



**HOUSE OF COMMONS
CANADA**

ISSUES SURROUNDING SECURITY AT THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Public Safety and National Security**

**Kevin Sorenson, MP
Chair**

MARCH 2011

40th PARLIAMENT, 3rd SESSION

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 Standing 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>

**ISSUES SURROUNDING SECURITY AT
THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS**

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Public Safety and National Security**

**Kevin Sorenson, MP
Chair**

MARCH 2011

40th PARLIAMENT, 3rd SESSION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

CHAIR

Kevin Sorenson

VICE-CHAIRS

Mark Holland

Don Davies

MEMBERS

Roger Gaudet

Andrew Kania

Phil McColeman

Rick Norlock

Alexandra Mendes

Ben Lobb

Dave Mackenzie

Maria Mourani

Brent Rathgeber

OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO PARTICIPATED

Brian Storseth

Ed Fast

Paul Calandra

Meili Faille

Randy Hoback

Scott Andrews

Jean-Yves Laforest

Merv Tweed

Joyce Murray

Hon. Navdeep Bains

Robert Vincent

Mike Allen

Sukh Dhaliwal

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Roger Préfontaine

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Parliamentary Information and Research Service

Lyne Casavant, Tanya Dupuis

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

has the honour to present its

NINTH REPORT

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(2), the Committee has studied issues surrounding security at the G8 and G20 summits and has agreed to report the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ISSUES SURROUNDING SECURITY AT THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY	1
1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT	4
2. PLANNING OF THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS	4
2.1 THE CHOICE OF SITES	4
2.2 COSTS	5
2.3 THE SHARING OF SECURITY RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES.....	8
3. TREATMENT OF THE DEMONSTRATORS	9
3.1. ARRESTS, DETENTIONS AND TREATMENT BY THE COURTS.....	14
4. CONCLUSION	20
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS	23
APPENDIX A: LIST OF WITNESSES	27
APPENDIX B: LIST OF BRIEFS	29
APPENDIX C: LETTER FROM THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC SAFETY	31
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT REPOSE	37
DISSENTING OPINION OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA	39
COMPLIMENTARY OPINION OF THE BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS.....	41

ISSUES SURROUNDING SECURITY AT THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS

1. INTRODUCTION

The holding of two summits in a single weekend was a first in Canadian history. It was also the first time that a country attempted to organize the G8 and G20 summits one after the other and in two separate locations. These two major events, held in Huntsville and in Toronto, Ontario on 25, 26 and 27 June 2010, were the occasion for one of the biggest security operations ever on Canadian soil, an operation which required the deployment of just over 20,000 security personnel from all over the country. Summit planning and coordination and management of security operations posed significant challenges for the federal departments and agencies concerned and for the provincial and municipal police services responsible for the security of all participants.

1.1 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

On 6 October 2010, the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (hereafter the Committee) agreed to study the issues surrounding security at the G8 and G20 summits.¹ It should be noted that our Committee was not the only party to take an interest in these issues. Further to complaints filed by demonstrators as well as the many questions raised by the media and citizens, reviews were launched at the provincial and municipal levels and by various oversight bodies, by civil society organizations and international groups.

At the time of drafting this report, the available documents were:

- “Caught in the Act”—Investigation into the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services with respect to Ontario Regulation 233/10, passed under the *Public Works Protection Act* by the Ombudsman of Ontario (December 2010);
- “Breach of the Peace”—*A Citizen’s Inquiry into Policing and Governance at the Toronto G20 Summit* by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the National Union of Public and General Employees (February 2011);
- Support Document for the General Hearing on the Status of Freedom of Expression, Assembly and Association in Canada and the Right to Liberty,

1 In accordance with Standing Order 108(2) of the House of Commons. Committee minutes, 6 October 2010.

Security and Integrity of the Person by the applicants UQAM International Clinic for the Defence of Human Rights, Ligue des droits et libertés, International Federation for Human Rights (October 25, 2010);

- Canadian Government response to request for information from Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Organization of American States following the special hearing on the Situation of the Right to Freedom of Expression, Assembly, Association, and Movement in Canada (31 January 2011);
- Report tabled by the Government of Canada in the House of Commons on 5 November 2010 entitled “G-8 / G-20 Incremental Expenses by Department and Agency (as of October 28, 2010” (Sessional Paper No. 8525-403-27).²

The following studies and reviews were still underway at the time of drafting:

- Review of expenditures for the G8 and G20 summits, by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada;³
- Review by the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD);
- Review by the Special Investigations Unit⁴ (SIU);
- Independent civil investigation by the Toronto Police Services Board;
- Study by the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates on the Effectiveness, Management and Operation of the Expenses Incurred for the G8/G20 Summits;

2 This public report is available on request from the Library of Parliament, Sessional Paper No. 8525-403-27

3 According to the Web site of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, the report is expected in spring 2011.

4 Charges have been laid against police officer Babak Andalib-Goortani under section 267(a) of the *Criminal Code* in the case of demonstrator Adam Nobody. In a news release dated 27 January 2011, the SIU announced that it was reopening the case of Joseph Thomson, who alleges that he was struck in the face by a police officer during the G20. The case of Dorian Barton who sustained injuries during his arrest at the G20 was also reopened by the SIU in January 2011, due to new photographs depicting officers in interaction with Mr. Barton. In March 2011, the SIU announced that it was reopening its investigation into the “custody injuries” sustained by Canute Fernandes at the G20 summit. As a result of additional video imagery, the SIU hopes to determine the events leading to his arrest and injuries. The cases were still open at the time that this report was being prepared.

- Investigation launched by the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP (CPC);
- Independent inquiry by former Chief Justice Roy McMurtry;
- Review by the Summit Management After Action Review Team (SMAART) of the Toronto Police Service;
- Inquiry by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the National Union of Public and General Employees (report released in February 2011).

From 25 October to 6 December 2010, our Committee held five hearings during which it received the evidence of the Minister of Public Safety, representatives of the Privy Council Office (PCO), the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), the Integrated Security Unit (ISU), the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA), the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), the Toronto Police Service (TPS), the Peel Regional Police Force (PRP), the Department of National Defence (DND), the Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario, the University of Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs, the Canadian Youth Business Foundation, the Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan, TVO, the University of Toronto Research Groups on the G20 and G8 summits and demonstrators.⁵

The Committee's mandate was to shed light on the numerous incidents in the public security operations.

Some witnesses mentioned the successes of the summits, while others referred to the failures relating to the public security operations. The Committee heard that the mass arrests and conditions of detention tarnished the image of Canada and of our police forces. Some even said that they had lost confidence in Canadian democratic rights and values.

On the other hand, some witnesses stated that the planning and execution of the summits were "resounding successes."⁶ Appearing before the Committee, the Minister of Public Safety, the Hon. Vic Toews, stated "I think it goes without saying that Canada can be proud of hosting such a massive undertaking when the eyes of the world were upon us."⁷

5 The list of witnesses appearing before the Committee can be found in Appendix A, and the briefs in Appendix B.

6 See for example the testimony of Brigadier-General John Collin, Chief of Staff, Canada Command, Department of National Defence, *Evidence*, 1 December 2010.

7 *Evidence*, 25 October 2010.

This report summarizes the comments heard during these hearings, and also presents our own observations and recommendations.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report consists of two sections, one on the planning of the summits (choice of sites, costs and sharing of security related responsibilities), and the other on the treatment of the demonstrators (arrests, detention and treatment by the courts). Each section contains a series of recommendations designed to ensure that the management of similar events in the future is more effective and transparent.

