



House of Commons  
CANADA

# Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

---

SECU • NUMBER 045 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Monday, December 6, 2010**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Kevin Sorenson**



## Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Monday, December 6, 2010

• (1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC)):** Good afternoon, colleagues. This is meeting number 45 of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, on Monday, December 6, 2010. Today we're continuing our study regarding issues surrounding security at the G-8 and G-20 summits.

Later on, we do have 15 minutes on the agenda for committee business. Madame Mourani's motion was before the committee at the last meeting. I don't see her here yet, but I imagine she will be coming. We may reserve the right to move to committee business at 5:15.

In our first hour and three-quarters, we have, from the University of Toronto, John Kirton, co-director of the G-20 Research Group and director of the G-8 Research Group.

We have anchor and senior editor Steve Paikin, from TVO.

Welcome to our committee.

Also, from the Canadian Youth Business Foundation, we have Vivian Prokop, chief executive officer. From the student union at the University of British Columbia, Okanagan, we have Grayson Lepp, the executive chair, and Kirk Chavarie, external coordinator.

Also, appearing as an individual, we have Justin Stayshyn.

I understand that each of those witnesses will have a comment. We're giving 10 minutes to each particular group or organization. We thank you for being here and helping our committee on this study and on this evaluation of the G-8 and G-20.

Perhaps we'll start with Madam Prokop. You are sitting as the only lady there today. My mother always used to tell me "ladies first", so perhaps you could begin.

**Ms. Vivian Prokop (Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Youth Business Foundation):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the standing committee, for allowing me to present to you today regarding the G-20 Young Entrepreneur Summit that took place from June 20 to 22, 2010 in Toronto.

The Canadian Youth Business Foundation was pleased to host this inaugural international summit, and we were delighted when the Government of Canada endorsed the summit.

The Canadian Youth Business Foundation, or CYBF, for those of you who don't know us, is Canada's go-to place for young entrepreneurs aged 18 to 34. We're a national charity and have an

extremely effective, efficient, and internationally recognized model for investing in young people with big dreams and great ideas.

Our model is based on that used by the Prince's Youth Business International, the not-for-profit organization led by His Royal Highness Prince Charles, and is recognized by the Kauffman Foundation out of the U.S.A., which is the largest foundation in the world dedicated to promoting entrepreneurship.

CYBF provides both character-based seed financing and, even more importantly, volunteer business mentors for start-ups across the country every year. In this past year, CYBF financed 600 start-ups from coast to coast to coast.

We offer an impressive and consistent return on investment and are proving ourselves capable of rapidly expanding Canada's pool of successful young entrepreneurs. For example, over the past three years, even through a major worldwide recession, our loan-loss rate has managed to remain at or just under 6%—this is for unsecured credit.

This year I had the pleasure of chairing the first ever G-20 Young Entrepreneur Summit in Toronto. The idea to host such a summit during the G-20 meetings started in July of 2009 when CYBF represented Canada at the first G-8 Young Business Summit in Stresa, Italy. The Stresa summit provided a unique opportunity for young entrepreneurs to meet, exchange ideas with like-minded business leaders from G-8 countries, and to establish international networks and partnerships.

The shared goal of the organizations and attendees at the Stresa summit was to establish an annual young entrepreneur summit that would be recognized as an ongoing component of the annual G-8 or G-20 leaders' meetings. We felt that it was important to expand this international discussion of youth entrepreneurship to the G-20 for the same reason that it has become the premier forum for collaboration between governments on global economic issues: it is small enough to be manageable but diverse enough to reflect the challenges facing countries all over the world.

In light of the recent recession, the slow pace of economic growth around the world, and our focus on championing youth entrepreneurship, we decided that the theme of our summit would be "Entrepreneurship=Recovery=Jobs". With our summit theme chosen, CYBF worked very closely with our international partners to identify the issues of shared concern, and these concerns are reflected in the communiqué included in the packages that have been distributed to you today.

This communiqué reflects a remarkable degree of consensus around five key issues that either discourage young people from launching new businesses or limit their success for growth. These issues are: insufficient access to funding; excessive regulation and taxation; the need for a more entrepreneurial culture; inefficient coordination of available support; and the need for entrepreneurial education in schools and universities.

On the last day of our summit, the participants jointly signed and delivered the communiqué to the Honourable Tony Clement, Canada's Minister of Industry, and to the Honourable John Manley, the president and chief executive officer of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, who was the chairman of the G-20 business summit, better known as the B-20, which was held on June 25 and 26. I was honoured to be invited to attend the meeting of the B-20 on June 26 to present the communiqué to the world business leaders in person.

While the communiqué is aimed at G-20 leaders and emphasizes the role of governments in providing a policy environment that encourages entrepreneurship, young entrepreneurs throughout G-20 countries are working with our national governments to address the need to encourage a shift to a culture of entrepreneurship among their countries' young people.

During the Toronto summit, we decided to forge a continuing G-20 young entrepreneur alliance. We met for the first working session of this alliance this past November 7 through 9 in the Republic of Korea. I serve on the executive committee of this new alliance. The organizing members of this alliance either are organizations that must work to foster youth entrepreneurship or are organizations that are led by young entrepreneurs. These organizations must also have a national footprint and have a positive working relationship in both the public and private sectors.

I am pleased to say that CYBF takes its relationships with government and the private sector partners seriously and is seen as a collaborative partner by all. During our first working session, we signed a charter document outlining how we would encourage the G-20 process to include entrepreneurship in its agenda moving forward. We also committed to sharing best practices with each member nation in order to help build supportive entrepreneurial environments worldwide.

Over the next year—until the next G-20 leaders' summit—the new G-20 young entrepreneur alliance will be building a new platform for collaboration among organizations supporting entrepreneurship. We'll be collecting information about what is working and what is not in each country, and we'll be helping each other and governments do a better job of inspiring and enabling young people to be potential entrepreneurs.

• (1535)

My colleagues in France have informed me that they will host the next G-20 Young Entrepreneurs Summit in November 2011 in Cannes. As well, my colleagues in Mexico are working with their government in preparation for a 2012 G-20 Young Entrepreneurs Summit.

Members of the standing committee at this table, I know you'll be very supportive of entrepreneurship within your committees, and I

hope that you will also be supportive of this historic new G-20 Young Entrepreneur Alliance that had its birth right here in Canada. It is something that all of us should be very proud of. Canadians took a leadership role in creating an international platform where young entrepreneurs, who will be the job creators, revenue generators, and community sustainers of the future, can bring their ideas regarding ongoing economic and business success to the G-20 leaders' attention and hopefully see some of those ideas embraced.

Young entrepreneurs have the potential, creativity, and energy to launch new businesses and create jobs that will power our economic recovery and growth. And not just in our economy here in Canada: young entrepreneurs will be the drivers of economic recovery in developed and developing nations.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the legacy of the G-20 Young Entrepreneur's Summit held in Toronto this year. It's something that I believe Canadians should be very proud of, as I am. Positive things did get accomplished during the G-20 summit period, and I am pleased to have been able to give you this first-hand report of that positive accomplishment.

Thank you for your invitation to be part of this today.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madam Prokop.

Mr. Paikin.

**Mr. Steve Paikin (Anchor and Senior Editor, TVO):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the invitation to appear before your committee today. I am the anchor and senior editor of a program on TVO called *The Agenda*. It's TVO's flagship current affairs program.

Just by way of background for those of you who don't know the program, we provide analysis and a forum for debate on issues that are shaping Ontario and the world, and we aim to do so from an Ontario perspective.

[Translation]

We did a lot of programs about the G8 and G20 summits. During the weekend when the G20 was being held, I shared what I saw in downtown Toronto on the Saturday and Sunday via Twitter and my blog. Our program, *The Agenda*, also did a lot of related programming before and after the G20 weekend in Toronto.

[English]

For example, we produced programs on an “outsider looking in” account of the G-20 from the former president of Peru. We did an examination of how emerging powers, such as Brazil, India, and China, are reshaping the global order within the G-20; whether the G-20 was a boon or a boondoggle for Toronto; what Canada's number one priority should be as it tries to define itself on the new G-20 stage; a critical examination of the events of the summit weekend; and an interview with Toronto Police Chief Bill Blair regarding police actions during the summit.

[Translation]

In addition, *The Agenda* welcomed a number of other journalists who had been present during the events of the G20 weekend in June.

I hope this shows that our coverage was really very comprehensive.

[English]

And finally, for the record, I should just say—I guess I should say this—I'm here as a journalist who does not have a stake in the outcome of your proceedings here. I'm here at the request of your committee and feel that it's my civic duty to honour that request, but because I'm a journalist, I hope you'll understand that it's my job to remain neutral.

So I'm happy to answer any questions you may have, but obviously cannot offer any opinions beyond that which I've already put on the record. *Merci beaucoup*.

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

We'll now move to Mr. Kirton.

**Mr. John Kirton (Co-director of the G20 Research Group and Director of the G8 Research Group, University of Toronto):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and *merci* to members of the committee for having two members of the G-8 and G-20 research group testify before you on separate occasions. I am pleased to follow my colleague, Jenilee Guebert.

In assessing the security performance of Canada as a G-8 and G-20 host in 2010, three key standards stand out. The first is a comparative record of Canada and other summit hosts since 1975 through to the latest Seoul summit in November, recognizing the unique challenges that Canada confronted in 2010.

The second standard is Canada's success in meeting the many security requirements, above all for the leaders and their delegations, and then in turn for others producing the summit, for uninvolved Canadian citizens, for summit protestors, and for those suspected of breaking the law.

The third standard is the cost to Canada of ensuring such security and reaping the many other benefits that hosting such summits bring.

When these standards are considered by scholars of such summits, such as myself, even while the evidence continues to evolve, the conclusion seems clear at this stage. Canada, as host of the historic 2010 twin G-8 and G-20 summits, produced a near perfect performance on the central security requirements at an appropriate cost for ample reward.

The first standard of comparative performance requires complete consideration of the unique context that Canada confronted in 2010. Here, the fundamental fact is that for the first time in G-8 and G-20 history, Canada had to host two summits together and to do so in separate locations on one weekend in the summer. This produced the triple challenge, as you know, of securing the Muskoka G-8 site, the Toronto G-20 one, and the transportation corridor in between, as well as the larger areas over longer times, where those intent on disruptive violence could plausibly strike.

