

16-11-08-IPOR-Hamilton

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Facilitator: Good evening, everyone. And welcome again to the Independent Police Oversight Review Consultation, public, here, in Hamilton. Hamilton, thank you for hosting us and we're looking forward to a very frank and fruitful conversation about the three Police Oversight bodies. My name is Pamela Grant, I'm the facilitator and the strategic advisor to Justice Tulloch's Team as we have undertaken this process. I will pass over to Justice Tulloch without furtherer due so that he can make introductions and give you a little bit more context, followed by my colleague, Danielle Dowdy, who will also take us through this evening's format and procedure. And then I'll be back to facilitate the group discussion. Thank you.

Justice Tulloch: Good evening to everyone. I want to thank all of you for coming. My name is Michael Tulloch. I'm a judge, and I am a current sitting judge on Ontario Court of Appeal. I would like to begin by first acknowledging that we're gathered on the Traditional Indigenous Lands of the Haudenosaunee people – Six Nations, the Grand River territory. As Canadians, we acknowledge that these lands were the meeting place for several indigenous nations in the area, and by acknowledging this we're acknowledging the importance and the significance of traditions of indigenous peoples. Now, by way of background, on April 29th of this year, I was appointed by the Provincial Governmental to lead an independent review of three civilian agencies that oversee police conduct in this province.

The Special Investigations Unit, or the SIU, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director, or the OIPRD, and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission, or what is called the OCPC. Now, since my appointment, I've assembled a team of experts to assist me. I've held number and number of consultations with public and private stakeholders throughout the province including the GTA, Thunder Bay, Saulte Saint Marie, Sudbury and Ottawa. In the weeks ahead, I will be holding additional consultations also in the GTA, as well as London, Windsor, Kingston and Kenora. I'm consulting broadly and intend to draw in what I've learned to make recommendations to enhance the transparency, accountability and efficacy of the oversight bodies, while at the same time insuring that they carry out their work as effectively and as efficiently as possible.

Now, by March 31st of 2017, we will complete this process, and at that time I will submit my final report to the Government as well as to the public at large. So it's really important that those of you that are here fill out your names and your information, if you want to receive a copy of our report upon completion. It was mentioned the focus of the review is

on the three Civilian Police Oversight bodies – the SIU, the OIPRD, and the OCPC. Now, 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.

The OIPRD is mandated to receive, manage and oversee all public complaints about the conduct, policies and services of police in Ontario. Now, in addition, the OIPRD also has the power to examine issues of a systemic nature that may arise from complaints about the Police and make recommendations in addressing them. Now finally, the OCPC is primarily an adjudicated body. Its mandate, among other things, is to conduct hearings and adjudicate disputes related to police disciplinary decisions, budget disputes between municipal councils, and police services boards, and disputes related to the provision of police services. The OCPC can also conduct investigations into the conduct of police services, board members and police officers.

Now, with that background in mind about the review and the Civilian Police Oversight bodies, I want to take this opportunity, this evening, to hear from you. You, as citizens of Hamilton, you're an important constituency to the Province of Ontario into this entire review process. And so that is why we're here. The review is an independent review. That means that I am free to critically examine how these Oversight bodies operate. Meeting with you, members of the public, is a crucial part of that process. I'm grateful that you've taken the time to meet with me, today, and I appreciate that speaking about some of these issues may be difficult for some of you. However, 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.

I can assure you that I will do so. And so as long as you participate and offer me your perspective, you will be heard throughout this process. So again, I want to thank you for coming out tonight to share your thoughts and your experiences and your recommendations with us. And I assure you, once again, that in this process you will be heard. Thank you.

Danielle:

Good evening, everyone. I'm just going to go over this really quickly. I'll let you know what the agenda is going to be like before we get started. Just as a disclaimer, the review mandate – we're not looking at personal cases or reviewing past cases or past judgements. We do want to hear your stories, they're very important because they set a very important context for our report. But just so that you know, we won't be revisiting cases that have already been or judgements that have already been decided. The way that this is going to work this evening – this is the short introduction. We're going to get right into the round table. You've all been left materials at your table. We're going to ask you to discuss the questions that are before you for about 45 minutes.

My colleague, Pamela Grant, she's going to be doing the timing and making sure that we stick to that. And then that's going to be followed up by a report back in the feedback session. So this is where we get to hear what you discussed and your recommendations. Just so you know, we are on social media. You might see myself or Matthew Parker – he's at the back of the room, waving. We're going to be tweeting this evening and also taking pictures, as well as Peter Rehak. If, Peter, you could just wave. If you see any of us – and we're taking pictures and you don't want your picture take, – if you could just let us know. Otherwise we'll be tweeting and sharing your thoughts. And also, if you don't want us to capture any of that, just let us know.

