

16-11-01-IPOR-Pickering-Ajax

[Beginning of recorded material at 00:00:01]

Pamela Grant: Again, good evening and welcome everyone to the Ajax-Pickering Public Forum for the Independent Police Oversight Review. My name is Pamela Grant. I'm the facilitator and strategic advisor for the review. This evening I will be working with you and the rest of our team to ensure that your voices are heard and that there is a full and candid conversation about the three police oversight agencies about how they can be more transparent, accountable and build public confidence and effective. I'm not going to spend too much time at this point anymore because I'm going to ask Justice Tulloch, the lead of the review to say a few words and my colleague Danielle Dowdy will take us through the evening's procedures and timing. Without further ado, Justice Tulloch.

Justice Tulloch: Thank you Pam. Good afternoon or good evening. My name is Michael Tulloch. I'm a judge who currently sits on the Ontario Court of Appeal and I want to thank each and every one of you for coming out to be a part of our public consultations this evening.

Before I say anything more, I would like to begin by acknowledging the gathered on the traditional indigenous lands of the Mississauga's of Port Credit. These lands were the meeting place for several indigenous nations. By acknowledging this, we're also acknowledging the importance and significance of the traditions of indigenous peoples.

Now, during my time with you today I want to hear from you. Each and every one of us we want to hear from you. We'll begin by providing some brief remarks about the Independent Police Oversight Review and the civilian police oversight agencies that were tasks with that reviewing. Then we will break into small roundtable discussions before reporting back to hear about your reviews and your experiences.

Now, just as a background, on April 29th, 2016 I was appointed by the provincial government to lead an independent review of three civilian oversight agencies. They are the Special Investigations Unit or the SIU, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director or the OIPRD and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission. These are the bodies that we're reviewing and together with a diverse and expert team of lawyers, community workers and police personnel, I have been charged with reviewing the police oversight bodies and making

recommendations to enhance their transparency, accountability and efficacy.

Now to date we've actively engaged in public and private consultations with a variety of stakeholders across the province. These stakeholders include police, people who have had experiences with the police and the oversight agencies as well as members of the public. I've already had a number of consultations in the Toronto area or the GTA. We've also been to Thunder Bay, Sault St. Marie, as well as Sudbury. Last week we were in Ottawa. This week we're here in Durham Region in Ajax and later on this month we will be coming back to Oshawa.

Now in the weeks ahead we will also be holding additional meetings, more in the Toronto area as well as London, Windsor, Kenora and Kingston. We're consulting broadly and with the intent to draw on what we learn to make recommendations to enhance the task that we're asked to review on, which is the transparency, accountability and the efficacy of the various agencies. Now by March 31st, 2017 my final report will be submitted to the government and to the public at large.

Now as I've mentioned the focus of this review is on three civilian oversight bodies: the SIU, the OIPRD and the OCPC. These three agencies are an integral part of the civilian oversight system of police in Ontario.

The SIU is a civilian law enforcement agency --independent of the police --that conducts criminal investigations into circumstances involving police and civilians that have resulted in serious injury, death or allegations of sexual assault. When an incident falling within the SIU's mandate occurs, the SIU is notified and conducts an investigation to determine whether there is any evidence of criminal wrongdoing on the part of the police. In the course of its investigations the SIU gathers and assesses evidence. The director then determines whether or not criminal charges should be laid against a police officer and reports the results of the investigations to the attorney general. Now, in the course of its investigations if no charges are laid then the SIU director produces a report. I'm sorry, yeah, I've already stated that.

Now, the second civilian oversight agency that is the subject of this review is the OIPRD and the OIPRD's mandate is to review and to receive public complaints about police officers in all of the local police services in Ontario. Also the OPP. These complaints can be about the conduct of a police officer or about the policies or services of a police department. Now when a complaint is received, the OIPRD reviews it to determine whether it may be suitable for early resolution through customer services resolution

and if a complaint is not suitable for customer services resolution or if customer service resolution is not successful, the complaint enters the screening process and the OIPRD has a discretion to screen out and close complaints for a variety of reasons such as the complaint being frivolous or made more than six months after the incident.

Now if a complaint is screened in the OIPRD may retain it to refer it back to the affected police service or another police service for further investigation. Following the investigation, if the complaint is substantiated, a disciplinary hearing may occur or if the matter is less serious, it may be resolved by informal resolution.

Now finally, in addition to dealing with public complains, the OIPRD also has the power to examine issues of a systemic nature that may arise from complaints about the police and make recommendations addressing them.