Second, unlike the first two G-20 summits in Washington and London and the third in Seoul, both Canadian summits took place beyond the national capital, which is routinely secured for the conduct of the host government's ongoing operations and visiting leaders year-round.

Third, Canada, unlike all other G-8 members save Japan, does not maintain large standing security forces financed from regular government budgets and well trained for the special security requirements that summits bring. The RCMP had the unusual burden of providing security for the Vancouver Olympics earlier in 2010, and in June, there was an expensive need to assemble local police forces from across a large, geographically dispersed country to train with those they had never worked with before, and to serve on a summer weekend in Ontario in prime vacation time.

Fourth, in the lead-up to Canada's 2010 summits, there was ample evidence of deadly terrorist attacks in several G-8 and G-20 states, with Russia and India standing out in this regard.

In the neighbouring United States, on both sides of Toronto, in the six-month lead-up to the summit, al Qaeda-like attacks that almost succeeded occurred in New York City and Detroit. Also relevant may have been the memories of the recent arrest and subsequent conviction of some of the hometown "Mississauga 18".

These events may have raised the question, as arose when Canada hosted the G-8 in 1981 and 2002, of whether the President of the United States in particular would come to Canada for all summit sessions or even come at all.

In the face of such formidable challenges, Canada, on the second standard of the actual performance, I think put in a near-perfect performance on the core requirements—not all involved.

• (1545)

The first requirement is the physical security of the summit leaders and delegations. All invited leaders trusted Canadian security enough to come to the G-8 in Muskoka. The two who missed Toronto did not do so because of security doubts. All attending leaders and delegations had no visible disruption to them or their summit in any way, in striking contrast to the G-8 summit afflicted by terrorist attacks in Britain on July 7, 2005.

The second requirement is the physical security for others producing the summits, including the service personnel, the accredited media, and the security forces themselves. Here, the only defects in June seemed to come from minor injuries suffered outside the security perimeter by some of the security personnel involved.

The third requirement is the physical security of the uninvolved surrounding citizens, both at the time at the sites and also elsewhere before and after the summits took place. Here, Muskoka had a virtually perfect performance. The defects in Toronto, with only three injuries initially reported by emergency management services, and in the rest of Canada compare highly favourably with the G-20 2009 London summit, where an innocent passerby was killed at summit time. They also compare highly favourably with the G-8 2001 Genoa summit, where mail bombs injured Italian officials before the summit took place.

The fourth requirement is the physical security of the peaceful protestors. In Muskoka, it was, by all accounts, a virtually perfect performance. In Toronto, a few were hospitalized or seriously injured. Regrettably—and I say this genuinely—there was some physical pain, negative ongoing psychological effects, and inconvenience from the police dispersals arrests.

The fifth requirement is the physical security of those engaged in or intent on violence. At Toronto, it appears that minimal force was used in this regard.

The sixth requirement is deterring or pre-empting any violent assaults while permitting the peaceful protests routine in any democratic polity to take place. Here, I think the twin summits did well in this regard. They certainly compare favourably with the Seoul G-20 summit.

The seventh requirement is preventing any summit-associated attacks from outside the country, attacks that cause damage and death in or around the summit host. Here, Canada's twin summits had a perfect record. Some doubt that the Seoul G-20 did, in the aftermath of the event.

Next, Canada's successful security performance came at an appropriate and affordable cost. This one can conclude from the outstanding transparency of the Canadian government in offering summit-specific and largely complete cost estimates well before the summits were held, and the actual expenditures soon after the event.

You know the figures by heart, I suspect. They equal, in actual expenditures, about \$429 million for each summit, if one simply divides the overall cost equally between the two.

Estimating the actual costs of G-8 and G-20 summits is a highly formula-sensitive exercise. However, the high point for the G-8 alone appears to have been the Japanese-hosted Okinawa summit in the year 2000, which reportedly cost \$750 million in year 2000 dollars.

For the G-20 summit temporally closest to Toronto, that in Seoul, Mark McDonald of the *New York Times*, on November 10, the day before the Seoul summit started, described preparations as “extravagant” and concluded that: “Korea is not throwing its G-20 party on the cheap.... The organizers have declined to estimate the total cost”.

Beyond the basic requirements of securing the summit, several broader costs and benefits should be calculated before an overall assessment of the cost-benefit balance is made.

One benefit is the unique opportunity afforded for training many police forces from across Canada to work together for the first time to confront a mass emergency event.

• (1550)

A second subsequent benefit is the consequent improvements in procedures in response to the lessons learned about the positive and negative from the summit events.

A third benefit is the enhanced global image of Muskoka, Toronto, and Canada. In the case of the 2005 G-8, Scotland, host of the 2005 Gleneagles summit, calculated large direct economic benefits, even with the deadly terrorist attacks that scarred that summit. As Huntsville was a similarly small, remote, and globally

little-known location, it will likely reap large benefits from the largely favourable publicity it received before, during, and after its summits.

This is especially so as, like Toronto with its “Toronto terms” on debt relief from its summit in 1988, Muskoka mounted a peaceful summit from which two globally appealingly named “Muskoka initiatives” came: one on maternal, newborn, and child health; the other on improved accountability to help ensure that G-8 leaders actually deliver on the promises they made.

In the case of the G-20 summit, the most recent estimate of the overall long-term branding benefits comes from the Seoul summit, by an agency of the Korean host government itself. They claim an impressive \$28 billion in overall branding benefits. It is interesting to think what the comparable figure for Toronto would be. I would guess that it would be on the net positive side, but again, we need really comparable and transparent methodology to know.

One of the bases for my judgment is that the disruptive violence was much more reported by local media at the time of the event than by the international media at the time of the event, and certainly subsequently that compares with the favourable portrayal of Toronto in the lead-up to and increasingly after the event has long passed.

Beyond, of course,—my penultimate point—lie the policy benefits produced. Over \$800 million to physically produce the summit, but Muskoka did deliver \$7.3 billion in new money to save the lives of 1.3 million mothers and babies in the poorest places in the world. For the Toronto G-20 summit, the benefits start with containing the euro crisis erupting in Greece, and thus preventing the economic damage from its global contagion, damage that could have done considerable harm to the Canadian economy and our neighbours around the world.

• (1555)

**The Chair:** Mr. Kirton, I don't know how much more time you have. We're at about 11 minutes now, so can you...?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I can indeed, with my final point, Mr. Chair. Thank you for your indulgence.

Finally, there are the overall foreign policy benefits for Canada as a global leader coming from its selection and success in mounting the two summits together in June. This was the most important contribution to global governance that Canada was called on to make in 2010. Canada met the challenge in a very secure and successful way.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

We'll now move to Mr. Lepp, please, for 10 minutes.

**Mr. Grayson Lepp (Executive Chair, Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan):** Hello. My name is Grayson Lepp. I'm the financial coordinator and executive chair of the Students' Union of UBC Okanagan, Local 3 of the Canadian Federation of Students.

I was arrested after participating in a peaceful rally planned to coincide with the recent G-20 summit in Toronto. Despite what some pundits would have you believe, however, I am neither a thug nor a hooligan. I am in fact a university student about to graduate from the management program at UBC Okanagan. I was in Toronto not to attack the city, as has been alleged, but to highlight the importance of public education here in Canada and around the world.

I was sent by the executive of my students' union to represent some 7,000 students of UBC Okanagan. For my efforts, I became one of the victims of the largest mass arrest in Canadian history. I was placed under arrest on a variety of trumped-up charges and denied my basic civil rights.

My colleague Kirk Chavarie and I arrived in Toronto on the morning of June 26 and took public transit to the University of Toronto, which was the muster point for a rally organized by the Canadian Federation of Students. Upon arriving around 7 a.m. at an empty campus, we were cut off by a police cruiser that jumped the curb onto the sidewalk, blocking our path. The police proceeded to bend us over the hood of the cruiser and rummage through our belongings. They went through our bags and read through all the text messages on our phones. They even confiscated an article of my clothing.

At this point, they told us that if we stayed out of trouble, we would in turn not be troubled by the police. Unfortunately, this turned out to be untrue.

Later that day, we participated in a peaceful, well-planned, and organized rally in favour of public education. We marched through downtown Toronto and we witnessed no acts of violence, neither against people nor against property. When we arrived at Queen and Spadina, we were told that we should go no closer to the site of the G-20 meetings as we would most likely be arrested if we did so. And we certainly did not want to be arrested.

At this point, we were told that the rally was basically over, so we decided to do a little sightseeing. We had dinner at the Red Room pub and then decided to retire for the night. We had been told that the gymnasium owned by the University of Toronto students' society had been set aside as a hostel for visiting students free of charge. So in order to save on costs, we decided to stay there for the night.

The next morning, at around 9 a.m. on June 27, I was awakened at gunpoint. I was kicked and cursed at by an officer in riot gear—I will not go into details of what the officer said unless the committee asks for that—and was told to wake up. I looked around the room to see other people being subjected to the same rough treatment. One young man who had the audacity to ask what was going on was grabbed by the throat and slammed against the wall by a police officer.

At this point, we were told we were being charged with unlawful assembly. We were placed in zap straps, which were briefly taken off so we could be paraded in front of the media in handcuffs. Other

than this brief respite, however, we remained in zap straps for around 16 hours.

We were then escorted to the Eastern Avenue Detention Centre and placed in the holding cages there. I say "cages" because I feel that to call them "cells" is an insult to holding cells everywhere. These were cages made of modular fencing, around 10 feet by 20 feet, and despite the small size, these cages were crowded with upwards of 30 people. We were not given toilet paper for over 12 hours. We were not given water for another two hours after that.

I saw detained people denied basic medical treatment, including one diabetic man who was denied access to insulin until he fell into shock. I saw an officer even make a death threat against a man in my cell. What had the man done to provoke the officer? He'd simply had the audacity to ask for more water.

I was detained for approximately 40 hours and never granted a phone call. Luckily, I was able to see a lawyer, one that had been hired on my behalf by the Canadian Federation of Students. She told me that she'd been looking for me for over a day. After around 36 hours, I was told that the charge against me was conspiracy to commit an indictable offence, to wit, mischief over \$5,000—not unlawful assembly, as I had previously been told.

Throughout the entire ordeal, I was never treated as a citizen of Canada, a citizen who had the right to engage in peaceful protest. Instead, I was treated as an invading alien whose supposed rights were an inconvenience to the police who were supposed to be there for my safety.