2. PLANNING OF THE G8 AND G20 SUMMITS

The issues surrounding the planning of the summits, in particular the choice of sites and the costs arising from the two events, sparked lively debate within the Committee. The Committee heard from Alphonse MacNeil, Division Operations Commander 2010 of the G8 and G20 summits, (ISU), who acknowledged that the organization of these summits was not easy. Indeed, preparations began nearly two years before the events were held.

2.1 THE CHOICE OF SITES

Throughout our study, certain witnesses maintained that the decision to hold the summits in two different locations was justifiable. Other witnesses disagreed with this assertion, stating that this decision had led to additional costs. Some pointed out that there were not many places which could suitably host the G20 and G8 summits. The Committee was told that, due to their logistical complexity, G20 summits are usually held in urban locations that can effectively receive a great many participants and also have the infrastructure necessary to accommodate them. The G8 summits, on the other hand, are usually held in rural regions. The Huntsville region was chosen because its perimeter was easier to secure. The Committee heard that neither Toronto nor Huntsville had the necessary infrastructure to host the two summits on their territory.

While security concerns can make one site better than another, the Committee was told that security is only one factor among many. Regarding the choice of sites, the Committee was told that the government had determined the sites based on advice provided by its experts. According to Ward Elcock, Special Advisor, PCO, many federal organizations were involved in making the decision, including security officials, the Senate management office, the Department of Foreign Affairs, and other government departments and agencies.

Although it was impossible to obtain further details from the Government of Canada about the other possible sites and the recommendations made concerning them, the Committee learned that the Canadian National Exhibition (CNE) site in Toronto was not

chosen because of additional human and financial costs that would have been incurred to make that site and the hotel zone for accommodating the delegates secure. The Committee was told that choosing the CNE site as the venue for the summits would have complicated the security operations because it would have been necessary to make all roads leading to the site and the hotel zone secure as well. In the next section, we will see that, according to Jenilee Guebert, Director of Research, G8 and G20 Groups, University of Toronto, Munk School of Global Affairs, the costs of the summits would have been lower, had they been held at one location.⁸

2.2 COSTS

The choice of the sites is of great importance to the Committee because of its consequences for security costs and operations. The organization of international events carries an obligation to ensure an appropriate level of security for all participants as well as the delegates who enjoy international protection. Thus Canada had a duty to provide appropriate police protection for all participants and delegates for the duration of the G8 and G20 summits.

The Minister of Public Safety informed the Committee that 85% of the total budget of the Public Safety portfolio, i.e. \$790.1 million out of \$930 million, was earmarked for summit security. More specifically:

- \$507.5 million for the RCMP to conduct planning and operations related to policing and security at the two summits;
- \$278.3 million for Public Safety to administer the security cost framework policy and reimburse security partners for the incremental and extraordinary security-related costs they incurred;
- \$3.1 million for the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to provide intelligence support related to threats to the national security of Canada, including the G8 and G20 summits;
- \$1.2 million for the Canada Border Services Agency to support activities associated with the provision of incremental border services and critical program support for the G8 and G20 summits.⁹

It should be noted that, in response to a question from Mr. Holland on 25 October 2010, the Minister tabled a letter to the Committee, informing it that \$33 million had been allocated to the RCMP for private security contractors during the summits.¹⁰

8 *Evidence*, 1 December 2010.

9 Hon. Vic Toews, Minister of Public Safety, *Evidence*, 25 October 2010.

The Committee's study pertained more specifically to the planning and implementation of security for the two summits, which is why only the amounts for security operations are indicated in this report. During our study, the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates decided to undertake a study on the effectiveness, administration and activities relating to the expenses for the two summits. The Committee's study includes the analysis of the Government of Canada report entitled G-8/G-20 Incremental Expenses by Department and Agency. That study was still in progress when the present report was adopted.¹¹

The Minister also told the Committee that the security costs were higher than predicted, but necessary given the scope of the security operations. This statement by the Minister was corroborated by Alphonse MacNeil, Division Operations Commander 2010 on the G8 and G20 summits (ISU), who pointed out the necessity of meeting the accommodation and logistics requirements of all security partners:

One of the reasons it was as costly was because of the security requirements for all of our partner agencies. As you can imagine, we had the highest level of security groups in the country in that building. No one was going to come and work there unless the building was at a top secret level. There was a requirement in the construction of that site to put more into it than would normally be put into an ordinary building. It was costly, but that was a part of doing business. We needed everyone together. We needed all of our security partners. Without that site, we wouldn't have had them, and we wouldn't have been able to secure the sites in the manner we did.¹²

The site chosen for the G8 summit did not have existing structures to accommodate over 4,500 police officers. It was therefore necessary to erect temporary premises for the police assigned to the G8 summit in Huntsville. Ms. Jenilee Guebert noted that the Government of Canada incurred additional expenses because of its decision to hold the summits in two different locations. Specifically, she maintained that less money could have been spent to hold the events if the two summits had been held in Toronto.¹³

The Committee agrees with Ms. Guebert's analysis, and finds that the choice by the Government of Canada to select two different locations for the G8 and G20 summits was unnecessary, fiscally imprudent and caused significant resource duplications and cost overruns. Accordingly:

10 The letter from the Minister is in Appendix C. For more information see also question no. 671 from Ms. Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine in the House of Commons on 14 December 2010.

11 For more information, consult the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates website at <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/committeebusiness/CommitteeHome.aspx?Cmte=OGGO&Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=39&Ses=1>

12 *Evidence*, 25 October 2010.

13 *Evidence*, 1 December 2010.

The Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security:

- **Reprimands the government for holding the G8 and G20 summits at two different locations.**
- **Denounces the Government of Canada's lack of control over the cost of the summits, and asks the Government of Canada to develop a strategy to prevent future cost overruns of this magnitude.**
- **Condemns the partisan spending in the Industry Minister's constituency and asks the Government of Canada to develop a strategy to prevent future vote-buying with public funds.**

In order to limit disbursements for the organization of similar events in the future, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 1

That if multiple summits are to be held at the same time in the future, that priority be given, where possible, to holding these meetings in a single location in order to more efficiently use financial and human resources and ensure that costs and infrastructure are not duplicated.

RECOMMENDATION 2

That the Government of Canada undertake a nationwide consultation with the provinces and territories to select locations across the regions where permanent event and security infrastructure can be built for large scale events, such as summits, so that these locations can be reused and to reduce the use of tax dollars on ad hoc infrastructure wherever possible.

The Minister informed the Committee that the costs incurred for the summits will not be known for several months. Security partners such as the OPP, the TPS and the PRP had until 1 December 2010 to submit their claims to the Government of Canada for reimbursement. The Minister told the Committee that these claims will be verified by an auditor to ensure that the services invoiced were in fact provided and were justified under the circumstances.

Some witnesses also noted that the costs might be lower than anticipated. The RCMP informed the Committee that it had used only \$329 million out of its total budget of \$507.5 million to the end of the month of August, and that certain facilities could be sold to recover part of the amount disbursed. The Department of National Defence also noted that only \$20 million out of its initial budget of \$77 million had been spent.

Before the Committee, the Minister noted: “that compared to other countries, Canada has been more transparent on the [projected] cost of security related to the summits”, as noted by the Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) in his June 2010 Report.¹⁴

The Committee has noted this finding, however, it has difficulty understanding the cost overruns disclosed to date for the holding of these summits, and finds it regrettable that the Government of Canada has not yet disclosed to Canadian taxpayers the final costing of these events. In order to ensure a more effective and transparent management of similar events in the future, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 3

That, in advance of a summit or large-scale international event hosted in Canada, the Government of Canada be required to supply Parliament with reasonable cost estimates in a transparent manner and that, following such events, the Government of Canada be required to submit to Parliament the final costing in an expedient manner.

