

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT TRANSLATION FROM THE CART CAPTIONER'S OUTPUT FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. TO DO SO IS AN EXTRA FEE. THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE ELSE UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU; FINALLY, THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW.

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*

>>CART PROVIDER: On standby. ¶

>> Oh it might be. [general hum of conversation in the background]

>> Hello everyone, good afternoon. I would really love to see more people up helping themselves, have something to eat before we start, because we would really like to start right at 5:30. So hello Roy, how are you? [LAUGHTER] Yeah so please help yourselves and feel free to do that through the course of the evening, but it's nice to get that now. Thank you. Sorry, I forgot, I forgot. [LAUGHTER]

>>CART PROVIDER: On standby.

>> Check, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, okay, perfect, no problem.

>>CART PROVIDER: On standby.

>> Okay. Good evening everyone, welcome. Welcome to the first in 18 public consultations across the Province of the Independent Police Oversight Review, so you're the lucky ones, you are the first. What I want to do before we get started actually, if you don't mind, could I ask everyone to move up so that we can fill the front of the room, please? I know you're eating, but I really would appreciate it if we could fill the tables at the front of the room. You can stay in groups of four if you like, but I just like to see, there's a lovely table there with a gentlemen and a baby that could be filled right over there. Thank you. So while you are doing that I will introduce myself very briefly, my name is Pamela Grant. I am the strategic advisor and facilitator for the review and I will be tonight the timekeeper and um nudger to make sure that we respectfully take note of everyone's busy time schedule and finish at 8 o'clock sharp. So I'm hoping you'll all work with me to achieve that goal. What I'd like to do first, without further ado actually is to introduce Justice Michael Tulloch to give opening remarks, Justice Tulloch is the leader of this review, um he will be responsible for listening to you with his team and putting in a report with recommendations at the end of March, next year. So please tell us what you think, we really want to hear what you think and without further ado, Justice Tulloch. [APPLAUSE]

>>Justice Michael Tulloch: Good evening to everyone, as you heard my name is Michael Tulloch, to the organizers, the Jamaican Canadian association, thank you for allowing me and my team to begin our public consultations here with you today. It is a personal honor for me to be here. The JC is an important cultural institution in the black community, it has played a critical role in the wider community in police oversight and human rights. It is the reason why we felt it was important to hold our first public meeting here, to recognize the contributions that the JCA has made in our presence we have one of the founders of the JCA, Mr. Rory Williams and we acknowledge you and thank you for coming. [APPLAUSE] I also want to thank the President, Adoma [Name?] Patterson for opening up the space to us to have this important discussion. It is a privilege to be here also next to the JCA is a very important church, the Apostle Church of Toronto and we have the senior pastor and an assistant Pastor, Elder, Dr. Collin and Elroyd, thank you both for joining us. [APPLAUSE] I'd also like to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional indigenous lands of the Mississauga, by acknowledging this we're acknowledging the importance and significance of the traditions of indigenous peoples. As many of you have known I have been involved with these issues for quite some time. I know and recognize many of you in the audience from the important work that a lot of us have done together over the years. Prior to 1981 there was no independence civilian oversight in Ontario. After a series of reports on civilian oversight the Office of the Public Complaints Committee and a Police Complaints Board was created to establish public complaints against police officers. In 1988, after the shooting of Lester and Michael Wade, the public demanded greater police oversight. The JCA worked alongside the then newly formed black action defense committee or BADC as it is known, led by Charles Roach, and Lenox Farrell, in calling for establishment of civilian agency that would oversee and investigate police conduct. This would eventually become the SIU. In 1990, under Part 6 of the Police Services Act a Provincial system for police complaints was created based on former Toronto Office of Public Complaints Commissioner and Police Complaint Board. They had power to refer complaints before an independent board of inquiry. In 1997 the commissioner along with the board of inquiry was abolished. In 2005 the Office of Independent Police Review Director or OIPRD was established following an extensive report by retired Patrick, his primary recommendation was creation of independent civilian body to administer the police complaint system in Ontario. Although these bodies were established to enhance the oversight system, the public remains concerned that the current police oversight system needs strengthening. This is why we're here tonight and we will be conducting 17 more public meetings over the next few months. I want to hear from you. I want to know how you'd like to see the system improved and what can be done to improve accountability and transparency. I'm confident that I will be able to make recommendations that will reflect what I, what I feel will be an important task. I believe that I will be hearing a lot of your concerns during the course of this process. Just a little about me, I'm a judge with Ontario Court of Appeal, prior to that I was a judge with Ontario Superior Court before that I was an attorney and criminal defense lawyer. It's part of earlier review by Ontario government, review of civilian oversight on placing, that was in 1996. On April 29th, 2016 I was appointed to be the independent reviewer of this review. I along with a diverse and expert team of lawyers, community workers, and police personnel will be reviewing the police oversight bodies in the Province and will recommend ways to enhance their transparency, accountability and effective, and efficacy. Is important to confirm for everyone, that I'm here to listen and hear what you have to say about police accountability. Police oversight ensures that Police Services and their officers do not abuse their positions, trust and power. It is also intended to maintain public confidence in police. The review that I'm conducting is an independent review. This means that I'm free to critically examine how these

