



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

SECU • NUMBER 036 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. Kevin Sorenson

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC)): Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to meeting number 36 of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. It is Wednesday, October 27, 2010.

I remind everyone here today that we're televised, so I kindly ask you to turn your cellphones off. I will be the first to do that, because it has happened in the past that I've made that announcement and then mine has rung. That won't happen anymore.

Today we're continuing our study of the issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits. We have a significant number of witnesses on the panel today.

From the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, we have Steven Small, assistant deputy minister of the adult institutional services and organizational effectiveness division. From the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, we have Nathalie Des Rosiers, general counsel, and Graeme Norton, legal director of the public safety program.

Appearing as individuals, we have Jacinthe Poisson and Wissam Mansour.

Each witness, as you know, may have as much as 10 minutes for an opening statement. I invite the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services to begin.

Go ahead, Mr. Small, if you please.

Mr. Steven Small (Assistant Deputy Minister, Adult Institutional Services and Organizational Effectiveness Division, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It is a pleasure to appear before this committee to outline the involvement of Ontario Correctional Services in the G-8 and G-20 summits and to answer questions this committee might have on provincial responsibility and protocols for the treatment of those who were transferred to our custody.

The G-8 and G-20 summits were the largest domestic security undertaking in Canadian and Ontario history. Ontario worked closely with the federal government, host municipalities, and police services to ensure that appropriate resources and plans were in place for the G-8 and G-20 summits. Since there were no admissions to a provincial ministry correctional institution related to the G-8 summit, I will contain the remainder of my opening statement to the G-20 summit.

The ministry's adult institutional services division is responsible for the safe, secure custody of all Ontario adult inmates held on remand, awaiting trial or other proceedings, as well as adult male and female offenders serving sentences of up to two years less a day.

By the numbers, Ontario's 31 provincial correctional institutions house roughly 8,750 inmates on any given day, both sentence and remand; 76,000 inmates were admitted to our custody last year. Approximately two-thirds of our inmate population is being held on remand and is awaiting trial or other court proceedings. The average length of stay for those inmates on remand is approximately 34 days.

As part of the G-20 planning process we identified two facilities as receiving institutions for individuals transferred to our custody on G-20 summit-related charges. Those facilities were the Maplehurst Correctional Complex for males and the Vanier Centre for Women for females. Both of these facilities are located on the same site in the town of Milton, approximately 50 kilometres west of downtown Toronto and the site of the G-20. A third facility in Hamilton was designated to handle any overflow but was never used.

In preparation for the summit, senior managers from my division were asked to join a working group with representatives from the summit integrated security unit, which included Public Safety Canada, the Toronto Police Service, Ontario Provincial Police, crown prosecutors, and others.

As a result of that process the ministry put together a plan to ensure the continued safe, secure, and smooth operation of our correctional facilities. The plan included having extra staff on duty on every shift to accommodate a possible increase in admissions during the summit, providing two clerk-of-record staff to assist the Toronto police in the processing and transport of prisoners from court, and providing a correctional officer at court to serve as a liaison between the Toronto Police Service and the Vanier and Maplehurst facilities.

I should note at this point that all individuals transferred into ministry custody were done so from the court. No prisoners were transferred directly into provincial custody from the Toronto Police Service's temporary prisoner processing centre on Eastern Avenue in Toronto. Ontario Correctional Services had no role in the set-up or operational policies of the temporary detention centre at 629 Eastern Avenue, which was established and operated by the Toronto Police Service, and at no time during or immediately following the G-8 and G-20 summits did ministry personnel enter that facility.

There have been 170 admissions to the Maplehurst and Vanier facilities on criminal charges related to the G-20 summit. Of those admissions, 125 were male and 45 female.

•(1535)

Let me reiterate: all of those individuals were transferred from court to provincial custody. None were transferred directly from the Eastern Avenue facility.

As of today, only seven males with criminal charges related to the G-20 remain in ministry custody.

The Province of Ontario has high standards to ensure the safety, care, custody, and control of those under our supervision. Those individuals are entitled to appropriate care and appropriate conditions of confinement. I can tell this committee with all confidence that those standards were met during and after the G-20 summit for all of those in our custody.

I should also say that there were minor planned disruptions to our normal operations over the weekend of the G-20 summit. For example, at Maplehurst Correctional Complex, personal visits over the weekend of the summit were cancelled as a precautionary measure. Existing inmates were notified well in advance so that they could advise their family and friends. That said, inmates at both the Vanier and Maplehurst facilities had access to telephones and were permitted visits from legal counsel.

Although interpreters were ultimately not required, the ministry had in place a process for acquiring language interpreters for inmates whose first language was not English.

If individuals attended court and were released while at the court, their property was transferred to the Toronto West Detention Centre, which is a facility close to public transit, and pickup of items was made easier at that facility. Individuals released from either Vanier or Maplehurst were provided with a bus ticket and transport to the local bus terminal, as per standard ministry policy.

All policies and procedures governing the cases and treatment of inmates were followed. I am proud to say that Ontario's correctional services staff conducted themselves in a professional and respectful manner and ensured that our ministry's strict policies for the just and humane treatment of those in our custody were met.

Thank you for this opportunity. I would now be happy to take your questions.

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

We will continue with the witnesses to get all the 10-minute testimony.

Next on the order paper is Ms. Poisson.

•(1540)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson (As an Individual): Thank you.

Good afternoon. Before starting, I would like to thank my parents, my grandmother and my friends who are here today for their support. They have been supporting me from the start and they are supporting me in this proceeding.

My name is Jacinthe Poisson and I am 21 years old. I am studying international relations and international law at the Université du Québec à Montréal. Until June 27, 2010, I was a student engaged in

my community, working in the summer as a facilitator in a disadvantaged environment.

Thank you for inviting me here today, and I would ask you to listen to me carefully because my experience at the G20 really traumatized me. It changed my life and my perception of my country. I'm here today to testify on my own behalf and that of my sister Maryse Poisson, who is seated at the back, with whom I went to demonstrate at the G20 and who experienced somewhat the situation as I did.

Both of us were arrested in our sleep the day after the demonstration, detained for 57 hours in horrible conditions and charged for nearly four months with conspiracy to damage property over \$5,000 following the G20 demonstrations.

I went to the G20 in Toronto to attend my first international summit and to express my opposition to the Canadian government's current international positions. So I spent Saturday, June 26, demonstrating peacefully with more than 30,000 persons. That evening, I slept in the University of Toronto gymnasium, which had been made available by the graduate student association, with some 100 Quebecers from Montreal who had come to demonstrate.

From that point on, my story is the same as those of hundreds of demonstrators who came from Quebec, who were arrested with me and who experienced the same things as I did.

First, around nine o'clock Sunday morning, tens of police officers entered the University of Toronto gymnasium heavily armed, aggressively shouting to us not to move and pointing their weapons at us. A francophone police officer informed us that we were being charged with participating in a riot. No arrest warrant was presented to us, and I was unable to move, get up, change clothing or go to the bathroom until 2:00 p.m. Police officers circled round us with their rubber bullet rifles. So I was unable to go to the bathroom for approximately six hours.

All my property was seized when I was arrested. The police officer removed my glasses because, he said, I might injure myself if I kept them on in the patrol wagon. I am very nearsighted and get serious headaches without my glasses. So while I was detained, and even after asking a number of officers to give them back to me, I was never able to recover them. That lasted three days. So I was unable to see the badges of the other police officers or the faces around me; it was quite destabilizing. So my sister and I were taken to a temporary detention centre that had been set up for G20 demonstrators. We were separated for most of the detention period.

Now I'm going to tell you about the detention conditions, which in my opinion were humiliating, dehumanizing and cruel—and I'm choosing my words here. I spent 57 hours cold, hungry and afraid. There were 15 to 25 of us detainees per cell measuring approximately four by seven metres. So three of the four individuals could sit down on a small bench; the others all had to sleep on the floor, which I found was freezing cold. During the first half of my detention, I was allowed only a short-sleeved shirt to warm me. The air conditioning was really very high, which prevented me from sleeping. Since we had no beds, we had to sleep on the floor, lying against one another in order to generate a little warmth. The light was really very bright and was on around the clock. So it was not turned off during the night. I got very little sleep.

From the time of our arrest, we had access to no food or water for eight hours. Then we were given a cheese and margarine sandwich roughly every eight hours and a glass of water every five hours. My hands were handcuffed for more than 15 hours, and my sister's for more than 20 hours, whereas we were in cages and presented little danger. We had to go to the bathroom in the cell, in a chemical toilet that had no door. The other detainees, as well as the police officers who passed in front of and around the cages, could see us at all times. None of the girls had access to their contraceptives, and most therefore got their periods. We had to beg for sanitary napkins, which came one by one after a long waiting period. Since no disposals was provided for, we had to leave them on the floor. I don't think I need to tell you that hygiene was really an issue for the women while we were detained.

A number of individuals did not have access to essential medication. In the first cage where I was, one woman asked for her anti-depressants at noon and did not get them until late that night, despite making tens of requests to police officers. In my sister Maryse's cell, one woman was borderline psychotic and told the police officers so when she was arrested. All the detainees in the cell demanded her medication starting early in the afternoon, but the police officers waited until she had a serious episode before dealing with the matter and ultimately taking her to hospital, with her hands and feet cuffed, of course.