2.3 THE SHARING OF SECURITY RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

There is no doubt that the evidence we heard indicates that security operations for the summits were extremely complex. No one police force on its own was large enough to provide appropriate protection for all the participants and delegates, as well as the sites and their perimeters. It was therefore necessary to divide responsibilities among the various Canadian police services in order to provide for the safety of all the participants and delegates.

Thousands of police officers and troops were deployed by the RCMP, the OPP, the TPS, the PRP, and the DND and many officers were seconded from other municipal and provincial police forces. The security plan that was drawn up also involved the federal departments of Public Safety, National Defence, the Canada Border Services Agency, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), Health Canada, Transport Canada and Industry Canada.

The ISU, designed and directed by Alphonse MacNeil, Chief Superintendent of the RCMP, was responsible among other things for the coordination of summit and perimeter security and for the protection of the Heads of State and the members of their delegations. The ISU was composed of police officers from the RCMP, the OPP, the TPS and the PRP, plus a number of troops. The OPP was responsible for the G-8 area and the TPS was responsible for the G20 summit area and the Eastern Avenue temporary detention centre.

14 The report of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, *Assessment of Planned Security Costs for the 2010 G8 and G20 Summits* can be consulted at this address: <http://www2.parl.gc.ca/Sites/PBO-DPB/Reports.aspx?Language=E>.

The PRP specifically handled security at Toronto's Pearson Airport. The mission of the Canadian Forces was to recognize and communicate any potential threats and to carry out any possible emergency evacuations. The Forces also had to provide for the air transportation of the Heads of State, dignitaries and various police forces. CSIS was responsible for evaluating threats to Canada's national security.

Lastly, the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services was responsible for housing the detained demonstrators and ensuring liaison between the TPS and the Maplehurst and Vanier correctional facilities.¹⁵ Moreover, a budget of \$33 million was allocated to the RCMP for the services of private security firms.

3. TREATMENT OF THE DEMONSTRATORS

The Committee wanted to shed light on what proved to be the largest mass arrest during peacetime in Canadian history. During the G20 summit, police arrested 1,105 individuals. Those arrested included various members of the media, human rights observers or peaceful protesters and passersby who were scooped up off the streets.¹⁶

Throughout our study, several witnesses shared the disturbing security-related experiences that they lived through or observed during the G20 summit. Several also raised many issues regarding how security measures were developed in preparation for the summits. This evidence reminds us that the Government of Canada and agencies involved have lessons to learn from these events and that major changes must be made to the planning and implementation of security measures in keeping with similar events to prevent future violations of citizens' rights.

The Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA) noted that "security efforts, especially after 5:00 p.m. on June 26 and 27, failed to come up to the standard of constitutional commitments."¹⁷ In the view of the CCLA, "[p]olice conduct and actions were at times disproportionate, arbitrary and excessive".¹⁸ This finding was confirmed by numerous witnesses, who noted "a concerted effort by police to terrorize participants".¹⁹ Steve Paikin, anchor and senior editor at TVO, told the Committee that the "police brutality" he witnessed even extended beyond the demonstrators to the journalists who were trying to do their job and assert their rights. According to Mr. Paikin, this behaviour was unnecessary under the circumstances.

15 Steven Small, Assistant Deputy Minister, Adult Institutional Services and Organizational Effectiveness Division, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

16 National Union of Public and General Employees and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, *A Breach of the Peace: A Citizens Inquiry into Policing and Governance at the Toronto G20 Summit*, February 2011.

17 *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

18 *Ibid.*

19 Mike Leitold, Member, Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario, *Evidence*, 1 December 2010.

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.²⁰

The evidence clearly demonstrates that arrests increased after 5 p.m. on 26 June 2010. Mike Leitold, a member of the Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario, told the Committee that over 80 persons were harassed, detained and searched by police officers between 21 June and 26 June 2010. Nevertheless, the significant increase in arrests as of 5 pm. on June 26 remains unexplained. According to observers for the CCLA, there is no doubt that there was a change in attitude on the part of the police. Speaking before the Committee, Nathalie Des Rosiers, General Counsel, for the CCLA wondered whether this change was the result of a directive issued to the police.

In her evidence, Ms. Des Rosiers also drew the Committee's attention to various problems related to the planning of security operations. The following evidence shows that the planning of security measures for summits, like their implementation, was not conducted with respect of citizens' right to freedom of expression. According to Ms. Des Rosiers:

During the G20 and in preparation for it, I think security imperatives redefined fundamental aspects of Toronto life and Canadian life, without much democratic engagement or discussion and without legal authority. Space and mobility were redefined. Weaponry was redefined. Privacy was redefined. Policing and criminal law were redefined. Such redefinitions may have been necessary, we don't know, but they occurred without public input and without some legal framework around them. It's not true that martial law was declared during the weekend of the G20. The price tag is questioned, but is presented as a *fait accompli*. Indeed, it is a major issue for our democracy that the security infrastructure is not only costly, but it appears to be immune from any scrutiny or democratic input.²¹

According to demonstrators, including Ms. Mansour and Ms. Poisson,²² the police nevertheless stated throughout the G20 Summit that martial law was in effect and the demonstrators no longer had any rights. According to Ms. Des Rosiers, the police officers seemed to believe that they were obeying orders or that they had the right to do it. The Association stated that there seemed to be a fundamental problem of understanding the law during that time.²³

In preparation for the summits and without citizens' knowledge, the Ontario legislature passed the security regulation entitled *Public Works Designations* (Regulation 233/10) under the enabling statute, the *Public Works Protection Act*. It should

20 Steve Paikin, Anchor and Senior Editor at TVO, *Evidence*, 6 December 2010.

21 *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

22 *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

23 *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

be noted that the constitutionality of Regulation 233/10, which granted additional powers to peace officers, was studied by Ontario Ombudsman André Marin in his report entitled *Caught in the Act*. In that report he notes that Regulation 233/10, enacted in anticipation of the summits, triggered “unusual, even extravagant police powers that could be—and in fact were—used to intimidate and arrest people who had done no harm.”²⁴

Certain police officers told the Committee that, before the summits, they spent a lot of time with the ISU community relations group in order to meet with the various groups of demonstrators and facilitate their right to demonstrate peacefully. The police seem to have worked with these groups to learn the locations and times of their demonstrations and to ensure an appropriate police presence. Speaking on this matter, Mr. MacNeil also stated that there were a great many peaceful demonstrations before and during the summits.

Although the police demonstrated “instances of commendable and professional conduct”²⁵ before and during the summits, based on the evidence received and the many reports subsequently tabled on this subject, it is indisputable that neither the planning nor the implementation of security measures during the G20 Summit were “carried out in a manner that was respectful of the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly.”²⁶

Before the Committee, Chief Blair tried to explain to members why certain operational decisions were made. He explained that on Friday evening the police learned of a serious public safety threat arising from the demonstrations. A masked group (the “Black Bloc”) dressed in black had formed and had started throwing objects at the police.

“Black bloc” is a tactic that is utilized by groups who normally dress in black. Their faces are covered. They blend in with the crowd, and then at some point they dress in their black outfits, break away, and do what we saw at the G20. The type of damage we saw at the G20 is not unusual for black bloc tactics. Once they're finished doing that, they blend back into the crowd, take off the black outfits, and go back to the clothes they were wearing before. They're very difficult to find because of that.²⁷

Ward Elcock, Special Advisor, PCO, mentioned that the “Black bloc” tactic is thus designed to draw the greatest number of peaceful demonstrators into the violent protest. On Saturday, the Toronto police were confronted by several hundred persons who, according to Chief Blair, had no intention of joining in peaceful, legal demonstrations but whose purpose was to engage in criminal behaviour and penetrate the security perimeter.