oversight bodies operate. I will report on my findings and provide recommendations to the Ontario government on how police oversight bodies in Ontario can be improved to operate more effectively. Meeting with you, members of the public, is a crucial part of my review process. I am so very grateful that you have taken the time to meet with us today. I appreciate that many of you have taken time from your work and from your family commitments to be here. I also appreciate speaking about these things may be difficult for some of you. I want to ensure you that we will listen with great interest to your stories, we want to understand and learn from your experiences. We know that you are uniquely positioned to provide us with meaningful insight into how the system can be improved. It is essential that a review of this kind be as thorough as possible. And that as the independent reviewer, I consider all relevant information from a variety of perspectives. And I will, so long as you participate and offer me your perspective. I must clarify, we will not revisit any past judgments nor investigate any current or individual cases. By March 31, 2017 my report will be submitted to the government and to the public at large. My hope is that the report will be supported by most, if not all, of the people involved in this process. I'm encouraged by the government's commitment to strengthening police oversight systems and I'm confident that recommendations that I will make will be acted on and will lead to positive changes in Ontario's police oversight systems. This review should also contribute to public education and to a greater understanding of the many issues involved with police oversight. So again I thank you for coming out today to share your thoughts, experiences, and recommendations and I assure you that this process, that in this process you will be heard. We do have a presentation and I think Pam is going to introduce -- okay so we have with us Danielle Dowdy [Name?] one of the team members with us. She is an expert in police and community issues and she will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation which gives you contextual overview of what we're doing and outlines how we are going to be proceeding tonight. I want to introduce my team, besides Danielle is Jamie, Jamie is a lawyer with a lot of years' experience. And she has been, one of our senior council from our team and beside Jamie is another council, Danielle Robiti and Danielle she is a criminal law specialist and has been dealing with these issues for years. So those are two of the individuals I want to introduce for now. Thanks very much. [APPLAUSE]

>> Danielle: Good evening everyone, good evening, thank you for coming. We're so happy to have you here and thank you so much for taking the time to come out today, oh sorry. Let me just grab this. So I'm just going to give a really quick overview of what this evening is going to be about. Our expectations of you and the agenda and that's it. So why are we here? We're here to discuss police oversight. Some of the things in this presentation is going to involve the order and council, police oversight bodies, we're going to review our time lines, our agenda, do some quick housekeeping items and also don't forget about social media. So why are we here? There's been many issues with the public feeling that you don't have confidence or trust in our oversight systems and the government struck this task force so that we could have a critical look at the oversight bodies and how they can be improved repeatedly you hear about issues on accountability or transparency. There is a significant public interest in this matter and now is a perfect time for us to look at this and see how we can improve the system going forward. So the government, after the review was struck, issued an Order in Council and Order in Council is basically a legal document that outlines our mandate. So you'll see from our mandate that what we'll be looking at is looking at how we enhance transparency and accountability. We will be looking at if there is um overlap, we will be looking at are the mandates of these bodies effective, some really important questions that we've seen in the media and we have seen in different communities circles like the discussion around should SIU reports be released, if they are released what would that look like, should

the names of officers under investigation be released? Should there be, should SIU or any of the investigative bodies be collecting demographic information like race or gender or age of people that are, that are involved in an investigation. Another question is should former police officers like retired police officers be investigators in a case. So these are all things that we're looking to get answers on and we want to hear from you, so we're really glad that you are here today so we can get your feedback on these matters and other matters as well. The Order in Council is actually at the back table, so if you didn't have a chance to grab one, they are just at the back of the room on the table with all the materials there. In terms of civilian oversight the three bodies that we will be analyzing and discussing this evening is special investigations unit also known as SIU, the mandate of the SIU is to investigate incidents involving police officers and civilians that have resulted in serious injury or death and also sexual assaults. The office of the independent review director, that's the OIPRD, they are the body that reviews and manages all police complaints, so we look at complaints and conduct and also at policies and systemic issues. And the Ontario Civilian Police Commission, the OCPC is an adjudicated body so they conduct hearings on matters of placing, disciplinary decisions or budget disputes between boards and services and so forth. So these are the three bodies that we have been tasked with reviewing and these are the three agencies that we're going to ask that in your discussions you discuss this evening. It's really important to note that as Justice Tulloch mentioned we will not be looking at individual cases, we will not be reopening past cases. But it is important to hear those stories or the experiences that you may have, it is important for us at the review for context and historical context um to hear these stories but we just want to be clear that we won't be actually assessing or reviewing or opening any of those past cases. Just in terms of time lines, for your information, the Justice Tulloch was appointed in April, at the end of April of this year and so from June to September we conducted a lot of stakeholder meetings with law enforcement agencies and community groups and legal groups and many people just one-on-one private meetings, stakeholder consultations. So from September to November we will now be doing public consultations where we are going to be traveling across the Province, we have 18 public meetings set up from Thunder Bay to Windsor, right across, between November and March we will be researching and writing and compiling all of the information that we collect from you and the report will be released in March of 2017. . So just for your information today, so this introduction, that's what I'm doing right now, hopefully shorter than 15 minutes, I know we are short on time. The next portion is going to be the round table discussion. So I'm really glad that some of you moved up. If you see someone sitting at a table, of one or two people, and you are at another table of one or two people, it would be nice if you could join because this part is really important. We're hoping the folks around the room will engage in some really meaningful and fruitful discussions around oversight.

We provided a questionnaire, so you'll see at the tables there um there is a list of five questions that we're going to ask you over the course of the next hour, to just work through. And if someone at each table can assign themselves to be head of the Spokesperson for the table, we're going to ask that at the end of that process, at the end of the hour, we're going to ask someone from each table to give us a recap on what it was that was discussed and what are the ideas that came forward and what it is that you would like for us to know. We will be collecting these forms as well, so it is very helpful for you to fill them out, but anyone that does get up and is the Spokesperson for the table will also be capturing these notes. It is in this forum we really want to hear about your recommendations, your concerns, your ideas, bring forth all of it because that's how we will have a chance to really make sure that this report is reflective of what the community is looking for. Just a few housekeeping items, for those of you who are French speakers, we do have French translation available. There are headsets at the, if you