● (1545)

She was never able to see a francophone nurse. This aspect is very important because, being a unilingual francophone, she could not say exactly what her illness was. The nurse took her blood pressure, told her that she was suffering from nothing and sent her back to her cage. Another detainee in my sister's cage was suffering from a mental illness, but, since she did not go into crisis, she did not have access to her medication for three days.

Another very important point is that, during my 60 hours of detention, I had to undergo two strip searches, which was very humiliating. The first occurred approximately 10 hours after I was arrested. In my sister's case, it was some 20 hours after her arrest. The second search was conducted at the Vanier Centre for Women, where we were transferred after more than 40 hours in detention.

So I had to completely undress before two female police officers, who seized my bra and shoes. During the second search, there was no door, and a male guard was able to see us. I was asked to turn around, bend over and expose my genitals to the hall. In addition, the

insults and discriminatory comments were hurtful and degrading, particularly toward francophones and women. My sister was called a "fucking Frenchy" and an anarchist. One police officer told all the girls in the cell that he thought we were nothing more than animals. One female police officer repeated to me several times that she was my "babysitter", treating me in a condescending manner as though I were a child.

The last officer who accompanied my sister and me to the court exit told us: "You should have committed your crimes in Quebec." A number of times, in different places, police officers told us that martial law was in effect and that we no longer had any rights. I think some questions must be raised about the instructions the police officers were given. They seemed to believe they were entitled to do what they were doing.

During those three days when I felt like an animal in a cage, I was always given the impression that I was a criminal. I never felt there was a presumption of innocence, which should nevertheless be the basis of our criminal system. And the discrimination wasn't just verbal. As francophones, we were not given access to the same services. Throughout my detention, I encountered no officers who spoke French. I was told that, if I asked to appear in French, I would have to stay in detention longer. One woman who was with me in the cell was from France. She was visiting here and spoke no English. She was unable to see a lawyer who spoke French until about 50 hours later. I sensed that I was being discriminated against on the basis of my language.

About 40 hours later, we were transferred to the district court, where we were told that, since the judge was tired, we would not be able to appear that day. At 4:00 a.m., the police officers transferred us to a women's prison, the Vanier Centre for Women. In that prison, we were interrogated and strip searched again. We underwent medical tests and had to go back without even being able to sleep, which meant a second sleepless night for us.

Back in court the next day, I was finally able to appear before the judge, and that is where I finally learned that I was charged with conspiracy to commit an indictable offence. At the time of my arrest, we had all been accused of participating in a riot, but it was not until the appearance that I learned my new charge. I had to post bail of \$1,000. I was ultimately able to leave, but on very harsh release conditions. I was threatened with being returned to a cell if I took the time to read the document concerning my bail. I was therefore unable to read my release conditions before being released. This is something that very much troubled me.

When I was released from my cell, my personal belongings had been lost. I no longer had any I.D. papers, money, clothing or glasses. It took about a month and a lot of pressure before I was able to recover them. My sister's cellular telephone, black coat and black clothing were confiscated from her, and she still has not recovered them. They are still there four months later.

I had to go four months with a charge of conspiracy to damage property over \$5,000 over my head. Fortunately, that charge was dropped not very long ago, on October 14.

I want to become a lawyer. And I was afraid for months that I would not be able to enter the profession I want to practise. Being subjected to serious criminal charges for demonstrating in a peaceful manner is completely unjust, in my view, but the permanent stress especially was very hard to live with over those four months.

Now, if you try to put yourself in my shoes, I will tell you that I felt humiliated, traumatized and stripped of my dignity, simply for exercising the right to express my political opinions in a peaceful manner, which I believe is a constitutional right. I sensed that they violated my rights by arresting me, by arbitrarily detaining me, by subjecting me to clearly abusive searches, by violating my dignity and, I believe, by discriminating against francophone citizens.

I sensed that they simply wanted to discourage me from demonstrating, to shut me up, to prevent me from expressing my ideas and to deter me from demonstrating in future. It's quite unfortunate, but I have now lost the trust I had in my country's democratic values and in its commitment to respect for individual freedoms.

● (1550)

In conclusion, don't forget that 1,100 persons experienced a situation similar to mine. So I've just painted you a picture that represents 1,100 individuals. My specific story is the same as that of nearly 100 individuals arrested in the gymnasium. As a citizen who considers that her rights have been interfered with, I hope for—and I really want—an independent investigation to be conducted to shed light on the G20 incidents.

Thank you very much for holding this parliamentary committee meeting, but I would like much more to be done, and I also hope it will be.

In conclusion, I would like to tell you that Quebec rights advocacy organizations have gathered and compiled some 30 testimonials from individuals who were arrested. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights deemed the reported facts serious enough to hold a meeting, which is quite exceptional.

I attended that hearing in Washington on Monday, October 25, and I saw commissioners who were outraged by this situation and who called for the Canadian government to account for itself.

In my view, the situation is historically serious and Canada has a responsibility to conduct an independent public investigation. As one of the 1,100 unjustly arrested individuals, I believe this is the only valid option.

That is my testimony. If you have any questions, I will be pleased to answer them.

[English]

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

We will now move to Ms. Mansour.

[Translation]

Ms. Wissam Mansour (As an Individual): Good afternoon. I would like to thank you for the time you have allotted me. I will be brief, but I'm going to stick to the important details.

I was arrested in the gymnasium as well, like Jacinthe, her sister and my friends. However, my story is different. At the time of the arrest, police officers handcuffed us. Police officers from the SPVM, the Montreal police department, were also there and communicated without making any physical contact.

Once my friends were arrested and removed from the gymnasium, a police officer from the Montreal police department entered the gymnasium and recognized me, since he asked me if I knew Fredy Villanueva. I won't go into the details, but, when he looked at the Toronto police officer who was handcuffing me, he told him in English: "You should take her somewhere else because she has information to give you." At that point, I was handcuffed and taken outside. I was led away from the place where the buses were located and put in a regular police vehicle and taken to a police station.

Once we reached that place, I was filmed, with audio and video tapes, and the charges laid against me, which were breach of peace and unlawful assembly, were repeated to me. That's what one Toronto police officer had said in the gymnasium. In French, it was about participating in a riot.

So I was told that I was charged, and then they put me in a room to search me. Two inspectors in civilian dress then took me up to their office, a little room, to ask me what I had done during the demonstration on Saturday—why, where and how. The interrogation went very well at first, but midway through it, as the inspectors were not satisfied with my answers, and they started raising their voices. They then called me a "fucking little princess from the middle class".

[English]

The Chair: Madame, we have certain rules in this committee as far as language. I mentioned in our last meeting that even if it's in a quote we don't use vulgarities like that.

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Okay. But they used them at the police station.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Chairman, I think it's fundamentally important that people report what the police officers told them. How do you want her to say what she just said? The police officer told me that... How do you want her to express that? She has to say what the police officer said. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, that would be an interpretation of the police officer's words.

We're in a somewhat specific context, in which quite violent words were spoken to these women, and these women have to state them accurately, as they were said. Unfortunately, this is the reality of what these people experienced. This is raw evidence, and we therefore have to listen to it.

● (1555)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

I don't want to take away from the testimony in any way. If what we call "unparliamentary language" was used, then you can make a written version and supply us with it.

I'm saying that on this committee we're going to try to hold to parliamentary language.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.): Can I say something?

The Chair: Well, do you want to hear from all of them? We're just taking away from their time. If everyone wants to make a comment on this, I can do that.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: I'd like to make a statement in terms of parliamentary or non-parliamentary language: they are not parliamentarians.

The Chair: No, but we are in a parliamentary committee. My responsibility in this committee is to maintain order and decorum in the committee. I'm saying that I would gladly accept on paper...and I haven't heard a lot; I heard the one word. I don't want to hear it again.

Go ahead, Mr. Kania.

An hon. member: Mr. Chair, I had my hand up before other people.

The Chair: I don't see you on the list here, but we'll work on getting you on the list.

Go ahead, Mr. Kania.

Mr. Andrew Kania (Brampton West, Lib.): Mr. Chair, with respect, I think there is a difference between a witness using unparliamentary language in a personal description and their quoting of other persons who used unacceptable words, especially in a police station. I would think that as a quote it would be acceptable, because, frankly, we need to know what happened in those police stations.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): I was going to make the exact same point. That is a critical distinction. It's not the witness who is using unparliamentary language; she is giving accurate testimony of what was said.

If that's your ruling, Mr. Chair, then I hereby challenge your ruling. I'll challenge your ruling right now.

The Chair: I would say to attempt to refrain from those types of vulgarities. If you continue to use them....

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion to challenge your ruling. I want the witness to be able to give her testimony and tell us what happened. If she's quoting other people and that's what was said, this committee has a right to hear what was said unvarnished. We can draw our own conclusions.

Your ruling has been made and I challenge it.

The Chair: All right, we have a challenge of the chair.

