



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

SECU • NUMBER 044 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, December 1, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. Kevin Sorenson

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Wednesday, December 1, 2010

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC)): Good afternoon. Welcome, everyone.

This is meeting 44 of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, Wednesday, December 1, 2010. Today we are continuing our study on issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits.

Towards the end of our meeting today, at approximately 5:15, our committee will go to committee business, if that's still the wish. It was at the end of last meeting, so our intentions are that we will go to committee business at 5:15 today.

Appearing as witnesses, we have with us, from the University of Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs, Jenilee Guebert, director of research, G-8 and G-20 groups; from the Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario, Mike Leitold, member; from the Department of National Defence, Brigadier General John Collin, chief of staff of Canada Command; and from the Peel Regional Police, Superintendent Brian Adams.

I understand that each one of you has an opening statement for our committee today. Hopefully we can hold those statements to approximately ten minutes each, and then we would proceed into the first and subsequently the second round of questioning. The first round of questioning will be a seven-minute round for each party.

We look forward to your statements, and looking across the panel, Ms. Guebert, if you would begin, we would appreciate it.

Ms. Jenilee Guebert (Director of Research, G-8 and G-20 Groups, University of Toronto, Munk School of Global Affairs): Thank you.

I will try to keep to ten minutes, because I know there are probably a lot of questions and comments perhaps that need to be made.

Before starting with my official presentation I want to give a brief context of what I am going to present. I am the director of research at the G-8 and G-20 research groups at the Munk School. Our group's mission is to serve as the world's leading independent source of information, analysis, and research of the institutions, issues, and members of the G-8 and the G-20 summits respectively within both groups.

In this capacity I research trends related to both groups, both in terms of policy and in terms of the physical summits themselves. I have been on site at several G-8 and G-20 summits as well as at

other ministerial meetings. I generally attend these meetings as part of the accredited media, whereby our groups conduct on-site analysis and interviews.

Today I am here to discuss issues surrounding security of the G-8 and the G-20 summits that were hosted in June. I am simply going to try to provide you with facts and evidence that the G-8 and G-20 research groups have gathered on this topic from past summits, as well as provide you with any insight and thoughts that I have from my personal experiences at these past summits.

I have no expertise in regard to policing or proper security protocol. I can offer examples of problematic cases that have come up at other summits or give you an idea of some of the security measures that have been enforced at other summits. But I have little knowledge to offer in regard to what instruments should or should not be used, how many personnel should or should not be required at each summit, or what is unlawful or inappropriate.

It is extremely difficult to predict what sort of events will transpire at a G-8 or G-20 summit. Protesting can be expected now, but how violent, in what numbers, where the protesters will gather, and what instruments they will use is impossible to know. There is also now a common fear of potential terrorist attacks that might take place at these summits.

It is also difficult to come up with a single figure for how much a G-8 or a G-20 summit will cost, including for security, particularly on a country-comparative basis, since there are many variables to take into consideration. When assessing overall summit costs, one needs to assess factors including already-available facilities at the summit sites, regular and overtime salaries, accommodation, travel expenses, meals, security, technology, infrastructure, communications, and service staff. There are also differences in when and how hosts report these costs, what they include as a special summit expense rather than part of their regular operation or capital budget, how much of the pre-summit preparatory and post-summit implementation period they include in these reports, the timing of their fiscal years, and exchange rates at the time of financial reporting and subsequently, as most costs become known.

Some hosts benefit from the use of large military and security facilities that are already in place, as was the case at the recent summit that I attended in Seoul. Or they'll use the summit as a trigger for major capital investment in a particular region. This was the case, for example, at the 2000 Okinawa summit in Japan.

In the lead-up to the summits this summer, it was estimated that the Canadian government was going to spend \$1.1 billion on the events, including \$930 million for security. This number has come down a bit since then. The last report I saw was about \$858 million, lower than the predicted cost but still one of the highest in summit history, at least from the available evidence that we have gathered.

The G-20 summit was actually the most expensive, in terms of the costs for Toronto; however, when we take out the costs for the Muskoka summit, it was actually fourth. The 2000 summit and the 2008 summits, which were both hosted by the Japanese, came in as first and second, and the Russian summit in 2006 was actually the third most expensive.

It is not uncommon that the majority of the money for G-8 and G-20 summits is spent on security. This is in line with the majority of past summits. What stood out for the Canadian summits was the overall dollar figure that was actually spent. For example, British estimates from the 2005 summit in Gleneagles suggest that it cost £90.9 million, approximately \$157 million U.S., the majority of which went to policing and security. The London G-20 summit was reported to have cost approximately \$30 million.

● (1535)

It is estimated that the 2002 Kananaskis summit cost around \$200 million to \$300 million. Again, most of the money went to security. This was the first summit that was to take place after September 11, as well as the G-8 summit in Genoa 2001, where there were massive protests and the first civilian actually died on the sidelines of a G-8 event.

I would like to point out that it is not uncommon for Canada to spend more on security than other countries at summits because we don't have massive infrastructures in place for security, such as large military contingents, as was the case at the Seoul summit in November.

The high costs for the G-8 and the G-20 summits this summer were not unprecedented. The 2000 Okinawa summit is reported to have been the most costly. Media reports claim that this summit cost between \$750 million and \$780 million. While this is less than the \$858 million reported for the Canadian meetings, it was only for one G-8 meeting. The Japanese government intentionally selected Okinawa as the G-8 summit location to usher money into this area.

There has also been much discussion over damage, security protocol, and the degree of force used by officers on duty at the G-8 and the G-20 summits. These challenges do not always accompany summits. For instance, at the first G-20 summit in Washington in 2008, there was very little in terms of this to report. However, on the whole, this is not uncommon.

For example, at the 2001 Genoa summit, arguably the most violent of all the summits, an estimated 200,000 demonstrators showed up, hundreds of people were injured, and one man was shot dead by an Italian officer. The officer was acquitted of any charges, as the judge determined he was acting in self-defence.