Now the third and final civilian oversight agency covered by the review is the OCPC and the OCPC's primarily and adjudicative body that's mandate among other things is to conduct hearings and to adjudicate disputes related to police disciplinary decisions, budget disputes between municipal councils and police services boards as well as disputes related to the provisions of police services. The OCPC can also conduct investigations into the conduct of police services boards, their members and police officers.

With that background in mind about the review and the civilian police oversight agencies, I want to take this opportunity to let you speak. We want to hear from you. As indicated, the review is an independent review and what this means is that I'm free to critically examine how these oversight bodies operate. Meeting with you members of the public is a crucial part of the process. I'm grateful that you have taken the time to meet with us today and I appreciate that speaking about some of these issues may be difficult for some but it is essential that a review of this kind be as thorough as possible and that the independent reviewer, myself, consider all relevant information from a variety of perspectives and I will so long as you participate and offer me your perspective.

So again, I want to thank each and every one of you for coming. As indicated, we're going to be listening very carefully and we would like you to speak freely, openly and I also understand that perspectives are going to be different but we're open to every perspective and every experience that you have. So with that I won't take any more time but we will be hearing from you and thanks so much again.

Danielle Dowdy: Good evening everyone. Thank you for coming tonight. I just have a couple of slides I'm going to go through and then we're going to get started. As our disclaimer, we will be listening to your stories and hearing your stories but we want you to know that we are not revisiting any past judgments or reopening any past cases for reassessment. So while it's important to hear your stories and we really do want to hear them because they set a very important context for us and for our recommendations, we just want you to know that we won't be looking at specific, particular stories for reassessment.

The way that this is going to work, this is part of the introduction and then we're going to get right into our roundtable discussions. There should be questions on each of your tables there and we're going to ask you to just discuss and go through all the questions and then we're going to move into a feedback period after 45 minutes. With the feedback, we want to hear from you: your thoughts, your ideas, your recommendations, your concerns, all of it. So we'll be here taking notes.

Just so you know, we are on social media. Also, this meeting is being recorded. You'll see a camera at the back of the room. If you don't want to be on camera, just be sure to keep your back to the cameraman or if you do want to speak but don't want to be on camera, just let us know and we'll make sure we take the appropriate steps to protect your identity. We're on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, also on YouTube so all of these meetings, after they've been edited, they go up within a week on our website, which is right there: policeoversightreview.ca.

Myself, Matthew –if you can just wave and Peter, if you can also just wave –will be taking pictures and we'll be Tweeting tonight so if you see us taking pictures, that's what we're doing. If you check our Twitter feed, which is at IPO review, you'll see the questions and the pictures. Again, if you don't want your picture taken and you see us coming around, just let us know and we'll move on and that's it.

We're also Tweeting under the hashtag #BeHeardON. "ON" for Ontario, so if you want to post questions, have comments, Tweet yourself and tag us in then that would be good. We're also collecting the feedback that we receive off of social media. Okay, thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thank you Danielle and thank you Justice Tulloch. I've seen that there have been a few newcomers in the room. I've been asking everyone to come together and make the tables fuller so that there's no one sitting by themselves. Sorry to pick you out. So if you can, move to a table close to you so that you are part of a

group. That will help keep the conversation and the discussion that much more fruitful. So I will give some time checks through the 45 minutes that's just about to start and to remind you that it's important for you to go through all of the questions and pay special attention to the last question, which asks for recommendations and there are no right or wrong answers. These are really questions to help tease out the conversation and to ensure that your stories that you want to tell can be told in a safe environment but gives you the opportunity to be as candid as you would like to be.

I also want to ask, every table has one of the very long sheets. They're sign-in sheets but the real purpose and bonus for filling those out and including your email address is that when the report is release at the end of March 2017, we will be sending everyone who has participated the link so that you can have access to your own copy of the report. So it's very important that you remember to fill those forms in and I will speak no more and start our 45 minutes now but reminding everyone to please try to come together in larger groups.

The team, Justice Tulloch, Danielle and Jamie and Jody Lynn and Matt will be rotating and Mr. Labarge will be rotating and sitting in so that there are points of clarification that we may give but we're listening. Okay? Thank you.

We're going to start our report back now, thanks.

Okay. I'm going to ask Tammy please to go first.

Tammy: Yeah hi. Good everybody. I'm Tammy. I was put on the spot by Pamela. Try my best. Anyway, we have a group of people here but [unintelligible 00:17:20].