● (1600)

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie (External Coordinator, Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan):** Good afternoon. My name is Kirk Chavarie. I'm the external coordinator for the UBC Student's Union Okanagan, Local 3 of the Canadian Federation of Students. Currently I am pursuing a bachelor of fine arts.

My experiences in Toronto from June 26 to 29 were much the same as my colleague Grayson's. I experienced many of the same things he did. In the Eastern Avenue Detention Centre, however, we were separated, and we weren't reunited until I was released some two days later.

I want to reinforce much of what Grayson said and comment on my own experiences in the detention centre. Like Grayson, I saw people being denied basic medical care. There was a young man in my cell who repeatedly vomited on the floor and who simply lay in that afterwards, too weak to move. Despite this obvious medical emergency, he was granted no care, as the officers assigned to our cell deemed him to be fine. The cell was also not cleaned the entire time I was there, so the rest of us were forced to stand next to this puddle of vomit and, once the toilet eventually overflowed, a puddle of urine and feces.

Also, like Grayson, I witnessed systemic discrimination against francophone detainees. The officers assigned to our cell seemed to be unaware that Canada has two official languages, English and French. This ignorance prompted them to tell us that those detainees who spoke fluent English would be processed first. However, if you spoke French or if the officers deemed your English not good enough, you were sent to the back of the line.

I am told that the integrated security unit contained a detachment of the Montreal city police. Presumably these officers would have been able to process francophone inmates, but it seems they were not available to do so. Still to this day, I am not sure why.

Unlike it was for Grayson, the police made token effort to fulfill my right to a phone call, after I had begged the officers assigned to my cage for over 12 hours. I was glad that my civil rights were finally being recognized and respected, firstly because I believed them to be important, and secondly because I had promised to call my parents on a regular basis and had been unable to do so for 24 hours.

I was marched by an officer into a small room that contained a bank of phones, one of which was off the hook and being held by another officer. He told me that this was who I probably wanted to talk to. I said that I wanted to call my mother to reassure her that I was alive and well and to get her to coordinate in regard to a lawyer for me. The officer then cursed at me and ordered me to answer the phone, so I did. The person on the other line told me that she was shocked at the situation I was in and that she'd get help, and then she hung up. Apparently, the police didn't consider this to be my phone call.

This was typically the way the police treated the civil rights of detainees: as a trivial, bothersome detail to be sorted out at the officer's convenience.

I never received a phone call. I was held for over two days, processed, and released on bail without ever seeing a lawyer. For those two days, I languished in a freezing, urine-soaked cage that I wouldn't wish on a dog.

Like Grayson, I was eventually charged with conspiracy to commit an indictable offence—mischief over \$5,000. The charges against me have been dropped, and I still have not been told what evidence the police had against me. However, this is merely a point of interest, as I know what evidence the police had against me—none. I just want to hear them admit it.

Grayson and I, until quite recently, had a great deal of faith in the Canadian government. It was my firm belief that here in Canada civil rights were sacred, and if they were violated, the government would

work to make restitution. That faith has been severely damaged, perhaps forever. I now see that my civil rights are a mere inconvenience to be set aside for the benefit of a small group of visiting dignitaries.

On behalf of Grayson Lepp and me, I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to testify today. It is my hope that this is the first step down the long road to justice for the G-20 detainees and to restoring the damage facing the Government of Canada. The next logical step is a review with full judicial powers.

Thank you.

• (1605)

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

We'll move to the last member on our panel today.

Mr. Stayshyn, please.

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn (As an Individual):** Thank you.

I'd like to thank the committee for allowing me to come before you.

I'm a local resident who was kettled in the rain for over four hours only two blocks away from my house. I was participating in demonstrations that weekend for a number of reasons: international, national, and—as someone decided to have this in my front yard—local concerns. That weekend, I brought my passport with me everywhere to comply with the requests of the integrated security unit, though by the end of the weekend and of my ordeal in the kettle, it was a wet, pulpy, unrecognizable mess.

My experience started on Tuesday, when I took part in a queer demonstration on the second day of themed resistance to the G-20. It was a peaceful protest and, though police presence was heavy, we were allowed to move through the streets largely unfettered.

Only minutes after that demonstration, the Toronto Police Service posted pictures from the event online, with this message: "Police Helping Activists Facilitate Lawful+Peaceful Protests". It was in that context that I joined the demonstration on Saturday afternoon that marched within 15 metres of my house. I watched that day as my neighbourhood was destroyed while police did nothing. I watched as a police car sat un-towed for five hours until it was ignited.

The next day I went to King Street, and joined the "bike block". It was a peaceful group that had returned from a peaceful demonstration outside the University Avenue detention centre. I followed them along Queen, past my house, until we reached Spadina. There we were blocked from continuing west, away from the fenced area. We were far from the fenced area. As the crowd continued to chant "peaceful protest" to the police and to each other, I expected this to be like any other protest. The mood of the crowd was similar to that of Tuesday—positive and upbeat.



There we began to feel that things were starting to change. I started to realize the alleys had been blocked and a line of riot police was making its way south toward us. This seemed odd, as no warnings were given, and as I said, when I looked around at the people who were there with me, there was no black bloc and there was no one who was looking to do any violence at that moment.

As the riot police approached, I could hear people behind me crying. We were all very frightened. We didn't know what was happening or why it was happening. I looked around and couldn't see anyone who wanted to do any damage. It was a mix of locals, tourists, and the innocently curious. By that time, we were kettled in a small area. As we were forced to sit in the rain, you could see the doubt on the faces of the officers who were around us. I actually in fact had a conversation with one of them in which I asked them to point out one person in that kettle who they thought could pose any harm at all. They couldn't do it.

By that time, we were wet and shivering. It wasn't a chanting group at all, because it wasn't a traditional protest type of group. It was a frightened group. And many of the officers there knew that. By the time the RCMP shift arrived, wearing massive equipment—they were almost like walking war machines—the crowd was certainly wet and more frightened than it had been earlier. At that point, I had had conversations with people in the crowd: the Sunday cyclists, the German tourists who were getting hot dogs, the four rugby players from Europe...it was a mix of people.

It was soon after the RCMP shift that we were allowed to leave—some of us who hadn't been detained were allowed at that point to leave. But of course we were all left wondering why we were kettled in the first place. Were we paying the price for damages that took place the day before? Who was responsible for keeping us there?

It is my hope that this committee—or someone—can answer these questions.

•(1610)

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

We'll now move to the first round of questioning.

Mr. Holland, seven minutes, please.

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

Thank you to the witnesses for coming out with some very powerful testimony.

If I may, I'm going to start with Mr. Paikin.

I appreciate your opening statement. I appreciate that you may not be able to answer the questions, but I'm sure, and particularly as the testimony has unfolded, you'll understand the reasons why I ask. I think a number of us are deeply concerned with what took place. Obviously there was some extreme behaviour on the one hand, which nobody supports, and it has to be dealt with severely, but on the other hand, we're hearing from peaceful protestors who had some experiences that are deeply unsettling and could fundamentally impede the ability of people's right to protest or to speak freely.

On June 26.... I'm going to read to you some of your observations. A lot of us were reading your tweets and following what was

happening from some of your observations. I'll read you some of them and ask you whether you care to or are able to expand upon what you saw:

i saw police brutality tonight. it was unnecessary. they asked me to leave the site or they would arrest me. i told them I was doing my job.

they repeated they would arrest me if i didn't leave. as i was escorted away from the demonstration, i saw two police officers hold a journalist.

the journalist identified himself as working for "the guardian". he talked too much and pissed the police off. two officers held him....

a third punched him in the stomach. totally unnecessary. the man collapsed. then the third officer drove his elbow into the man's back.

no cameras recorded the assault. and it was an assault.

the officer who escorted me away from the demo said, "yeah, that shouldn't have happened." he is correct. there was no cause for it.

i can appreciate that the police were on edge today, after seeing four or five of their cruisers burned. but why such overreaction tonight?

the demonstration on the esplanade was peaceful. It was like an old sit in. no one was aggressive. and yet riot squad officers moved in.

the police on one side screamed at the crowd to leave one way. then police on the other side said leave the other way. there was no way out.

so the police just started arresting people. i stress, this was a peaceful, middle class, diverse crowd. no anarchists.

literally more than 100 officers with guns pointing at the crowd. rubber bullets and smoke bombs ready to be fired. rubber bullets fired.

Do you care to or are you able to expand upon your experiences of that evening and what you saw?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Mr. Holland, I think that really sums it up. Five months later, I wouldn't change a paragraph, a word, or a comma of all of that. I think that sums up very accurately what I saw that night.

If one defines police brutality as the thoroughly unnecessary over-the-top implementation of violence to achieve something that otherwise could have been achieved without it, then I saw it that night. It was unnecessary. Much of what happened was unnecessary.

I think our friend down at the end of those tweets has asked an interesting question about whether or not the police may have overreacted on Saturday night because they were skittish about what happened during the day on Saturday. I think I'm on pretty solid ground in speaking for the vast majority of Canadians who would say that they have no time for those black bloc techniques, in which people come out of a crowd and start destroying property with pickaxes and that kind of thing.

No one has any time for that. But there is an open question as to whether or not police on occasion may have overreacted on Saturday night during peaceful protests because they had been spooked, for lack of a more technical term, by what had transpired earlier in the day.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** What I think we don't want to see happen in this country is what I think the government has done, where they have lumped all protesters into one group; I think it's a convenient thing.

We've heard from Mr. Lepp, Mr. Chavarie, and also Mr. Stayshyn. Any time we raise the issue of protestors, I'll say to those gentlemen, we're attacked for supporting the black bloc or supporting extremists.

I thank you for coming here and sharing your story, because I think it's important for Canadians to hear this using of the word "security" to get out of accountability. Using the word "security" to get out of having to answer questions about attacking fundamental civil liberties is I think deeply distressing.

One of you, and I can't recall who, talked about restitution, and about the importance, when a mistake happens, of correcting it after the fact. I'm wondering if you gentlemen could share with the committee what happened after these events. You took us to the moment at which you were there and said what transpired.

What did you do after this happened? What actions did you take? What response, if any, did you get from the government or from police?

I'm happy to start with Mr. Lepp, if you like.

•(1615)

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Kirk and I personally were in shock about what had happened to us. We've never before in our lives participated in any sort of rally, so this is all new to us. I guess our first response was to ask why... We met with a couple of different MPs, sent out different letters and press releases, and got zero responses, save for Don's, actually. Don was the first one to respond to us and he has helped us with being able to share our story. It has been very minimally received, especially since we're from B. C.