After the G-20 finance ministers meeting in Australia in 2006, 26 people were charged and arrested for reasons including damaging property, arson, and disorderly conduct. At the G-20 summit in London in April 2009, 86 protesters were arrested, and just a few

days ago it was reported that the U.K. police officer who attacked Ian Tomlinson at the London summit will in fact be charged for inadvertently causing or contributing to his death. At a gross misconduct hearing the officer is being charged for using force that is considered not necessary, proportionate, or reasonable in these circumstances.

I have a variety of other facts and information available from summits past, as well as the Canadian summits, which I'd be happy to share. I look forward to your questions or comments later.

● (1540)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Guebert—all in seven minutes and 30 seconds. We appreciate that.

I'll just warn our committee members, as well as our guests, there is a chance that the bells may start ringing fairly soon. If that happens, we will have to suspend and then go to the House for a vote. But our intentions are that we're going to come back here and continue with this. If that happens, if you see lights flashing and bells ringing, not to fear.

We'll now proceed to General Collin, please.

BGen John Collin (Chief of Staff, Canada Command, Department of National Defence): Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to explain the role and actions of the Canadian Forces during the G-8 and G-20 summits and also to address any questions or concerns that committee members may have.

I'm here today in two capacities. First, I am currently the chief of staff of Canada Command, the organization that is responsible for all routine and contingency domestic operations, less air defence, which remains a NORAD responsibility. Second, and perhaps equally important, in my previous job I was the Canadian Forces joint task force commander for the G-8 and G-20 summits, and as such was responsible for all the tactical planning and execution of the military operations associated with the summits.

[*Translation*]

In these short opening remarks, I would simply like to offer a few main themes and also describe in broad terms the primary functions undertaken by the Canadian Forces during the summits.

[*English*]

First and foremost, it is important to remember that the Canadian Forces were in support of law enforcement agencies; we were not the lead. You are aware that the overall responsibility for summit security rested with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Working with them and other police forces of jurisdiction, the Canadian Forces developed plans and executed operations as part of the larger team, but always in support of requirements and requests from our law enforcement partners.

Specifically, the Canadian Forces provided, either directly or indirectly, support to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Ontario Provincial Police, Toronto Police Services, and Peel Regional Police. Throughout and consistent with normal practice and government policy, the Canadian Forces focused on providing capabilities that are unique to the military or capabilities that were clearly beyond the capacity of the first responders. Our main roles can be summarized in four broad areas.

[*Translation*]

First, the Canadian Forces, working within the bi-national command known as NORAD, were responsible for Air Defence. This is a standing task for Canada's military, which is executed 365 days a year. For the summits, there were increased demands in the form of "restricted flight zones" and increased forces required to satisfy the demands and potential threats, but, essentially, the task was one which our military executes on a regular and continuous basis.

• (1545)

[*English*]

Next, the Canadian Forces contributed significantly to surveillance and early warning. We did this with ground, air, and, to a limited degree, naval resources. Our main task was to ensure that all potential hazards and threats were identified and communicated quickly and accurately to the decision-makers for action.

The Canadian Forces also provided military air transport with both fixed-wing airplanes and rotary-wing helicopters in support of the summits. Tasks included the transportation of the heads of state and other VIPs to and from the G-8 summit location and administrative transport of some police forces to alternate locations. We were also prepared to execute other tasks, such as emergency air evacuation of the heads of state, rapid delivery of police emergency response teams, and emergency medical evacuation. In the end, none of these tasks were required.

[*Translation*]

Finally, the CF provided assistance in establishing and then operating the command and control architecture for the summits. To be clear, we did not lead this effort nor were we the only agency to contribute to it, but, our past experiences and our integral capabilities were used to enhance the capabilities at various command nodes; most notably at the RCMP led Integrated Security Unit and Unified Command Centre at Barrie, Ontario.

[*English*]

As a sidebar comment, it is important to also remember that the Canadian Forces were not asked, nor would we have entertained the request even if asked, to conduct crowd-control operations or what police forces call public order duties. Maintaining public order is clearly a police responsibility, and the Canadian Forces are neither trained nor equipped to fulfill that role. For that matter, we also did not undertake any of what might be termed traditional police functions such as arrests and evidence-gathering. These limitations on the use of Canadian Forces personnel were clearly understood by all of our security partners and led to no difficulties whatsoever in our ability to support the police in the four broad areas I have just outlined.

[*Translation*]

To accomplish this support, the Canadian Forces contributed approximately 3,000 personnel dispersed primarily in and around Huntsville, the Lester B. Pearson Airport in Toronto, the Toronto waterfront, at various command and control nodes, and in the skies overhead. The majority of the elements were deployed for no more than 25-30 days and this included all of their movement and training requirements.

[*English*]

The initial budget allocated to the Department of National Defence was approximately \$77 million, of which, although the final figures have yet to be tallied, we expect to have expended only approximately \$20 million, or 26%. The significant reduction can be attributed to several cost-saving measures that were implemented and the fact that since everything went according to plan, contingency funds, which were approximately \$20 million, did not need to be used.

Overall, from a CF perspective, the planning and execution of the summits were resounding successes. I was quite pleased with the leadership and competencies demonstrated by our police partners, and together we formed an outstanding team. As the Canadian Forces joint task force commander, I must close by stating how impressed I was with the professionalism and accomplishments of all CF personnel associated with the summits. I know I also speak for the entire senior leadership of the Canadian Forces when I state that we would have it no other way, and that our men and women in uniform continue to do us proud.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, General Collin.

We'll go to Mr. Adams, please.

Supt Brian Adams (Superintendent, Peel Regional Police): Thank you very much.

Good afternoon. On behalf of the Peel Regional Police, my chief's management group, and me, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address this committee with regard to the roles and responsibilities of Peel Regional Police during the G-8 and G-20 summits.

I was the designated command lead for Peel Regional Police, and I was responsible for the overall operation. During the summits themselves, I was the assigned incident commander for Peel police at the unified command centre in Barrie.

I'd like to begin by giving you an introduction to Peel Regional Police.

The Peel Regional Police, being the second-largest municipal police organization in the province of Ontario, provides policing services to the 1.2 million residents of the cities of Brampton and Mississauga. There are 1,891 uniformed personnel and 764 civilian staff within our organization.

Police services are made available through five divisional facilities, eleven community stations, the Emil V. Kolb facility, and police headquarters. The service delivery area is 538 square kilometres. The city of Toronto is on our eastern border and the regional municipality of Halton is located on our western boundary.

