomplish. We will always seek to promote it and the entire region, because it's an extraordinary place.

I encourage some of the people opposite who have not had an opportunity to come and visit not only Toronto but perhaps my riding, Markham, to see what they're talking about, what they're saying the advantages were. They might have a bit of a different perspective on this from simply coming here and bringing forward a motion that seeks to divide us, that seeks to point out the actions of hooligans over the actions of our Prime Minister and the other world leaders who are leading the world and helping make sure we have economic growth and sustained prosperity going forward.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Mr. MacKenzie, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Thank you, Chair.

There are a few issues I'd really like to clarify, because Canadians at home had a chance to hear a few things said from the other side that were inaccurate, and maybe not meant to be inaccurate, but can easily be repeated as being the gospel truth.

The very first thing I'd like to say is that not once did we mention the names of any organizations. Mr. Dewar and a couple of others have indicated that we have said some organizations support the thugs, hooligans, and anarchists. We didn't say that. You've made that connection, not us. We've never mentioned those organizations.

Mr. Kania, who I have a great deal of respect for, mentioned some figures here. He's usually accurate. As he frequently does to witnesses we have who come before the committee, he always asks them to produce that. He indicated some fairly low costs in England for a summit that was held there. I would like to know if he can produce those documents, so that everybody understands. I do not think they're accurate. They may reflect some costs, but they don't reflect all of the costs of the summit. That's one of the things we certainly have been very open to. The Auditor General is going to audit ours. I would respectfully suggest that those people who float numbers out there that are obviously ridiculously low compared to what we are talking about don't have all of the information. We've heard numbers from other countries, including Japan. We've heard numbers from Great Britain that are certainly different from those that Mr. Kania quoted, and I'd really like to see him produce those numbers and the accuracy of them.

Three times since we've taken power we've had screaming matches in the House of Commons about everything that's going to go wrong, and I'll tell you what they are. On the H1N1, the other side were just over the top—that the world was coming to an end and that Canadians were in huge, huge danger. Obviously we took the concerns seriously. We reacted to it, and I think we reacted to it in a proper way. And you know, when the H1N1 didn't develop into what either they thought it would or hoped it would, all of a sudden they went quiet.

If Canadians will recall, prior to the Olympics there was a great deal of hollering and screaming and moaning about the cost of security for the Olympics and the cost of the Olympics in general. Well, you know, Mr. Chair, the Olympics were a great success. Canadians are extremely proud of our Olympians. They're extremely proud of what occurred with the organization. I think we had an opportunity for the world to see a picture of Canada as somewhat more cosmopolitan than what many around the world would have believed of us before that. And guess what? The G-8 and G-20 were the same thing.

It's interesting, because the rest of the world saw two summits, which has never occurred before in a country. And I would say to you, Mr. Chair, we didn't just decide to have the G-8. If you're part of the G-8, you host it on your turn. This was our turn. And I think that Canadians and the rest of the world had an opportunity to see good things. Unfortunately, a few bad apples may have spoiled it for some others.

I have a quote here:

If you step outside of Canada for a moment, these kinds of summits attract violent protests, they have everywhere. By those standards, Toronto's police acquitted themselves very well and I think most people around the world are not going to associate Toronto with these violent acts, they will associate the G-20 with those acts.

That was from David Miller, the mayor of Toronto.

In another quote, more recent:

To suggest, as some do, that police Chief Bill Blair should resign or be fired is as absurd as holding an inquiry, which would serve only those who don't like the police and want to embarrass the city.

That was from Peter Worthington in the *Toronto Sun* on the ninth of this month.

• (1715)

Mr. Dewar seemed agitated about a witness who was here today. I don't know who called the witness. Certainly it would have been premature to call a witness to come before the committee before decisions were made.

You know, Mr. Chair, I feel bad for the witness who was brought here. Somebody took it upon themselves to contact the witness to be here, which is somewhat the cart before the horse, obviously.

Some of my colleagues talked about Toronto being paralyzed. Toronto wasn't paralyzed. I think my colleague mentioned the hospitality industry, talking about it being their economic stimulus package. They did very well. I would say to my friends that when the gay pride parade is on, or the Caribana parade, or the Toronto Grand Prix, parts of Toronto are shut down and you can't move in them. That's fair. Those are big events, as is this a big event.

Now, my friend Mr. Holland doesn't like any of those things, but that's a fact of life. They all bring money to Toronto. From time to time people are inconvenienced. Toronto is a big city. And I would say that the rest of the world had an opportunity to see Toronto in a very good light, with the exception of a couple of people, or maybe more than a couple, who took it into their own minds to act as thugs and break the law.

Ms. Mourani, you did say a few things that I would certainly agree with. Canadian democracy works: it was nice to hear you say that. We agree.

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** The other part she talked about was that it's too early to hold these meetings. If you will recall, I said previously, and I'd just like to make this clear, an independent civilian review is being undertaken by the Toronto Police Services Board. Ontario's ombudsman has announced that he will be looking into the role the province played. As I've already mentioned....

To back up a bit, I think Mr. Dewar was alleging that there was a law passed. I'll use the words of one of my favourite cabinet ministers, who said that their premier was now being blamed for some of these issues. You know what? I think the ombudsman will look into those issues, and I think that's appropriate. As I've already mentioned, the Auditor General will be conducting a review.