Let me make it clear for our viewing audience that we have an opposition that outnumbers the government. The chair sits trying to maintain order in the committee room—

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Chair: I'm just saying—

Mr. Don Davies: No, it's a point of order—

The Chair: Now Mr. Davies is—

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Chairman, you are editorializing a question to challenge the chair. By the rules, the question should immediately be put. There is no debate on that motion. You're debating and you're trying to editorialize before the motion. That's totally inappropriate.

Your job as chair is to follow the rules of procedure. The rule of procedure when the challenge has been made is that you are to immediately put the question to the committee without debate.

The Chair: All right. You see that the chair has been challenged on his decision. The decision that I stated was that this type of language would be refrained from in this committee and that as the chair I would try to maintain decorum. I have been challenged on that, and we will now take the vote.

All those in favour that the ruling of the chair be sustained, please so indicate.

(Ruling of the chair overturned)

The Chair: The chair has been overruled.

Madam, that means you can use whatever language you want.

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Thank you, but again, it's not my language; it's what I was told. I do have a lot of respect for everybody here.

The Chair: You have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: I'm describing the circumstances to you. I was questioned for some time. I obviously didn't know the time and was therefore unable to verify how much time had elapsed. The interrogation was very respectful at first. It was subsequently, when the police officers seemed dissatisfied by my answers, that they started to raise their voices and to insult me. One thing I would like to mention is that I was also called a "fucking foreigner" and that was very hurtful. I'm Canadian, I was born in Canada, and I don't at all accept the fact that I was called a "foreigner". Even though I wasn't born in the same province as they were, we all belong to the same country. I was also told that if I had to break objects, I should go back to my city, to Montreal, and do it there. That's it.

The two inspectors left the premises and slammed the door with a degree of frustration. When they came back—it took some time for them to come back—one of them entered the room, left the door open and told me I was lucky because his colleague believed me, but that, if it had just been up to him, I would have had to stay there for a very long time. Then he told me that I would be released and that the charges would be dropped. I was left in the room for some time to do the paperwork, and they came back to...

I apologize for going backward, but I simply want to point out that, when I was searched, they put me in metal handcuffs, and when I entered the room where I was interrogated, they removed them from me and never put them back on. I was able to recover my personal property. They did a second audio and video recording of me so that they could tell me that the charges were dropped. I never had to sign anything and I was able to leave.

I had no idea where I was. I was in pyjamas and my telephone batteries were low. I had little money on me and no one offered to let me use the telephone or to call anyone. So I left, I found myself—I don't really know how, but on foot—on the campus, and I was not allowed to go in and pick up my personal property. During all that time, I really thought that all the people in the gymnasium had experienced the same series of events. It was only afterwards that I learned they had been imprisoned in the temporary detention centre.

So I would like to emphasize that. To a certain degree, I was lucky to have experienced that situation. I had the opportunity to answer questions, which was not afforded to my friends or all those who were in the gymnasium. My friends were incarcerated for 62 hours before being released and actually acquitted on October 14, whereas we had spent all our time together during the events. I believe it would be very important to conduct an investigation so that my experience can show how disorganized things were and especially that no one went to meet these people in order to ask them questions, and that is something fundamental. In any democracy, I believe everyone has a right to speak and must be allowed a chance to do so before being incarcerated in a cage like animals.

Thank you very much.

● (1600)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much. *Merci beaucoup*, Ms. Mansour.

We'll now move to Ms. Des Rosiers.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers (General Counsel, Canadian Civil Liberties Association): Thank you for your invitation. I am here on behalf of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association. I am accompanied by Graeme Norton.

The Canadian Civil Liberties Association has been in existence since 1964 and is a rights and liberties advocacy agency in Canada. My predecessor is Alan Borovoy, whom you no doubt know. In Toronto, the association had 50 trained volunteers, neutral observers, who circulated throughout the week.

First I will speak in French and then in English. My presentation is divided into three parts. The first part contains the on-site observations that the association made, and I obviously invite you to look beyond the images conveyed by the media to see what actually happened across the city of Toronto. We had the opportunity to obtain evidence and to see it directly.

Second, I will talk

[English]

about the issues that this raises for a democracy, about several factual issues that need to be investigated, and about some really fundamental issues in future public security for other large events in the public policy order in Canada.

Finally, I have some conclusions about the need for a public inquiry. We have some proposed terms of reference that we want to circulate to the committee. I want to conclude on that.

[Translation]

First of all, the association had recruited 50 volunteers. We had met with representatives of the Integrated Security Unit in early May to discuss our evaluation and observation program with them. They were aware of the program. We also discussed certain issues that are generally the same in the context of major demonstrations. Among other things, we tried to raise the capital importance of international relations after large demonstrations, such as

● (1605)

[English]

“Adapting to Protest”, which was done after the London G-20.

In this report that was issued after an inquiry into the policing of the G-20 meeting in London, the first recommendation starts this way:

The right to freedom of assembly places obligations on the police. The starting point for the police is the presumption in favour of facilitating peaceful assembly. [Certainly] police may impose lawful restrictions on the exercise of the right....

But these restrictions must have a legitimate aim; they must be lawful and they must be necessary and proportionate.

[Translation]

The association's findings, based on the reports that have been submitted to it and on the observations it made during that weekend, were as follows.

We have circulated the summary of our report. It is our view that, despite instances of commendable and professional conduct, security efforts, especially after 5:00 p.m. on June 26 and June 27, failed to come up to the standard of constitutional commitments. Police conduct and actions were at times disproportionate, arbitrary and excessive.

We obviously recognize that the task of police officers was difficult, and we also noted that there were instances of competent and professional conduct throughout the week—and we were there all week. In spite of everything, Canadians are entitled to police services that do not undermine constitutional values. It is therefore essential to investigate to determine to what extent constitutional values were disregarded. How is it that we experienced the weekend that we had? How is it that more than 1,100 people were arrested? We now know that no charges will be laid against 1,000 of them. Consequently, 1,105 individuals were arrested and, in 1,000 of those cases, no charges will be laid. These were therefore innocent people.

[English]

I want to move quickly to the fact that throughout our media observations, five of our monitors were arrested in these mass arrests. There was a mass arrest on the Saturday night at The Esplanade and one on Sunday morning that was described very eloquently here. There was another mass arrest on Sunday afternoon at the corner of Queen and Spadina, which has been well documented. Some of our monitors were arrested both Saturday night and Sunday at Queen and Spadina.

I'll just read the quote from our monitor, who, with his partner, was in charge of following the march:

My monitoring partner and I followed the march of about 300 protesters down Yonge Street and onto The Esplanade. A line of police officers dressed in riot gear with what appeared to be tear gas guns formed a line about 300m west of Yonge St. on The Esplanade. The protesters stopped in front of the police line and continued chanting the lines they had been chanting for as long as we had been following them that day: “This is what democracy looks like!”, “Peaceful protest!”, “Who's streets? Our streets!”, and so on. This continued on for about twenty minutes without the police line or the protesters moving, or anything more than chanting and cheering. Then, from the east out of Scott St., a line of police officers in riot gear formed along The Esplanade and marched towards the crowd.

The officers in both police lines began marching slowly towards each other, clattering their batons and shields, and so forcing the crowd together. The police lines stopped when they were about 30 meters apart. The protesters, and anyone else who happened to be on the street or sidewalk, were now boxed in between two police lines, including my partner and I, and three people who had been standing outside of a restaurant, smoking. The protesters chanted where more urgent and more often people called out or chanted with "Peaceful protest!" at the police lines. Several times then, and in the time that followed, small groups of officers would suddenly charge into the crowd, grab someone and pull them back behind their line. One protester called out to the crowd to say that everyone should sit down, which many did. The crowd was much more quiet, and we all were waiting. Calls and chants began saying, "Let us go!", and one protester called out, "Okay, I've learned my lesson, I want to go home now!" After an hour or more of waiting like this, an officer announced that if we raised our hands and waited we would all be peacefully arrested. This was the first time we had heard any communications from the police. My partner and I waited for another two hours or so before it was our turns to be pulled from the crowd and arrested.

He stayed in a detention centre for 20 hours. We were unable to call him. His hands were tied for 20 hours, and so on.

This is the testimony. I think you will hear more testimony. It was certainly a sad weekend for civil liberties in Canada. We can do better. These are some of the issues that have arisen.

I want to speak now to some of the larger issues that I think a public inquiry could look at. There are some questions about where the police were, why they were not where the vandals were, why they stayed with the protestors, what orders were given, and why there was dispersement of a peaceful crowd. We were there. We saw that it was peaceful. Was there a miscommunication somewhere? Something went wrong.

Second, I think the larger issues are what I want to discuss briefly. During the G-20 and in preparation for it, I think security imperatives redefined fundamental aspects of Toronto life and Canadian life, without much democratic engagement or discussion and without legal authority.

Space and mobility were redefined. Weaponry was redefined. Privacy was redefined. Policing and criminal law were redefined. Such redefinitions may have been necessary, we don't know, but they occurred without public input and without some legal framework around them. It's not true that martial law was declared during the weekend of the G-20.

The price tag is questioned, but is presented as a *fait accompli*. Indeed, it is a major issue for our democracy that the security infrastructure is not only costly, but it appears to be immune from any scrutiny or democratic input.