The Region of Peel borders Lake Ontario, and our marine unit patrols all accessible shoreline, including inland bodies of water and 272 square kilometres of water to the international border with the United States. Canada's busiest airport, Lester B. Pearson International Airport, is situated in the city of Mississauga. It is policed by Peel Regional Police under a full-cost-recovery agreement with the Greater Toronto Airports Authority. An estimated 32 million passengers pass through the airport annually.

The mandate of the Peel Regional Police is to maintain peace and good order, protect lives and property, investigate and resolve criminal activity, prevent crime, and respond to our community's needs. Balanced by sensitivity to the importance of successful major crime resolutions, the organization is committed to community-based policing, the development of effective and proactive initiatives, crime prevention programs, and victim services, as delineated by Ontario's Police Services Act.

With respect to Peel Regional Police's G-8 and G-20 summit involvement, in July of 2009 the Peel Regional Police were invited to partake in meetings with the integrated security unit in preparation for the G-8 summit. It was believed that Lester B. Pearson International Airport was being considered as a possible arrival point for dignitaries and their families. The degree of involvement for our organization in the summit was unknown at that time.

When the announcement was made in September of 2009 that Canada would also be hosting the G-20, it was anticipated that the Lester B. Pearson International Airport would play an integral role in the movement of those heads of state who were considered to be internationally protected persons. This would necessitate the involvement of the Peel Regional Police in the protection of these individuals.

It was at this stage of the process that the Peel Regional Police selected a lead planner and a small dedicated group to begin preparing preliminary operational plans for the summits. The responsibilities of the planning team included airport security, motorcade security, accreditation, and security checkpoints, as well as maintaining ongoing airport division operations.

As a member of the integrated security unit, Peel Regional Police ensured that in coordinating and developing their security plans they fully integrated with our policing partners.

In December of 2009 it was announced that Toronto was to host the G-20 and that Lester B. Pearson International Airport was to become the main port of entry for several heads of state and their delegations. As a result of this announcement, Peel Regional Police had to increase its initial G-8 planning team to support the additional functions and scope of the G-20 summit. This process involved the following list of activities or tasks: development of integrated operational security plans; implementation of a community relations group to engage with citizens, area businesses, and the community impacted by the summits; gather intelligence and conduct investiga-

tions; development of logistical plans; development of financial plans associated with the overall security of the operation; and procurement of supplies and equipment, as well as the identification and implementation of infrastructure upgrades.

All areas within our organization participated in the preparation of the operational plans for the G-8 and G-20. These areas included tactical and rescue, explosive disposal unit, canine, criminal investigations, forensic identification, traffic services, bicycle units, intelligence, fleet management, telecommunication systems and services, information technology services, uniform patrol—and I'll add to the list I originally provided communications, finance and administration, and public affairs.

It is important to identify that the Peel Regional Police formed strong partnerships with the Greater Toronto Airports Authority and the emergency management teams from the Region of Peel, Cities of Mississauga and Brampton, as well as our partners from fire and EMS. Their contributions were essential in the overall development of our plans.

- (1550)

The Peel Regional Police were fully committed to the RCMP-led integrated security team. We were involved in over 30 committees and working groups. We participated in all the mandated exercises, which were conducted in preparation for the summits. Training programs were provided for our officers at all levels in preparation for the summits, which included the incident management system, incident command system, incident command, and CBRNE training.

The mobilization process for Peel Regional Police effectively began on Monday, June 21, 2010, and concluded on Monday, June 28, 2010. All regular days off and vacation time were cancelled during this time period. Peel Regional Police personnel were phased in during the week of mobilization. During the peak times during the summits approximately 650 personnel were used each day.

Peel Regional Police had executive representation on the steering committee and assigned incident commanders to the unified command centre in Barrie and the Toronto area command centre at Lester B. Pearson International Airport. We did not have representation in the other command areas for the summits.

Peel Regional Police also provided assistance to our policing partners in Toronto. A memorandum of understanding was prepared for ten motorcycle officers, four marine unit officers, and two video producers to provide assistance during the week of the summits.

On Friday, June 25, 2010, the Toronto Police Service made a request to have the Peel Regional Police public safety unit attend the city of Toronto for support. This request was approved, and 81 Peel Regional Police officers were subsequently assigned to Toronto. The public safety unit has two commanders and supervisory staff within its structure. They worked in Toronto under the direction of the Toronto Police Service until released on Monday, June 28, 2010.

On Saturday, June 26, 2010, the Peel Regional Police received a request from our integrated security partners for additional uniform resources to be assigned to the city of Toronto. The Peel Regional Police provided an incident commander and supervisory staff, as well as 128 uniform officers to the Toronto Police Service for June 27, 2010. Again, these officers were subject to the command and direction of the Toronto Police Service.

We would like to recognize the commitment and professionalism of our partners within the integrated security unit. The combined efforts and extensive planning of our partners were exceptional.

In closing, the G-8 and G-20 summits were the largest security undertaking in the history of the Peel Regional Police. The safe and efficient policing operations at Lester B. Pearson International Airport were integral to the success of the G-8 and G-20 summits. We are extremely proud that we were able to ensure the safety and security of the general public and heads of state during the summits. This is a tribute to the men and women within our organization.

Once again, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today.

• (1555)

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

My understanding is that these bells are not going to be long bells. So we are going to suspend at this point and we'll come back and with great expectation wait to hear what Mr. Leitold has for us.

We'll suspend.

• _____ (Pause) _____

•

• (1640)

The Chair: Order.

Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): I know that we had indicated that at 5:15 we would go to committee business, but because of the vote and the delay, I think it would only be fair to the witnesses that we go to 5:30 so that these people who have taken time out of their lives to be here get an opportunity to talk to the committee.

• (1645)

The Chair: Is that all right? Do we have a consensus? I see everybody nodding their heads.

All right. It looks like we're going to be able to hear from you, Mr. Leitold.

Then we will proceed and we'll go until 5:30, at which time we will adjourn. There will be other bells.

Welcome back, committee. At the break, before we went to votes, we were just preparing to hear from Mr. Leitold.

Mr. Leitold, you have the floor.