see the audio technical people at the back of the room, you are able to get a headset and there is a lady who is doing translation and you can listen to this meeting in French, oops, sorry, I'm trying to go backwards here. If you would like to do a private video statement at the back of the room you'll see Hillary and is waving at the back there, if you want to do a private statement, and don't want to speak in public but having you want to share with our review team, it is possible for you to do a private video submission, call one of us and we will take you to the private room there where you can do your own recording and then we will collect that, that of course will be kept in confidence. This meeting is also being recorded, you'll see the media is here and also the audio-visual people at the back of the room, so if you do not want to be recorded and this is also being Webcast, if you don't want to be recorded, just ensure that you keep your back to the camera, because the cameras are at the back of the room. But we are going to be putting this up on our website, it is a Webcast right now and it is going to stay on our website as well. Just so you know this meeting is being recorded. Again if you have something you would like to say in the report back session, but don't want to be on camera, the opportunity to go to the private room is available to you. In terms of the accessibility we have, as you can see, our American Sign Language translators, we also have an accessible washroom at the front of the building, just between the doors, between this door and the exit. We also have, I'm sorry, our Webcasting is also being closed captioned today in French and in English. So if you would like to go back and revisit or if you need to have, if you want to watch on your mobile device you can do that and it is being closed captioned right now. The washrooms, the ladies washroom is just right here, the man's washroom is around the corner and the exit is right, the one there where you came through. For those of you on social media that would like to Tweet or share your comments, your thoughts, your questions, these are our, we are on FaceBook, we're on Twitter at Iporeview, independent police review, also on Instagram, hashtags we have been using is independentreview and hashtag beheard. If there is anything you would like for us to know, that's where we are capturing or information on social media. Feel free to use that throughout the night if you want to share or post or anything of that nature. Not just this evening, but going forward for the entire duration of this review will be on social media and those are the hashtags that will be capturing the information. And that's it. Thank you so much for coming, we are really looking forward to hearing from you and we are confident there's going to be some really fruitful discussions. Again there is also food at the back of the room so feel free to make sure that you get the food, because it is there and I still see a lot of it so please eat up because we are not going to be taking it home and thank you so much. Have a good evening. [APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you Danielle. There are actually a couple of things that I just would like to reinforce before we get into the group discussions. One is that our two wonderful American Sign Language interpreters need you when we get to the point of the feedback session in about an hour, to speak into the mic that you will be given and to speak slowly so that they can one, hear you and capture what you have to say for the livestream and for anyone in the room who needs interpretation. The other thing too that I'd really like to remind us about is the importance of looking at the five questions and bringing to the conversation information that you may personally have experienced, but also information that family, friends, others have heard. Because to a certain extent you are representing not just yourself but a number of other people in the community who I know you know and love. And perhaps are unable to be here tonight or perhaps are still recovering from whatever their experience might have been and so are unable to be here tonight. So I'm putting that additional on you to be as thoughtful and communicative as you can be using all of the various opportunities that we have, including the opportunity for a private video in the booth in the next room with Hillary and the staff that are there.

So the next component is probably the most important component and that is the opportunity to work as a group with the questions that are on the table. These are five questions, and as you look at them, I'm just going to spend a little time just to make sure that you are comfortable with the questions and understand the questions but before I do that I want to have all of the independent police oversight review staff who are in the room just identify themselves, including the ones at the table. Just if you can please put your hands up so we can see you, because what will be happening through the course of the evening is you are having your discussions and through the feedback is that members of the staff, including Justice Tulloch and Danielle and Danielle and Jamie will be circulating around the tables they can certainly help clarify things but it is also an additional way in which they can hear the basis of your concerns. The basis of your ideas and so on. So I'm suggesting do have difficulty with that, please let us know. But it is part of the process of being able to Garner and gather as much as authentic and deep information as we can. Okay. So everybody, I'm still seeing tables where there are just two people. I really would like us to, to move. So there is a table here with one person. There is another table there with another, just one person. So may I ask um, will the gentlemen who has a baby in his arms, I'm going to ask if someone, a couple will join him over at that table. So the three people that are right there, could you join that gentlemen at that table, please. I'm going to have to do this because [LAUGHTER] there will be no fruitful discussion with a table of one. Okay. Well the thing is, I'm not starting anything, we're actually going to be asking you to answer the questions and discuss. So and I will be also roaming to work with people. So it won't be, the focus will no longer be the front of the room, it will be the body of the room, if that's okay. All right. So one of the most important elements, the first question is really speaking to what familiarity, if any, you may have with the SIU, the Special Investigations Unit, the independent police review Directors Office and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission. And it really is an honest response about what you know or what you have heard about these organizations and what they do. So I'm saying that because you all have copies of all able to go online now, you have copies of Order in Council, really not about being correct in terms of what the OIC says, it is about what your impressions are, what your familiarity is and we need to get an honest sense of that as we start out. Of course to break that down in terms of the B section and C section of that question it is then an opportunity for you to provide any information about interactions you or others that you may know have had with these organizations and which ones of those organizations. So importance of being able to go through and work your way through in the time that we have is a good one. I think it would be important to have the groupings because there may be people that would be able to assist you. Once you hear someone else story it might trigger your own. That's the nature of this organic kind of conversation that we're hoping to have. Okay. So without saying much more I'd like us to get started and I'd like to ask my colleagues to get up and join whichever tables and we will all work around and answer any questions that you may have but also listen to what you have to say. Thank you very much, we are starting now, my time is search minutes after 6, so at seven minutes after 7 we will reconvene and begin the feedback process. And also to remind you that you will need someone at your table who is prepared to take notes and who is prepared to give feedback, it doesn't necessarily have to be the same person. And what we will be asking for is the top three points or themes from you. And I ask and I will remind you later, that when we when we do feedback process, if another group or another table has already said one of the things that you have to say, it would be helpful to go to the next thing on your list rather than repeating, thank you.

>>CART PROVIDER: On standby. I just wanted to bring to everyone's attention we have a little over 17 minutes left, so let's just call it 17 minutes left. [LAUGHTER]

>>CART PROVIDER: On standby.

>> Just under one minute.

>> Yes. Can I see which table is ready to make their presentation first? May I see that? I'm testing the room to see if I give you five more minutes you will all done? You're a friend, I know that, thank you. So we have five more minutes. There will be staff um posted around the room to be able to give you the mic, so you don't have to come up for anything. You can just stay at your table with the mic and report back, thank you.

>> No worries, starting in less than five minutes. We will make this speedy for you.

>> Can I see the review staff with mics please? We're going to start the feedback component of this evening and is there a table that would like to go first? It's good to go first because then all of your points are just crucial. Okay. So one table, this table in the middle and two, okay. Thank you. And I'm giving you five minutes cause you're first. Everyone will have less.