In B.C., no one seems to know about what happened, what transpired. Often I was labelled. There was an article in a local paper in which someone said that "he's probably one of those guys who was throwing stones". I have a very clean record, I have never done anything wrong in my life, and here I am, persecuted for conspiracy.

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

I know that I only have a moment left. This one is just quickly to Mr. Kirton. I hope that maybe I'll hear from the other two gentlemen a little later on.

Mr. Kirton, it's fair to say that we probably substantially disagree on a lot of what you had to say. Take maternal health, just as an example: it's reallocated dollars. This isn't new money. It's money being taken away from other departments and CIDA, taken away from other priorities, and the amount of money that Canada committed was less than was spent on the entire 72 hours. I don't share the heralding of that as a major accomplishment. I think it's good. I think it's good that it did something, but it's bad that it took it away from other things.

I have a question that is more on going forward and taking a look at the lessons from what happened here in the spending of money on infrastructure and what we saw happen with protestors. Would it not make sense, instead of always randomly selecting locations, to have a few designated locations where we could invest in permanent infrastructure, where we could have established protocols on the chain of command and on how to deal with protestors, where they

could protest...to have these things prearranged and pre-agreed to? Would this sort of thing make sense to you?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Some elements of it would, certainly, and I spoke of the lessons learned. But on the broader question of a site for hosting summits of this sort, assuming that we share the value of such exercises in global governance, I'm deeply aware of the fact that Canada is a very diverse and geographically widely spread country, and I do think—as every Canadian government that has hosted a summit has—that it's probably wrong to simply designate one location: for example, the scenario of hosting both of the G-20 summits in downtown Toronto and not using these events to show the journalists from abroad, the media, the true diversity of Canada.

If I can go back to you—

**The Chair:** No. No more. We're a minute over.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** I'm suggesting—

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

Madame Mourani, please.

[*Translation*]

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

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for being here today.

In particular, I would like to say hello to those young people who were a little mistreated, not to say considerably mistreated, during that time, as you were, sir. At the very start, this committee heard from people from Quebec who were in the gymnasium with you. They wound up in those cages and were mistreated as much as you may have been.

If possible, I would like to check something with you. We are now learning that the Toronto police intervened, whereas they did not have the necessary warrants, to arrest some 100 individuals. Did you see any black bloc elements or rabble-rousers in the gym?

[*English*]

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Absolutely not.

•(1620)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** I have the French translation here. Tell me if I'm wrong, but from what I understand, the police officers were around the University of Toronto. They knew perfectly well that young people were in the gym. That wasn't the first time.

You were arrested when you arrived at the University of Toronto. Is that correct?

[*English*]

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** That is correct. When Grayson Lepp and I both came to the campus, as Grayson explained, we were approached by seven officers—between six to eight officers—at 8 a.m. We were completely searched. All of our belongings were looked through. At that point, we were actually told by the police officers that we were good to go.

Another good note on intervening with the police officers: I was able to speak with a police officer the night before the Sunday arrest who was fairly open on expressing why he was there in and around campus. I asked him: "Am I safe? Am I allowed to stay on campus?" He assured me that he was there for my public safety, and that if anything were to happen or go wrong, he would let us know right away, which is definitely a big change from the next morning and being woken up with a gun in the face.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Paikin, we get the impression that Toronto police somewhat lost control of the situation on the Saturday in question and that, on Sunday morning, it wanted to set an example, to make a demonstration and give the population of Toronto the satisfaction of seeing rabble-rousers arrested.

As a journalist, were you invited to attend that police spectacle that Sunday morning? Were other journalists you knew invited?

[English]

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** No.

[Translation]

I can't say, madam.

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Do you know any journalists who were invited? We were told that, on Sunday morning, rabble-rousers were taken out in handcuffs and that all the journalists were there, as if by chance on a Sunday morning. You aren't aware of that?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I didn't hear about that. Pardon me, but no.

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** All right.

Did you see any journalists on that Sunday morning who were waiting for you when you came out, like criminals? They were waiting for you when you came out with police officers.

[English]

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Yes, that is correct. There was a big group of 10 to 20 individuals who had cameras. Different kinds of journalists were there. We were originally put in zap straps, and then the zap straps were taken off and we were put in handcuffs. We were then paraded in front of the media. Following that, we were put back in the zap straps. I basically had the zap straps around my hands for over 16 hours.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** All right, I understand.

Mr. Paikin, when we met, you said you had seen colleagues and journalists being somewhat mistreated by police officers. You don't refer to that in your statement. Could you tell us a little about what you saw? Were journalists mistreated, even though they knew perfectly well that they were journalists? Did they have their badges or press cards?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Yes, madam.

First, I would like to note that I learned French 45 years ago in Hamilton, Ontario. I don't speak it very well, but I'm going to try to answer you.

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** You may answer in English. That's not a problem.

[English]

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Sunday morning, I can't speak to. Saturday night at the peaceful protest that took place on the esplanade, I did see the police assault a journalist. The situation was as Mr. Holland described in the Twitter account from that night. They were taking anybody who looked like a journalist and they were saying, "You've got to go". They offered me the option of being arrested or leaving.

I had official G-20 accreditation, so they looked at my badge and were satisfied that I was, I guess, a journalist from a reputable organization, and therefore allowed me the option of being arrested or leaving. I didn't see how I could do much reporting behind bars, so I left.

There was another reporter who said he represented *The Guardian* and who did not have official G-20 accreditation around his neck. But he did have *Guardian* accreditation around his neck. They took his accreditation; they wanted to check out whether he was who he said he was. Two police officers held him. He was, *en anglais*, "chippy". *Il n'a pas juré*, but he was talking a lot. He was saying: "Why are you holding me? There's no need to hold me. I am who I say I am."

•(1625)

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** He was asserting his rights.

[English]

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We're at the seven-minute mark here so...unless you want to very quickly finish?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Sure. One officer held one arm; the other officer held another arm. A third officer came up to him and basically told him to shut up three times, punched him in the stomach, he doubled over, and the same officer brought his elbow down on the small of his back and flattened him. It seemed to me that this was a massive overreaction to trying to check to see whether somebody was who he said he was.

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

Thank you, Madame Mourani.

Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Kirton, briefly, just hearing that last bit about police officers—from obviously a reputable source—who punched someone in the stomach who had his arms held and who elbowed him down to the ground, is that an example of the kind of successful security that you seem to be testifying about?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I certainly think that would lie in the category of regrettable defects that I spoke about. But on that particular incident, as I recall via a publicly reported media story, there were at least allegations—they would be worthy, I think, of further inquiry—that the individual may in fact have been denied accreditation under the summit, that he might more appropriately lay in the category called “citizen journalist”, posting stories to *The Guardian* website, if I recall correctly. And what the police officers were following by way of procedures and what information they were acquiring is really beyond my professional competence. But I will point to a larger issue, because often—

**Mr. Don Davies:** Actually, sir, I don't want you to point to a larger issue. I have limited time. But even if that person did not have accreditation, the penalty for not having proper accreditation is not a punch in the stomach and an elbow to the back of the neck. Surely you're not suggesting that, are you, sir?

**Mr. John Kirton:** No, I'm not. I'm suggesting that for other categories of individuals associated with the summit, there were regrettable defects.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Yes. That's certainly a regrettable defect, I would argue. I agree with you.

Mr. Lepp, what did the police officers say to you when they awakened you that morning in the gym? You alluded to that. I want you to tell the committee exactly what the police said to you.

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Okay. I apologize ahead of time for my language. I was kicked in the ribs and the officer said, “Wake the fuck up, you fucking piece of shit.”

**Mr. Don Davies:** And you've mentioned gunpoint.... Can you tell the committee briefly, when you were awakened, what was the first thing you saw when you opened your eyes?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** The first thing.... I'm not very good with weapons, so excuse my description. The first thing I woke up to was a rather large weapon pointed directly into my face, upon being kicked awake. So I was kicked awake and there was a gun barrel pointed in my face.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay.

Now I want to back up a bit. You commented that when you first got to Toronto and came in from the airport, as you approached the University of Toronto gym you said you were met by some officers who came up onto the curb. You talked about them searching through your property. I think you made a reference to them scrolling through your text messages on your phone. Is that correct?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** That is correct.

They read through all my e-mails and my text messages and asked me what my phone number was so they could look after it.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Were you under arrest at that point?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** No, I was not. I was being held, though.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Did they give you any indication of why they were seizing your property and reading your private e-mails?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** No. They said they were just doing security checks.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Okay.

You also mentioned, Mr. Lepp, that you heard a death threat issued when you were in detention. Can you tell us what you heard?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** There was a young man in my cell who asked for water, and the police officer...I don't know, maybe he had had a hard day, but he said: “Shut the fuck up, you fucking French piece of shit. You're lucky there's cameras here, otherwise I'd send you home to Montreal in a body bag.”

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Paikin, I also looked at your tweets that day, and I want to put this to you. You wrote that night, on June 26, that: we must make a distinction between the “thugs” who broke store windows and torched cop cars and the very reasonable citizens who...

...just wanted to reminded the authorities that the freedom to speak and assemble shouldn't disappear because world leaders came to town.

i have lived in Toronto for 32 years. have never seen a day like this. shame on the vandals.

and shame on those that ordered peaceful protesters attacked and arrested. that is not consistent with democracy in toronto, G20 or no G20

Can you expand on that? What was in your mind when you wrote those words?

• (1630)

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I'm not sure that requires much expansion. I think that pretty much sums it up. I could not help but be impressed by the.... I've seen a lot of protests in my time. I've been in journalism almost 30 years and I've seen hundreds of demonstrations in Toronto, for everything from people trying to get more money out of governments to nuclear freezes to everything you could imagine. I think that by this point I know a violent out-of-control protest when I see one, and I think I know a peaceful protest when I see one.

This was Saturday night. It was three or four hours into it. There were people sitting on the street. It was pouring rain. The numbers were dissipating because it was pouring rain. Everybody was wet. It did not seem to have any of the elements of something about to explode. Quite the contrary. It was winding down. And it just seemed at that point that the reaction of the police force was not warranted by the conditions at the time.

**Mr. Don Davies:** You asked who specifically gave the order to clear the street. Was that decision made on site or by a higher authority? To this day, as a journalist who's used to asking questions, do you have an answer to those questions, Mr. Paikin?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I don't.