Mr. Mike Leitold (Member, Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm here speaking today as a member of the Law Union of Ontario's movement defence committee. I'm also a lawyer, but I'm today speaking as a member of that committee. Just by way of background, that's a working group of the Law Union of Ontario, and that working group focuses on providing legal support to progressive organizations and social justice activists in Toronto.

Our role before, during, and after the G-20 protest was threefold, in essence. We provided some background know-your-rights information and legal trainings to those who had expressed an intention of attending the demonstrations. Through our summit legal support project we did those workshops around southern Ontario. We also trained and fielded approximately 100 legal observers to monitor police action and misconduct, and those persons were easily identifiable wearing orange hats during the demonstrations. We also created a legal response office that would have been staffed for about a total of 12 days, from June 18 to 30, with a legal number that people could call if they were experiencing police harassment or in a circumstance of being detained or arrested, or simply to report searches or other excesses by the police. In some instances we did receive calls about police brutality.

We also—for people who had been arrested—created a list of lawyers who were prepared to offer their services pro bono to individuals who were arrested. We did end up requiring the services of all 25 of the lawyers who had offered those services for free.

We were in many cases the first non-police point of contact for the over 1,100 people arrested. We received hundreds of calls from the prisoner processing centre. We also supported those detainees and arrestees, connecting them with their parents, connecting them with possible sureties to bail them out, and also taking steps to ensure that dependants or pets or other things that needed to be dealt with while they were detained were dealt with, and also advocating on their behalf in order to obtain medication, assistive devices, or other supports.

Our direct experience in that regard I think gives us a unique perspective on the events of the policing of the G-20. I think what our experience has led us to conclude is that there are many unanswered questions that arise out of these demonstrations and the policing of them. We hope you will join us in our call for a public inquiry with subpoena powers in order to get to the bottom of those questions.

Some have characterized the policing of the G-20 summit as sort of a threefold process, characterized by police restraint initially, then negligence, and then a police overreaction later on in the weekend. Our experience diverges from that criticism. In fact we don't necessarily see the negligence for the overreaction part. We actually observed a systematic targeting of social justice movements in Canada over the period leading up to the G-20 demonstrations—and during them and after—and what amounts effectively to a systemic repression of critics and those who oppose the policies of this government.

We point out in our written submission the differences in the policing of two major demonstrations that took place in Ontario this summer: the anti-choice demonstrations on May 13, 2010, in Ottawa versus the G-20 protests, which of course took place in the last week of June 2010. One obviously didn't have a prison created for it or millions of dollars spent in preparation for the policing of it, and one did. Of course it's the second, the latter, the G-20 protests that we're here talking about today.

There are seven basic areas—and I'll go through them quickly—of police repression that we identified arising out of our committee's experience this summer, the first being searches, harassment, and detention of activists and protesters. Second was the militarization of police tactics in operational functions. Third was the use of preventative arrest and detention against protesters. Fourth was violations of a person's procedural rights when in detention or arrested. Fifth, we received considerable concern about the conditions in the prisoner processing centre, and I will spend a bit of time on that.

- (1650)

Also, we noted mass violations of the Human Rights Code and the Canadian Human Rights Act, which of course governs the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Finally, there were certain indicia of the criminalization of dissent that took place over the course of those demonstrations.

I will go through them briefly, if I might. With respect to police harassment, detention, and searches, we received reports, leading up to the demonstrations, of dozens of instances of police harassment of activists and organizers, leading to home visits, workplace visits or visits at schools, involving RCMP agents or operatives contacting people seen to be organizers of the demonstrations. We received reports of 29 incidents of that type of harassment.

Between Monday, June 21, and Saturday, June 26, we received reports of over 80 people being harassed, detained, and searched by the police. We believe that many others were similarly harassed, detained, and searched but may not have known that our services existed.

Notable indicia of these types of harassment and search almost always involved pedestrians walking in downtown Toronto, generally young people who were targeted because of their appearance. Harassment was conducted by police, in our view, without reasonable grounds. It often involved groups of armed police officers surrounding those pedestrians. It invariably included searches of people's bags and pockets without any caution that they were not required to participate in that search, and often involved the illegal seizure of personal belongings, including leftist political literature. I'll just note that this was prior to the afternoon of Saturday, June 26.

In many instances the police relied on fictitious powers under the Public Works Protection Act in order to justify the detention and search of those pedestrians. In many cases they also claimed expanded detention and search powers under the Trespass to Property Act.

For example, on Friday, June 25, persons entering Allan Gardens in Toronto were told they could not enter the park without having

their bags searched pursuant to the Trespass to Property Act. Further, the police, near the subway system, often would assert that the Trespass to Property Act allowed them to search people's persons and belongings.

In our view, the above and what I have described show a blatant pattern of bad-faith searches on the part of the police, and a pattern of proactive targeting of activists that began well in advance of Saturday, June 26.

We've highlighted questions that need answers, such as what were front-line officers told, and by whom, of the legal limits of their powers to stop and search persons during that period of time? What orders or directions were given with regard to police searches and investigative detentions? Who gave those orders?

I now turn to the second area of concern, that being the police militarization of operational tactics. Many of our legal observers described how there was, at Queen's Park, on Saturday, June 26, 2010, a concerted effort by police to terrorize participants in a demonstration on the lawns of the legislature.

Numerous horse charges were used. Baton charges were used. Protestors were corralled into small groups. Snatch squads would then proceed and target individuals. Tear gas and rubber bullets were used. And as I believe the special investigations unit has at least concluded, there was excessive use of force by police with respect to physical assaults of individuals who were being arrested.

In these instances, I think what we're asking is why those militarized use-of-force tactics were used against demonstrators at Queen's Park and what orders police forces were given in relation to the gathering at Queen's Park, which of course is the grounds of the legislature, which has been subject to much debate in the media and in the public.

We would also note that the legal observers we had present did not hear any announcements by the police asking the crowd to disperse at that time.

Third, I'd point to the rampant and illegal use of what we'd describe as preventative arrest and detention. The Movement Defence Committee concluded that at least 740 people were held under breach of the peace provisions of the Criminal Code. For those who don't know, that is not actually a criminal charge. That section of the code requires that in fact people be released within 24 hours.