>> Can you hear me, can everyone hear me, yes, no?

>>Audience Member: Can you hear me?

>> No. Is there a switch on the bottom or the side?

>>Audience Member: I'll speak loudly, there we go, okay. So good evening everyone so I guess I'll go through the questions one by one, for number one in terms of familiarity with different oversight bodies, the organization this table was most familiar is the SIU, we're all aware that is an oversight body that investigates incidents between the police and the public that are serious, including incidents of harm, killing, shoots, things like that. We know less about the OIPRD, but some of us are familiar with the fact it is a complaint body for the general public, the organization we knew least is OCPC, not really exactly clear on mandate is in terms of police action and conduct, but we have learned a bit more by being here today. We haven't had any direct interactions with any of these organizations in terms of personal circumstances, most are familiar through media or other unfortunate community members who had those interactions, particularly SIU. In terms of expectations, perception first of all that our table primarily had is these organizations are not transparent and not only that they are not accessible. They don't always seem to operate in the interest of the communities they serve. Especially with respect to an organization with OIPRD, which is meant to be an avenue of recourse for the public so we can come forward with complaints and have our issues addressed. We felt we didn't really know enough about them or as much as we should know, their process, how to access them, given their mandates. In terms of expectations on what we would like to see, we would like to have more access information on cases that are being investigated, especially those by the SIU, where there has been a killing or serious incident with a police and a citizen. We would like more engagement with the community, this is a big one at the table, an issue of trust, a lack of trust that needs to be addressed. People need to feel secure that these bodies are not operating with biases and systemic engrained in their processes. That requires talking to us and hearing from us about what they're doing and whether it is working or not. Especially again the bodies that are meant to address concerns directly from the public like OIPRD. We need to know officers are being held accountable for incidents when they occur, there is a cloak of silence that happens, when they begin investigating we don't really hear much about it after that. We expect them to be more proactive, you know, instead of waiting for us to ask us in the

community to raise an issue, be proactive and reach out to us and hear from us before expecting something to go wrong, before we storm the gates kind of thing. Expect to see bodies reflective of the communities they serve, more people of color, more indigenous people, people from various backgrounds that comprise much of Ontario as well as GTA. In terms of number 2, confidence in oversight system, not very confident there is little trust there in fair practices for the reasons I mentioned before. Little trust in access to Justice for citizens, the big issue we see there is that they, especially SIU do not have legislative mandate, police bargaining agents seem to raise opposition when incidences of SIU trying to create change and remedy a situation that exists. There needs to be the toothless tiger is the term I'm sure we are all familiar with SIU, I'm sure that's a major issue with confidence. Also a bit confusing there are these three bodies since we don't know a lot about them individually sometimes I think there might be confusion for folks in the public on who to go to for what, why they even exist, how can they help, those kinds of questions.

>> One minute left.

>>Audience Member: Almost done. So yes people have had negative experiences, generally resolving around a lack of respect and poor communication from police, even saying that most people or everyone at the table would encourage individual to report an incident to police if they had a negative experience. These bodies exist for a reason and we should hold them accountable. We believe demographic information should be released from these bodies, useful in systemic issues and important of transparency and important to identify what's working and not working. More information on the process from the beginning to end of all these organizations, release of reports and decision that is made and information on individuals involved in incidents and those that pros these bodies, with OIPRD greater mandate, engage with community and make us aware of how they can help us and what we do. Frequent updates from SIU when they investigate a case quick action thereafter, it is a timely process. Thank you.

>> Thank you, good.

>> I understand that, that you are working with some tight time lines but our interpreters asked if you could slow down a bit. So what that means is perhaps we need to edit what we, what we're saying somewhat and a reminder, if one of the other, the other groups have said what you have on your list, skip on to the next point. So I'm giving this group five minutes as well.

>>Audience Member: It's difficult to talk slower within a five minute time frame but we're going to try. We're going to start first with solutions because we may not get to the end and we want to be sure the solutions come forward. An issue outstanding is that the issue of police accountability and holding them accountable for their actions. We see there is a feeling within the act the Police Services act and a failure for the different levels within placing to follow through. So specific to the Province, the Province several years ago allowed for the police to no longer be personally liable for their actions. So for example, if a criminal act is committed by a police officer, we the public pay for them to go through the judicial system if we're holding them accountable in whatever way or fashion. And so we're asking that there is a change in legislation that holds the police, puts the responsibility of their liable back in their own pocket and/or police Union pocket so that the public is not paying for their failure to um keep the law. And again we can go back because we will come to that. Right now we are paying for them, so no incentive for them to stop their behavior. When you take it out of their pocket then people think maybe twice or maybe start thinking about their actions before they commit it. The other issue is with regards



to the SIU and the formal process for complaints and coroners reports, et cetera. Currently family members who are affected by the, sorry affected by a death by a police officer have to use money out of their own pocket to pay for a follow-up on a coroner's report, ballistic assessment, own assessment or investigation. We're asking for the government to change its policies on that and to create, this may be unique, but it is something that's required, to create a fund that is a portion of the police budget for each police agency to be set aside for those types of investigations to take place, so that money is prepared and ready to a family member who is affected by a death by a police officer. So going into the history of what we were saying, thank you for that, going into the history of what we were saying, we've actually had a gentlemen at our table that had three to four complaints to OIPRD at each time outcome has been nothing, been mute. What his concern is he has gone through the process is you make a complaint to OIPRD, it appears OIPRD sends that information back to the police division you are complaining about, police division investigates themselves and says there is no problem. So where, the question that we all had at this table is why are the police investigating the police? I think that's a question that public has raised time and time again. When we talk about time and time again the issue of analysis and reports, investigations, all done by various levels of government, but yet what is the outcome from that? Do you these reports, do these analysis but no actual outcome, we don't get to see it, we don't get to hear about it and don't see the change. We are asking for actual fundamental change to have the public appreciate that there is an actual change and that we feel we are actually being heard. No due diligence to ignorance, there is a disconnect when complaining to local, police officers conduct, seems no distinction with that, an officer or superior will report and say if you got a complaint rather than hear you and take steps as in any other governmental organization make a complaint, go to manager, go to supervisor, it will be addressed.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: It seems experience the public is having police dismiss you and say make a complaint to OIPRD. And knowing that it won't go anywhere, so the lack of due diligence is an issue and that it is outstanding and the common sense issues of naming the police officers being investigated in SIU report. This is common sense. It is common sense that if you are a public servant and involved in something that the public should know who you are that's involved in it. This is common sense. Overlapping jurisdiction as well when you look at OIPRD and three levels we are identifying today. Seems convoluted to the public, disconnect to what each identify role are and responsibilities are to you as a public to address you. And I think that's the one minute.