**Mr. Don Davies:** You asked whether the Toronto police had any evidence of dangerous acts from those demonstrators that forced them to act that way at that time. Again, some months later, do you have any answer to that question today?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I did put that question to police chief Bill Blair when he was on *The Agenda*. He said he had reason to believe from intelligence sources he had that there were so-called black bloc elements within that protest on Saturday night on the esplanade. That's why the protest was broken up. When I asked him to share what the source of that intelligence might be, obviously he said he couldn't tell me.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Chavarie, you were in detention for some time. We've heard some evidence of indignities. I've been written to by other people about women being forced to toilet themselves in front of male guards. One man was handcuffed, hands behind his back, for 16 hours, and he had to urinate in a cup without the use of his hands. Did you see those events?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** I'd like Grayson Lepp to speak on that. I think he actually witnessed a woman—

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** When I first entered the detention centre, I was greeted with three large cages to the left, all full of people screaming for water. On the right-hand side there were three porta-potties with the doors removed.

On my bus, there was a young French girl of about 18 years of age who had to go to the bathroom. She voiced that concern to the police officer. The police officers then removed her from the bus and took her to the outhouse. With her hands handcuffed behind her back, she had to remove her pants and undergarments and go to the bathroom in front of male and female officers and the rest of the males on the bus. It was absolutely appalling.

In another incident, I ran into an individual in the courthouse. He had been handcuffed for about 18 hours—I believe that's what he said—with his hands behind his back. When we first got to the detention centre they removed our handcuffs, which they had used to parade us in front of the media, and replaced them with zap straps—hands in front of us—so we could move. They kept us in those until about 11 at night. However, he was kept with his zap straps behind his back, put into a small single-confinement cell with no porta-potty, and given a styrofoam cup to pee in.

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

I will now move to the government side.

Mr. MacKenzie, please.

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

Thank you to the panel for being here.

Mr. Paikin, I'm sure you've been following some of this through the process in the committee.

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Some of it, yes.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Some of it? Okay.

I'm sure you're also well aware of there being a number of inquiries in the past that indicate the police are separate from government. I think the APEC one was a good example of that. The suggestion was the police were directed by government and that there's been direction of that....

Would I be right in saying you may have heard from the police authorities that the government did not direct the police operation on the G-8 and G-20?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I've never heard that anybody from the police force suggested that the government directed them to do anything.

•(1635)

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Okay. Having said that, have you made your complaints known to the authorities in Ontario that are responsible for dealing with police misconduct?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Well, just for what it's worth, I don't have any complaints about it. I wrote about it. It's for others to complain.

But I was interviewed by the complaints procedure that takes place in the office of the...I guess it's the superintendent for the Toronto Police Service.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** So you're aware, though, that there are processes.... If somebody has a complaint about police conduct, you are aware that there are processes within the—

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I'm not only aware of it; I participated in it.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Okay. Fair enough.

Ms. Prokop, your group has younger people, young entrepreneurs. This was the first opportunity you had...?

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** That's correct. It was an inaugural G-20. There was a smaller G-8 event in Stresa the year before, in Italy.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Could you tell us how you were received by the larger body that was meeting at the G-20?

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** I'm sorry. Are you referring to the delegates?

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Did you have access to government officials? Was there any interrelationship between them?

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** Our summit was officially endorsed; however, we did not receive any government money at all for our summit. We did have a press conference at the end of the summit when the Honourable Tony Clement came to receive the communiqué. Also, it was also opened by Mr. Rob Moore, and Minister Van Loan came to the closing event.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Was it worthwhile?

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** Absolutely.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** It brought young people together from all of the G-20 nations?

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** There were 200 international delegates. Just to give you an idea, our colleagues in France are expecting a summit that will have 600, so it's growing substantially.

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** So they had an opportunity to see Canada up front and personal.

**Ms. Vivian Prokop:** Yes, absolutely. But most importantly, they had an opportunity to talk about how young people can positively work together to work positively with government to build policies. From our point of view, we feel that it was a terrific event, and we didn't have any security issues at all.

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

Mr. Kirton, you have studied these internationally for a number of years. We sometimes tend to focus only on what happens in Canada, but you're well aware of what has happened in other places. Although my colleague talked about having it in one location, it is my understanding that one member of the G-8 must host a meeting each year. That makes it cycle around.

Canada has hosted other international summits. We talked about this one being in the Muskoka region. We've held these different kinds of international summits in small communities at different times—the APEC summit and so on. Is this one unique or is it similar to the pattern of other international summits we've hosted?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I think the broad generalization is that for this particular class and kind of international institution, the pluri-lateral summit institutions, the larger the number of members—such as the APEC leaders meeting in 1997 in Vancouver, the Summit of the Americas, with 34 leaders, in Quebec City in April 2001, and of course the G-20 in Toronto—the tendency is, for I think understandable reasons, that they have to be held in larger cities.

But for the smaller G-8, the tendency, and perhaps the Canadian tradition, has been to hold them in smaller resort-like settings, in part given the unique advantage of having the event leaders looking each other in the face, relaxing, realizing they're all in it together, and interacting as human beings, rather than reading speeches at each other, which can come alive as it did at Deerhurst.

The Canadian tradition, of course, was set by the Right Honourable Pierre Trudeau in 1981. He had the choice of hosting Canada's first what was then a G-7 summit just in Ottawa, in the capital city, but said no, that he wanted to share it. He wanted to do a significant portion of it in Montebello, Quebec, despite some of the known disadvantages the dual hosting would bring.

So the smaller the communities, the bigger the benefits. The historic Halifax summit of 1995 was held in the largest of the smallest communities, but the Canadian tradition does go back to Pierre Trudeau in 1981.

• (1640)

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Regarding the cost, I suggest to you that the numbers that have been provided have been done very openly. Do you see that in other countries, that all of the costs are made transparent?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I have never seen it before in any other country, and I've never seen it before in Canada.

For those close to this particular, specialized form of research, the operational wisdom of those producing the summits is that you simply never identify in advance what the costs are, partly for the good reason that you actually never know until all the bills are in, and then, when all the bills are in, which can take a rather long time—

**Mr. Dave MacKenzie:** Is it also fair to say that if you're not transparent, you don't have to answer a lot of questions about it?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Oh, very much so. I think there was an exceptionally large degree of public commentary and parliamentary commentary on the announced estimates for the Toronto summit in the time leading up to it, even though one of the natural news stories in the lead-up to the summit was how much it costs and is it worth the time and trouble.... But Toronto/Muskoka was exceptional in that regard.

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

We'll now move to Mr. Kania.

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

Mr. Kirton, is Jenilee Guebert a colleague of yours?

**Mr. John Kirton:** She is indeed.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** She testified before this committee last week. I was going to ask you about something she said, because when she was answering questions, she agreed with me that it was not necessary to split the summits between Huntsville and Toronto, and said that we, as a result of doing so, spent over \$200 million more in taxpayers' dollars. Would you agree with that comment of hers?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Well, it was an excellent question. I did have a chance to read the committee's proceedings from that session, so I've had a longer opportunity to reflect on that point.

Important in my thinking, before I come to a judgment, are a few considerations. One, we knew from a very early stage that Prime Minister Harper had announced that the G-8 summit, held in our normal year, would be in Huntsville. He did that long before G-20 summits had been invented for global governance life. My former colleague, Michael Ignatieff, publicly assured the voters of Canada that were he elected prime minister he would keep the G-8 summit in Muskoka. Again, that was before the fact that Canada would be hosting the G-20 summit.

So to come to the end, it really depends on where you start. Some considerable portion of the expenses to prepare the Muskoka site were actually incurred before we knew we would be hosting the G-20—

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** I just want to be clear, and I only have five minutes to get some scope on this.

**Mr. John Kirton:** Sorry. Yes?

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** She agreed with me that logistically the decision could have been made by the Conservative government to have both summits in one location, especially during recessionary times. That would have saved over \$200 million in taxpayers dollars. So I'm sure you must agree with your colleague, and with logic, that you could have held both summits in one location and saved over \$200 million.

**Mr. John Kirton:** The great advantage of having more than one person is that we are professionally obliged not to agree for agreement's sake; I would need to know the already sunk costs in Muskoka. I must say that I am of the view that it would have been far more expensive and far more insecure to have hosted the G-20 in Muskoka, along with the G-8. That was the natural first instinct. I really do not think, even as a resident of downtown Toronto, that I would want to tell the people of Parry Sound, Muskoka, "Sorry, but everything has to be done in downtown Toronto to save on the expense".

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Well, I don't think that's the issue. I think the issue is whether the taxpayers of Canada should have been on the hook for another \$200 million because of splitting the summits between two locations, when your colleague and many others, including myself, have agreed that both could have been held in downtown Toronto with savings of \$200 million during recessionary times.

You must agree that there is no need to split the summits along those lines, especially during recessionary times. You must agree with your colleague.

**Mr. John Kirton:** I think the.... At university we seldom agree with our colleagues, I might say, but I think the key decision for the Canadian government is, do you want to host the G-20 summit, too, and accept that responsibility? Then, secondly, what is the most secure place to hold it in and is one that will reap some of the associated benefits?

I do think that the decision to host the G-20 in Toronto was the right one.

• (1645)

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Fine, but the G-8 could have also been held in Toronto at the same time for savings of over \$200 million.

**Mr. John Kirton:** By the time that decision was made, a considerable part of the expenditure for preparing the Muskoka site had been spent—

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** How much?

**Mr. John Kirton:** —and could not have been recouped.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** How much?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I don't have an estimate.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** How do you know it's considerable if you don't know the number?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Well, because I do know on the timing of it that the decision for Muskoka was publicly announced by the Prime Minister two years before it was held, and that is when expenses started to be incurred to prepare the site.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Okay. How much?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Don't know.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** So how can you come to that conclusion and oppose your colleague when you don't know the numbers and you're speculating?

**Mr. John Kirton:** I can make an estimate based on the normal cadence—

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** So what's your estimate?

**Mr. John Kirton:** —for spending money for preparing summits—

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** Some estimate.

**Mr. John Kirton:** —from the moment when the site is actually announced.

**Mr. Andrew Kania:** What's your estimate?

**Mr. John Kirton:** If we...I think I'll need to get back to you on that.

**The Chair:** All right. That's fair.

That brings up another point. On any of these questions, if any of our guests would like to get back to us.... Certainly we don't expect you to have some of those figures right off the top of your head, but if you wouldn't mind getting back on some of those, we would appreciate it.