• (1610)

The cost to our liberty, to the freedom of peaceful assembly, and to the freedom from arbitrary detention and arrest and from unreasonable search and seizure are mentioned and presumed necessary. This is dangerous. Our system of government requires that all powers be exercised according to law. The absence of a legal framework for a broad exercise in redefining police powers and space and weaponry is dangerous.

In our report we mentioned the difficulty in how the fence was set up. I think the issue of what the framework is for defining a fence should be looked at in a public inquiry. It's not that people say there shouldn't be a fence; it's how big it would be and who decides how big it will be. Will it be a prioritization where Parliament or some

other official can look at and evaluate whether indeed it is necessary, because "reasonableness" and "necessity" are the words that are mentioned in the act? As you know, it's the Foreign Missions and International Organizations Act.

The only thing we're saying is that the way in which it was done... we may learn from what has happened to indeed ensure that there are some appropriate safeguards ahead of time.

It is interesting that in the design of the roots for protest no one paid attention to what the APEC's report mentioned at the end of the 1990s. In the APEC's report, Ted Hughes, who was then the chairman, said that in establishing the parameter of security, the foreigners are not allowed to be completely immune from seeing and hearing the protesters. Their business must be conducted, they should not be interrupted, but the idea that you can create a retreat-like atmosphere completely immune from looking at or seeing the protesters was described as incompatible with our constitutional law.

I understand my time is running out.

• (1615)

The Chair: Actually I've been very generous to you. You're about two minutes over.

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Okay. I'll just conclude briefly on this.

Basically, on the fence, we are inviting a prioritization. The weaponry is the same, and I think for the entire legal structure....

I want to conclude with two things.

You have now the terms of reference that we're suggesting, which were designed with Amnesty International. We understand why the public may be reluctant to spend other money on the G-20. However, all the reviews that are taking place now are partial and they will not get at the interactions between CSIS, the RCMP, and what was going on. That's a crucial piece of information that is needed, both for the public and for the police to be able to present what indeed happened.

In our view, it will be cheaper not to wait for the two class actions to be resolved, but to proactively exercise leadership from the federal government to indeed recognize that something went wrong there and that it should be concluded.

I have one more point. I just want to say that you cannot have 1,000 people arrested and the message is that their government does not care.

I also speak to you as both men and women of political life. In our view of what happened, the freedom to peaceful assembly is as important as the right to vote. If we don't support it, if we don't support peaceful political engagement, I think we're losing a generation. I implore you to listen to them.

[Translation]

Thank you very much.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. McColeman, on a point of order.

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC): I'm speaking now because I wanted to give the witnesses time and not interrupt the testimony. I've been waiting quite patiently for you, sir, to provide a ruling on Mr. Davies from the NDP.

At a recent committee meeting he blatantly broke the rules of speaking about in camera business in a public forum. It was our committee forum. I brought that to you and I've been waiting for your ruling for two meetings now, sir. I'm wondering if you are able to deal with the fact that Mr. Davies has done this. He's done it for a second time. I'd like to know what your ruling is.

The Chair: Thanks, Mr. McColeman, for bringing that forward today.

I'm going to come with something written down and a little more clear than just speaking. I've taken a look at it, and I will be ruling on it, but I won't be ruling on it today.

Mr. Phil McColeman: Do you know when that might be?

The Chair: Fairly soon.

Plus, there are things in that breach of confidentiality, if indeed it was a breach, that I can't disclose in a public meeting. I'm looking at how we can go in camera for the disclosure of what was said, if there was something said that would have been a breach.

I'm not going to make a ruling on that today.

We're going to continue with our witnesses. We'll go to Mr. Kania.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Mr. Chairman, before I start, we do have at least two motions today, so I want to clarify that we will follow procedure and leave the last 15 minutes of this meeting to deal with those.

The Chair: On the notice of motion, correct? They're just notices, so—

Mr. Andrew Kania: Yes. Thank you.

I'd like to start by addressing Madam Mansour and Madam Poisson. I listened intently to both of your stories about your treatment and the words stated to you, and I find it all unacceptable. I just want to state that as a member of Parliament.

Mr. Small, did you or your ministry have any role with the detention centre?

• (1620)

Mr. Steven Small: If you're referring to the Eastern Avenue detention centre, no, none whatsoever.

Mr. Andrew Kania: In terms of the planning for this, in my analysis, to me, there was some deficiency. We had two things here: roughly 1,000 innocent people who were arrested without charges; and at the same time we had a small group, the black bloc, and perhaps others, who were allowed to go through the city and cause mayhem and damage.

I will ask why you think this happened, based on your role. Who was responsible for the breakdown in the planning with both measures?

Mr. Steven Small: I'm not in a position to answer that question.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Did you or your ministry have any planning role whatsoever in terms of when arrests of protestors would be made?

Mr. Steven Small: None whatsoever.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Did you have any role in terms of when and how the police would be deployed to guard against persons who might seek to cause damage in the downtown of Toronto?

Mr. Steven Small: None whatsoever.

Mr. Andrew Kania: In terms of such planning, based on the experience and knowledge you had, who from the federal government was responsible to coordinate and make these decisions, in terms of both arrests and the protection of persons and property in Toronto?

Mr. Steven Small: We joined a working group, as I said, with representatives from the summit integrated security unit, which included Public Safety Canada, the Toronto Police Service, the Ontario Provincial Police, and others.

Beyond that, I have no comment regarding the planning.

Mr. Andrew Kania: That's fine. But at the end of the day, this was an international summit held in Toronto, so the ultimate responsibility for the summit was with the federal government, correct?

Mr. Steven Small: I'm sorry, I'm not in a position to answer that. I just—

Mr. Andrew Kania: I'll try to ask this in a different way. Do you have any information you can provide in terms of who, politically, from the federal government was responsible and who made these decisions, in terms of any of these matters that we're complaining of?

At the end of the day, it almost rests with the politicians. It's not the individual police officer on the street; it's not any of these forces. Somebody has to decide. We're the elected officials. I'm asking you if you're aware of who the elected officials were who had this power and who were exercising this power.

Mr. Steven Small: No, I'm not aware.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Were you involved with the planning of the summit in any way?

Mr. Steven Small: No.

Mr. Andrew Kania: What was your role?

Mr. Steven Small: We were to receive individuals who were remanded into custody at correctional facilities.

Mr. Andrew Kania: So in terms of your Ontario ministry, you were not involved in the planning of the security for the summit. You were simply asked to receive these individuals.

Mr. Steven Small: I work for the correctional services division of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services. In the correctional services division we administer the adult provincial correctional facilities.

Mr. Andrew Kania: You're aware of the fact that there's a huge discrepancy in what this summit cost for security in relation to other summits. I'll use a couple of examples. The London, England, G-20 in April 2009 was \$30 million and the Pittsburgh G-20 summit in September 2009 was \$18 million. We've spent over \$1 billion.

Can you provide any comments to us on how we got our money's worth as taxpayers for the security, in comparison?

Mr. Steven Small: I have no comment. I'm not aware.

Mr. Andrew Kania: The other thing is that Minister Toews was here a couple of days ago, and we were asking him questions about why the summit was split between Huntsville and Toronto. Before I ask you the question I want you to know that from what I have read there's about a \$200 million difference because of the splitting of the summit, rather than having it one location.

We asked Minister Toews why that decision was made, and he in essence said that he followed the recommendations of certain officials, but he couldn't provide any reasons to us in front of the committee. He couldn't remember anything, and he referred it to Mr. Elcock. Later on, when Mr. Elcock was asked these questions, he essentially said it was a political decision and he couldn't say anything.

I'm wondering if you and your department have any information in terms of—

• (1625)

The Chair: On a point of order, Mr. Lobb.

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): To be fair to the minister, that's not exactly what he said. I think Mr. Kania knows better.

He said he would refer it to Mr. Elcock and he could hear it from the horse's mouth. I think he could remember that saying. He may want to refrain from his selective memories—

Mrs. Maria Mourani: That's not a point of order.

The Chair: Just hang on, Ms. Mourani.

I would encourage all members here that if you're going to quote the minister, quote him correctly. I didn't hear him say exactly what you said. I guess I can check the blues again, but I take it as a point.

It's more of a reminder for everyone. I'm not going to make a decision on that right now, Mr. Lobb, because I don't have the blues of what Mr. Toews said.

Mr. Kania, I'm not going to take that as a point of order, so continue.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Thank you.

I'll be happy to show them to you after, if you like. I have no difficulty with that.

Can you provide any information to the committee on why this additional approximately \$200 million was spent to split the summits between Huntsville and Toronto? What recommendations were followed, and why was this political decision made by the Conservative government to do this?

Mr. Steven Small: I have no information in that regard.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll move to Ms. Mourani.

[Translation]

Ms. Mourani, you have five minutes.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to welcome all of you and to thank you as well for your evidence because I also know that it is not easy to appear here to provide this kind of testimony.

Mr. Small, it is a great pleasure to see you. I asked to have you appear here by means of a summons. I have very specific questions concerning your task and role at Maplehurst prison and Vanier prison. I really have some very specific questions.