24 Report of the Ombudsman of Ontario, *Caught in the Act*, December 2010.

25 Nathalie Des Rosiers, General Counsel, CCLA, *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

26 National Union of Public and General Employees and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, *A Breach of the Peace: A Citizens Inquiry into Policing and Governance at the Toronto G20 Summit*, February 2011, p. 19.

27 Alphonse MacNeil, RCMP Division Operations Commander 2010 on the G8 and G20, *Evidence*, 25 October 2010.

Although they were prevented from entering the security perimeter, these individuals still managed to escape the police and caused damage estimated at over \$2 million dollars in the streets of Toronto. According to the intelligence collected, these individuals intended to continue their criminal activities for the entire weekend. Based on this information, operational decisions were made by the commanders to disperse the crowds of demonstrators in order to prevent a breach of the peace. If they refused, the police were under orders to put them in preventive detention. According to Chief Blair, the police did not intend to lay criminal charges against many of the persons arrested. Detention, which could not exceed 24 hours, was nothing but a preventive measure to place individuals in custody while the peace was truly under threat.²⁸ The Committee heard that even individuals who followed police orders were arrested during this police operation. This information is confirmed in the Ombudsman of Ontario's report.

On Sunday, there were also 70 arrests of demonstrators sleeping in the University of Toronto gymnasium. The Committee was told that they were awoken by police officers brandishing weapons at them, before detaining and arresting them for participating in a riot. One of the witnesses stated:

First, around nine o'clock Sunday morning, tens of police officers entered the University of Toronto gymnasium heavily armed, aggressively shouting to us not to move and pointing their weapons at us. A francophone police officer informed us that we were being charged with participating in a riot. No arrest warrant was presented to us, and I was unable to move, get up, change clothing or go to the bathroom until 2:00 p.m. Police officers circled round us with their rubber bullet rifles. So I was unable to go to the bathroom for approximately six hours.²⁹

Chief Blair told the Committee that, in his opinion, the police officers had reasonable and probable cause to believe that the individuals in the gymnasium had participated in a criminal act.

It is clear to the Committee and based on the evidence received that these operational decisions led to unjustified arrests which violated civil liberties. The Committee deplores the massive arrests during the G20 Summit and agrees with Ms. Des Rosiers' analysis that the provisions of the Criminal Code regarding breaches of the peace were applied abusively in a context of peaceful demonstrations where there was no real threat to the peace. It should also be noted that in October, all of the charges arising from the arrests made in the University of Toronto gymnasium were withdrawn. Chief Blair explained to the Committee that this was because the police officers did not have the

28 Sections 30 and 31 of the *Criminal Code*.

29 Jacinthe Poisson, *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

correct type of warrant. The circumstances of arrest required a Feeney warrant,³⁰ i.e. a warrant for an arrest in a private dwelling.³¹

The Committee finds it difficult to understand why the Toronto Police Force decided to arrest the more than 70 people who were sleeping in the University of Toronto gymnasium rather than arrest the many masked individuals who were in the crowd and were known to police. The police officers told the Committee of the information that the police force had in its possession regarding several violent protestors who used the Black Bloc tactics. The police also had photos of these individuals in action and had information indicating that they had committed or were on the verge of committing indictable offences. In response to the Committee's question about the police's treatment of these two groups, Chief Blair stated:

[T]he decision was made to not try to penetrate that crowd, because it would have created a more dangerous situation. In fact, an operational decision was made by the investigators that a safer place to apprehend people whom they believed were involved in criminal activity was the school gymnasium, away from the crowd. That was a safer thing to do.³²

To the question of whether clear directives were issued by the federal government, the Minister of Public Safety testified that all operational decisions were the responsibility of the police on the ground, and that he had not given any directives. In his words: "I would not have sent any directives of that nature". He also added that "it would be highly inappropriate for me to intervene in a political way in the independence of any policing agency".³³

The same question was asked of Chief Blair, who informed the Committee members that martial law had never been declared by the TPS and he had no contact with the federal government on that subject. "I'm not aware of any direction or instruction, or any comment, that was made by anyone in the federal government as we planned and executed our plans for the safety of the summit."³⁴

The Committee was unable to investigate this question any further. It should be noted on this point that, because of the security partnerships, the incidents often involved more than one police service. As a result of this situation, it is difficult to determine who is ultimately responsible for the security operations management problems that occurred during the summits. Furthermore, the Minister of Public Safety and government witnesses [refused] to identify the person or persons responsible for making the decisions that led to

30 *R. v. Feeney*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 13.

31 *Evidence*, 3 November 2010.

32 *Evidence*, 3 November 2010.

33 *Evidence*, 25 October 2010.

34 *Evidence*, 3 November 2010.

the mass arrests and mass rights violations. The Committee finds that there has been no transparency from the Government of Canada regarding who was responsible for the serious security errors that were made at the G8 and G20 summits.

The Committee deplores the fact that the Minister of Public Safety and government witnesses refused to acknowledge the violation of the rights guaranteed by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (Charter) and to take responsibility for the events that occurred. The Committee therefore recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 4

That the Government of Canada issue a formal and unconditional apology to the thousands of Canadians and visitors to Toronto who had their rights violated during the G20 summit.

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security ask the Public Safety Minister, as the minister responsible for the RCMP and consequently the leadership of the G8/G20 Integrated Security Group, to apologize to the persons arrested illegally during the G20 Summit as a result of the lack of police coordination and supervision regarding human rights before and during the events.

Given that committee testimony plainly demonstrated that there was no clear chain of command in place to effectively handle the complex security requirements of the G8/G20 Summits, and that as a result serious violations of civil liberties occurred, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 6

That the Government of Canada develop a full structure for integrated security operations that can be put in place during large-scale events, such as summits, which will ensure a clear decision-making process is in place and that gross violations of civil liberties are avoided; and should they occur, a clear accountability structure is in place to handle them in an accountable and efficient manner.

3.1. ARRESTS, DETENTIONS AND TREATMENT BY THE COURTS

Throughout our study, witnesses reported troubling experiences at the Eastern Avenue temporary detention centre, at the two correctional centres of the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, and at the courthouse. While in detention, some demonstrators experienced strip-searches, insults and discriminatory comments, and were held for more than 57 hours. Some said that they were handcuffed for more than

15 hours, and were deprived of food or water for more than eight hours. A number of detainees were also denied the right to speak to a lawyer. The Committee was also told that a number of witnesses were denied access to their essential medication, including insulin and anti-depressants. Ms. Poisson mentioned the latter in her evidence:

A number of individuals did not have access to essential medication. In the first cage where I was, one woman asked for her anti-depressants at noon and did not get them until late that night, despite making tens of requests to police officers. In my sister Maryse's cell, one woman was borderline psychotic and told the police officers so when she was arrested. All the detainees in the cell demanded her medication starting early in the afternoon, but the police officers waited until she had a serious episode before dealing with the matter and ultimately taking her to hospital, with her hands and feet cuffed, of course.³⁵

To accommodate persons assigned to the custody of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, two correctional facilities were designated; Maplehurst for the men and Vanier for the women. A third location in Hamilton had also been reserved to receive any surplus detainees. That institution received no detainees during the summits. A plan had also been set up to facilitate procedures for admission to the Maplehurst and Vanier correctional facilities. That plan provided, among other things, for the assignment of additional staff in the event that the number of detainees assigned to the ministry should increase, as well as the assignment of a correctional services officer at the courthouse to facilitate the transfer of detainees between the police services and the correctional services.