>> No you had that, you have four seconds. [LAUGHTER]

>>Audience Member: We have a lot to say but thank you very much.

>> Thank you. [APPLAUSE] I actually like to remind groups you are able to leave your notes so that we can gather them and have the fullness of your discussion documented, thank you. Next table. That's way, way in the back.

>>Audience Member: Good afternoon everyone. Question one, SIU is manned by ex-police man and most of the people at the table wanted to know why. I was the only person at my table that knew anything about the OIPRD and OCPC, everybody else knew nothing about that. Regarding, so let's come back to the SIU, one other person at the table knew about the SIU and what they did based on what they read in the media. So they didn't have a common understanding of exactly the parameters in

which they work. And they believe that we should have on a more timely basis the outcome of their investigations. And if I said that before forgive me, they wanted to know why it was only ex-police men that were hired to do the investigation I'm going to skip over some, some of the same things other people have said and we are going to leave you our notes anyways. People couldn't understand why OIPRD did investigation it had to go back to the police that is definitely an issue. Why, why does the chief have to have the last word on a civilian complaint. This is counter-productive in our opinion. We feel no one would want to file a complaint under these circumstances if it is going to come back to the very division you are complaining about. Based on that the final decision. OCPC, only one at the table had ever heard of them. Yes we have had interactions with the SIU via community organizations and the clients. We would like to know why we need three civilian organizations to investigate issues that surrounds the police. Why do we need the SIU, the OIPRD and the OCPC? That to me and to the other people at the table, didn't make any sense. Especially in the final analysis it says if they are not really serving the community because if they were serving the community transparently and accountable to the community most of the people who interact with them would know that there were bodies that could have gone to complain. None of the members at the table were confident in the area that if something happened you would want to intersect with the chief of the specific division. The negative part of reporting an issue with the police is that when it comes to the African Canadian community, anything that happens, the community is overwhelmed by an enormous amount of police, military equipment, locking down the neighborhoods and preventing people from going about their business in a normal and a reasonable and timely fashion. So if something happened they wouldn't encourage anyone to report.

>> 30 seconds.

>>Audience Member: And to go back to, let me just go to my conclusion. Nothing except complete overhaul is good enough. We want to know why we have these three organizations, SIU, OIPRD, OCPC, where is the accountability resolution of issues, positive outcomes. At our table the majority of the participants did not know about all of these organizations, we feel these organizations are of little value to the African Canadian community.

>> Time.

>>Audience Member: Because the majority at the table knew nothing about them, thank you.  
[APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you. Matthew, this table here in the middle.

>>Audience Member: Hi, my name is Sadid, I'm speaking on behalf of everybody because sitting at this table obviously. With regards to the first question regarding the awareness of all of these three different bodies, the ladies on my left were aware of all three. Me and my friend James, we were of SIU because that's kind of really high profile, you switch on the radio and the TV or even the newspapers you hear about it. With regard to the OIPRD and CSCP, to be honest we weren't even aware of that. So the, but my learning has been that these are all start by either current or ex-police officers or retired police officers. If it is supposed to be um there should be some civilian oversight in that, that obviously should be start with civilians, they could be professional nurses or teachers or paralegal folks or a lot of professionals that would be willing to be part of the civilian oversight. Now the second question was have you had any direct interaction watershed these organizations, none of us on this table had any

direct interactions with these. The third one is what does your perception and expectation. Now the perception on the table is not really good the consensus are all three are biased, which I will, so that's not very good assessment of the three units. The expectation was that these all three would have a better community involvement. More between communities, between the community and the police. And then there should be an initiative for it, getting the community about the three organizations and to create awareness about their existence. And how they actually operate and whom to approach in case of what. The subsequent question to that is overall how confident are you, again the consensus was lack of confidence. And more to the next one which talks about any positive or negative experiences, luckily for us we have a couple of positive experiences where the lady on the table was unable to put a sticker, a license plate sticker, because her legs were hurting and then the officer put the sticker and put himself, that's good. I also, there was one positive, but two negatives to talk about. The same lady, I mean she was pulled over because her license was um suspended, but the officer took away her insurance card, she had it to go to the court as a \$5000 don't have it, rather than attending to the situation, causing more grief for the lady. Then James, he had a pretty funny incident, he was followed by an officer, almost 20 kilometers from western all the way up to Morningside and that is getting followed on the highway 20 kilometers and being told everything is okay after checking license and everything and saying bumper is shaking. I'll move to the next one.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: If you have negative experience to be reported, no one has reported on this table. Would you consider suggesting someone else to report it, yes in case of physical abuse. Should these organizations make the complaints public, the answer is no for the fear of reappraisals and to protect the confidentiality and privacy of the complainants. In terms of recognitions of the list is not too long but the number one is education with ongoing psychological assessment. This pertains more to police officers than to the three units. Sensitivity training, that's a topic that came up a lot of times, the police officers are not sensitive to the cultural needs of the community and there is a gap on that. Making better disclosures when investigations are complete.

>> Time.

>>Audience Member: And then the last point is to revamp the view and educate the public on all three. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Next table, all the way over here.