It's not an issue at all. So we're on Facebook, we're on Twitter, we're on Instagram, and we are tweeting under the hashtag “#BeHeardON,” and ON is for Ontario. Okay? Thank you so much.

Facilitator: Thank you very much, Danielle. What I'd like to do is ask those who have just joined us to come on in. There're sits towards the side of the room. I just want to make sure as well that every table has a number of copies of the list of questions that you'd be working on for the next 45 minutes. And if I may, the suggestion is that – over the 45 minutes that your table decides who will be reporting back. You will have five minutes per table to report back, and we want to go through that fairly quickly in the hopes that we can come back around and take other comments. But to use your time strategically in terms of the report back, to not necessarily repeat what others have said, but to ensure that what is unique to the discussion at your table is shared or different from what's been said previous to you.

The team of Justice Tulloch, and Danielle, and Jamie, and Matt, and we're – okay. Justin and Hillary will also circulate to tables and... Not to participate in that way, but to clarify anything. I will, as well. And I will give you time checks through the process. And I will come around to find out which person at each table is going to report back and get your name. Okay? So that's how it will be and your 45-minute starts now. So, Jennifer?

Jennifer: Do I stand?

Facilitator: Yes, please stand.

Jennifer: That's more [unintelligible 00:10:46]Okay. Do I just read the questions, kind of our results?

Facilitator: No, you don't need to. As I said, just simply...

Jennifer: So for the beginning, we kind of voted. So all of us knew what the SIU was. A couple of us knew what the OIPRD and the OCPC were, but we had no idea what they did. And then for the SIU, really, it was just things that we had heard at the news, nothing directly. One of the members of our group has had some SIU contact, and one member had

had some indirect contact, for number two. So good and bad experiences. I wanted to share my experience, but there were good and bad experiences here, one person that had no experiences with police and mainly good experiences. Two of us had something different and I will share mine. So my daughter is eight, and I would have loved for her to be here, today. She's extremely brave, but I couldn't get her to do it with all these people.

So I went to John Sopinka Courthouse, here in Hamilton, and I was serving some documents to the Courthouse for Small Claims Court. I'm currently trying to become a paralegal. And my daughter had in her hand my purse, and I had my briefcase. In my purse, I forgot that I had left a toiletry bag. And in the toiletry bag was a disposable raiser. They took the bag from her and opened the bag, and I had explained to her at the time that they would do that, but I forgot that it was there. And I really wanted her to see the Court process. They took the item from her, they put it back in the back and they told her to leave. They did not offer her the sharps bin that was on the wall, they did not offer her another conversation.

She's, again, eight years old and momma bear got quite upset. I said, "That's my bag, I apologize. I forgot. Can we put it in the sharps bin?" And she said to me, "You should've known better. I've seen you here before. Get out." So I turned around and I took my daughter and I left. I walked out the backdoors and down the street, over to the front doors, and when I got into the front doors, my goal was to give my toiletry bag to the security office and ask them if they could either hold it there or destroy the sharp, so we could come in and do our business. They refused and, in addition to that, they met me with four armguards to escort me and my daughter off of John Sopinka property. At that point, I walked over to Hamilton Police's Central Station, and I spent about 45 minutes on their lovely bench out front, convincing my daughter that she should complain.

She finally went in and spoke to a staff sergeant. Both herself and the staff sergeant, cried. It was extremely emotional. I cried quite a bit. And then after that, I got a call from Court Services and the staff sergeant there and I got an apology. And that was all that happened. I went two days later, the same guard who spoke to me and removed my daughter was working there, and nothing else has ever happened of it. That guard has never apologized to me or my daughter, and my daughter will never go back. My daughter won't go near a police officer, she won't speak to one. There's a community engagement officer at her school, and she won't go anywhere near them – she's terrified. So that's my experience. The majority of us for question number four, five to one says, "Yes."

One member said no – that member was me. I did not think that I would ever tell another person again to report an incident to the SIU or to the Police Services. I just think it's too traumatic. I think there are other places that you can report. If you're a church-going person or if you got good friends and family, that's really a better way to get rid of this pain

that you're feeling. Because if you're not an extremely strong person, it will be very painful for you – I can tell you that. And we were worried about the mark that it leaves on your record. If you ever complain to police, your information is now theirs forever and a day – and who knows what that will be used for. If you're ever in a traffic stop or something like that, you're now known as a police complainer.

For number five, we had no idea how to answer this. And I think that that just kind of speaks volumes to how most people feel about the SIU and those agencies. We really had no clue. Number six – we kind of just skipped through. And number seven, we said no. And the reason being is because innocent to approving guilty. If somebody is cleared of a crime, we think that they should be able to get their life back. But on the backend of that, we also said that if that person was then investigated a second time, that that investigation from the first time – if similar – should now become public and part of that, as well. If there's a crime trend that's persisting, that should be public knowledge.