Some witnesses said they were humiliated and traumatized by the conditions of detention at the Eastern Avenue temporary detention centre and the Maplehurst and Vanier correctional centres. They said that at the temporary detention centre there were over 25 persons in the cells, which were more like "animal cages". The men, like the women, were obliged to use chemical toilets in front of other detainees and all of the police officers on duty. Others stated that the chemical toilets had no doors. They were not given toilet paper, and said they were forced to wipe themselves with paper lying about on the floor. Certain women also said that they were denied their contraceptive pills. The Committee was told that several of them started menstruating as a result. They had to ask for a fresh sanitary napkin each time they required one, and the soiled sanitary napkins had to be left on the floor as there was no garbage container for them.

Some witnesses repeatedly emphasized that they were cold, hungry and afraid while at the detention centres. Several stated that the air conditioning was on high and that they could not sleep because the lights were on in the cells at all times. Many testified that they had been subjected to personal searches without cause and that their property had been illegally seized by the police. A good many witnesses said that they were forced to

35 *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

undergo more than one strip-search during their detention. The following testimony is from a female demonstrator detained at the Vanier Centre For Women:

The second search was conducted at the Vanier Centre for Women, where we were transferred after more than 40 hours in detention. So I had to completely undress before two female police officers, who seized my bra and shoes. During the second search, there was no door, and a male guard was able to see us. I was asked to turn around, bend over and expose my genitals to the hall.³⁶

In a document provided to the Committee, Steven Small, Assistant Deputy Minister, Adult Institutional Services and Organizational Effectiveness Division, Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services stated that “it is not the practice at the Vanier Centre For Women to strip-search women in front of men”.³⁷

Witness Kevin Gagnon also told the Committee he was vaccinated against his will at the Maplehurst correctional facility. This is what he had to undergo:

When we got to Maplehurst, I was strip-searched twice in an open cubicle, in full view of all my cellmates. They gave me a tuberculosis test, although I had refused. I said that I did not want anyone injecting me with anything. Anyway, I did not understand why I was being formally processed into the prison since I was supposed to go back to the court in the morning. So I refused the test, but they said that they would give me the injection by force if necessary. They also took my orange prison jumpsuit away. I started to get cold again, even though the temperature at Maplehurst was a little better. We had to sleep on a cement floor again. “Sleep” is the wrong word because we only had three hours and we had all been cold from the time we had been on our feet. I did not sleep, anyway.³⁸

In his response to the Committee on 31 December 2010, Mr. Small noted the following:

No, inmates are not vaccinated without their consent nor are inmates in provincial correctional institutions vaccinated upon admission. More specifically, in the Maplehurst Correctional Complex, a registered nurse is assigned to the admitting area to ensure that the health status of all new inmates is assessed and health needs are identified and met in a timely manner. Maplehurst has health care staff on-site and available 24 hours per day, seven days per week. The admission process and staffing remained consistent for signs and symptoms of infectious disease, including and specifically tuberculosis. Further, because jails are considered to be an at risk environment for tuberculosis, enhanced screening, additional to the symptom screen, is offered. This enhanced screening includes offering a Tuberculin Skin Testing (an intradermal injection of Purified Protein Derivative [PPD] or in some cases a chest X-ray. The *Tuberculosis Screening, Prevention and Control Policy and Procedure* attached outlines the procedure for the management of tuberculosis in provincial prisons, including screening for tuberculosis at admission. There is no requirement for inmates to participate or consequence for

36 Jacinthe Poisson, as an individual, *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

37 Document provided to the Committee on 31 December 2010.

38 Kevin Gagnon, as an individual, *Evidence*, 3 November 2010,

refusing to participate in the enhanced screening process. Inmates who decline to participate in the enhanced screening are housed in general population unless they have symptoms of an infectious disease.³⁹

The following excerpts from the evidence present a picture of the discriminatory behaviour toward women, francophones and homosexuals that was displayed by some police officers in relation to arrests, detentions and court appearances, and that was witnessed by many:

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.⁴⁰

As francophones, we were not given access to the same services. Throughout my detention, I encountered no officers who spoke French. I was told that, if I asked to appear in French, I would have to stay in detention longer. One woman who was with me in the cell was from France. She was visiting here and spoke no English. She was unable to see a lawyer who spoke French until about 50 hours later. I sensed that I was being discriminated against on the basis of my language.⁴¹

In addition, the insults and discriminatory comments were hurtful and degrading, particularly toward francophones and women. My sister was called a “fucking Frenchy” and an anarchist. One police officer told all the girls in the cell that he thought we were nothing more than animals. One female police officer repeated to me several times that she was my “babysitter”, treating me in a condescending manner as though I were a child. The last officer who accompanied my sister and me to the court exit told us: “You should have committed your crimes in Quebec”.⁴²

We got a lot of homophobic comments from the police officers, both male and female. They laughed at us, because we were a bunch of guys huddled together. A few hours later, three jumpsuits, the orange prison jumpsuits, arrived for seven people. So we had to take turns wearing them, but no one wanted to take my suit because I was so frozen.⁴³

The Committee heard from demonstrators claiming that their rights, as guaranteed and protected by the Charter, were not respected during their arrests and detentions. Most of the witnesses spent many hours and even several days in detention without being informed of the charges against them. On other occasions, the charge laid against the individual at the time of arrest was inconsistent with the charge before the court. According to the evidence collected, many persons were unable to consult a lawyer within a reasonable time, while others were unable to consult one at all. One witness said that a

39 Documentation provided to the Committee on 31 December 2010.

40 Grayson Lepp, Executive Chair, Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan, *Evidence*, 6 December 2010.

41 Jacinthe Poisson, as an individual, *Evidence*, 27 October 2010.

42 Ibid.

43 Kevin Gagnon, as an individual, *Evidence*, 3 November 2010.

police officer had interfered with the process of consulting his lawyer, once he had finally been allowed to make a telephone call. The following two passages of evidence reveal the magnitude of the situation:

We were not given the right to a phone call or anything. I saw people scratching their arms with the end of a zap-strap in order to write a lawyer's telephone number. We were not yet at 16 hours, and things had come to that.⁴⁴

After being under arrest for 32 hours, I was finally able to speak to a lawyer. When I appeared in front of her and she saw the condition I was in, she started crying. When your lawyer starts crying, it is not a good day. Honestly, I did not know what was going to happen to me. I broke down in tears too; I was in a complete panic.⁴⁵

The Committee was also troubled by the apparent 'staging for the cameras' of arrested individuals. "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."⁴⁶ The Committee also deplores the fact that some 90 TPS officers had removed their name tags, in direct violation of a directive to the contrary from Chief of Police William Blair.

The Committee has difficulty understanding why a number of questions still remain unanswered:

- What was the RCMP's level of involvement in the abuses noted during the crackdown on the G-20 protests?
- What was the federal government's level of involvement in decisions concerning both the organization of the summit and crowd control?
- Why did the police disperse a crowd of peaceful demonstrators?
- Why were the police not where the vandals were?
- Why did police detain protestors, journalists and innocent bystanders on the street by the process of 'kettling'?

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

46 Grayson Lepp, Executive Chair, Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan, *Evidence*, 6 December 2010.

These issues and many others would benefit from a public inquiry. The Committee therefore recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 7

That the Government of Canada convene a full judicial, independent public inquiry to investigate the security at the G8/G20 summits, with sufficiently broad terms of reference to allow it to investigate all levels of government, all decision making processes and all the events that occurred that led to property damage, civil rights violations, and bodily harm, and with the power to make recommendations stemming from its findings to ensure similar events are never repeated in Canada.