We'll now go to Mr. Norlock, please, for five minutes.

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

Thank you to the witnesses for attending today.

My first question is for Mr. Kirton. On May 30, reporter Daniel Lessard of Radio-Canada interviewed former Prime Minister Paul Martin with regard to the G-8. It flowed, I suspect, into the G-20.

The response to his questions concerning the G-8 and G-20 was as follows, and I quote: "Well listen, it's part of our responsibilities. We're members of the G-8. Now it's turned into the G-20. We cannot refuse. It's part of our responsibilities. We have obligations as a country. We have obligations to fulfill them. Obviously this money is flowing into our economy and this will increase Canada's prestige."

Number one, would you agree with that statement of former Prime Minister Martin? Would you say it's accurate to say that it's part of our responsibility in those organizations? Number two, would you agree that when Mr. Martin referred to "prestige", this goes along not only with your obligation, but with showcasing your country—I think that's the common expression—as a mature economy, as a responsible economy, and as part of an international decision-making process within those organizations?

Number three, from an economic point of view, would you also comment that the money spent there, when it's spent in the country, stays within the country and eventually governments do what governments do and they tax it back? For instance, when you're dealing with security, since we didn't use the Canadian armed forces and chose to use the civil authority, the police, many of those police organizations were paying their members overtime, and when people work overtime, the government tends to tax that revenue at a higher rate in that case?

Would you comment on those statements and on the statement of the former prime minister?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Yes, I would. I certainly agree with the Right Honourable Paul Martin. It's important for Canadians to remember that Paul Martin was the co-creator and founding visionary of the G-20 back when it was a finance ministers forum invented with Larry Summers in 1999.

Secondly, we need to remember the 2001 G-20 finance ministers meeting held in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on North America on September 11. All other international meetings were cancelled, as was the G-20 scheduled to be held in India. Paul Martin stepped forward on behalf of Canada and said that we needed international meetings. He did incur the cost of securing a site in Ottawa so that the G-20 finance ministers meeting could take place and effectively it turned its focus to combatting terrorist financing.

As we move forward, of course, in 2004 and 2005, Paul Martin led the international crusade to elevate the G-20 finance ministers forum to the leaders level and got all of his colleagues as leaders to agree, save one. That was President Bush of the United States. Three years later, President Bush changed his mind. I think Paul Martin speaks from having been there and done that, if I could put it that way.

As for the benefits and the responsibilities of hosting—let's call them the branding benefits, broadly defined—we always have to remember that the Government of Canada and many Canadians quite properly were going around the world and saying, “Look, we have the world's finest financial system and we survived the crisis intact.” Toronto had become one of the world's leading global financial centres, so there was a particular message for a finance-focused summit to be in that particular location.

More importantly, the Toronto G-20 summit was the first that was co-hosted by an old established advanced G-8 economy, Canada, and a newly emerging rising trans-Pacific one, Korea. By hosting that summit, and in the home of Canadians of Korean and Asian origin in large number, Canada made history, and of course the visual venue was appropriate for the political innovation in global governance that was being held.

• (1650)

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

We'll now move back to the Bloc.

Monsieur Vincent, welcome to our committee. You have five minutes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Vincent (Shefford, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to share my speaking time with my colleague.

Mr. Kirton, I'm going to ask you a brief question, and I would like quite a brief answer because I'm sharing my time.

Earlier you said that where the G8 and G20 summits took place, in Muskoka and Huntsville respectively, and also in the other surrounding villages, expenditures were incurred in connection with those summits. You couldn't state the exact amounts. However, could you tell us what action was taken?

In fact, you said that it couldn't stop as amounts had already been spent. How was that money spent before the G8 Summit?

[English]

**Mr. John Kirton:** If I may, in English, firstly, from the moment a summit site is publicly announced, there is, on behalf of the Government of Canada, a great deal of activity. There are resources spent primarily by civil servants in doing all of the necessary logistical preparations. Much of it is related to security. Some of it is rather mundane FAC-OPS, as it's known in the jargon of the trade, facilities and operations, including such things as whether there will be adequate electricity to the specific site, the Deerhurst Inn and whether the rooms are individually large enough for the appropriate foreign visitors who will stay there? Of course, contracts then have to be let to provide for the backup arrangements.

I do recall in the lead-up after the announcement, from discussions with Mayor Doughty on site, that there was some concern that the Ontario Provincial Police, the Huntsville detachment, had only one or two two-way radios—completely inadequate for the volume of telecommunications to secure the event. So there were investments like that beginning, from the starting pistol, as it were.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Vincent:** I understand what you mean. They wanted to invest immediately where they were for the G8 Summit. However, there was a lot more spending than that. For example, they rebuilt a landing strip at an airport, which cost \$4.6 million.

Maria, do you want me to continue?

[English]

**The Chair:** Madame Mourani.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was asking you to act as a time keeper. It's because we're not following that. That's what I wanted to tell you, but it's not serious. It's fine.

[English]

**The Chair:** You have two and a half minutes, but I'm not going to cut off Monsieur Vincent. You can cut off your own colleague. He does very well.

• (1655)

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** All right.

Mr. Kirton, I'm going to pursue my colleague's line of questioning. Since we're talking about money, what is your opinion of the big \$10,000 meals, the artificial lake, gifts given to certain individuals, all the bells and whistles, the tablecloths and so on?

[English]

**Mr. John Kirton:** I can speak with a little more knowledge than normal about this because we had the responsibility of hosting the Russian presidency and advising them on how to host their first ever G-8 summit in 2006. One of the questions they first asked was, how much should we spend on gifts for each of the levels involved? There's a well-known G-8 summit tradition of what the range of those gifts should be. To my knowledge, the Canadian government followed that and respected it as a matter of standard operating procedure for the G-8.

On the second point you mention, I recall—

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** I don't understand, Mr. Kirton. You're telling us it's normal to use taxpayer's money to build artificial lakes worth several millions of dollars, to hook up sewers to the tune of \$80 million, that have nothing to do with security.

How many millions of dollars are involved in this affair? Is it \$1.2 million?



You told us about \$15,000 meals, tablecloths and so on. Is that all normal? Is that all right in your mind? Taxpayers' money can be used for that purpose, when there are people starving to death here, in Quebec and in Canada? You think it's normal for us to welcome people from everywhere and to give them presents? Is that normal?

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame Mourani.

You have about 25 seconds to answer.

**Mr. John Kirton:** I was speaking specifically of the gifts. But on the water feature, I do recall that we had one at the Toronto summit in 1988, and because a little more money was spent, some authentic Canadian wildlife was brought in, our summit beavers. It was an enormous hit with the media, and it really did help convey a favourable image of Canada to the world and show a part of Canada that would not otherwise have been seen in downtown Toronto.

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

I will now move to Mr. Rathgeber, please.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber (Edmonton—St. Albert, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to all the witnesses for your attendance today.

My questions will be to Mr. Lepp and Mr. Chavarie. I understand you both hold executive positions with the University of British Columbia Students' Union, Okanagan Campus?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Yes, that's correct. I'm currently the executive chair and financial coordinator and have previously held an executive position. I've done two terms on senate—

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** That's fine.

You're an executive as well...?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Yes. This will be my second year on student council.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Who prepared this brief?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Kirk, me, and our staff.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Okay.

Now, Mr. Lepp, you indicated that you don't know a whole lot about guns, if I heard you correctly?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** That is correct.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Mr. Chavarie, is your knowledge of guns any better than your friend Mr. Lepp's?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** I think generally looking at the guns that were presented, we definitely did see exactly what type of guns they were, and there was a gun listed in there that actually looked somewhat like a grenade launcher.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** If neither one of you is a gun expert, how do you know you were awoken with an M-32 six-shot 40-millimetre launcher with riot-suppressive ammo?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** With regard to that, we looked through a variety of pictures of basic armaments that police officers usually carry and pointed at that one specifically that—

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** So you picked it off a website?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I looked through it, yes, to identify the weapon that was pointed in my face. To be honest with you, I do not know what it was called, aside from looking at a picture of it and recognizing it.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** That's fine.

So your executive—

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** We could definitely clarify it as being a large gun.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** A large gun I might accept. An M-32 six-shot 40 millimetre launcher with riot-suppressive ammo seems like a pretty specific description, but that's fine.

You flew all night to get there. You left Kelowna at 8 o'clock, flew to Vancouver, and then boarded a plane from Vancouver at 11:38?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Your student union was paying for this trip, correct?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Yes. That's correct.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** So I'm curious. Since the University of Toronto gymnasium wasn't available for boarding until days or possibly a week before the commencement of the summit, did you have arrangements to stay someplace else?

• (1700)

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** No. We had previously been in discussions with members of the GSU, the Graduate Students' Union, at a national meeting of the Canadian Federation of Students, and it wasn't until about a week before the summit that Kirk and I were nominated to go on behalf.... In our mandate with the students' union at my local, it is within our mandate to stand up for the right to public education and to speak out with regard to public education and the access to it. So with our mandate, we thought it was more than necessary for us to go and speak out.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** So you made these arrangements to travel to Toronto a week before the commencement of the summit?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** That is correct.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** That's outside the normal academic year. Does your council even meet in the month of June?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Some board members actually have leaves of absence during the summer, but we hold regular executive meetings throughout the summer and we stay in office throughout the year. Kirk and I hold an average of 30 to 40 hours a week during the summer, so yes, there were board meetings.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** So you're telling me that your itinerary included a stay at the University of Toronto graduate students' gym? That was always the plan?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** That was the plan, yes.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Okay. So you get in at 7:30 in the morning Toronto time, you go to the University of Toronto and you're immediately arrested, correct?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** We were approached by police, I guess you would say, and then illegally searched. From my discussions with lawyers afterwards, my lawyer informed me I had been illegally searched. At the time, I had no idea.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Okay. And then you drop off your suitcases and you go to a rally, correct?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** Actually, we got Gatorades because we hadn't had anything to drink, and then had about a two-hour nap. So it was about 10 o'clock in the morning that we went to meet at the rally point where the Canadian Federation of Students—

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** According to your brief, the rally commenced at 11 and didn't end until 5 p.m.

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** That is correct.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Is that correct? It was a six-hour rally?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I guess I'll let Kirk...