Pamela Grant: Tammy, can I ask you to hold the mic right up because that way the interpreter and the cording is clear okay? Thanks.

Tammy: Okay. So I don't know how we can go about this way. We just talking about going question by question but we just going to talk about if the oversight bodies can decide what to investigate. There is zero accountability. We have to go by the questions right? I can't do this one.

SIU, yes it should be reported to the public. Since the public need to be treated with respect, the officers should treat the public with respect. So they should report it the superior or the police stations and we also had a different opinion about things. They said they wouldn't advise friends to report, no independence. If you complain, the police are the first one to know and the public might be in some kind of trouble. So we had two different

opinions about that. The SIU may only share limited information -
- what the public needed. So we disagree on one of the things that
will the SIU share the information to public.

Also families. . .okay so this is where we agreed on everything.
The families don't get to find out until it goes to the court system,
so they are not sharing everything with the public or the family
members or who get affected by the issue. So all of us agreed not
to make public. If the public is charged by the SIU, they should
publish the officer's name.

Should the former police officers work as investigators as SIU,
OIPRD or OCPC? No they shouldn't. The real bias, no
independence and no more police as a culture. Currently it will
oppose or changing the system and the collection of data is
important, if the data is used appropriately. If the data is not
shared with the police and other bodies can have access. So that's
all we covered today and if there's anybody else, you can pass.

Pamela Grant: Fred is next. Could you pass the mic Fred? Would you stand and
take the mic please? Thank you Tammy.

Fred: Thank you. Okay so we talked about most of the questions on the
questionnaire and so I'll just summarize sort of what was said. In
terms of the first question, well there were eight people at the
table and in terms of the SIU, seven new. In terms of the OIPRD,
five new and in terms of the OCPC, four new.

Have you had any contact with police oversight agencies? Two of
our people said "no," three of our people said they had good
contact and another person said they had a bad contact.

In terms of if you've ever had a bad experience with the police,
whether it was reported. Did you report it? The consensus was
"no."

The next question would be, "If yes, who did you report it to?
What happened? If 'no,' why didn't you report it?" Well the
reasons for --well first of all, let's go positive. The reasons for
encouraging a report is to build trust, create a record, optimism,
accountability, to improve organizational practices in policing and
to neutralize the power imbalance between civil society and
police.

And then we moved on to the next question. Well actually, on the
flipside reasons for not encouraging to report included --sorry,
these are some additional reasons. Sorry, so we'll move back.
Additional reasons for encouraging a report would be developing
a move towards police/community relations. Can you hear me
okay? Okay.

Now then we skipped forward to question number 7 and question number 7, “Should the names of police officers who are investigated by the SIU be made public even when the SIU decides not to charge them?” And two, three, four, five said “yes” and one said “no.” Why yes? Because of transparency and because a police officer is a public figure.

Pamela Grant: You have 44 seconds left.

Fred: Okay and then moving right on to number 11, which are the recommendations. Okay, recommendations. What we’d like to see is transparency, accountability, fair treatment, education and anti-oppressive practices. Education to end anti-oppressive practices. We’d like to see profiling stopped. No retired police should be overseeing the agencies and then we would like to see the head of the SIU perhaps removed.

In terms of the need to create a more open relationship with police, police budgets have become targeted on criminals instead of citizens. One example of that is with intelligence led policing. It’s a terrible practice and it’s been adopted everywhere. In fact, street checks --carding in other words --is done under the rubric of counter-terrorism mitigation and I have the document right here okay?

So another recommendation is less police officers and more public education for the community in general. We’d also want to see an easier access to correct incorrect information using Freedom of Information practices. Have I missed anything? Okay. Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Okay so actually we have a speakers list. Tammy’s next and then we will get back to you. We will get back to you. Could you pass the mic please --not to Tammy, to [Marianne]. Sorry. She’s at the table right beside you.

Marianne: Good evening. My name is Mary-Anne [Mijares-MacIsaac]. I would like to first thank Justice Tulloch and his team for allowing us this opportunity to speak. I’m here on a personal note. My husband, Michael MacIsaac, was shot and killed by Durham Police on December 2nd, 2013. Sorry. Michael suffered a seizure and had a high fever that morning and he was not himself and he basically ran out of the house naked. We tried to stop him and he fought us and one thing led to another and everything snowballed and my life came crashing down. Twenty minutes later Michael was shot.

I am here not to go over every detail of this horrific story but I want to explain to you our interaction with the SIU in particular.