As a result of the large-scale detention of individuals and the fact that they were held beyond those 24-hour limits, we would argue that there were breaches of police powers. We're concerned about who ordered those breaches and whether they were done to prevent or undermine further demonstrations that weekend.

•(1655)

Turning to the fourth area, the violations of procedural rights that I mentioned, many of the people who were held at the prisoner processing centre were not told the reason for their arrest. Those who spoke French weren't told in French. People weren't able to access counsel in a timely way. They weren't able to use the phone in a timely way. Many were held for 24 hours without seeing a justice of the peace, which is not justified in the Toronto region. There is no shortage of resources to bring people before a justice of the peace. Many who were released were subject to what we would characterize as unreasonable terms of release.

I've cited some questions that need answers with respect to those violations, most notably, who gave those orders, and were there really resource issues with respect to the undermining of those procedural rights?

You've heard much about the conditions at the prisoner processing centre. We've cited many of the accounts that we heard in the over 200 calls we got from prisoners at that centre. Many people had their photographs taken in illegal circumstances that weren't justified under the Identification of Criminals Act—i.e., they weren't charged with any offence. Many people were held without regard to proper conditions: lights were left on all night, no food or water was provided for 12 or more hours, people—

The Chair: We're over 12 minutes now.

Mr. Mike Leitold: I'll be very quick. I only have two other areas of concern that I'd like to highlight.

The Chair: I'll give you about 25 seconds. We want to get to questions.

Mr. Mike Leitold: Absolutely.

There were mass violations of the Human Rights Code and the Canada Human Rights Act. People can go to our submissions in order to talk about the targeting, notably of many visibly queer persons. Also, those who were disabled were not accommodated when they were detained.

With respect to the criminalization of dissent, many people were targeted. For example, community organizers were targeted and intimidated by police visits, and isolated and silenced by restrictive bail conditions. Those who actually had our leaflets giving them background on their rights were singled out for arrest.

Our conclusion is that we need answers to these unanswered questions. A public inquiry with subpoena power is the best way to go forward with that. It's the citizens of Canada, the people who live in Canada, who are seeing our hard-won rights and freedoms undermined by the conduct of the police that week, who really suffer when those answers aren't addressed in a public forum.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Leitold.

We'll go to the first round with Mr. Kania.

Mr. Andrew Kania (Brampton West, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Can you please let me know when I have one minute left?

The Chair: Well, yes...or buy a clock.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Madam Guebert, I have your paper here on the G-8 and G-20 summit costs, July 5, 2010. I'm looking on page 3, at the breakdown of the various countries and expenses.

First, can you explain what the major differences were in the expenses in Canada in relation to other countries—why they were so much different, what the main differences were within the context, as you already indicated today, of this being one of the most expensive summits in history?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes, thank you.

There's a variety of different factors that come into play as to why some summits are more expensive than others. For example, if a host country picks a facility where they already have a structure in place to host the meeting, they won't have to spend money on erecting a certain facility. Broadband communications have to be taken into account. Also, there is the transportation of the leaders. For example, if you had a summit in Toronto versus having it in Muskoka, you'd be able to avoid the additional costs to get the leaders from Toronto to Muskoka. Most would fly directly into Toronto.

There are other factors in assessing a location—for example, security. Since 9/11, in particular, there have been efforts to have G-8 summits at more remote locations, because they're seen as more securable and harder to get to in terms of demonstrators. Again, these are the sorts of costs that come into consideration.

One of the major reasons Canada tends to have to spend so much more money on security is because we don't have major structures or major annual portions of our budget that are awarded to military structures. For example, when the Washington summit was held in 2008, they already had so much security infrastructure in place because of the everyday goings-on of Washington that they didn't need to usher in special summit dollars for such security measures.

These are all the types of things that come into play. I'm happy to answer more specific questions, but I hope that gives you a bit of an idea about it.

•(1700)

Mr. Andrew Kania: My understanding is that the government spent more than \$200 million extra because they split the summit between Huntsville and Toronto. Is that an accurate figure? Do you have an exact figure of how much extra they spent?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: I can't give you a specific dollar figure, but certainly it would have been less if they had had both of the summits in Toronto because you would have been able to combine all of the facilities. You would have been able to not have the extra security measures that were needed in the second location.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Based on your analysis, historically, of all these other summits, was there any reason why they could not have combined the G-8 and the G-20 summits only in Toronto?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: In technical terms, no, there is no reason why they couldn't have done it. There are a variety of other reasons why they may have stuck to the way it was.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Political decisions.

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes.

Mr. Andrew Kania: Right.

Mr. Leitold, in terms of your report here, starting on page 1 and then going to the last page, you have a quote here that I will say as a Canadian I find disturbing, but I'm going to read it.

The rampant violations of civil, political, and human rights by police and security during the G-20 represents not a misstep by police in how they handle large protests, but a systematic targeting of social movements on the left, and a deliberate repression of those who criticize and oppose the policies of this government.

I take it you mean the Harper government when you say “this government”?

Mr. Mike Leitold: Yes. In particular we've identified the Harper government. But having said that—

Mr. Andrew Kania: I'm sorry, just let me read the other quote as well. Page 10:

The G-20 policing and resulting civil, political and human rights violations was not a random blip in our country's otherwise solid record of respecting the rights of its citizens and residents. It was, in fact, the most obvious and recent example of a long tradition of state interference against social justice critics of government policies—

...and as you say, “a pattern that seems to have become even more pronounced with the current Harper Conservative government”.

I'd like you to more fully explain what you mean about how our civil liberties are being targeted and this pattern by the Harper Conservatives.

Mr. Mike Leitold: Certainly. Looking into recent history, there has been much criticism of the mass arrests that took place in Quebec in 2001 during the free trade area of the Americas protests. That pattern of mass arrests is exactly what we're seeing fleshed out, and even on steroids, as it were, the weekend of the G-20.

This is the largest mass arrest in Canadian history. Over 1,000 people were held, and at least 740 without charge. And we've seen many of the charges crumble in court as they've attended and had them withdrawn, as the media has reported.