Are we saying no to this committee studying the matter, as some in the press have suggested? Absolutely not. We're not. But as we've said from the start, we'll remain open and transparent. We will serve Canadians better by waiting until the integrated security unit and others have had a chance to complete their work. We on the government side believe we owe it to the victims of the thugs, hooligans, and anarchists to do this properly, and this means waiting to study the issue once all the facts are available. To do so before that is wasting Canadian taxpayers' money.

I think my colleagues have talked about what it costs to bring the committee together. It only makes sense that we wait until we have all the facts. We might all agree on a number of issues, we may disagree on some, but you know what? I think that if we thought about it in a logical sense, we could all agree that we look at this when all of the facts are known. We don't need to go on the hunt on our own. People are out there doing the same thing. Why duplicate it?

• (1720)

**The Chair:** Mr. McColeman, then Mr. Dechert, Mr. Desnoyers, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, and Mr. Dewar.

Mr. McColeman.

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Interestingly enough, my colleague Mr. MacKenzie covered off—

**The Chair:** I have a point of order from Mr. Kania.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Mr. Chair, we're here today based on this motion for a special meeting.

**An hon. member:** Is this a point of order?

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** It is a point of order. Thank you. I'm addressing it to the chair.

What I'd like to know, Mr. Chair, is that it's my understanding... Obviously we've all been brought here and borne this expense. I'd like to know whether we're going to actually have a vote today or whether the Conservatives are going to be allowed to talk out the clock. We only have seven minutes left, and to my understanding there's nobody on the opposition side who actually wishes to speak any more. I just want to make it clear, to find out whether that's what's going to happen.

**The Chair:** That's actually not correct. My last three speakers are all from the opposition—Mr. Desnoyers, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj, and Mr. Dewar.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** No, nobody wants to speak, Mr. Chair, just the Conservatives.

**An hon. member:** We just want to vote.

**The Chair:** Mr. McColeman.

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MacKenzie has covered off a lot of the notes I made in listening across the table.

I want to underscore a couple of things, but I also want to add this. These are the quotes from Rick Bartolucci, Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services for the Province of Ontario. He said:

When you consider what has happened in the past in other jurisdictions, I think there's something to be said for the level, the competency and the expertise of the policing in the province of Ontario.

That was in the *Toronto Sun*.

He also said:

These officers showed remarkable professionalism in what were often very trying circumstances.

There were a couple of other quotes that Mr. MacKenzie used, but the one thing that is so striking and so interesting here at committee—and I concur, and I just want to say this.... We sit on this committee, and this committee has dealt with some of the most contentious issues before Parliament. Today we're hearing people speak who have come to committee... It just so happens that the person moving the motion wasn't able to get here, so we've heard the MP sitting in for him. But what's most interesting to hear is Ms. Mourani's comments, that democracy works in this country. I think it's such a departure from the political orientation of those she represents, and I want to thank her for making that comment here today at the committee. There are a lot of issues that we do discuss here that have a very strong importance for Canadians, and this is one of them.

I want to—

•(1725)

**The Chair:** Mr. Holland, on a point of order.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** I ask for unanimous consent that we move to a vote. You can always ask for unanimous consent to move to a vote if there's... There's no unanimous consent to move to a vote?

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, that's out of order.

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** May I continue?

I really just want to conclude with one quote, again from the *Toronto Sun*, made on July 8 by OPP Commissioner Julian Fantino, who said "We gave our heart and soul to make sure that that went well."

I think we need to congratulate a lot of people in how it went well. I think my colleague from Markham stated it so clearly and so articulately...that we have a world-class community in Toronto. Many of us benefit from that community. I myself, to the west of Toronto, benefit tremendously from what happens in the greater Toronto area. We see it as a world-class city. We treat it as our destination for ourselves to celebrate what Canada can show on a world-class level.

The G-20 meetings did that. The G-20 meetings said to the rest of world that we are open for business here on a world-class level, and that's a message the world needed to hear. We did it, and we did it in fine fashion. We kept the most important leaders around the world safe and secure as they dealt with the bigger issues on a global basis, the global economy. We should be proud as Canadians here today and not be hijacked by the political motives of political parties who would take advantage and bring us back to Ottawa at taxpayers' expense to take advantage of this and try to carry it on.

When the studies are here and we have the facts, we can deal with this as a committee. We can deal with it in the fall when we come back. We don't need to see this place again and cost Canadians more money. There are studies being done. The Auditor General is going to do a full review. End of story.

This, as Canadians, is something we should be proud of, in terms of how we hosted the G-8 and the G-20.

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

Mr. Dechert.

**Mr. Bob Dechert:** Thanks, Chair.

I was encouraged to hear, Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** Sorry, there's another point of order.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Mr. Chair, given the fact that the meeting is about to end, I seek unanimous consent to extend the meeting so that we can at least get an opportunity to get to a vote.

We're all here, guys.

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous consent to...? I don't see unanimous consent.

We have about one minute left. I would encourage members... There is a consensus on some issues and there's not a consensus on other issues. I would encourage the members from both sides to get together and see where we can go on this. Some people have mentioned that we could pursue this in the fall. Some have suggested various other things.

We're obviously not going to be resolving this today, and I would encourage people from both sides of the table here to get together.

I was hoping that maybe we'd get a little further than this, but at this point we didn't, so I'm going to have to adjourn the meeting. I encourage people from both sides to get together and decide where we go from here. In some respects there is agreement that we look at

this once all the facts are in, but at this point it doesn't seem we're going to resolve that today. This meeting stands 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>