First of all, we were not notified by the SIU that Michael was shot. We were notified by the Durham Police, although SIU was already on scene. Second of all, the witnesses --and there were many witnesses --they were taken to the Durham Police station. SIU's mandate is to have a completely separate and impartial investigation. You tell me why witnesses are being taken to Durham Police and allowed to sit there for hours and to be spoken to by investigators there to just taint the witnesses and have this horrible image of my husband.

[Jon Ansell] from the SIU was investigator who decided to do a media scrum just minutes after our family was notified that Michael was shot. He told the media that Michael ran out of the house as police were approaching. He told the media that there was a domestic. . .we had a confrontation with Michael but it wasn't domestic. He was ill and he was trying to fight to leave. And he said Michael was possibly armed and dangerous. Well I have to tell you that is so far from the truth.

The SIU's mandate on their website says, "The SIU shall not during the course of an investigation by the SU, make any public statement about the investigation unless such statement is aimed at preserving the integrity of the investigation." I don't feel that was the case in our situation. When we confronted the SIU about this complaint to their lawyer, it was just fluffed off as, "Oh we try very hard to preserve the integrity and it's such a delicate situation," but really it took them a month to reply to my email and then insult to injury we were at the hospital while Michael's had surgery. The SIU allows the RPS officers to come and interrogate us at the hospital. We didn't even realize we were speaking to the RPS. We didn't know who we were speaking to, to be quite honest. It wasn't until SIU appeared at the door and said, "Oh we are the SIU and Durham Police was interviewing us," and they kind of looked shocked and then they allowed the questioning to continue.

At the SIU meeting on June 4th when they advised us they would not be charging the officer. They said, "Had we had to make that decision again we wouldn't have allowed RPS officers to interview you."

So these are the issues we take with the SIU amongst many other things but these are the ones that hurt the most. When we are suffering and our loved one is, you know, dying in the hospital, who's there to protect us? Where's our Victim Services or representative? We had none. SIU has a Victim Services person -- never heard from her. Yet Durham Police they have their counselling, they have their lawyers and within minutes of Michael being shot, that officer was escorted away and comforted. We got zero.

So this is my issue with the SIU. Changes have to be made. Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Deputy Chief Uday. Thanks. Yes it'll come back. I just want to. . . I start the speakers list and we'll rotate around. Thank you Marianne.

Uday Jaswal: Thank you. So my name is Uday Jaswal. I'm actually the Deputy Chief for the Durham Regional Police Service. We started into our discussion. I don't think we reached any conclusions but certainly had good discussions on all the questions that were asked. In terms of experiences with the police, question number 3, wide range of experiences from negative to some positive. Certainly lots of indication that background, as an immigrant, as a racialized member of the community, they felt targeted at times and that their experience was differentiated from other citizens.

In terms of how they responded, none of the individuals who had negative experiences with the police indicated that they sought to report that, which is interesting. One member of the table actually indicated the response was to get involved with the police and to change from within, so they're actually now involved with the diversity advisory committee within the Durham Regional Police Service.

In terms of number 5, in terms of oversight agencies, there seemed to be limited knowledge of all three agencies and it was difficult for the group to comment I think on transparency.

In terms of information sharing, again, a number of perspectives. Some felt the SIU was doing a good job in terms of information sharing but certainly felt they could do a lot more in terms of educating the public, explaining decisions and basically publicizing the decisions of those cases in a much more I guess open, transparent way.

There was an interesting question that got asked. "Is the public actually interested in the final result? After the incident that occurs, it's quite sensational. Is the public actually interested in the final result and what steps are members of the public actually taking to get informed about the SIU and other agencies?"

Again, about naming police officers, a number of different perspectives. Certainly we heard that police officers should be held to a higher standard given their role and therefore names should be made public. We also heard perspectives on, "Is that the same in every other profession?" So whether that be lawyers, doctors or other professions where complaints of misconduct are leveled, are those individuals named as well and is it fair? Is it

appropriate within a policing environment to begin to name members? Again, no real resolution of that but certainly some good discussion.

With respect to number 8 and police officers working with the SIU, I think there was strong sense that they should not be, that there's an inherent bias of police investigating police or former police investigating police and that for the SIU to be seen to be independent or any of those agencies being seen to be independent, they needed to be not police officers. That's unfortunately where we got stuck.

Pamela Grant: That's fine. Thank you. We'll have another go-around. So Ian is the next speaker, so I'll come help him get the mic.