From our group's perspective, we are seeing, as we've indicated in the report, a pattern of targeting of social justice activists. In essence, what we're saying is the policing and the pattern of policing, which involved surveillance at the beginning, harassment of activists, leading up to illegal detention and arrest, is one that we've seen before, such as around the free trade area of the Americas, but essentially beefed up and on steroids with respect to what we saw at the G-20.

Those conclusions that we've drawn I think are rational under the circumstances of what we've seen and what our on-the-ground observations were.

• (1705)

Mr. Andrew Kania: Thank you.

Mr. Adams, from a policing perspective, is there any reason why the G-8 and G-20 summits could not have both taken place in Toronto?

Supt Brian Adams: Sir, a decision of that magnitude isn't made by the policing partners. That's a government decision. They certainly didn't ask my opinion on it.

Mr. Andrew Kania: No, I understand that, and I understand as well that the Peel Regional Police Force, which does fine work, had nothing to do with the downtown operations of Toronto in terms of making decisions, the mass arrests. That was all in the city of Toronto police department, correct?

Supt Brian Adams: Yes, sir.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kania.

We'll now move to Madam Mourani.

Madam Mourani, *vous avez cinq minutes*.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank everyone for being here today.

I have some questions for you, Mr. Adams. You said earlier that several uniformed officers of your police force had been sent as reinforcement for the G20. Security was under the control of the Toronto police but 128 uniformed officers of your department were on site.

Is that right?

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: That is correct. On Saturday night our integrated security partners asked us for additional uniformed resources and we sent down a command team with supervisors and 120 uniformed officers.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: On Sunday, did your men—or maybe yourself as a commanding officer—take part in the arrests, in fact in the operation that I would call the “Toronto University Operation”, in the gymnasium?

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: No, we did not.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: You were not part of it.

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: No, we did not.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Very well. I have another question for you, Mr. Adams. When your officers or investigators enter private places, a university, a residence, a bar and so on... if they have no evidence of a possible threat to life... Let us take, for example, the gymnasium of the University of Toronto. Do you believe that an operation in that place would require a warrant?

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: It all depends on the circumstances and information that we have, and what evidence we have. It's sort of a general comment that you're making. It all depends on what my investigation says, what intelligence we have, and what evidence we have.

Does that help you?

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: No, not really. In fact, my question is simple. When you enter a private place, do you need a warrant, yes or no? I am talking about police in general.

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: Once again, it depends on the circumstances. I'll give you an example. If I'm sent to a call where there is a husband and wife involved in a situation where there's violence involved—

Mrs. Maria Mourani: No, no.

Supt Brian Adams: But you asked me for an example.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: No, I am going to be more specific. There are young people sleeping in a gymnasium. Would the police need a warrant to enter the premises and arrest everybody?

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: Once again, Madame, it depends on the evidence and the information we have.

My apologies, I'm—

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Okay.

I hope you know Mr. Blair, the chief of the Toronto Police Service.

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: Chief Blair, yes.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Okay.

Mr. Blair said that a warrant would have been required, but that he didn't have one. This is what he told us on November 3. In answer to my question about the reason why all charges against people arrested in that gymnasium had been dropped, Mr. Blair said that the court had decided that the officers did not have the warrant required.

[English]

The Chair: Madame Mourani, just one moment.

Mr. MacKenzie, on a point of order.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I don't believe that's exactly what Chief Blair said. I think there was a discussion about it, and if you were to go back to the record, that's not exactly what he said.

I know that Madame Mourani has said that in the past, but I don't think he said that a warrant would have been requested. They had the grounds to go in, and I think there—

The Chair: Madame Mourani, I do admit that you did not use a quote. You may want to clarify a little bit more.

● (1710)

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very clear, and I can read. On November 3, Mr. Blair said and I quote:

The Crown and the court determined that the circumstances of that arrest required what is called a Feeney warrant and that the police didn't have the appropriate warrant to make those arrests.

I think I can read and it is written here. So, here is my question. Mr. Blair told us that the police did not have the appropriate warrant to enter the gymnasium and that those arrests—these are my words—are somewhat illegal.

Is the Feeney warrant something new for the police or is it a warrant that you use rather frequently? Does the police know that it must have a warrant to enter private places, yes or no? Don't you find that strange? I find it surprising.

[English]

Supt Brian Adams: I'll just try to break that down.

First, is the Feeney process new? No, it's not.

But you're asking me to comment on a Toronto investigation, a Toronto operation. I don't have all those facts. You want me to give you a simple answer. Unless I have all that information in front of me, I can't give you a truthful answer.

I apologize, but the information you are giving me is on a Toronto investigation.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: I understand. Very well.

What do you think of this, Mr. Leitold? What do you think of Mr. Blair's comments to the effect that if all charges were dropped, it is because the police didn't have the appropriate warrant to enter that place?

[English]

Mr. Mike Leitold: Certainly the Movement Defence Committee has concluded that people's rights have been trampled upon wantonly by the security forces, both in the weeks leading up to and during the weekend of the G-20. We would opine that this is one more example of a pattern of disregard for the charter protections that people expect in this country. We're deeply concerned by that, and I think everyone should be.

It is exactly for those reasons that we need to get to the bottom of who gave those orders, who made those tactical and operational decisions. I think a public inquiry is the best forum for that to be elucidated.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Then I understand that you favour a public inquiry. The Minister came to see us at the beginning of our study. I questioned him several times about a public inquiry but it didn't seem to be a priority for him. In any case, he never told me that he would be agreeable to a public inquiry. He didn't say anything either about any need to apologize to the people who were completely cleared of all charges after October 15, if my memory serves me well.

Several people came to see me and told me that there were “agents provocateurs” in the crowd. I raised that question with Mr. Blair and the person who accompanied him and whose name I can't remember. He told me that there were no agents provocateurs.

According to the information you have, are they just allegations and urban legends? Were there any agents provocateurs or not?

[English]

The Chair: Madam Mourani, we're out of time.

We'll move to Mr. Davies.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Leitold, you're a lawyer, and in your brief you seem to have covered comprehensively what you say are the rights that were violated. What is your understanding of the right of Canadian citizens to be informed of the charges against them after being arrested? When must that happen?

Mr. Mike Leitold: It's not only for citizens of Canada; the charter would apply to anyone in Canada. Section 10(a) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms would indicate that one is to be advised of the reasons for one's detention or arrest immediately upon that transpiring. There's a line of cases that would support this view.