>>Audience Member: Testing. Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to our beloved judge here today. I'm really glad to choose JCA because this is a place that has been here crying out for the public. Because of so many things that happen and so many people speak before I do, I have to say that it would have been repetitive to start from number one. Because this gentlemen here said you guys were listening to us and I have to say that yes what they are saying is correct. So for that I want to start at number 5. It says please share any thoughts, experiences or recommendations for police oversight. It has been, consensus that young black youth have police are like oil and water. Have to come to a point in which the two can coincide. We live together here in the city anyway or in this Province. We believe our recommendation that we have to find a way that the youth of the police can start interacting, I would say from maybe grade 1. Which state sexual education in grade 1 anyway, may as well start this two by the time they reach age of 10 there is a perception against them. Whether right or wrong. And

it grows up by the time you are a teenager, here is an enemy, which I don't want to see continue. So I'm asking to share if there is a way in which you can recommend that we start with interaction between the youth of the police and the next 20 years we all have a place to live knowing that it started right here. I go on to number 4, we agree that how then, it says should the organization collect and make public demographic information with regards to race, gender, age, et cetera. We feel that if this going to make public after a while, somebody realize that yes there is a tendency to lean that there is more things going on with black youth than with any other culture there is in the city. And I feel that yes we should do that because it will show the public the pressure that these young people are under. Number 3c says if someone know, if someone you know had a negative experience with police, would you encourage them to report it and why not? We would have to ask them to report it, but then again there could be repercussions. So sometime it depends on what it is and how it is. Sometimes it is better to be quiet. As a pastor I would say pray about it. I have to say we here did not have any negative interaction with the police.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: Number 3a said any positive or negative experience. I put down to say that if it is negative there is a way of making it positive. Depends on the question that we ask and the answer you give to them. So we said yes it could be changed. Number 2 says, overall how confident are you in the police oversight. We have no confidence at all. Unless things are changed, says to us that systematic way of doing things is totally wrong. The attitude of the police officers totally off board, the training is something that have to be taken care of so it's something that we don't really appreciate at all.

>> Time.

>>Audience Member: Thank you very much, I wish we had more time, but God bless you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you. Is there one or two more tables? In the middle and then this one here, okay. Yes, thank you.

>>Audience Member: Good night, um so question 1, what I know about the SIU is that it is operating as a wide-boys club to white wash the crimes, that's all I know about it. If you look at the records you are seeing time and time again that it's blatant that a crime has been committed, everybody can see that except the SIU. And honestly what it does, it allows activities that we condemn in other countries, in five countries, it allows them to justify it. That's all that happens. The secrecy that happens, no transparency, no accountability and to me that was a function, when the other people, people like Charles swap for that, sort of accountability that's what we expected. We expected accountability and transparency, instead of what we're getting is a secret organization. I'm going to sort of go around, because I know time is limited, what we need, we need an infusion of black people, brown people, and other minorities in the SIU. We cannot be a white boys club, that's number one problem. It cannot be a white boys club as it is today. Number one. So we need that to happen. Now I'm sad, I have had interaction with the OIPRD and I'm telling you something, useless, it is a waste of time. It is useless. As a matter of fact in all the recommendations that came back to me the word was like cutting and pasting, cutting and pasting, cutting and pasting and I have had those interactions and they are documented. So always a time. I think I do, confidence, zero confidence. How many more minutes I have?

>> You have two, you have time actually.

>>Audience Member: Okay --

>> Two minutes and 50 seconds.

>>Audience Member: Oh really, I thought I didn't have, okay. Now I'm going to kind of jump again to number 5 because I, I want to stress some things, right. With the SIU, and I know probably, I want to put the word out. With the SIU we need to have some specifics, you cannot say that the police officers should report an incident as soon as possible, you should have a precise number of minutes. And I'm suggesting five minutes, within five minutes of an incident you should be contacting the police chief, police chief should have responsibility of then contacting the guys, the SIU and within ten minutes they should be off and ready to go with some black people and some brown people in that mix. [LAUGHTER] Right, cannot have wishy washy thing you can do it two weeks after, have enough time to change the scene to plant evidence or remove things and to discuss, you know, what to present, to present an alternative reality. We have to stop that issue, within ten minutes I'm saying, within ten minutes the SIU should be on its way. Otherwise it is just a joke, our life is not a joke, because the only thing that we have is our lives, you cannot enjoy any, any of those rights you are talking about, the right to freedom of speech, to association, to movement and those things, they depend on right to life and our lives are the ones on the line. So for me, that's number one. We should have --

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: Yeah, we should have SIU should be contacting, should be contacted within ten minutes of an incident. I want that to be laid down, the other thing I want to jump on, during process of investigation, should not be paid, it should be unpaid leave, because what you are doing, here is what is happening, you know, there is a thing called game theory, right.

Here is what is happening, what you are doing here, right given an incentive to do things, to harm people, because who cares what. If I shoot somebody, I get six months off, I get a year, depending on how long the investigation and I get paid, right. It is a vacation, so you are giving the police many inadvertently, but in action, in reality what you are doing, you are giving an incentive for people to do the wrong thing. So you need to cut that out. I'm going to stop here. [APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you. And Mr. Marsh? [LAUGHTER]

>>Audience Member: Thank you. My name is Louie Marsh [Name?] I was around many moons ago when Buddy Evans was shot, when Mr. Donaldson was shot and I was working with a mentor of mine named Dudley and we were the ones that were Marching and demanding accountability and also civilian overview of police actions. So my experience is vast in terms of the SIU, which we demanded, the government at the time did respond and it looked good on paper, but in reality 30 years later we are struggling with did they really understand what this was all about. So with that said at the table and this is indicative of the audience. Not many people here that have had any interaction with the police on the level we're looking for right now. Of the trust and confidence in the process, confidence and trust in the people, confidence in what will happen because what we are discussing today we've been discussing for the last 30 years.