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Yes, I can definitely motivate to that. We actually took part in the peaceful rally that went all the way down through Queensway. When we got to the end, we had officials, who were wearing fluorescent vests as well as carrying megaphones, telling us exactly where to go and saying that if we were even to go close to or approach the fence, there was a chance we could be arrested. So we instantly made the decision that this wasn't part of what we were there for and so we were not going there, and—

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Okay. That's fine.

Now, had you not been arrested Sunday morning, what was the rest of your itinerary? What were you going to do on Sunday?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** On Sunday? The plan was basically that there were going to be other members meeting. We hold connections with York University as well as Ryerson. All of these students fall under the Canadian Federation of Students, which is the largest body of students in Canada. Our plan was to tour their campuses, meet up with them, and basically see Toronto on the side of how students in Ontario experience it.

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** Okay.

My last question is for you, Mr. Lepp.

You said you've lost faith in the Canadian government. But isn't your real concern with the Toronto police force?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I would say that—

**Mr. Brent Rathgeber:** No, I'm sorry; it was Mr. Chavarie who said he had lost faith in the Canadian government. I apologize, Mr. Lepp.

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** I think at this point my faith has definitely been lost in the sense of justice for what had happened. There haven't been as many conversations as I would expect on an issue this large. We are experiencing the largest mass arrests in Canadian history, and it's just starting to be talked about in a committee forum.

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

We'll now move back to Madame Mendes.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes (Brossard—La Prairie, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Thank you all for being here.

I would like to start by telling you, Mr. Chavarie and Mr. Lepp, that I think it's unfortunate that our Conservative colleagues consider it more important to question you on your motivations and your

history than to apologize for the behaviour of authorities during the G8 and G20 summits. I believe that's particularly the case for the G20 Summit, when you were stopped.

I would also like to ask you something, Mr. Stayshyn. You're a resident of Toronto, where the G20 was held, and it no doubt affected you directly.

After all these months, do you think that was worth the trouble?

[*English*]

Was it worth it?

• (1705)

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** Not where they held it, no; I don't think it was.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** In no aspect at all? Tourism-wise, commerce-wise, you don't think it was worth it?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** I don't at all; not downtown, not in the location they held it in.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Do you think the disturbances to commerce left permanent scars? Is it still something that they are going through?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** It seems that way. There was a lot of damage. As I said, I watched a lot of it happen without any police attempting to stop it.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Has there been compensation?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** I don't believe so. The local places that I go to every day were damaged, and there have not been any moneys as compensation.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** How about you? Have you received any apologies?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** No. To this date, I have not received any form of apology from the Canadian government.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** How about you, Mr. Lepp?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** No, I have not.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** When the case was dismissed, what were you told?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** This is actually rather shocking. It was the Friday before the Thanksgiving long weekend. I checked my phone. I had a miscall and a voicemail. I checked my voicemail. The voicemail said that it was a lady from Duty Counsel and that my charges had been dismissed, or more presumably.... My voicemail says "Grayson" and my legal, binding name is Brian Grayson Lepp, and it said that the charges against "Brian" had been dropped. There was no formal call again to make sure that I got the message.

I phoned Kirk. He had not received it at that time, not until I got in to the office, when he had. Then we proceeded to call our lawyer. She actually had not been informed that the charges against us had been dropped.

So yes, I received—

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** And to this day, have you received any formal dismissal of the charges?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** We received paperwork after asking our lawyer to ensure that we got proper paperwork, because we weren't sure whether it was a prank call or an authentic call.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Okay.

Mr. Chavarie?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Yes, definitely along the same lines, I received a phone call that I had missed, so I called back and was assured that my charges had been dropped.

One of the weirdest things was that I did not receive my camera or iPhone until most recently, about a month ago. It was held as being considered evidence. I have now received everything back, which is

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Intact?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Intact, yes.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** So everything that was in it is still there?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Yes.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Do you still have no idea of what the charges really were dropped for, of why they were dropped?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** At this time, I specifically don't, no. Around the issue of why our charges were dropped...?

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Yes, why they were dropped.

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Definitely that there was no form of evidence to put forward on Grayson or me.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** But as Madame Mourani said earlier, one of the things that had been said to us was that there were no valid subpoenas that had been issued to the police, so that's why they dropped the charges. They never said that they actually didn't find any reason.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I was just going to say.... I didn't include it in my brief, but on that note, when the police officers came in, someone did ask them if they had a warrant. The officer replied to the individual...I believe it was Daniel Vandervoort, who is the external coordinator for the graduate society at the University of Toronto. They said that they did have the right warrant and then they proceeded to arrest everyone.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Did they show it to you?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I personally did not see it, but he did hold up a piece of paper to Daniel.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Have you ever been told if that was a proper warrant? Did you ever find out?

**Mr. Grayson Lepp:** I have not been told. I never found out.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:** Do you want to go—

**The Chair:** Well, you have 10 seconds for a statement.

Thank you very much.

We'll now move back to Mr. McColeman.

**Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

Thanks to all of you for coming here today. We've had some very good evidence presented here today, and frankly some new things, which we welcome. We welcome hearing some of the more positive aspects that have come out.

My first question is to Mr. Kirton. In your role at the University of Toronto, your analysis group does scientific analysis and comparisons from across these conferences worldwide?

**Mr. John Kirton:** Social scientific analysis, which some of my colleagues doubt is as scientific as the work they do, but yes. We have a heavy focus on the G-8 and now the G-20 summits.

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** Okay. Because my time is limited, I just wanted to put that up on the board. Having been involved in graduate programs myself and knowing some of the parts of coming up with the analysis, you're in very good company.

I really want to tell you that you're in the company of security experts, the Auditor General, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who all have confirmed that the security costs are reasonable and that direct cost comparisons that the media and the opposition have been making to other summits are disingenuous and false. So I appreciate the clarification from the University of Toronto and the type of institution you represent that the costs were appropriate.

Secondly, I find it quite interesting that my colleague, Mr. Holland, disagrees right out of the gate with your objective analysis. He says in his opening comments that obviously we disagree with a lot of what you said here today.

I can say this also about what Mr. Kania brought up, which is the cost issue. Just to clarify on that issue, his leader, Mr. Ignatieff, said to the people of Huntsville...and I will quote from *The Huntsville Forester* on September 17, 2008. He wanted to make it very clear that "when we are the government of Canada, the next G-8 Summit will be held at Deerhurst Resort in Huntsville". He said, "You heard it from me: the G-8 Summit will be in this community when we form the next government". Now, it would seem that the Liberal leader supported Huntsville when he thought it would boost his electoral prospects, and now he's against it in order to score cheap political points.

The new information we have here today—you know how Ottawa works—is that we as a committee get to look at the benefits of what you have brought to the table, Mr. Kirton, in terms of long-term branding. Again, as a past businessman, I understand the importance of branding and the importance of that in terms of a larger world market available to Canada. I understand the economic benefits around strong branding and how that basically has a way of attracting business or pushing business away.

Could you just expand a little more on what you meant by your comments on the branding benefits? I think you cited—and you might also want to include this—Korea's analysis, because you said you had not done a firm analysis on that, but you certainly have some projections from Korea.

• (1710)

**Mr. John Kirton:** Thank you very much.

On Korea, it is an institute affiliated with the Government of Korea, which naturally is noticed by we independent scholars. They did estimate that part of the benefit was that their Seoul summit attracted, first 10,000, and then the subsequent estimate was 15,000, visitors.

Typically that's when most people do the benefits—as if it were just another service club convention in the city. The analysis we've done selectively over several years really looks at the international media coverage, at whether it is favourable, neutral, or negative, and then attaches how much money you would have to pay to buy that. Of course, the high point for us was Peter Jennings' coverage on ABC News in 1988.

I think more importantly than that...and I did make reference to the Toronto terms on debt relief. That is a phrase that is talked about in development circles to this day. So it is the city, but the city associated as a sharing and caring place. In the case of Toronto, we haven't done comparable international media analysis, but we do know from selective work following the Toronto summit that the image of Toronto was not as firm as for the other great cities where summits had been held.

By the time we get to Toronto, it was not regarded as one of the world's leading financial capitals. So that is one of the opportunities to show. If the summit works on financial stability, the core founding mission of the G-20, then there's a consonance between what Toronto is now and why the world needs Toronto and its summit for that.

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

**The Chair:** You have another 20 seconds.

**Mr. Phil McColeman:** Fantastic.

I'll go to Ms. Prokop.

Frankly, I might just observe how inspiring it is to hear today that we have such a group, which is actually the inaugural group of these young entrepreneurs, because we're talking now about the future of our country, the economy of our country. Can you just tell me briefly—

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, she can't, Mr. McColeman, in 20 seconds. Unless you want to work it into another comment later, thank you very much.

Now we'll move back to Mr. Holland, please.

• (1715)

**Mr. Mark Holland:** It's rare these days that Mr. McColeman speaks and doesn't reference me, so I'm glad that he's thinking of me.

First of all, I just have a comment. One of the things that is left out of the quote of Mr. Ignatieff is the fact that there had already been a decision to put the summit in Muskoka and that he was saying he

wouldn't reverse the decision, and secondly, that the G-20 had not yet been added. At the time, Mr. Clement was bragging about how much money would be saved by having it all in Muskoka. So the government had told us it all could be held in Muskoka and we would realize incredible savings as a result of that. Of course, that's all left out of it.

Mr. Kirton, in talking about how this reflected internationally, you stated it was really an unequivocal success. I'm paraphrasing, but that's essentially how you put it. I'm going to read you some headlines:

[Translation]

In *Le Point*, an article entitled, "Toronto Summit: A G20 for (nearly) nothing".

[English]

"A Missed Opportunity" is from the *Times of India*.

[Translation]

"G20: Leaders find no common path," is another headline, which appeared in *Le Monde*, in France.

[English]

"G-20 deficit cuts 'a fantasy'" is from ABC News.

"The Summit of Disappointment" is from *FOCUS Online*, Germany.

"After the G-20 Summit in Toronto: Gabriel: The Markets Remain Unregulated, Nothing Happens" is from a German paper.

It goes on.

"The Summit that could not have been" is from *Gazeta Prawna* in Poland.

"The G-20 accord: you go your way, I'll go mine" is from *The Guardian*, the United Kingdom.

I didn't hear in any of your comments—aside from glancing acknowledgement of some of what I thought were very disturbing things that we heard from some of the witnesses today—any criticisms. So I would afford you the opportunity, looking at it objectively, to say, "Where did it go wrong?" Or in your opinion, did it not go wrong at all in any place?