It's distinct, in effect, from the right to counsel, which is to be provided without delay. The right to know the reasons for one's detention or arrest is framed positively and should happen almost instantaneously upon arrest or detention.

Mr. Don Davies: So when Canadian citizens are arrested, they must immediately be given the right to retain counsel.

Mr. Mike Leitold: That's correct.

Mr. Don Davies: You had some 25 legal advisers, I presume lawyers, who were retained during the course of the G-20 process. Did you hear reports of people who had either or both of those rights ignored? If so, can you give us an idea of the extent of the violation?

• (1715)

Mr. Mike Leitold: We are concerned about what appeared to be a systemic violation of sections 10(a) and 10(b) under the charter.

To clarify, those rights apply to anyone in Canada, regardless of citizenship. Further, with respect to retaining counsel, we actually hadn't retained counsel. We received volunteer commitments from people to act in bail-hearing settings.

We saw people held at the prisoner processing centre who were not able to contact counsel. In some cases there were extensive delays. These were reported by people who were responding to phone calls. Some people were saying they had been held in excess of a day. Others never knew why they were detained or arrested. Francophones, especially, said they never understood what had happened during the last 36 or 48 hours.

To me, and I think to everyone living in Canada, that is shocking.

Mr. Don Davies: I want to turn to you, Mr. Adams, as an experienced police officer.

What is your understanding and what are your officers in the Peel Regional Police Force told about their obligation, after arresting

people, to inform them of the reasons for arrest? In their training, at what point in an arrest are officers told to make that information known to the person they're arresting?

Supt Brian Adams: Sir, I believe you articulated that perfectly. Our officers are taught that right at the Ontario Police College from day one of their training.

Mr. Don Davies: And similarly, your officers would also be told that they had to inform someone upon arrest that they had the right to retain counsel without undue delay? Is that what your officers would tell someone?

Supt Brian Adams: Yes, sir.

Mr. Don Davies: Sir, you're probably aware that there were dozens and dozens—maybe even hundreds, I'm not sure of the number—of people who alleged during the G-20 process that they were arrested, not told the reasons why they were arrested, and were not told that they had the right to contact a lawyer for some time. Did you hear those allegations as well, sir?

Supt Brian Adams: Via what I've heard in regard to this committee and the media, yes.

Mr. Don Davies: Have there been any complaints that any of your officers may have violated those rights, allegations that they had?

Supt Brian Adams: Absolutely not.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Adams, on what grounds is it your understanding that police officers are legally entitled to stop, question, and search an individual in a public place?

Supt Brian Adams: Our officers understand.... As far as an individual's rights, they're well aware of what their rights are under the charter. Our officers, once again, sir, are trained that right from the first day of Ontario Police College.

Mr. Don Davies: So you'd agree with me that officers do not have an unconditional right to stop someone in a public place and detain them?

Supt Brian Adams: No, sir.

Mr. Don Davies: You heard the question from Mr. Leitold. I want to pose that question to you on his behalf. What were front-line officers told—the Peel Regional Police officers—of the legal limits of their powers to stop and search people in the G-20?

Supt Brian Adams: That didn't change from what their normal daily duties were, sir.

Mr. Don Davies: I presume they would have been instructed that they can only stop and detain someone and search them if they have lawful or reasonable grounds, whatever those may be?

Supt Brian Adams: That's part of their training, sir, yes.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Leitold, you also stated, I think, that protesters were targeted simply for having legal support phone numbers on their person. Is that correct?

Mr. Mike Leitold: Those are reports that we've received. Our submission to this committee is a synthesis of legal observer reports and reports received by members of our committee.

Mr. Don Davies: Okay.

Back to you, Mr. Adams. Do the Peel Regional Police engage in any activities to educate the public about their rights and responsibilities when dealing with law enforcement individuals?

Supt Brian Adams: Do we educate....

Mr. Don Davies: Do you have any activities that sort of educate the public community at large about that?

Supt Brian Adams: As far as educating the public? As far as the G-8 and G-20, we had a community relations group in relation to the summits, but as far as what their rights are, not as a general program, no. When we deal with them, they're dealt with professionally and with courtesy, as far as their rights.

Mr. Don Davies: Now, you would agree with me that simply possessing a document that just outlines your constitutional rights or your legal rights would not be grounds upon which a police officer would make any negative assumption or arrest that person?

Supt Brian Adams: Can you reword that for me, sir?

Mr. Don Davies: A person just simply having a constitutional document on them, a know-your-rights card, would not be a reason for any officer in your detachment to make any negative assumption about that person, would it?

Supt Brian Adams: No, sir.

Mr. Don Davies: Okay.

By the way, is it a requirement of your force, sir, that Peel Regional Police officers are required to display their names and badge numbers when they're dealing with the public?

• (1720)

Supt Brian Adams: With our organization it's your epaulettes. You'd find it up here on the shoulders. They have to have their epaulettes on their most outer gear. So in the winter-time it would be on your winter parka. In the summer-time, if you're just wearing a shirt, it would be on your shirt.

Mr. Don Davies: And that's name and badge number?

Supt Brian Adams: That's just your badge number. As a senior officer, we have name tags, but our constables have their badge numbers.

Mr. Don Davies: I take it that would be a violation of your departmental policy if an officer were to cover that up when they're out dealing with the public.

Supt Brian Adams: Yes, it is. Our procedures clearly indicate you are to wear your epaulettes.

Mr. Don Davies: That would be improper. Okay.

The Chair: Thirty seconds.

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

I want to just explore quickly the concept of preventative arrests, Mr. Adams. A lot of people, it seems, were arrested by police not for what they'd done—not even for any evidentiary basis—but as a preventative measure for what a mere suspicion was that they might

do. Do you have any comment to this committee about that practice by police? Is it something your officers endorse?

Supt Brian Adams: Are we talking about the breach of peace, if that's the term that we're using?

Mr. Don Davies: The concept of preventative arrest.

Supt Brian Adams: If we're talking about the breach of the peace—

Mr. Don Davies: Would you agree with me that there would have to be an evidentiary basis before such an arrest would be made?