So I'm not sure why [APPLAUSE] not sure why we go through this process again. It's painful at times to talk about this because we work with the young people on the streets that have had encounters with the police and what has happened after that encounter. And we tell stories that are positive in any

shape, way or form. We do encourage young people to report to the police station, to the SIU and to the other agencies, but always ask us do you really think we would do that, right? Because any interaction with the police or those institutions have been negative and there has been repercussions. In terms of moving forward, I'm going to just put a couple bold recommendations out there and hopefully the new process, the new people will treat it with some significance. One of the first recommendations is the timely and accurate release of information regarding investigations. We appreciate confidentiality, we appreciate privacy about information but when you have a shoot shooting on a street car and six cameras record it and it takes the SIU three years to come out with a report, that doesn't go well for the work they have done. [APPLAUSE] Another recommendation is the collection of data race, demographics, Regions, I come from the Corporate world, I'm an Operations Manager, where we had to do a regular reports, quarterly reports, semi-annual reports, annual reports, that were examined by the public. I think we should demand that from the SIU, not the reports, what's that word we use when they black all this stuff -- oh yeah the reports where you redact half the information. It doesn't bode well for confidentiality, transparency and confidence, it doesn't. Okay. So collect the data, what were the results.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: So that we can look at the trends, we can look at the challenges and we can look at the opportunities. We're concerned about over-policing of certain communities, the expense, the damage that takes place and that's why we have to hold police accountable for their actions. Because there are some police officers out there that are doing their job to the best of their ability. Certain police that are trained to deescalate but it seems as though there are certain police that are trained to escalate. When we call data and report clearly what's going on we can identify the trends and what needs to be done. This review must not come from the police, must come from public, from academic, it must come from professionals, it has to be arm's length, we all know that, right.

>> Time.

>> I would like to hear your next.

>>Audience Member: Thank you very much. Not about, it is not about who is there on the SIU, what we want is people that understand the relationship to the public and who is paying who to do what. Sometimes it seems as though the public is a second thought when the SIU produces their report. Let's just get a report out there so we can satisfy the legislation that we did something. The public has to be the center, transparency, accountability has to be the center, principles that guide the way to SIU and these agencies work. One young lady at our table said why do they exist? If they were not there would we miss them and sad fact is that we would not miss them. We would not. So here is an opportunity. Here is an opportunity to make a significant difference, I know you got 18 consultations to do. What you see here is not the audience that you need to speak to if you really want to get information. This audience is important, yes, but please make a deliberate attempt to get into Neptune, into Lawrence Heights, to get into Malvern, even if you have to pay the people to show up, right, you do it. We know the communities, they know them too. Even if you have to pay them, please consider it because their information is so invaluable because they have the encounters with all these agencies. Please, please, do that, we pay other people to participate I don't see why we can't pay them to participate. Whether you have focus groups, right or go into a community and setup something do it, it doesn't have to be this elaborate because you need real information. They tell us in school whoever defines the problem

defines the solution. And if we are defining the problem, you are really not going to get a true sense. I'm going to leave it at that, thanks for your time. All the best. [APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you.

>> Matthew there is one --

>> Yeah.

>>Audience Member: Sorry I'm just going to sit because my back will be to too many people, just echoed many things, if you look into the room not individuals who have had encounters with the police. We have to ensure we reach out to the various individuals that have had the real content and gone through the processes. My table in a sense, a lack of confidence with regards to all of the agencies that you are looking at. But we will address some of the solutions or possible things to deal with. One, data collection should be housed by a third party. Third party should have all of the data with regards to the different bodies that we are dealing with. The potential hold in that data for up to five years, the caveat being this, if it charges are not linked that should be expunged. Only those issues to try or appeal processes should be only data that get warehoused no reason we should be storing demographic data on individuals and situational data without it having a need to be there. That should all be expunged out of the systems. To point made FRIs far more transparent no redactive, whatever put in the statement should be what is issued, other part of FOI component it should be free. Putting a cost to issues of social economics, people are putting out money to get this data, this information, yet redactive, useless information to them. So when we're talking about the processes that you have to do it is multilevel, it is not just about talking about the overview as to what is the remedies put forward or solutions, but go to the processes at each one of the bodies you are looking at. Third party investigators should be hired because retired officers have unique bias when doing investigations. The data clearly indicates that this bias is there when you look at the minimal number of charges being laid against officers. The public should know the demographic breakdown of the investigators, are they all white males, where do they come from, background, are they trained, in anti-black racism theory, the psychological components, the FRP being produced with the Police Services, what are the training and abilities these individuals have that are sitting on the various boards. SIU investigators should be, the investigation should be expedited there is no reason why this should take three years to points being made, should easily be racked up in a few months for those small or readily caught on video or audio, whichever one we have. It should be easily dealt with. Other things too, officers when we talk about processes going back, the officer should not be able to go back and tamper with their notes. Right now a lot of the public is not aware that an officer, once an incident takes place, is able to watch video or hear the audio of what has happened to get to look at the statements put forward by complainants and then allowed to go back to their notes and make changes to what has been put forward, the public does not get to that until they get to a hearing. It has to be if you are saying your mind is best when the situation occurs, whatever the officer creates that gets field, what the complainant gets, gets sealed to time of hearing, investigation and they go out and gather more information, officers should not have access back to their notes, they get to talk to people, other video and audio the complainant has not had the ability to look at. Officers names should be released once, when subjected to any form of investigation, when we think about in the media, we have the media here, media readily chooses images, for most part within 24 cycle we know name of individual who committed the offense or potential offense, who the victim potentially is, the same should be held accountable for officers, not at a higher threshold. Why are they held to a

higher threshold, if teachers, an issue, out there in the media. If a nurse violates or doctor violates out there in the media. An officer should be held to the exact same account your name should be released and you go through the same process.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: Other aspects the OIPRD should have a bi-annual review of officer service conduct so talking about all the complaints of abusive weapons, server revolvers all of that should be put out there. If they are collecting this data there should be a bi-annual review put forward. OCPC should hold all officers and have same consequences. Right now if we look at data, predominantly realized officers coming up with charges, higher consequences or loss of jobs or losing their jobs, compared to white counter parts. That has to be looked at. The three bodies require an even greater oversight and accountability with regards to their findings and remedies, so again annual report must be put out to the public. So that we have a clear understanding, not just from the pamphlet given when you go to a station to report or if you happen to be certain community organizations we need to know what the agencies are doing.

>> Time.