Ian: Good evening everyone. My name is Ian Webster. Thank you for having this evening. Honorable Justice Tulloch, to you and your team. Marianne, sorry for your loss and anyone else in here who's had a loss. Number one, we have different people at the table so we had people who are dealing with the boards all the time to, you know, myself who's just heard of the SIU only. I've never heard of the OIPRD or the OCPC.

Good experiences or bad experiences with the police. Again, there were good experiences with the police and there were also bad experiences with the police. With those experiences did you report it? No. In one case yes it was reported because that individual was educated about the different boards. In another situation it wasn't reported because there was no education that these other boards were available to the public.

Number 4, "If someone you know had a bad experience with police, would you encourage them to report it? Now knowing that these three agencies are there to help us, the public, absolutely.

"Do you think the police oversight agencies are open enough about their investigations?" We have said "no."

"In particular do you think the SIU shares enough with the public about their investigations of police officers?" Again it was "no." There's no transparency, especially when it comes to the chief, deputy and any member of the police board.

Six, "If you think they do not share enough, how do you think they should improve? What information do you think the public should show after an SIU investigation?" Again, you want to have transparency, you want there to be accountability and there's also length of time. There seems to be a long length of time in between the investigations.

Where are we now? Seven. “Should the names of police officers who are investigated by the SIU be made public even when the SIU decides not to charge them?” And we said “yes” to some, “no” to others. It’s really circumstantial.

“Should former police officers work as investigators at the SIU, OIPRD or OCPC?” And again, that was overwhelming “yes.” You know, they’re the ones who have the experience. You want good officers to be in those roles.

Number 9, “Should the SIU, OIPRD and OCPC collect data on things like race, gender, age and mental health?” The data should be on an internal police investigation. Me personally I would have a problem with anyone doing it based on race.

Ten, “If you think they should collect data, how should the data be handled? What should be done with it?” I’m not sure that we really were able to answer this as a team. We didn’t really talk about this but some of the things that did come out is that the information, you know, should be non-specific and there should be more details around trends.

And the last, “Do you have any other recommendations on how to improve the SIU, OIPRD or OCPC?” You know again, I think there has to be a lot of transparency, accountability, public oversight, they have to shorten the time that’s in between the investigations and better education of vulnerable communities is a big thing. Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thank you Ian. I’m going to start the mic back around to the gentleman here but I’m going to ask if you could please give us more information in terms of recommendations and so on, okay? Just one sec.

Dary: Thank you. I came a little late, so I have to apologize first of all but when joined the group discussion, you know, a couple of things sort of popped up into my mind. My name is [Dari] by the way. [Ashanti], [Shah] last name Shah. First two names are African. Trying to reclaim my roots but anyway, it’s not about me.

I have some recommendations and one of the recommendations, which my friend did allude to, I want to speak on to that point because I’m the one that raised that. The head of the SIU needs to go. Very simple English. He needs to be fired, terminated, deactivated, whatever you want to call it. He shouldn’t be there. His name is Mr. Loparco and find it strange that nobody seems to talk about the head of the SIU. I don’t know if he’s here tonight. Maybe. I don’t know what he looks like. Is he here? Even if he is here, I’m still pulling for his resignation. He wants to leave with

dignity then he can resign and have a little dignity but he needs to go and the reason I say this is because in the case of [Jermaine Carby], young black man pulled over for a simple traffic stop in broad daylight, ended up dead and the SIU, which is supposed to be impartial but it isn't. . . I'm old enough to remember the days when Dudley laws and Charles Roach, the founders of the Black Action Defence Committee, which I don't hear much about anymore. That's the reason why they have an SIU is because the Black Action Defence Committee who many police officers loathe and harassed him until he died, poor man, I think he died of stress. He was constantly monitored by the police just because he stood up for justice --stood up for ordinary black people in the city and I was one of them. I was a younger person at the time.

I admire those two but he needs to go because he singlehandedly decided not to lay charges in that matter and it was clear case of wrongdoing. I like to ask the question, since the SIU has been formed I understand there's been 12 different heads of this organization, which shows it's not very stable if you have that many different leaders. It's like a revolving door and he needs to go because he made the decision not to lay charges and get this, do people know who this person even is? I mean it's on the Internet. I looked it up. He spent 25 years of his life basically working with the police as a crown prosecutor in Ontario. That's what crown prosecutors do. They work with the police to lay charges and to convict people.