Supt Brian Adams: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Davies.

We'll now proceed to the government side. Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the panel for being here.

Superintendent, my friend asked about breach of the peace. It's the reasonable, probable grounds to believe it's about to occur.

Supt Brian Adams: That's right.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: So it's a little bit different.

The other thing my friend said, and it's something we rarely hear around here—and I thank him for it, because I think it is important.... He said something about someone with something on their person—the rights and freedoms and so on—but he also said something about responsibilities. Somehow we never hear anybody talk about the responsibilities that people have for this. It's always the responsibility of the state for everything else. But sometimes I think the average citizen out there wonders what kinds of responsibilities—

There's nothing in the charter that talks about responsibilities that I know of. Do you know of anything in it?

Supt Brian Adams: Off the top of my head, no, sir.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Brigadier General Collins, there have been different costs associated with the summits. One of the things mentioned was glow sticks. Some people made fun of the glow sticks. My understanding was that it was the military who used the glow sticks.

BGen John Collin: It was the military that used glow sticks, yes.

I will preface my remarks by re-emphasizing that we were very cautious with the moneys we spent, and we came in well under budget, partly because of the cautious approach, the frugal approach, if you will, that we took.

Specifically on glow sticks, they are a non-electric, low-level light source. We all know what glow sticks are; a lot of kids use them at Halloween, etc. That's clearly not what we use them for.

The fact that they are non-electric means they can be used in any environment, including close to flammable materials and explosives, and the fact that they are non-electric means they are more reliable. Batteries don't run out. Flashlights don't break.

We use glow sticks primarily for safety reasons. They mark fence lines. They mark trenches, if we are in combat operations. They'll mark wires. They'll mark all sorts of hazards. They'll mark trails for us in night operations.

In domestic operations you can appreciate that all of that becomes even more important, because we are in and among the community. Even though we may be in a wooded area that's dark, the chances of a community member coming into that area is quite high. We did not want them to be walking into fence lines or tripping over wires, or walking into our tents—or, even worse, driving into our tents. Therefore, we used glow sticks for safety, for illumination purposes at nighttime.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Ms. Guebert, I appreciate your studies worldwide. Have you done any studies where G-8 and G-20 summits were held back to back in any country?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: No, this was the first time that's happened, and it doesn't seem like it's going to happen again. The French, who are the next to host both summits, will be holding separate summits. The G-8 will happen in the summer, and the following G-20 summit will be in November.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: So there is some cost involved in running two summits, back to back. Fair enough?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: When you talk about other locations—and we've seen different numbers—there's certainly a sense that the other numbers don't compare with ours, for a variety of reasons.

Is it fair to say that the police department in London, England, is several thousand times larger, in terms of numbers of personnel, than any municipal police department in Canada?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes, to my knowledge.

• (1725)

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Is it fair to say that London has been a centre that has faced numerous protests, some violent and some not so violent, and that it's a community that has actually been hardened in many respects? They have more video equipment and thicker glass in the stores, all of those things that Canada is not used to having.

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: I can't answer that 100%. I would guess they have spent more money on those types of measures, just because of past experiences, such as terrorist attacks in London.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: We've seen and heard of some other communities from the press that have spent only a few million dollars on their summits. Is it accurate to say those are the total costs, or are they the costs of some smaller parts of summit security?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: What we see varies from country to country. For example, there were figures that the Pittsburgh summit cost around \$18 million. That was largely for additional services that were needed. If you tallied up all of the security services needed for that summit, for example, those were probably around \$90 million. That would be the total summit costs in terms of security.

Certainly there's a reason I alluded to that earlier, and why Canada has to spend more money on security. In terms of these summits being an outlier, the question was why the figure was so much higher and whether it needed to be. From the studies we've done, the costs

seemed higher than other summits hosted by countries that are more comparable with Canada. But certainly there's a reason for the numbers being significantly lower in particular countries.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I think you indicated that Japan may have had the most expensive summit.

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: It was the most expensive. It cost about \$750 million just for the G-8 summit in 2000.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: That was for the G-8, and it was not significantly less in the big picture than our numbers currently in Canada for two summits.

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes, but for the Japanese summit, more of the money was spent on infrastructure than on security. In the 2000 summit, less money was spent on security than in the Canadian summit. The overall figure, however, was higher because of the infrastructure that was put in that area.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Is it fair to say that it's very difficult to compare apples to oranges in these summits, because different countries have different situations?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: Yes, it is an extremely excruciating exercise. At the end of the day I would say that the figures we come out with offer a snippet, in trying to compare them, but they're never going to be exact.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Sure. I think everybody has to realize that the situations are not the same in every country we go to. Is that fair?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: I would say that's fair.

The Chair: You have five seconds left.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I want to mention to Mr. Leitold that I think he gave us credit for being in power in 2001, but it wasn't the Harper Conservatives.

Mr. Mike Leitold: I didn't say that.

The Chair: Mr. Holland.

Mr. Mark Holland (Ajax—Pickering, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Guebert, this meeting was supposed to be about austerity and attacking international debt. If the government had put its austerity hat on and its priority was reducing costs, looking at other experiences with other jurisdictions and the possibility of hosting both summits in one location instead of spreading it to two, in your opinion would it have been possible to do this for a lot less money?

Ms. Jenilee Guebert: I think there are ways that less money could have been spent. Hosting the summit in one location would have been one way to do that. Costs could have been cut at the summit in a variety of other ways.

Mr. Mark Holland: I notice that Mr. MacKenzie didn't mention as an example the security benefits of \$85,000 in snacks at one hotel, or the security benefits of fake lakes and other such expenses.

Mr. Leitold, you called for a federal inquiry. We know that the Toronto Police Board has said that there is a need to look at this from a federal perspective. In your opinion, what would the context of that be? What would be the scope of it?

Secondly, we don't have a lot of time, but I'm wondering if you could give an example of a group that has been highly critical of the government that faced the type of treatment you referred to.

● (1730)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Holland.

The bells are now ringing and the lights are flashing. We want to thank you for attending. That brings the meeting to an end.

Thank you for your testimony. Thank you for your input on the study that this committee is conducting. If you would like to submit more information to our committee, we would appreciate it.

We are 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>