>>Audience Member: One last thing, how, for you guys in a review, how does 5816 new police service act implement and effect what you are doing, what is being put forward, for further policies will change, what is going to be happening policing for training, that's key and I think somewhere in this you got to be able to tell us how is that impacting you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Have we heard from all the tables, I kind of, I think -- so there, there is a table here. Matthew.

>>Audience Member: Well good evening, this thing was [speaker off mic] I must say that in correction every individual um where this forum has reached is significant in spite of the geographical location and so these bodies that has been put in place review police actions are indeed significant and would be this if they would not have been missed, missed the laws, would not labor would be in vein. So to remove these bodies with say Dudley Law, Charles and other persons of such labor and in the street and in the winter and the cold and in the rain and in the sleet would be in vein. And however these bodies cannot be truly effective, the OIPRD, the SIU and the Ontario civilian commission will not and cannot be effective in their review if we do continue to have personnel as such as lawyers, former officers and persons sitting in judicial seats on the board because it becomes still a buddy decision making and yes often times the SIU do take a long time in bringing forth their review having and also lacking to communicate with the, the grieving party of the person's whose life had been wrongfully and injustice taken. And so it is that the process does need to be investigated, why do they take so long and I believe they take this long due to the fact that we have officers who might of had sat or worked with other officers and lawyers who might have been school mate with those who are on the board. So it become a complex and a problematic decision process or investigation process. And have you had any direct, I believe those who may want to be silent aren't saying they not have any negative encounter with the police is basically again protecting one of their buddies. Whether they are officers themselves or not.

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: The entire community has been effecting negative, if not the honorable Marian Chambers would not have came up with a plan of youth and policing to try and stem the negative



reaction with police. And so it is we leave that if we take this approach and even put in youth on the review process, I believe some youth should be here even though I still think Mr. Justice Tulloch is a youth. [LAUGHTER] And recommendations again should be again one, revamp. There should be a total revamp even of the um [speaker off mic] should be arm's length of the judicial system and that means that this should not have had a loss society number.

>> Time up.

>>Audience Member: Also the judges should not have a loss society number. So there is a conflict right there even from every review body. So again this review body again is extremely bias. [APPLAUSE]

>> I'm conscious of the time, I just want to make sure that we hear from everybody and we will have just a few minutes for Justice Tulloch to wrap-up. Table? There is a table way back here. Matthew, have we, have we heard from everybody? I thought we had. There he is.

>> Hello.

>>Audience Member: We have a lot of stuff and what I'm going to read you is what we have heard, you know, because time is going so we're not going to repeat. I only repeat one and our opinion at this table is that the SIU is toothless tiger. We start our discussion by stating that the police has extra ordinary powers, therefore they should be subject to extra ordinary scrutiny. [APPLAUSE] It is our opinion at this table that that's what is taking place and we looked at one of the, where we see a problem with regards to the effectiveness SIU. That is requirement I'll preface it by saying for 38 years I have worked in the labor movement and in the mediation field in labor law. I have never ever come across an issue, incident in a contract where someone who is subject to discipline is suspended with pay. And at the time when tax payers are being squeezed left, right and center we think that the police services act should be changed so that when police officers are under investigation they will not be given a paid holiday for one, two, three years sometimes. So that must change. [APPLAUSE] If this when, we believe if this practice continues then they will just continue to drag out and frustrate the process. That's one of the main reason I think why the process is so, because they are on paid vacation leave. So that must change. And it is time to stop passing the buck saying it is the police Union and saying [speaker off mic] it need legislation therefore we are urging you to make sure in your report that, that recommendation is there and we are urging Queen to make sure the change legislation so that there is no more free lunch for the police who are well-paid as it is. Next issue, is the communication gap. We are concerned that process is tampered with because the police refuse to talk to the SIU. During my time as President of the JCA back in the 90's I had personal experience where I saw a situation where witnesses were on the TV the same night of the shooting saying that the police was in the right. And the victim was wrong. I also know for a fact when those statements were being made that SIU was not notified of the incident at that time. So that practice of trying to delay and correspond with each, whether you are a subject officers are not comparing notes and making all these changes to suit their needs has to stop. It will only stop if SIU get more in the manual they follow to carry out their duties. Whether or not we should encourage people who come in conflict with the police to --

>> One minute.

>>Audience Member: Yes we feel that they should be encouraged. We also feel that the statistics should be compiled and given to public so that we can monitor them. We feel that accountability is

lacking and if there are statistic to show how many complaints there were on a regular basis, then we would better able to keep a tab on what they were doing or not doing. We also believe that the idea of just calling an ex-police officer to do the investigation needs to be revamp, because there is a strong police culture when you leave and if you go back to investigate them they are telling these officers from SIU that they are sell out. Right. We think that they should look beyond, the former police officer services for investigators.

>> Times up.

>>Audience Member: All right, thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>> Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

>> All right. Well I'd like to profoundly thank you all for taking time tonight to be with us and we have gone over time and I appreciate you staying to complete this. Your feedback has been very useful and I think that um we have, as the first consultation of 18, public consultation of 18 you've given us quite a range of information and detail and some things that we need to follow-up on, particularly in terms of hearing some other voices at the table. We appreciate that. And I'm going to pass it over to Justice Tulloch to wrap-up and thank you again. [APPLAUSE]

>>Justice Michael Tulloch: Okay so I just want to reiterate what Pamela has said. I know that, you know, it is a sacrifice for each of you to come out here this evening and to participate in this process, so on behalf of the entire team I want to thank each of you for coming out and for, you know, enduring the process. For paying attention and for, for, you know, giving us the feedback that you have. I can assure you that we will take all of them into consideration and they will inform the ultimate report that we will be, you know, writing and providing to the government. You know, this is the start of the public process and we're appreciative to your input at this stage and it's going to help us as we go forward. So again, thanks very much. [APPLAUSE]

>> Please leave your, your notes on the table so that we can collect them or as staff, as you leave, perhaps can collect them from you. Thanks again, goodnight everyone.

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT TRANSLATION FROM THE CART CAPTIONER'S OUTPUT FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. TO DO SO IS AN EXTRA FEE. THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE ELSE UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU; FINALLY, THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW.

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*