He was doing that for 25 years and he's proud of it. In fact, that's how he got in to be the head because of his great record but he's obviously biased. He never lays any charges against the police. Have you noticed that? Could it have something to do with the fact that he's been working with them for 25 years and he gets \$200,000 a year? To do what? To block justice. He should be charged with obstruction of justice himself because that's what he's doing. When you don't lay charges when somebody has killed someone and there was no need to kill the person, that person should be charged. Isn't this Canada? Aren't we a country of laws? Are the police above the law? Is Mr. Loparco above the law? I think not.

You know, so that's why I made that recommendation because that's a visible action. Somebody gets fired because they're not doing their job. The role of the head of the SIU my understanding is to garner the public confidence that there is an open and transparent mechanism to oversee the actions of the police.

Having said that, I'm not saying the all police are bad. You might get that feeling but I don't. There are some very good ones. I've had some good relationships with police --some, but there are others I haven't had such an endearing relationship with but he

needs to go. \$200,000 or whatever he's making, what is this money being spent for? I mean is this money well spent? I think not and all these other acronyms that I never heard of either. There's the SIU and there's all these others. It looks like to me this is just a way to create jobs for more police officers or retired police officers. Are they doing this voluntarily? I don't think so. I think they're getting paid to be on these committees, SIU and also I could go but don't go on? Okay. I respect her a lot.

Pamela Grant: Are there any other comments? I saw a few hands.

Dari: I'd like to know, how many of the SIU are actually black males? I think probably 95% of them are white males. I may be wrong but I would like someone to prove me wrong. Let's have a picture of the SIU. I bet that will tell you something as to why they're so reluctant to lay any charges and I'd like to know how many charges have they actually laid against police officers since they started. I think the answer is zero from my understanding. If somebody wants to correct me, please feel free.

Male Voice: [Unintelligible 00:45:47].

Dari: That's one.

Pamela Grant: Okay. Can we just have one at a time please?

Debbie: Hi. Thank you very much. My name is Debbie. I'm a 38-year resident of Durham Region and actually love the area, haven't had too many scenarios of bad experiences until recently and so I'm just going to talk about a process I think that. . .I mean in the last six months I've been going through my own little personal hell, which I've looked to the police for guidance, for support and where it's in a neighbourhood dispute, which I know sounds pretty minor but this is going to an extreme. I had a death threat against me which was pretty much [unintelligible 00:46:53] and I've been pretty much told to just get along.

I've had numerous police officers to my house because of these situations and I've asked for guidance, "What do I do?" They say, you know, "I'm sorry. I really empathize but all you can do is record. Record, record and then finally go to the police station and say, 'I want this person to stop harassing me.'" I've got four video cameras aimed at my front door. Apparently that's all okay because it's public domain that somebody can watch me when I come and go from my house. So I'm thinking of taking it a little further.

It's even extended to. . .I have a complaint. Actually because of this meeting I did a little bit of investigating. Let me just back up a little bit because you mentioned about the SIU because I went to

their website and it's old data but it says there's eight members who are non-policing and six had policing background. My suggestion would just be a little more or less policing background and a little bit more citizens.

The instances I've had with the local Durham Regional Police, until let's say in the last month I've probably had probably 12 officers to my house and it's only been maybe the last two who actually gave me some valid information of what process to follow and that I could file a complaint or because of my death threat, a neighbour who was a witness to it was then harassed by this person who made the threat. They concocted a story that this person keyed their car. This gentleman was arrested on this video evidence apparently and he's an upstanding citizen. He had to go to court, pay \$3000 of lawyer's fees to have it completely thrown out with no actual evidence. The video tape, which is supplied by the person saying they keyed their car showed error between this person and the car. The crown attorney indicated that this should never have even come forth.

So since coming here I did a little bit of background because I didn't want to come in misinformed. I understood I could now request a meeting with the inspector. I've emailed an inspector friend last Thursday. I haven't heard [unintelligible 00:49:05]. I got an automatic reply that had nothing on it. It didn't say, "Thank you for your email. Somebody will be in touch within 24 hours," or whichever and so I called the next day to say, "Did my email actually get read?" Somebody who answered the phone said, "Oh probably. We just don't know where it is." So it's now Tuesday. I would've expected a call back because I would like to resolve my issues with these certain officers of Durham Regional Police like I would like somebody to go to my boss first before going up the line?

I'm hoping that there will be a process and that with this false charge because of me asking for a meeting, am I going to have retaliation against me now? I've had certain officers indicate that when they came to my door that there's an old school still and there's a new school, so you do have to complain because if you want to be heard and you want changes then you should complain. God forbid anything happens to me because I'm not so quiet if I get pulled over for something just because I've asked for a meeting and a complaint.