I have met a number of individuals who spent time in your prisons, in particular Maplehurst, more specifically men. The men I met all told me they had been vaccinated at your prison without their consent. Is that a normal procedure? Was there an epidemic at your prison? How is it that these people were vaccinated or that they were injected with something without being told what it was and especially without their oral consent? They said they did not want to be injected with anything, but that was done. Explain that to me. I am all ears.

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: I'm sorry, I'm not aware that took place, and I'm not aware of what you're referring to.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Small, it's your prison. Maplehurst is your responsibility, isn't it?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: Yes, it's one of our correctional institutions.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: All right. So you are not aware that there is a nurse, I believe, or at least nursing staff, at your Maplehurst prison, who vaccinates people without their consent?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: No.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Things are going pretty badly then.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Maria Mourani: Things are really bad. Mr. Small, you will have to know and investigate this matter because some people were vaccinated without their consent. That's unacceptable. I've worked in prisons, and staff are not allowed to administer medication if people don't want to take it. Am I wrong or right?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: I will review that matter and provide information to the committee on what exactly took place.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Very well. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Small to conduct an investigation and submit a report to us. That's one of the topics I wanted to address, and I'm not finished.

[English]

The Chair: Again, let me remind all of us that we have allegations toward certain things. We have witnesses, but we have allegations.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Chairman, these aren't allegations. I met these people and they told me they had been vaccinated; they didn't hallucinate. These aren't allegations, all right?

• (1630)

[English]

The Chair: It's an allegation.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: I'll continue.

Mr. Small, you have before you Ms. Jacinthe Poisson, who underwent—I hope she didn't hallucinate either, Mr. Chairman—a strip search at the Vanier Centre for Women, and that search was conducted while the door to the room was open. Any of the male guards could see her. Are you aware of that?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: I was not aware of that until I heard it from the witness.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Is it common practice at the Vanier Centre to search women in front of men?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: No.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Then you'll prepare a report on that matter as well. I don't believe these are allegations on Ms. Poisson's part. If you believe they are, that's tantamount to calling her a liar, Mr. Chairman. I believe she knows whether or not she was searched.

Very well.

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: I will review the matter and provide information to the committee.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Very well. Thank you, Mr. Small.

Ms. Poisson, I read your evidence. I met you, your sister and you, and you said that, when you appeared in court, the judge, a man or a woman, told you that you would at last be able to eat as much as you wanted and to sleep, and to have a place to sleep, because you were going to the Vanier Centre. Is that what happened?

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Yes. In fact, around 11:00 p.m., people started to file in front of the judge. I believe that approximately 10 individuals were released; they were able to learn their fate after 40 hours in detention. Shortly afterward, however, the judge said that she was tired and that she wanted to postpone all the appearances until the next day. She told us that we would be able to sleep in a bed that night, that we would be able to rest, to be in acceptable conditions, because she seemed surprised at the conditions to which we had been subjected. At 11:00 p.m., the rumour circulating among the cells was that we were at last going to be able to sleep in a bed. Unfortunately, that was not the case.

So, until 4:00 a.m., we were left in the basement of the prison, where, I remind you, the floor is very cold, and without clothing to

warm us up. We were transferred to the Vanier Centre at 4:00 a.m. Upon our arrival, we were interrogated and asked among things, “Are you crazy?” and “Are you going to commit suicide?” which was quite insulting. There was a partial medical examination and a second strip search. We received a cheese sandwich once again and we were ultimately unable to sleep. We were locked up in a cell for an hour and, at 7:00 a.m., we had to leave again to go to court. The judge's nice promises were never kept.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Small, it appears from the evidence from both men and women that, when they appeared in court, they were assured that they would at last eat and sleep, and that did not happen at that prison. However, according to your testimony, you say that all detention management policies were complied with and that the employees were respectful. I understand that that was not the case and that you are not aware of the matter. Perhaps there are grounds for a general investigation into everything that happened. What do you think of that?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: Many of the prisoners from port arrived very late at night, or very early in the morning, to be precise. We provided the care during their stay. If there are any matters that need to be reviewed, I would like to say to this committee that we will review those matters and provide that information to the committee.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: All right.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Mourani. Your time is up.

We'll move to Mr. Davies.

Mr. Don Davies: I'd like to thank all the witnesses for coming to give us the benefit of your testimony, particularly the two young women from Quebec. I appreciate the courage it takes to tell your story.

I want to address some questions to all of you, but first, Madame Des Rosiers, you said that you had up to 50 observers on the ground in Toronto observing what was going on. Is that correct?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: That's correct.

Mr. Don Davies: I've heard anecdotally—Mr. Chairman says they're allegations, and I think that's correct at this point—a number of allegations that there were individuals who were subject to illegal searches by police. Did any of your observers have any first-hand evidence of that?

• (1635)

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Yes, certainly. I think several of our own monitors were searched. The searches were done during the week, throughout the week, I think, and were far removed from around the fence. There were people being detained, people being searched. I did my own tour as part of the monitoring schedule, and I saw someone being stopped and searched by nine police officers.

Mr. Don Davies: Did any of your observers hear any reports of people having their goods or property illegally seized?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: I think we saw some property being removed from bags. Police officers seemed to believe that they were obeying orders or that they had the right to do it. We've documented not only what was happening but what was said, because it seemed to us that there was a fundamental problem of understanding the law during that time.

Mr. Don Davies: My understanding of Canadians' rights when they are arrested is that they are to be given the right to contact counsel and to instruct counsel without undue delay. Did you hear any reports of Canadians who were arrested who claimed that they were denied their right to counsel within an appropriate amount of time?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Our own monitors were denied the right to counsel when they went to the detention centre. We had someone trying to reach them, a lawyer, and I was trying to reach them through the night, and it was not to be so.

Mr. Don Davies: You've quoted the Hughes report. It's interesting that the Minister of Public Safety came to this committee on Monday and also quoted the Hughes report. You quoted Mr. Hughes' conclusion that part of the state's obligation is to facilitate a number of the constitutional rights of Canadians.

In your opinion, based on what your 50 observers saw at Toronto this summer, did the police facilitate peaceful assembly?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Certainly we recognize that it was a difficult job, but in our view, the incidents we saw reached a threshold that was higher than what we should expect. They were certainly not in compliance with the Canadian Constitution.

Mr. Don Davies: On August 23, your organization wrote to Minister Toews requesting his attention in a number of areas concerning summit security. You offered to meet with him to discuss your recommendations. Have you received any response from the minister?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: No, we have not.

Mr. Don Davies: Have you been contacted by any government officials, cabinet ministers, or government MPs regarding any of your documented observations on summit security and your clear conclusion, if I may say, that the constitutional rights of Canadians were apparently violated on a mass scale?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Yes. Justice Minister Rob Nicholson wrote back to us to acknowledge receipt of our report and indicated that the matter had been referred to Minister Toews. We have received some indications from the Auditor General, to whom we provided our report as well, that acknowledged our report. We also sent our report to CSIS and the RCMP, and this morning I was called by SIRC to acknowledge receipt of our report.

Mr. Don Davies: So other than acknowledging receipt of the report you sent, has anybody contacted you to get your—

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Not from the federal government.

Mr. Don Davies: I'd like to address some questions to the two witnesses from Quebec.

I had two young men from British Columbia who came to see me from the University of British Columbia in Kelowna. They told me they were sleeping in the University of Toronto's gymnasium—and I'm wondering if it's the same place—when they were awakened

early in the morning with police coming in with guns drawn. They were kicked in the ribs, and it was announced that everyone in the gymnasium—somewhere between 70 and 100 people—was mass arrested for conspiracy to commit an unlawful act. Were you in that gymnasium?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Yes, it was the same gymnasium. We were both arrested and everyone was charged with unlawful assembly at first and, at the hearing, with conspiracy to commit an indictable offence and with time, with damage to property over \$5,000. Everyone. That represented nearly 100 Quebecers.

[English]

Mr. Don Davies: And can you tell me, what is the status of those charges?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: At this time, they have all been dropped. On October 14, all the charges against the accused from the gymnasium were dropped. We're talking about nearly 100 charges.

Ms. Wissam Mansour: My charges were dropped the day of the arrest. I am the only one, by the way, to whom that—

• (1640)

[English]

Mr. Don Davies: Thank you.

The government uses the phrase over and over again that these were “thugs and hooligans” in Toronto. I must tell you that the people I've seen are young university students and people who wanted to peacefully protest. What's your observation? Were you “thugs and hooligans”? And were the people in that gym “thugs and hooligans”, the 70 or 100 people who you saw? What was your firsthand experience?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: They were the nicest people I've met. It's like we were a family. Everybody was very helpful to each other. No, I don't accept that.

Mr. Don Davies: Did you see anybody commit an act in that gymnasium...or was there any discussion from any of you to commit an act of violence or property damage?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Not at all. None.

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: We specified between us that we should be really careful.

[Translation]

Pardon me, I switched to English.

We were told that we had to be very careful, that we should commit no act or make any comment that might lead to charges. We really had to be as careful as possible not to get our colleagues in trouble. I know no one who committed any indictable offences, who intended to do so or who talked about it. The idea was to demonstrate peacefully, to express our opinions, which I believe is an essential freedom in a democracy.

[English]

The Chair: Your time is up, Mr. Davies. Thank you.