**Mr. John Kirton:** The first Toronto summit in 1988 received far more favourable publicity around the world than the more recent Toronto summit did. The point I made was that the Canadian coverage of the Toronto summit was more negative than the international coverage.

If we compare global media coverage of G-20 summits, the only one that received substantially positive treatment was the second summit in London. As we move forward in the coverage to the Seoul summit and the previous one in Toronto, there were very few references to the violence in Toronto. So part of the negative image had come off.

As for improvements that could be made—and I applaud your constructive instincts—I've come to the conclusion that, given the global challenges G-20 summits face, they are just too short. A good portion of the short time they have is taken up with the leaders sleeping. This lack of time has a number of negative impacts. It prevents this group of disparate leaders from coming together and bonding as individuals to face a common cause. I think we saw that in Seoul.

There were a number of issues that we had hoped Toronto would address: IMF reform, Basel free banking resolutions.... These were largely deferred to Seoul because there just wasn't enough time once the big job of containing the euro crisis through the macroeconomic message was achieved.

I deeply regret that the peaceful protest held a few days before the summit by my friends in the environmental community was not publicized. It didn't catch the attention of the country, and it didn't move G-20 governors to build on an option advanced at the previous summit at Pittsburgh—the fossil fuel subsidies phase-out. If we could just do that on time, we would help to meet our climate change control challenges, further the cause of human health, and, according to the OECD, save the hard-pressed taxpayers of the world over half a trillion dollars in subsidies. This would be a win for fiscal consolidation, for the environment, and for health. That's the kind of thing we want our summits to do.

• (1720)

**The Chair:** Mr. Holland.

**Mr. Mark Holland:** Mr. Chavarie, you said there was a need for a full judicial inquiry, with the ability to ask questions. Surely it would also be more than that. You spoke of losing confidence in the Canadian system's tolerance for peaceful protest. What would you want to see beyond that?

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** Accountability.

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

We'll now move to Madame Mourani.

I should also mention that all parties have decided not to proceed to committee business. I want to thank Madame Mourani for waiving her right on her motion so that we could have this other round.

Go ahead, Madame.

[Translation]

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

I'd like to inform those here present, particularly those who were arrested, that the Bloc Québécois has been calling for a public inquiry since last July, when our committee held its first meeting on the G8 and G20 summits. I'm pleased that my NDP colleague adopted that position in November. That's also been recently the case.

However, the Liberal Party still has not called for a public inquiry. The Conservative government, for its part, still refuses to meet that request. What do you think about that? Should there be a public inquiry? Do you think the Liberals' position should change?

[English]

**Mr. Kirk Chavarie:** I feel that this is something we want to look forward to seeing. From a lot of the questions that are going around today, I think a public inquiry, and eventually a judicial inquiry, will pave a way to those answers and provide accountability for what happened during the G-20.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** What do you think, Mr. Stayshyn? Do you believe we should conduct a public inquiry into everything that happened in Toronto during the G20 and that we should address the issue of human rights, not just finances?

[English]

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** Absolutely, yes.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Very well. Thank you.

Mr. Paikin, I know you're not engaged in politics, but I would at least like to ask you whether you think a public inquiry should be held.

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** You're right, madam: I'm not a politician. That's a political question. So that's your responsibility.

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Oh, all right. That's a good answer.

Now I'm going to speak to Mr. Kirton, who I'm very much interested in.

Mr. Kirton, we're talking about costs of approximately \$1 billion, but we aren't that sure, because not all the accounts have yet been put on the table. This isn't bingo money here, but rather that of ordinary citizens.

We're talking about an artificial lake that cost \$1.9 million. I'd like to know what security purpose that serves. We're talking about \$123 million for foreign affairs. There was \$4,600 for dinners. That's what's called serious eating. For 24 table settings, the figure given was \$11,000. But there weren't 200 people, but rather 24. We also see the sum of \$2,000 for pins and \$3,000 for woolen shawls.

Mr. Kirton, the construction of washrooms and a look-out some 20 kilometers away from the summit cost \$300,000. We're talking about upgrading an old steam boat at a cost of \$400,000. However, the boat was not even ready for the G8 and G20 summits. Don't you think all that's a bit excessive?

If I add up all these minor items, that comes to a total of \$1 million. You know what can be done with \$1 million in a society? You can help people eat and sleep in decent housing. You can contribute to the Guaranteed Income Supplement for seniors. Do you know how much money we need? And you're telling me that's acceptable?

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame Mourani.

Go ahead, Mr. Kirton.

**Mr. John Kirton:** It's a long list of expenses. You'll forgive me if I just comment on the ones I feel most passionately about.

The first is that I think the Canadian foreign service is one of our greatest national assets and is critical to our global success. So all of the money spent in producing both of our summits, and certainly for going around the world through a very extensive program of outreach to hear the views of the poorer countries that in the main didn't have a seat at the table, I think is money very well spent.

Some of the programs—

• (1725)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maria Mourani:** Pardon me, but this is illogical.

We invest millions of dollars in Canada's image, whereas we're dealing with social problems, in a world that's starving to death. Do you think that's logical? How does investing \$3,000 in shawls contribute to Canada's image? Can you tell me what that does, when children are dying of hunger in Africa, in particular, and can't obtain vaccines? There's also AIDS and a whole host of other problems.

You really think that the \$3,000 used to buy shawls, the \$2,000 for pins and the \$300,000 for the damned toilets that served no purpose will help the little children in Africa or elsewhere in the world who can't get be vaccinated and are dying of hunger or AIDS? Don't you think that's shameful, Mr. Kirton?

I'm ashamed.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame Mourani.

Mr. Kirton, unfortunately, we have a time limit.

That is another example of one of those questions. If you would like to submit a written response to each one of our committee members and send it to the clerk, we'd appreciate it.

I'll go to Mr. Davies.

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

Mr. Paikin, to go back to the tweets you wrote live, which I think have a certain power and immediacy because you were reporting as events unfolded, again, you said:

I saw police brutality tonight. It was unnecessary. They asked me to leave the site or they would arrest me. I told them I was doing my job.

They repeated they would arrest me if I didn't leave. As I was escorted away from the demonstration....

I take it "they" were the police.

Have you ever, sir, in the conduct of your duties as a journalist in Canada, been threatened by the police with arrest if you didn't leave the scene in a public place while doing your job of reporting?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** No.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Was there anything about what you were doing at that moment? Were you in a sensitive place or were you engaged in a dangerous operation or were you interfering with the police in any way?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** The demonstrators were in the middle of the street, on the esplanade, and I was off on the sidewalk, observing. I

made it quite plain to the officer involved that I didn't think that tweeting on a BlackBerry represented any kind of danger or difficulty for the officers in doing their job. He wasn't nasty about it, I have to clarify. He wasn't angry at me. He wasn't menacing or anything, but he did say, "I'm under orders to clear this place, and that means you too." So—

**Mr. Don Davies:** He said, "I'm under orders to clear this place"?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** Yes.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Did you ever find out who gave him those orders?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I was hustled out of there pretty quickly. And it was not he who hustled me out; it was two other officers who hustled me out. So I didn't get a chance to follow up on that.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Of course, we have already heard the information about your witnessing another journalist being assaulted by police. Does it concern you as a journalist in Canada, Mr. Paikin, that police are threatening to arrest journalists for doing no more than bearing witness to events that are going on in public places? Does that concern you?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** I'm trying really hard here not to take any political positions on anything—

**Mr. Don Davies:** As a journalist?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** —but yes. I don't say that journalists have any more rights than anybody else, but we don't have any fewer rights than anybody else, and provided that we're not getting in the way of the police doing their business, I'm not sure why.... I understand they're doing their job. We have a job to do. We have a job to do that's actually protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It seemed to me that the journalists I saw that night were doing that job and ought not to have been forced to leave. I've never been forced to leave any other demonstration ever before.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Mr. Paikin, did you have any idea of what he would arrest you for?

**Mr. Steve Paikin:** The conversation, Mr. Davies, did not get that specific.

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

Mr. Stayshyn, we had some information from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association that talked about some reports they received about other peaceful protests being contained by police, with protestors and passers-by held in torrential rain for hours without cause. Was that what happened to you? You were part of what was referred to as the "kettling" process. How long were you held in the rain for, Mr. Stayshyn?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** Almost five hours.

**Mr. Don Davies:** For five hours.

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** Yes. It wasn't just a rain. It was a torrential downpour. I haven't experienced rainstorms like that very often.

**Mr. Don Davies:** How many people, would you estimate, were contained with you in that torrential rain?

• (1730)

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** I'm not sure. I believe over 300. The numbers went down slowly as they were arresting people one by one. There were officers who were walking behind the line. The line would open up, they would come in, grab someone, drag them off, and then the line would close.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Were you arrested at any part in the process?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** No, luckily. I was told that I would be, that everyone in the kettle would be, so I was told to be patient and wait in the rain, shivering. But that didn't happen.

**Mr. Don Davies:** So after five hours of being penned in this.... Was it a caged area?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** We were surrounded by riot police on each side.

**Mr. Don Davies:** So you were penned in by riot police on all sides for five hours in the rain. You then were let go without any charge or arrest or apology.

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** Buses started to come in. An officer came and said: "I'm telling you two things. One, we've got these buses here to get you out of the rain, and the second thing we'll tell you once you're tied up and secured on the buses".

**Mr. Don Davies:** Tell you what, sir?

**Mr. Justin Stayshyn:** He didn't actually clarify. I asked him to. I said, "Historically, when you ask a group of people who are tied up

to go on a bus to travel anywhere, you should probably give it some context".

**Mr. Don Davies:** Just to get an idea of the scope of this—

**The Chair:** Very quickly, Mr. Davies.

**Mr. Don Davies:** Three hundred people kettled, a hundred people in the University of Toronto gym.... Mr. Paikin, I don't know what kind of scope you can give us, but it sounds to me like there were hundred and hundreds and hundreds of Canadian citizens who had their rights, at least on the surface, abused. Does anybody here not think we should have a judicial inquiry into this?

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for posing that question at the end.

We want to thank each one of our guests for appearing today. Thank you especially for coming out and for your testimony. Each one of you has helped us.

Mr. Paikin, you've told us that this was your first time appearing before a committee. I hope you come back some time, perhaps on another issue.

Thank you for being here, Mr. Kirton, Ms. Prokop, Mr. Stayshyn, Mr. Chavarie, and Mr. Lepp.

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>