Just in quick closing, we're looking for an increase in education workshops. The region is changing continuously with residents. We've got more people coming in. We need town halls maybe. We need to be able to be a partner with the police and not always that they're up here and we're just to do whatever the moment says.

In closing, in accountability I did see from the second group, sorry, when there is. . .I'm glad and I went on but they are transparent when there are active cases that the cases are on there and I was able to go see if any of the officers that I had an issue with were previously named, which would help me because it's like if there's continual complaints about a certain officer, the public should know about it because we are helping to pay for them but education workshops and more community support.

Pamela Grant: Debbie right?

Debbie: Debbie, yeah.

Pamela Grant: Thanks Debbie.

Devonito: Good evening. My name is [Devonito]. I'm a student from Durham College. I am in no way representation of the SIU. It's just all my personal opinion. First thing I would like to address is a lot of people are having issues with public relations. I'm very unsatisfied with the answers regarding public relations. I feel if you are uneducated on what the SIU and other organizations do, how can we say they're not informing us on certain things? It just doesn't make sense to me with my legal thinking.

The second thing is still regarding public relations. If there's something somebody wanted to know about an organization and you're well aware of the organization, investigate it. Go on their site, read more, etc. If you have then I'm sorry.

On the other thing of black issues, I can't really comment it but I am black. I've never been involved with the CIU. I have altercations with police officers but as my mom taught me when I was young, "You do something stupid, something will come back to you," and this police action, it's the purpose of officers. Us kids. . .as me in high school I do something stupid, we all get harassed for it and I hear what you're saying but just try to tone it down. We're all angry at the SIU. Maybe we all have issues with what police have done to us in the past but I believe just got to take it slow. Has anybody even read the legislation of the SIU? Does anybody even know of the legislation of the SIU? So then we have to really be careful on how we judge certain things and we have to really be careful. . .like it's right for us to be critical but we have to be critical with facts. That's what I'm trying to say. You have your facts here but your facts are more on a racial tension. Okay well keep your. . .okay.

The second thing I want to also address is a lot of people complain to the SIU. A lot of people say, "Well that SIU hasn't got back to us." Anybody ever consider a lot of people do not like

the SIU, which means that they have a lot of emails, which means that it's going to be harder for the SIU to get back to you. Well considering the sentiment on this place I see that a lot of people -- majority of the people do not agree with the SIU. Well whatever. As I said, it's my opinion. Do not look to the people behind me on anything. It's just me. It's just what I have to say before I leave and I just advise people take caution on how you assess things. Get the facts, get the issues and then address it. It's not the SIU personally. If you want to. . .given the fact that I've actually researched the legislation, if you actually have an issue with the SIU, it's better to go to your local MP or it's better to go to the Ontario Government, which actually handles the SIU. Don't attack the SIU for doing something that they're not really. . .yeah so thank you. Have a good night.

Pamela Grant: Okay thank you. Alright I see two hands and they will need to be the last two. Yeah and one there, yeah.

Male Voice: Thank you. I just have two issues that we didn't quite get to in our table but Tammy did a great job. I just wanted to say I had an issue with the OIPRD and the fact that like the Justice pointed out, they're able to screen certain complaints out. You know, it's easy to say that as just a procedural issue but the fact that they're able to screen things out actually allows them to decide. "I'm going to investigate this. I'm not going to investigate that." That's a very dangerous issue and we've thrown around these catch phrases like "accountability" a lot. Well you know I think we should get more into the nitty-gritty of what creates accountability and more importantly, is the public actually going to think that police are being held to account? And the answer is no.

If I submit a complaint and the answer is, "We decided not to investigate," not, "We investigated and found as follows." Just, "We decided not to investigate because your thing is frivolous or your thing is not in the public interest." Sometimes these complaints are submitted in times of crisis or submitted by people who are maybe not that eloquent so if just based on the initial complaint it's screened out.

That can't happen and again the gentleman here who just left, he allowed the SIU some cover in saying, "Oh they get a lot of emails." Well it's no excuse. If you have a body that's supposed to answer these complaints, they should investigate every single one and give reasons as to why they found in one particular way, not just say, "I decided not to investigate" because then they can do anything. They can say, "I don't investigate if it's somebody who's gay. I don't investigate if it's somebody who's black." So you can't give them that discretion.

Pamela Grant: Thank you.