We'll move to Mr. Rathgeber, please.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to all the witnesses for your attendance here today.

Ms. Poisson, my first question is to you. I understand you're a law student at the University of Quebec in Montreal.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: No, I'm doing a bachelor's degree with a double major in political science and law.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: You live in Montreal.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Yes.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Ms. Mansour, do you also live in Montreal?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Yes.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: And how did you get to Toronto on the last days of June of this year?

[Translation]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: If you're referring to transportation, we met in front of Concordia University in Montreal and we left in school buses, yellow buses.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: And those buses were provided by an organization called the Anti-Capitalist Convergence. Is that correct?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Yes, it was organized by that group.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Are you members of the Anti-Capitalist Convergence?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: We are not. I'll explain it to you. There were posters at the university stating that that community group was organizing transportation for anyone who wanted to demonstrate. It was not necessary to be a member of the organization in order to go. I wasn't at all familiar with the organization. It was mass transportation so that it would be less expensive.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Were you unaware that the Anti-Capitalist Convergence had on its website a call to attack the G-20? You weren't aware of that.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: No.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Ms. Mansour.

[Translation]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: No.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: How many individuals rode on these buses with you from Montreal to Toronto, which I understand must be at least a five- or six-hour journey?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: I'm not aware of that; there were a number of school buses. I couldn't say how many individuals there were in total.

Ms. Wissam Mansour: If I'm not mistaken, there were three school buses. However, I couldn't say the number of individuals.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: So over a hundred people. Would that be fair?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: That's probably fair.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Did none of the individuals who were on this journey discuss the tactics that were going to be employed once you got to Toronto?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: That wasn't the case.

Ms. Wissam Mansour: No.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Why did you go? What was your goal? What was the endgame here?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: I went to demonstrate peacefully because I wanted to attend a first international summit. I'm studying international relations. It's important for me to understand how it works in the field. I'm also opposed to some of the government's positions. I believe that, in our country, we have a right to express our opposition to certain government policies. That was my intention, and that's what I did peacefully.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: I agree that in this country you should have the right to peacefully protest. But you'll agree with me that you should not have the right to violently protest and destroy property of others—

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Of course.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: —or to turn over police cars. You agree with that. I'm not suggesting you were involved in that, but you will agree with me that is offside.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Of course.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: You didn't quite answer my question.

So you went there to peacefully protest—I appreciate that. But what was your ultimate goal? Did you think that somehow you would have an effect on the outcome, that somehow the G-20 leaders would be so moved by your protest that they would change their policies? Was that your goal here?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: I think your question is completely out of context. My intention was not to have an influence on the G20's decisions; my intention was to express my political opinions, which I absolutely have a right to do. So I don't understand the meaning of your question.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Ms. Mansour, what was your goal in being there?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Could you repeat your question?

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Yes. My question is, what did you hope to accomplish by taking several days out of your busy life to go to Toronto? Was your goal to somehow effect public policy? Was it to have some face time with President Obama? Or was it to cause disruption? What was your endgame here?

•(1645)

Ms. Wissam Mansour: You have a good sense of humour.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Thank you.

[Translation]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: What was my goal when I went to demonstrate? Right now, I would tell you frankly that I'm not proud to live in a Canada governed by Mr. Harper. I'm not proud of that, and I went to demonstrate against the political positions that Mr. Harper and his members have adopted. That's it.

I went to see Mr. Obama, and I knew very well that Mr. Harper was not going to change his mind because he saw 20,000 or 30,000 people in the street. I had no short-term goal; the goal was a long-term one.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Okay, so what's your long-term goal? Was your long-term goal to have the overturn of the Harper government? Or is it to defeat capitalism generally?

Voices: Oh, oh!

[Translation]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Look, I don't have a specific goal that I could summarize for you in one sentence. My goal is to express my opinions. I'm prepared to go and demonstrate in order to express both a positive opinion and a negative opinion. A demonstration isn't necessarily negative. I have no specific goal that I could express in one sentence. That's all I can tell you, sir.

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Nevertheless, 30,000 people went and demonstrated at that summit. I don't think every person who went to demonstrate intended to overturn the Harper government's policies. I believe we have a right to express our opinions. It's healthy to do that in a democracy; it's healthy for political opinions to be disseminated, even if they oppose government policies.

I don't see why we would need to think we were going to influence the G20's decisions. We're entitled to express our opinions without that.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: It's not my suggestion that it was your goal to overturn the Harper government or capitalism generally, because we both know that's unrealistic, but what I'm suggesting to you is that it was your goal to get on the news and to be seen and to cause disruption. That is my suggestion. Would you agree or disagree with me?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: I disagree.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Did the Anti-Capitalist Convergence provide you with anything besides free transportation to Toronto?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: No—well, apart from the stay at the campus. That's all.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: The people from that organization had entered into an agreement with the graduate student association of the University of Toronto so that we could sleep in a gymnasium in order to lower costs.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: I understand they also gave you information on what to do if you were ever arrested.

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: I don't remember that, but they gave out the numbers of lawyers we could reach in case of arrest. That's all.

Some people wrote the number of a lawyer to contact in case of need on their arms, which is a constitutional right. So some people were apparently arrested for that reason. That's all.

[English]

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Why do you think they gave you the phone numbers of lawyers?

[Translation]

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Pardon me?

[English]

Ms. Wissam Mansour: I think you'd have to ask them. I'm sorry, but you would have to ask them.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Do you not believe that they knew you were going to get arrested?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: Well, that's what you believe.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Rathgeber. Your time is up.

We will now move back to Ms. Mendes or Mr. Kania.

[Translation]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: Thank you for being with us and for your evidence. I can't even imagine what you went through. I also took part in demonstrations for a certain time, but fortunately I was never arrested.

I'd like to know whether you know why the Montreal police department was there at the outset.

•(1650)

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Those police officers were there when we were arrested, but not at the detention centre. They told me in the gymnasium, at the time of the arrest, that they were there because they had specific expertise in managing demonstration cases.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: The so-called riots.

Was it also to provide linguistic assistance?

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: Perhaps, since it was the Montreal police officers who informed us of our charge of participating in a riot. However, they didn't communicate with us much. So I can't be sure of that.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: They didn't at all accompany you through the ensuing process. Is that correct?

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: They were there during the arrest, in the gymnasium.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: With regard to the detention centre where you were placed, didn't you have an idea of what it was when you arrived?

Ms. Jacinthe Poisson: No, nothing was really explained to us. We didn't know where we were going or why.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: I can only repeat my colleague's remarks. We think that what you experienced is entirely unacceptable. That really isn't the Canada we think is ours.

[*English*]

If I may, Mr. Small, I'd like to ask you a question on the responsibility of the different security bodies that were supposed to supervise the detainees at the detention centres. Who had responsibility for what? Why were these young ladies detained in a centre where, supposedly, your department had no jurisdiction?

Mr. Steven Small: Before I answer that question, I want to clarify something the member said. I'd like to clarify that I'm appearing here voluntarily, rather than via summons. On two occasions I was asked...I sought clarification as to why I was coming. After I received that clarification I volunteered to come here. I am not under summons. I respect the work of this committee and I would not refuse to come.

To answer your question, individuals who are arrested by the police are detained by the police in a location. After they're processed they're brought to our correctional facilities. Generally, they're brought from a holding facility to the court to be remanded in custody and then brought to our correctional facilities.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: May I interrupt you for just two seconds because I want to clarify something with Madame Des Rosiers.

In terms of the international legislation or protocols that regulate international gatherings, if there are arrests—and sometimes it involves foreign nationals—who is responsible for the detainees?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: It depends, and it's a local arrangement. The country is responsible for—

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: Okay, so it's not something that is provided for by the protocols.

I'm sorry, Mr. Small, I interrupted you, but I just wanted to make sure that there was nothing....

Mr. Steven Small: That's my response.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: Okay, thank you very much.

Do I have any time?

The Chair: Yes, you have 40 seconds.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: What was the scope and nature of communications advice or any other such communications between the government and your ministry with regard to the G-20 summit? Were there any preparatory communications between the government and your department?

Mr. Steven Small: As I indicated, we were part of a working group with a number of law enforcement agencies. But beyond that, I'm not aware of any communication between governments.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendes: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Mendes.

We'll now go to Mr. Norlock.

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to all the witnesses for coming.

Despite what is politically...[*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

We have a choice, committee. We can take two minutes to reboot the system or we can continue.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you very much.

I want to make sure that the people at home are able to hear as well as see, because this is an important matter we're discussing here. Those at home will know that the other side will really take a lot of good shots at the government. And from this side, from time to time we're going to respond, because this is a political arena.

Sometimes I wonder if it is the truth that we're trying to get at, but I respect this institution so much that I know every member here wants to do that. I suspect it is the same for the witnesses.

I think Mr. Small, having a senior position in government, knows that many of the comments and questions that were coming from Mr. Kania weren't designed to get an answer from him but to actually put a statement in.

•(1655)

The Chair: One moment, please.

My understanding is that although the red light is on, the system is not on. So I am going to suspend for a few minutes and we will reboot the system.

Please, no one leave. Just stay here. It will only take a minute or two.

We will suspend.