RECOMMENDATION 8

That this independent public inquiry investigates the following issues in particular:

- **The RCMP's level of involvement in the abuses noted during the crackdown on G20 protests;**
- **The flow of information between the police officers on the ground, RCMP officials and the Minister;**
- **The federal government's level of involvement in decisions concerning both the organization of the summit and crowd control (conditions at the time of funding);**
- **The treatment in all detention centres of persons arrested during the G20 Summit, specifically with regard to the following: strip searches; access to legal representation; access to medical and psychological care; injections or medical tests administered without consent; food and water and how often they were distributed; room temperature; access to proper sleeping facilities; harsh and constant lighting; and the homophobic, sexist, racist or anti-Francophone behaviour of some guards;**
- **The existence of sufficient evidence to justify the decision to arrest individually and collectively the people in the University of Toronto gymnasium on the morning of June 27.**

RECOMMENDATION 9

That the Government of Canada should make compensation available to businesses in Toronto for loss of income that can be directly attributed to the mishandling of G20 security.

RECOMMENDATION 10

That the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security congratulate the Ontario Ombudsman on the quality and accuracy of his report, which focused on such details as misuse of “war measure” legislation—*Public Works Protection Act*—in the present-day context of G20 demonstrations; confusion on the part of the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services regarding powers of arrest, which led police to mistakenly believe they had certain powers; miscommunication by the Toronto Police Service in its dealings with partners and the public regarding Regulation 233/10, passed under the *Public Works Protection Act*; lack of cooperation by the Toronto Police Service in the Ontario ombudsman’s investigation; no public announcement of the Regulation; no notices to other interested parties; and the ensuing human rights violations.

RECOMMENDATION 11

That the Minister of Public Safety table a bill concerning the organization of similar events to ensure the federal government makes all security funding dependent on respect for basic rights.

RECOMMENDATION 12

That the Minister of Public Safety ensure that, during future events of this nature, being Francophone will never again be a disadvantage in terms of the right to free assembly or respect for basic rights following an arrest or the laying of charges.

4. CONCLUSION

The objectives of the G8 and G20 summits were to protect and strengthen the economic recovery, to reform the financial sector and to address numerous planetary issues. During the hearings, many representatives of the police services and the federal government noted that the summits were a great success and we should take pride in the work that was done.

In light of the evidence heard, there is no question, that errors in the planning of these events, especially its security operations, contributed to violations of the rights of many protestors during the summits.

The Committee therefore considers that a public inquiry is necessary in order to shed light on these incidents. The Committee hopes that the citizens whose rights were not respected will be able to find hope in the recommendations made by our Committee to ensure that similar events never happen again in Canada.

Furthermore, given the large cost overruns, lack of transparency and partisan spending, the Committee implores the Government of Canada to implement the Committee's recommendations that will ensure future summits respect taxpayers and provide clear information on costs.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1

THAT IF MULTIPLE SUMMITS ARE TO BE HELD AT THE SAME TIME IN THE FUTURE, THAT PRIORITY BE GIVEN, WHERE POSSIBLE, TO HOLDING THESE MEETINGS IN A SINGLE LOCATION IN ORDER TO MORE EFFICIENTLY USE FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES AND ENSURE THAT COSTS AND INFRASTRUCTURE ARE NOT DUPLICATED..... 7

RECOMMENDATION 2

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA UNDERTAKE A NATIONWIDE CONSULTATION WITH THE PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES TO SELECT LOCATIONS ACROSS THE REGIONS WHERE PERMANENT EVENT AND SECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE BUILT FOR LARGE SCALE EVENTS, SUCH AS SUMMITS, SO THAT THESE LOCATIONS CAN BE REUSED AND TO REDUCE THE USE OF TAX DOLLARS ON AD HOC INFRASTRUCTURE WHEREVER POSSIBLE. 7

RECOMMENDATION 3

THAT, IN ADVANCE OF A SUMMIT OR LARGE-SCALE INTERNATIONAL EVENT HOSTED IN CANADA, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA BE REQUIRED TO SUPPLY PARLIAMENT WITH REASONABLE COST ESTIMATES IN A TRANSPARENT MANNER AND THAT, FOLLOWING SUCH EVENTS, THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT TO PARLIAMENT THE FINAL COSTING IN AN EXPEDIENT MANNER..... 8

RECOMMENDATION 4

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA ISSUE A FORMAL AND UNCONDITIONAL APOLOGY TO THE THOUSANDS OF CANADIANS AND VISITORS TO TORONTO WHO HAD THEIR RIGHTS VIOLATED DURING THE G20 SUMMIT. 14

RECOMMENDATION 5

THAT THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY ASK THE PUBLIC SAFETY MINISTER, AS THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RCMP AND CONSEQUENTLY THE LEADERSHIP OF THE G-8/G-20 INTEGRATED SECURITY GROUP, TO APOLOGIZE TO THE PERSONS ARRESTED ILLEGALLY DURING THE G20 SUMMIT AS A RESULT OF THE LACK OF POLICE COORDINATION AND SUPERVISION REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS BEFORE AND DURING THE EVENTS. 14

RECOMMENDATION 6

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA DEVELOP A FULL STRUCTURE FOR INTEGRATED SECURITY OPERATIONS THAT CAN BE PUT IN PLACE DURING LARGE-SCALE EVENTS, SUCH AS SUMMITS, WHICH WILL ENSURE A CLEAR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IS IN PLACE AND THAT GROSS VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL LIBERTIES ARE AVOIDED; AND SHOULD THEY OCCUR, A CLEAR ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURE IS IN PLACE TO HANDLE THEM IN AN ACCOUNTABLE AND EFFICIENT MANNER. 14

RECOMMENDATION 7

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA CONVENE A FULL JUDICIAL, INDEPENDENT PUBLIC INQUIRY TO INVESTIGATE THE SECURITY AT THE G8/G20 SUMMITS, WITH SUFFICIENTLY BROAD TERMS OF REFERENCE TO ALLOW IT TO INVESTIGATE ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, ALL DECISION MAKING PROCESSES AND ALL THE EVENTS THAT OCCURRED THAT LED TO PROPERTY DAMAGE, CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, AND BODILY HARM, AND WITH THE POWER TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS STEMMING FROM ITS FINDINGS TO ENSURE SIMILAR EVENTS ARE NEVER REPEATED IN CANADA. 19

RECOMMENDATION 8

THAT THIS INDEPENDENT PUBLIC INQUIRY INVESTIGATES THE FOLLOWING ISSUES IN PARTICULAR:

- THE RCMP'S LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE ABUSES NOTED DURING THE CRACKDOWN ON G20 PROTESTS;..... 19
- THE FLOW OF INFORMATION BETWEEN THE POLICE OFFICERS ON THE GROUND, RCMP OFFICIALS AND THE MINISTER;..... 19
- THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN DECISIONS CONCERNING BOTH THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SUMMIT AND CROWD CONTROL (CONDITIONS AT THE TIME OF FUNDING);..... 19
- THE TREATMENT IN ALL DETENTION CENTRES OF PERSONS ARRESTED DURING THE G20 SUMMIT, SPECIFICALLY WITH REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING: STRIP SEARCHES; ACCESS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION; ACCESS TO MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CARE; INJECTIONS OR MEDICAL TESTS ADMINISTERED WITHOUT CONSENT; FOOD AND WATER AND HOW OFTEN THEY WERE DISTRIBUTED; ROOM TEMPERATURE; ACCESS TO PROPER SLEEPING FACILITIES; HARSH AND CONSTANT LIGHTING; AND THE HOMOPHOBIC, SEXIST, RACIST OR ANTI-FRANCOPHONE BEHAVIOUR OF SOME GUARDS;..... 19
- THE EXISTENCE OF SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO JUSTIFY THE DECISION TO ARREST INDIVIDUALLY AND COLLECTIVELY THE PEOPLE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO GYMNASIUM ON THE MORNING OF JUNE 27..... 19