Randy Henning:

Thank you. I'm going to step back here so I can address the crowd and the Justice. I'm Randy Henning. I'm the president of the Durham Regional Police Association and for those that don't know what that means, I'm the head of the union for lack of better terms of the police association. I'm a full-time member but before, I want to tell you something. I was born and raised in Bowmanville. I've lived there my entire 53 years on this earth. I'm a father. I'm a son. I'm a grandfather. I'm a husband and more importantly I'm a neighbour to many, many people in Bowmanville. So when I speak, I speak not only as the president of the association but I truly speak that I am a member of this community and I think that's very important for everybody in the audience to understand.

To say that I had a lot of dealings with all the oversight bodies would be an understatement. I truly believe in oversight of policing. I think it's good for everybody involved. I think it's very important for our community to see oversight and to have faith in oversight and that's the most important thing. It's not good to just have oversight, but it's very good to have faith in oversight because that's the only way it makes it worthwhile okay?

One of the things I want to talk about to the Justice that I see on almost a daily basis in my profession in what I do is the actual lack of time and I'm going to speak to you not as the president of the police association, I'm going to speak to you as a community member and a neighbour to some of you.

As a public we should be appalled and offended that it takes so long for any of our oversight people, whether it may be OIPRD or more importantly the SIU when it comes to investigating complaints. For instance, in a policing world if we had a shooting that involved a member of the public --not police related, just a shooting --in my neighbourhood and someone was shot and killed and we had the person who did it right away as a policing organization, you as the public would expect us to investigate that and charge someone as soon as we possibly could or not charge them depending on the evidence that comes out.

In a policing world when police are involved, every time the police are involved in a shooting or any kind of injury, the SIU does not have to investigate what I'm going to term as a "who done it?" They already know who was involved. In fact, they're right there on the scene or fairly close by for them to talk to and also witnesses as well. So each and every one of my officers that I represent must stay --just so you understand --must stay there until the SIU essentially says they can go. That can be upwards of five, six, seven, maybe ten hours later. So the SIU not only has the person that was involved, but they also have witnesses at their

disposal. So I'm going to talk about a couple cases and the first one-

Pamela Grant: We need to watch the time okay?

Randy Henning: Yeah. I'm going to very quick with this.

Pamela Grant: Thank you.

Randy Henning: The first one that I'm going to talk about is the most recent one in January of 2016 in Port Perry. An officer shot a gentleman up in Port Perry. It took nine months for the SIU to come back with their decision. I'm not here to talk about whether the decision was right or wrong because very honestly I wasn't involved in the investigation so I can't tell you that but I can tell you that I'm appalled that it took nine months for them to come back with their decision because that's wrong. As a citizen of this region I think that's appalling. I don't think that their investigators --so that's what I'm asking Justice Tulloch to look into is how long the investigators are taking and how long it's sitting on Mr. Loparco's desk before he decides to write up his. . .that's appalling and I see people shaking their heads and I thank you for that.

Another case we have outstanding. We had an incident. This gentleman right here. We're all board members. These are my board members. He was involved in a simple motor vehicle accident. Unfortunately there was a serious injury. That happened in April just around the corner here at MacMillan Orchards off of Lakeridge Road and Hwy 2. That was in April. In our world that would take our officers less than a shift to investigate. Considering there was multiple citizens on scene who actually gave witness statements. You would not accept one of my officers, one of my members taking from April until now --what's that, seven months, six months to investigate a simple traffic accident. That's wrong people. People need to step up and demand that the SIU, the OIPRD and the OCPC are quicker at what they do because that's what we as citizens demand and I thank you all for coming here tonight.

Pamela Grant: Thank you. Actually I'm looking at the time and it's five to 8 so what I'd like to do is thank you all very briefly but hand it over to Justice Tulloch to close off and thank you more fully. A reminder for those who have just come in to ensure that you sign and write very clearly on the long sheet. We will be sending a link for the final report using those email addresses so it's important that you do fill that out and please leave your notes on the table. We will collect those and thank you very much. So over to Justice Tulloch to close off.

Justice Tulloch: Okay. I want to thank each and every one of you for coming. This is a public meeting and all of you that are here are members of the public within the context of this community: police and citizens alike. So I've heard all of your comments and I've heard your concerns and we will take them as I would say "under advisement," and we will be considering all of your recommendations. A lot of the comments that we've heard, we've heard it from other groups as well and so we will take them seriously. So thank you all very much for coming and, you know, we'll look forward to you reading our report and hopefully it will in the end reflect some of what you've said to us. Thank you.

[End of recorded material at 1:03:43]