- _____ (Pause) _____
-
- (1700)

The Chair: I want to apologize to our witnesses and to our committee today. This is one of the new committee rooms that we are dealing with here. There are still a few bugs; we're still working them out. Hopefully we'll be able to go uninterrupted.

I've been told by the opposition that they would like about five minutes at the end for notices of motion. So rather than the 15, we can give the witnesses a little more time. Is that fair?

Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.): Yes.

The Chair: All right. Thank you, sir.

We will continue with Mr. Norlock.

Mr. Norlock, I'm just going to reset your timer. Go ahead.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If it's okay with Mr. Holland, Mr. Chair, it's okay with me.

By the way, I'm speaking primarily to the folks at home. That's how I usually do this. That is I think the reason that this is being televised. Of course, the people at home know that this is an adversarial atmosphere, opposition and government. The opposition tries to make the government look bad; the government tries to make itself look good. That's the way it is.

In this particular case, I will deal specifically with Mr. Small. Mr. Kania's questions weren't designed to solicit that much of a response from Mr. Small but to let the people at home know his particular slant on what was said when the minister was here.

My questioning will be actually specific to the Ontario government, and in particular, Mr. Small, to yourself, in that your organization was responsible for a certain part of the incarceration of people who were arrested. Normally when someone is arrested and brought to your institution—and you can correct me if I'm wrong—they come there primarily in two ways. They come with either a remand order, which was the case, I believe, in this circumstance, or they come with a warrant of committal. In either case, you don't accept people into your institution without some kind of paperwork, I would gather. Were there remand orders or were they just verbal?

Mr. Steven Small: With each and every inmate admitted to our custody there was a remand warrant.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Okay. There was a piece of paper. They saw someone in the justice system in order to be able to have access to your system.

Mr. Steven Small: Yes, someone remanded them into custody.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Okay. This is just so we know, because for some of your questions, Mr. Small, the people at home would think that you were trying to be evasive or that you should have had the answer.

For people to know your echelon or your level of responsibility, could you explain your organization, sir, in a very quick, simplistic form? Who reports to you? And eventually, where does the buck stop?

Mr. Steven Small: I have four regional directors overseeing four regions within the province. Those regional directors oversee a number of institutions within a region. Each institution is administered by a superintendent. The superintendent is responsible for the operation of the particular institution. I report to the Deputy Minister of Correctional Services, and I am operationally responsible for the administration of the adult correctional institutions in Ontario.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you very much. So if a person had a complaint with regard to how they were being treated in an institution for which you are responsible, they should initiate a complaint to whom, sir? What is the process, in its most simplistic, quickest way of putting it?

- (1705)

Mr. Steven Small: Each individual who has a complaint can make that complaint either verbally or in writing to the superintendent, a supervisor, or any employee at the institution in which they're incarcerated. All of the complaints are reviewed, and a response is provided to the complainant as to whether the complaint was substantiated or not.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you very much.

I'm curious with regard to injections. You are obviously very familiar with the policies and procedures of the correctional system in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Steven Small: Yes.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Are you aware—by the way, I worked for the ministry for about 30 years—of any policies, other than for a person who is declared not mentally capable? In other words, people who are suffering from an illness and could harm themselves or someone else might have to be injected, under a doctor's supervision, so they can be calmed down. Are you aware of any other circumstance, in your policies and procedures, whereby a person, upon entrance into one of your institutions, would automatically be given an injection for any reason other than that it was done under the strict supervision of a doctor and under a doctor's order?

Mr. Steven Small: If you use the word “injection”, the answer is no. I'm not aware of that procedure, and certainly I should be aware if that's taking place. An injection? No.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Small. Thank you, Mr. Norlock.

We'll go to Madame Mourani.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Small, I would like to continue in the wake of what Mr. Norlock said.

Correct me if I'm mistaken, but you said that a person could not be injected with a substance if that person was not consenting. Is that correct?

[*English*]

Oh, there is no translation.

The Chair: Reset it. There we go. Now we have that.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: I didn't understand your response to Mr. Norlock. Are you saying that, if a person admitted to one of your institutions is vaccinated on arrival without his or her consent, without there being any mental disorders involved, that is not a normal procedure?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: No, an injection is not usual procedure. We do testing, for example, for tuberculosis, but I'm not clear as to the nature of this injection you're referring to.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Are the tuberculosis tests administered to people placed in remand done with or without their consent?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: Yes.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: What do you mean?

[English]

Mr. Steven Small: Yes, they are done with their consent.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: All right. Thank you.

Incidentally, I would like to apologize, Mr. Small. You are entirely right in saying that you are not appearing here under a summons. I expressed myself very poorly. I meant that you had almost appeared via a summons since you had refused to appear. I want to offer my apologies.

Ms. Des Rosiers, in your practice, you have no doubt covered a number of demonstrations. I met some journalists, including Mr. Paikin and Ms. Amy Miller. I also spoke to some demonstrators. There increasingly appears to be a kind of criminalization of demonstrations. Moreover, and listening to my colleague Mr. Rathgeber ask Ms. Poisson and Ms. Mansour questions, I got the impression—and I may be mistaken, since this is an impression—that we didn't have a right to demonstrate in this country and that, in doing so we ran the risk of being immediately associated with the Black Bloc or I don't know what. I don't understand. Can you help me understand?

• (1710)

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: The major concern of a civil liberties association is to ensure that rights and freedoms advocacy continues to be valued, honoured and integrated into the judicial system. The day when 20 international leaders meet in Toronto but no one is there to express their enthusiasm, support or disagreement, out of fear of being arrested or mistreated, we will have lost democracy. It is important to acknowledge that the right and freedom to demonstrate peacefully is an integral part of the exercise of a vibrant political culture.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Do you hear me?

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Mourani, we do hear you, but your time is ten seconds over.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Can she at least complete her answer to my question, Mr. Chairman?

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Madam...only because Ms. Mourani asked.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: One of the aspects that trouble us is the bail conditions that prevent people from subsequently demonstrating.

We are indeed seeing a lack of clear knowledge or appreciation of the role of the freedom to demonstrate, which is definitely an integral part of our democracy.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Des Rosiers.

We'll now move to Mr. McColeman.

Five minutes, please

Mr. Phil McColeman: I, too, would underscore my thanks for your being here.

I'd like to direct two questions, very quickly, to the Civil Liberties Association and Ms. Des Rosiers.

They revolve around two points brought up by the Liberal member, Mr. Kania, who was mainly talking from Liberal talking points and asking for one-word responses: yes or no.

You obviously have had a lot of experience looking at different security situations in your role as the Civil Liberties Association. Can I make that assumption?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Yes, you can.

Mr. Phil McColeman: And you've done a lot of study in this field.

Now on the cost, the security plan, as you probably know, was developed by Canada's best experts. We've been transparent about all the costs, not just parts of the costs but all the costs. The security experts, along with the Auditor General Sheila Fraser and the Parliamentary Budget Officer, have all confirmed that the costs were reasonable. The direct comparisons the media is making and the numbers the opposition is using to compare these summits are quite disingenuous and false because they are not fulsome in their accounting of these other situations.

I'd like your comments regarding that. Do you believe that to be true, from the research you've done?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: We have not looked at a comparison of the costs. Our expertise relates to the cost to civil liberties.

We know there will be additional costs because there are two large class action suits that have been instituted, so—

Mr. Phil McColeman: Okay. Let me move on to the next question. I would have thought that with all of the discussion around the table today, perhaps you would have some knowledge on the comparisons.

The one you brought up, actually, was the APEC report.

The APEC report, which I will quote from, recommended that:

The RCMP must instill in its officers, by whatever educational or other means available, that they are to brook no intrusion or interference from government officials with respect to the provision of security services.

Now, this is in direct contradiction to what Mr. Kania was asserting, that somewhere up the ladder the politicians had influence in terms of directing the police. We are separate from the police, as politicians, and so should we be, in our opinion, because there are civilian organizations that oversee the police. His assertion was that it comes back to some minister, some bureaucratic person; it comes back perhaps to the Prime Minister who is somehow directing all of this, which is absolutely false.

In your opinion, does this recommendation in the APEC report further civil liberties?

• (1715)

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: We don't know what happened at the G-20, but certainly I think the extent to which there is some separation...Ted Hughes recommended that there should be no political interference.

I agree with that. That's correct.

Mr. Phil McColeman: And as far as the assertions made by the opposition on this issue, in your analysis of the G-8/G-20, do you believe there was political interference in the policing and the aspects that went into policing this?

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: The position of the Civil Liberties Association is that we need a public inquiry because we do not understand how what happened, happened. I think that's one of the points, that it's unclear how the policing tone changed at 5 o'clock on the Saturday. We were there; we saw it. It seemed to us to be unwarranted, and we'd like to have answers.

Mr. Phil McColeman: Of course, I can understand your wanting answers. But the reality is that the operational side of the G-8/G-20 summits was handled, as Mr. Small alluded to in his comments, by an integrated unit of all police forces involved, including the federal police force.

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Yes, including the RCMP.

Mr. Phil McColeman: Yes, including the RCMP.

But on the ground it was primarily foot soldiers from Toronto Police, the OPP—

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Yes, Calgary.