RECOMMENDATION 9

THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA SHOULD MAKE COMPENSATION AVAILABLE TO BUSINESSES IN TORONTO FOR LOSS OF INCOME THAT CAN BE DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO THE MISHANDLING OF G20 SECURITY. 20

RECOMMENDATION 10

THAT THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY CONGRATULATE THE ONTARIO OMBUDSMAN ON THE QUALITY AND ACCURACY OF HIS REPORT, WHICH FOCUSED ON SUCH DETAILS AS MISUSE OF “WAR MEASURE” LEGISLATION—*PUBLIC WORKS PROTECTION ACT*—IN THE PRESENT-DAY CONTEXT OF G20 DEMONSTRATIONS; CONFUSION ON THE PART OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES REGARDING POWERS OF ARREST, WHICH LED POLICE TO MISTAKENLY BELIEVE THEY HAD CERTAIN POWERS; MISCOMMUNICATION BY THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE IN ITS DEALINGS WITH PARTNERS AND THE PUBLIC REGARDING REGULATION 233/10, PASSED UNDER THE *PUBLIC WORKS PROTECTION ACT*; LACK OF COOPERATION BY THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE IN THE ONTARIO OMBUDSMAN’S INVESTIGATION; NO PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE REGULATION; NO NOTICES TO OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES; AND THE ENSUING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS. 20

RECOMMENDATION 11

THAT THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC SAFETY TABLE A BILL CONCERNING THE ORGANIZATION OF SIMILAR EVENTS TO ENSURE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAKES ALL SECURITY FUNDING DEPENDENT ON RESPECT FOR BASIC RIGHTS..... 20

RECOMMENDATION 12

THAT THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC SAFETY ENSURE THAT, DURING FUTURE EVENTS OF THIS NATURE, BEING FRANCOPHONE WILL NEVER AGAIN BE A DISADVANTAGE IN TERMS OF THE RIGHT TO FREE ASSEMBLY OR RESPECT FOR BASIC RIGHTS FOLLOWING AN ARREST OR THE LAYING OF CHARGES. 20

APPENDIX A LIST OF WITNESSES

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
<p>House of Commons Vic Toews, Minister of Public Safety</p>	2010/10/25	35
<p>Privy Council Office Ward P.D. Elcock, Special Advisor Marie-Lucie Morin, National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister and Associate Secretary to the Cabinet</p>		
<p>Royal Canadian Mounted Police Alphonse MacNeil, Division Operations Commander 2010 of the G8 and G20, Integrated Security Unit</p>		
<p>As an individual Wissam Mansour</p>	2010/10/27	36
<p>As an individual Jacinthe Poisson</p>		
<p>Canadian Civil Liberties Association Nathalie Des Rosiers, General Counsel Graeme Norton, Director, Public Safety Program</p>		
<p>Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services Steven F. Small, Assistant Deputy Minister, Adult Institutional Services and Organizational Effectiveness Division</p>		
<p>As an individual Kevin Gagnon</p>	2010/11/03	38
<p>Ontario Provincial Police Larry Beechey, Deputy Commissioner, Traffic Safety and Operational Support</p>		
<p>Toronto Police Service William Blair, Chief Gary Giroux, Detective Sergeant, Toronto Police G20 Investigative Team</p>		
<p>Department of National Defence John Collin, Chief of Staff, Canada Command</p>	2010/12/01	44
<p>Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario Mike Leitold, Member</p>		

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Peel Regional Police		
Brian Adams, Superintendent		
University of Toronto, Munk School of Global Affairs		
Jenilee Guebert, Director of Research, G8 and G20 Groups		
As an individual	2010/12/06	45
Justin Stayshyn		
Canadian Youth Business Foundation		
Vivian Prokop, Chief Executive Officer		
Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan		
Kirk Chavarie, External Coordinator		
Grayson Lepp, Executive Chair		
TVO		
Steve Paikin, Anchor and Senior Editor		
University of Toronto		
John Kirton, Co-director of the G20 Research Group and Director of the G8 Research Group		

APPENDIX B LIST OF BRIEFS

Organizations and individuals

McMurray, Susan

Amnesty International

Canadian Civil Liberties Association

Movement Defence Committee of the Law Union of Ontario

Peel Regional Police

Student Union of the University of British Columbia Okanagan

APPENDIX C

Minister of Public Safety



Ministre de la Sécurité publique

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0P8

DEC 03 2010

Mr. Kevin Sorenson, M.P.
Chair
Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security
Sixth Floor, 131 Queen Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Dear Mr. Sorenson:

On October 25, 2010, Chief Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil, Division Operations Commander of the G8 and G20, Integrated Security Unit, of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, appeared before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security to discuss issues surrounding security at the G8 and G20 Summits.

The Committee members requested additional information, which is provided in both official languages in the enclosed document.

I trust that this information is satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Vic Toews".

Vic Toews, P.C., Q.C., M.P.

Enclosures: (3)

**Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU)
October 25, 2010**

Mr. Mark Holland: Just to be clear, I don't want you today to go through a roll call. It's been four months of an archeological expedition to try to get these receipts pulled out of the ground. All I'm saying is open it up. Let us see how this thing got to the price tag it's at. What really concerns me about it is there is a defence of it, saying this is what the cost is. We keep hearing that.

I have two questions, and then I will turn it over to Mr. Kania.

One, can you provide a breakdown of these costs, not just isolated one-offs that I'm talking about here, but anything you are not waiting for a bill for? I don't know what you'd be waiting for a bill for anyway.

The second comment is, how do you feel about those costs? Is this the new bar? Should we expect that every time Canada hosts the G-20, unlike every other country that hosts the G-20, these are the kinds of costs we should expect? Is this a new bar Canadians should expect going forward?

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: Thank you.

I can answer the question, actually. The RCMP cost in this particular summit was \$507 million. I will just explain as quickly as I can how we come to that cost.

If you picture, as I said earlier, all the sites, there are 40 sites involved in the G-8 and the G-20. What we do is send an operational team out to each site. They go to the site, they assess the site, and they do what's called a vulnerability risk assessment on the site. They come back to me and to our planning team and they say, this is what it's going to take to secure that site: x number of police officers, x amount of equipment. We take that amount and scrutinize it. We go over it and ask if it can be done for less, because we are, obviously, concerned with costs, but we're also concerned that—

Mr. Mark Holland: I don't mean to interrupt, but because time is limited, can you provide the costs?

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: Yes, I can.

RESPONSE

Please find attached a table listing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police costs for the G8 and G20 Summits.

DEPARTMENT / MINISTÈRE Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmes royaux du Canada		04-G20					
Subject / Sujet: Total amount / Montant total :		\$208,760,000					
Date:		28 Sep-10					
1	RCMP Personnel Costs including pay, overtime and Employee Benefit (PNC - CBP (PNC) / Coûts relatifs au personnel de la GRC, y compris salaires, heures supplémentaires et Régime de prestation aux employés - RPE	\$162,760,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux	Forecasted personnel costs of which \$70.2 million has already been expended. The amount shown will include a contingency and final costs may be less than the amount.	Montant prévu relatif au personnel, dont 70.2 M\$ ont déjà été dépensés. Le montant indiqué comprend une réserve pour éventualités et les coûts finaux pourraient être inférieurs à ce montant.
2	Petrol Agency Costs / Coûts relatifs aux organismes pétroliers	\$11,000,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux	Forecasted expenditures. Less than \$0.5 million in partner agency invoices have been received and processed to date. Upon receipt of partner invoices, an extensive validation process is required to ensure the amounts claimed are in accordance with the MOU.	Dépenses prévues. À ce jour, les factures transmises par les organismes partenaires et salaires ont totalisé moins de 0.5 M\$. Sur réception d'une facture d'un organisme partenaire, un processus de validation approfondi est exigé pour s'assurer que les montants réclamés sont conformes au PE applicable.
3	Temporary Accommodation Costs / Coûts d'hébergement temporaire	\$25,200,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
4	Partner Security Costs / Coûts relatifs à la sécurité des partenaires	\$15,100,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
5	Mobile Radio and other IT Requirements / Radios mobiles et autres exigences de TI	\$15,400,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
6	Contract Centers and Real Property / Centres de commandement et biens immobiliers	\$20,000,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
7	Meals, Travel and Fleet Requirements / Repas, déplacements et exigences liés au parc de véhicules	\$40,000,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
8	Private Security Firms / Entreprises de sécurité privées	\$30,000,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
9	Specialized Equipment / Matériel spécialisé	\$17,860,000	Yes / Oui	Yes / Oui	Both / Les deux		
GRAND TOTAL / TOTAL GÉNÉRAL		\$208,760,000	Total Current Forecast of RCMP costs / Prévission actuelle totale des coûts de la GRC				
TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS / NOMBRE TOTAL DE DOCUMENTS							

** The table reports on the RCMP's full forecast to the actual costs to be incurred with the respect to the 04/G20 (\$208,760,000) whether it was a direct expenditure (e.g. salaries) or a cost incurred under a contract (e.g. by PWOSC on the RCMP's behalf) or a direct purchase by the RCMP.

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU)
October 25, 2010

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: If I may, I would like to refer to a document from Toronto that talks about the prisoner processing centre. I asked the question, how was the centre designed during the course of our planning? It was a collaborative effort involving both uniform and civilian members of the Toronto Police Service, from areas such as divisional policing, the courts, and investigative and facilities management. The design and concept were based on Toronto Police Service policies and procedures, legal analysis, and current and previous best practices in the design by the design architect. With all of those people involved, I'm sure there were systems in place to deal with the people who were arrested. The specific questions and the things you've brought up before will have to be brought to the people in charge.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: All right, thank you. Could we have—

The Chair: Very quickly, Madam Mourani.

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Could this document be tabled with the committee?

The Chair: I'm not sure if that's a public document. Is it a public document?

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: Right now it's simply an e-mail that I received. I asked the Toronto Police Service for it.

The Chair: All right. But is it something that you'd be willing to submit?

Mrs. Maria Mourani: Could we obtain it?

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: Yes.

RESPONSE

Please find attached a copy of the requested e-mail.

Date: 10/20/2010 7:53 PM

To: Alphonse MacNeil
Fr: Tom.Russell@torontopolice.on.ca

Re: Prisoner Processing Center

Hi Phonse

The PPC design was a collaborative effort involving both uniform and civilian members of the TPS from areas such as divisional policing, courts, investigative and Facilities management.

The design and concept of operations was based on TPS policies and procedures, legal analysis, current and previous best practices as identified by design architects and the physical constraints of the facility secured for this purpose.

The coordinated effort was overseen by members of the G20 Planning Team "Investigative section"

Tom

----- Original Message -----

From: "Alphonse MacNeil" [Alphonse.MacNeil@rcmp-grc.gc.ca]
Sent: 10/20/2010 04:03 PM AST
To: Thomas Russell
Subject: Prisoner Processing Center

Hi Tom,

Can you tell me who designed the PPC. Was it taken from another jail model etc?

Thank you,
Phonse

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (SECU)
October 25, 2010

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to all the witnesses for your attendance here today and for the good job you do in protecting Canadians. I'm always concerned when members opposite are overly critical of security and police forces, especially in a difficult time like policing the G-8 and G-20. So I join with my friend Mr. Lobb and the members on this side of the table in commending primarily Superintendent MacNeil, because he was the operations director of this operation, and all of the men and women under his command and from the other forces that were coordinated in that effort. I know it was a difficult job and I think he ought to be commended for his efforts.

I have a couple of questions. My friends on the opposite side of the table frequently find individuals who claim to have been aggrieved by some of those operations and the tactics of some of those people who may have been under your charge. But I suspect they were not under your charge, given the jurisdictional realities of that operation.

Superintendent MacNeil, are you aware of any complaints against members of the RCMP? Are there any files pending before the RCMP complaints commission?

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: I'm not aware of anything specific, but I don't want to say that I'm absolutely not aware. I'm just not aware, but I don't know if there is anything.

Mr. Brent Rathgeber: I know it may not be a complete answer, but to your knowledge, are you aware of any? I'm not aware of any.

C/Supt Alphonse MacNeil: To the best of my knowledge, I'm not aware of any.

RESPONSE

In his testimony, Chief Superintendent MacNeil, in response to a question, accurately stated that he is not aware of any complaints about Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) member conduct at the G8-G20. However, the Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP has received 28 complaints related to the G8 and G20 Summits, although 24 do not specifically relate to individual members of the RCMP.

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this Report.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings ([Meetings Nos. 32, 35, 36, 38, 44, 45, 60, 61 and 62](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Sorenson, MP

Chair

DISSENTING OPINION OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA

Conservative Members of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security must vigorously disagree with the conclusions drawn in this extremely biased report.

Over the last several months, this Committee has met to discuss the important issue of security provided for the unprecedented undertaking of back-to-back G-8 and G-20 Summits in Ontario.

Conservative Members agree that this is an important issue, worthy of study. However, it is clear that the Opposition Coalition is not of the same view. Instead of working towards a balanced and fulsome report, the Coalition blocked fact-based contributions at every turn. Furthermore, they even went so far as to force irresponsible recommendations that were not even supported by a single piece of evidence heard by the Committee.

Rather than focussing on the important issues of security, the Opposition Coalition focussed on impugning the good work done by Canadian law enforcement officers.

This Committee was tasked with undertaking an in-depth analysis of the security provided at the summit. Instead, the Opposition Coalition transformed Committee proceedings into a tribunal to pass judgement on the actions of police officers. As was stated numerous times, Conservative Members believe the appropriate bodies for complaints against police are far better equipped to adjudicate these matters than a Parliamentary Committee.

As well, it must be noted that throughout the majority report, there are reference to dishonest claims by the Government about the cost of the summits. We believe the Government has been transparent in disclosing the cost. In fact, no other Government has disclosed costs of summits in a similar level of detail.

Conservative Members also take issue with the argument that the cost was excessive. The fact of the matter is that the bulk of the costs were related to security. The Government has been clear about what those costs are, and the RCMP has repeatedly indicated that they will be coming in under budget. It is patently false to state otherwise.

Conservative Members of this Committee believe that this summit was an unmitigated success. The irresponsible and inaccurate recommendations contained within this report are not a result of thorough analysis, but merely an attempt by the Opposition Coalition to score political points at the expense of Canadian law enforcement officers.

Bloc Québécois Supplementary Opinion

What about the next time?

Report

The Bloc Québécois does not in any way disagree with this report, which highlights the problems with the organization of the G20 summit in Toronto, particularly in terms of security, and the unacceptable violations of the basic rights of hundreds of peaceful protestors.

For that reason, we were expecting the committee to take the Toronto chief of police to task for making comments before the Committee that effectively tarnished the reputation of the people who were unlawfully arrested in the University of Toronto gymnasium the morning of June 27, 2010, when all charges against them were dropped.

To conclude, because these key players refuse to take responsibility for their part in this fiasco, we fear that there could be a repeat of this type of over-the-top action.