Mr. Phil McColeman: —and other police forces across the country who lent some of their forces to this event. And there were some 20,000.

I might note, just as another side note to this, that we heard testimony two days ago about the fact that in the upcoming G-20, the country that's hosting is having 50,000 police officers to handle the security of that summit, compared to our 20,000.

Having said that—

The Chair: Mr. McColeman, thank you. Your time is up.

We're going to move to Mr. Kania.

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

Although I'm a Liberal, in terms of the comments of my Conservative colleague, Mr. McColeman, whom I do respect, he mentioned quotes about how the costs were reasonable. I just want to quote directly from the presentation of the Minister of Public Safety, Mr. Toews, who was here two days ago. He said:

All claims for reimbursement are to be submitted to Public Safety by December 1, 2010. Once these claims are received, the final audits will commence, with the intent to have the process completed by March 31 of next year.

And he further states:

I can assure the committee that the government will respond to all questions posed on the security budget and costs, and it will deliver a full financial report on actual costs incurred once it is available.

I would suggest to you, and pose to the witnesses, that obviously at this point the full costs are not available, so it would be hard for anybody to say they're all reasonable.

I asked Minister Toews if he would commit to attending before the committee again so we could ask him those questions and he could substantiate the costs, and he declined, at least for that Monday, and said he would not make that commitment, which I was surprised about, considering he said he wants to be transparent.

But in any event, to all the witnesses, in Canada we have something called the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I think you've heard of it. Is that correct?

For the two witnesses who were arrested, I ask you—because I don't know what Mr. Rathgeber was suggesting—is it fair to assume that when you were coming to Toronto you didn't mean to do anything illegal, you didn't mean to break anything, and you didn't mean to hurt anybody, but you were simply trying to exercise your freedom of speech, which you are guaranteed under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and which you don't need to justify to anybody?

Ms. Wissam Mansour: We don't need to justify. You're right on that.

• (1720)

Mr. Andrew Kania: Madame Des Rosiers, in terms of the question that was put by my friend, Mr. McColeman, on politicians and directing, I ask you and Mr. Small.... We live in Canada. At the end of the day...currently the Conservatives are the government. They made the decision to bring the G-20 summit to Toronto and to split it and have the G-8 summit in Huntsville.

My friend Mr. Norlock says he speaks to the people at home, so let's speak to the people at home. Obviously, by definition, the Conservative government decides whether to have the summit at all, how to split it, how much money to spend on it, and how to organize the security at an international summit. At the end of the day it's their decision in terms of how to direct this and who to delegate responsibility to. So when we see mayhem on the streets of Toronto in terms of the black bloc creating a ruckus and damage, and when we see more than a thousand people arrested and then released without charges, we must assume.... I'm going to ask Madame Des Rosiers. There was a failure of leadership at the top of the Conservative government to lead to this.

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: We think there should be a full public inquiry to disclose what happened and what went wrong here. In our view, it's not sufficient for the federal government not to be part of this public inquiry, because all the current reviews that are going on now are partial.

A key element that I did not get a chance to speak on is the role of CSIS and information that was...and the role of the RCMP in this. In our view, the leadership, once a conference is held, must be proactive in setting up in order that people who deserve to be heard, be heard; that answers be given; and that compensation be offered to the people who require it.

Our suggestion is that it will be better than waiting for class actions that can take eight to ten years and will cost more money. So we are inviting the government to continue their leadership—and they decided to hold the party—and handle the aftermath.

Mr. Andrew Kania: On the summit and how it actually played out, obviously it was not successful. The minister said he followed the recommendations of bureaucrats, couldn't state what they were, really couldn't analyze them, and gave no reasons. Then we heard from our colleagues across the way, "It was the police and everybody else down there. Don't talk to us. It has nothing to do with the Conservative government. We take no responsibility. It's not our fault."

What do you have to say about that?

The Chair: It'll have to be fairly quick.

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: Our report does say that we need to look at this more broadly. If we don't want another G-20 we need to take action to change the legal framework surrounding these decisions. That is a legitimate thing to ask of the government. The Criminal Code certainly did not help in those circumstances. I think it was abused. We have provisions for breach of the peace that were applied in a context where there was no breach of the peace.

So what do we do? How do we move forward? We can do better, and that's our invitation. We should look at the future and how to create a legal infrastructure so it doesn't happen again.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now move back to the government side.

Mr. Norlock is next, and then Mr. Lobb.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you very much. I have just one question.

I understand you're with your legal counsel, so if you need his intervention, please feel free to do that.

I'd like to carry on with Mr. Kania because he knows this very well. In the end, the government does decide to host, because being part of the G-8 and the G-20, each country has a responsibility. Mr. Kania also knows that the G-8 is.... In my personal view, if you take a look at the last meeting of the G-8 when the G-20 came, the G-8 is going to morph into the G-20, so there will probably be only a G-20 down the road.

I think the people at home understand—and I know you do—that politicians don't get into who you arrest and who you don't arrest. The evidence of the chief superintendent who was here last simply

said that the government told them, "We're holding this meeting. We need security. The police and public safety agencies need to tell us what they need from us to allow them to do their jobs." So if the rights of someone have been interfered with, pursuant to our Constitution or any law of the country, it isn't.... For example, if one of those police officers had done something criminal, does that mean the Government of Canada did something criminal? The answer is quite obvious that it did not.

For the edification of folks at home and you, in the province of Ontario there is a civilian complaints process called the Ontario Civilian Police Commission. Any person can go to any police officer at any time and make a complaint and it will be thoroughly investigated. I know that because I was part of the system.

So in all fairness, taking the politics out of it and trying not to slam anybody, whether it's a Liberal or NDP government, provincially or otherwise, if something goes wrong there are processes in place already to cure that. Your job is not to protect innocent victims, like the store owners and public property. In this particular instance, I think your job is to make sure that individuals are protected from the intrusion of the state. The government's job is to make sure we have the correct people in place to do it, like the police and other folks.

I'll pass on to Mr. Lobb now.

● (1725)

Ms. Nathalie Des Rosiers: I want to make a correction. In our report we ask for compensation for both the store owners and the people who were affected. I want that to be quite clear.

The Chair: All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lobb, I'm sorry, I hate to do this to you, but Mr. Norlock took up some extra time.

We now want to thank our witnesses for appearing here today and telling their stories. Thank you for the extra information. If any of you want to make application or supply us with any other answers—perhaps you answered a question and want to add something to it—please send it to our committee.

When the bells start we will have to adjourn, so I encourage everyone to say their goodbyes very quickly.

We have a number of motions that we will receive notice on. Mr. Kania submitted one in a previous meeting and we have circulated it, so it has been given notice of motion.

● (1730)

Mr. Andrew Kania: Yes. To be clear, it's the motion that is dated October 26, 2010, that reads, "That the Minister of Public Safety provide all documentation submitted to him", etc.

The Chair: That's good. That motion has been received.

Ms. Murray here would like to also place a notice of motion.

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to give notice of a motion regarding an injustice to certain Canadians who experienced being placed under a cloud of suspicion, and with the will of the committee, I would like to read the motion into the record—

The Chair: Actually, Ms. Murray, as soon as you start explaining what the motion is—plus you're going to read it into the record—you're moving it into debate, and I can't take it into debate.

If you want to give notice of motion, and just notice of motion, that's fine.

Ms. Joyce Murray: Okay.

May I ask the will of the committee to read the motion into the record?

The Chair: You can ask the will of the chairman and I will grant it.

Ms. Joyce Murray: Okay. Thank you very much.

The motion, then, is as follows:

That, in the opinion of the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Public Safety (the Committee), the government has failed to either substantiate or refute public allegations made by Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Director Mr. Richard Fadden with prior approval from a member of the Executive Council, in which he denounced municipal politicians and provincial ministers in B.C. and Ontario for being under the influence of foreign governments, therefore the government is complicit in and responsible for these unsubstantiated assertions; and further given (a) the discriminatory nature of Mr. Fadden's remarks regarding foreign governments' influence over cultural community members including those with an interest in politics through university and college clubs, and specifying

first and second generation Chinese Canadians, and (b) the consequential implications of untrustworthiness and disloyalty of newer Chinese immigrants compared with third generation Chinese community members, and (c) the negative and harmful impacts on Canadians of Chinese origin and other cultural backgrounds, and their elected representatives, resulting from these unfounded claims and innuendos, and (d) the erosion of confidence and respect by the international community towards a country whose government fails to take action to remedy inappropriate, inflammatory and hurtful allegations made by a senior officer responsible for the security apparatus of that country, and (e) the absence of means for the citizens, who feel they have unjustly been placed under a cloud of suspicion, to rectify this injustice, and (f) the responsibility of parliamentarians to be a voice for those they represent;

Therefore the Committee calls on the government to (a) unreservedly apologize for approving and allowing Mr. Fadden to make these unsupported assertions, and (b) such apology to be made in the House of Commons, (c) and to the Chinese Canadian community and other cultural communities implicated in and offended by Mr. Fadden's allegations concerning growing foreign interference in domestic politics and (d) require Mr. Fadden to tender his resignation as CSIS Director.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Murray.

You're a very good reader—not a speed reader, but a very good reader.

Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

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

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

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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