Facilitator: Jennifer, your time is actually up. So if there's a –

Jennifer: Do you want the recommendations?

Facilitator: Sure, yeah.

Jennifer: I'll just skip to the bottom.

Facilitator: But I'm just letting you know that your -

Jennifer: Okay. So we wanted there to be a Town Hall to review results that are given by the SIU, so they make recommendations. We wanted those to be public to the community in the Town Hall, where we could ask questions, et cetera. We wanted those reports to be available in all languages that service our community because, as it stands now, they are not. We also wanted a follow through body who lets us know on a percentile basis how many of those recommendations were actually implemented by the Community Police Agency. And then officers, we thought, could not investigate within their own community. So if they had served with Hamilton Police, for example, they could not then move on to the SIU and then again investigate their own agency.

And we thought that there should be a balance on the SIU between police, judges, lawyers, perhaps the law society, mental health professional civilians, people with special skills, and a community leader that could build some trust between the investigation and the people that it serves. So it was our stuff in a gist.

Facilitator: Thank you very much. Matthew, can you pass it on to [Hatta Hollis]? Did I get that right? There. Sort of. Okay.

Hatta: It's on. [Foreign language 00:16:53]. So to sum up before I go into details, the basic feel of our group was that the police system doesn't work. The systems we have in place, they don't work. They're garbage,

and they suck. I listened to all the stories here, at the table, and every single time it's, "The Police did this and I feel I should've done this. I did this, I reported it. I did that and that guy still got a full-time job and nobody cares." So we believe we're being underserved from the police and the police services, all these different organizations. Like me, myself, I've been a victim of – I was a victim of domestic abuse for over five years. I reported it, I had the physical marks from it and everything else, but because I'm a big indigenous man, I'm a little scary to some people.

All I ever got for a response from that was, "What were you doing? How many times did you hit her? Whatever you, you know... You know, have you been drinking? I know all Indians drink, so you must have been drunk." All of this different stuff. So for me, that loses faith in the police – I'm not going to call the police again when my partner's beating me. And that's the main focus – it's that we've lost faith in this system. We don't want to call the police. You call the police, you got to deal with three months of someone saying, "It's your fault, just forget about it," and you can go home and live your life or sit here and tell the same story 500 times and have them tell you, "Yeah, we don't care." So for some of the recommendations here, I don't fully understand all the systems – I, personally.

Everyone here knew all the different organizations. I didn't. I guess I represent the young people in our indigenous community. So the young people, we have a lot less faith in the police than most people. For the point of indigenous youth, this is how most of us see it, and I'm just going to explain it as clearly as I can. We see it as a police officer could come in here, right now, as I'm speaking in front of all you people, in front of all these cameras, beat me to the ground, and then they would have all those evidence and they would still say he had a reasonable cause to assault me. So the issues we're seeing is when we have these problems, the police are being investigated by other police, which is somewhat needed because you need someone who understands the systems, on how to be a police officer.

But at the same time – you know, you're not going to send me to investigate my mother because I'm going to have a bias. You can't send your partner to investigate you because of, like, "He's a good guy. It wasn't a big deal." So the system we have enables these officers to commit these crimes. We can catch them doing it. We have police officers caught abusing people. They're given two weeks paid vacation, they're back right on the force. If I did that, I would be in jail. No question. Minimum, probably, five years. So I highly recommend, if you have time, to talk to these individuals at this table. They can explain their recommendations for this system a lot better than I could because I don't understand it.

But one of the things I thought was really cool is the no need for internal affairs. The OIPRP should have a greater role in the disciplinary role. We should have other people overseeing these investigations in the

police other than police officers from the same precinct. Like I said, you wouldn't send a member of the family to investigate that family, or you're going to get bias results. Yeah.

Facilitator: Thank you. Karen. See, we're right on time. Karen? Come in here.

Karen: Thank you for being here. At this table, we have three affected families that have lost loved ones shot by police. I represent a group called The Affected Families of Police Homicide Ontario. We have met with many people across the Province. We have met with the SIU, the Director. We've met with [unintelligible 00:21:42], we've met with the Ministry, the Attorney General. We've met with many, many Government bodies. What I'd like to tell you today is these questions that we have on here seem a little ridiculous to us, so what we thought we would do is tell you what we think are recommendations for good, positive change. What we'd like to see is that all of these bodies report to the public, fully, that there's a full report of what's happening in our communities.

The problem is, here, that we see a community here. And it's not just my son that dies nine years ago. This is his birthday – 35 years. He would've been 35, today. So I'm trying to do something very positive, okay? So they need to be very transparent. That was the initial mandate of the SIU. Ever since it started, it was supposed to be transparent. It was supposed to do rigorous and full investigations. It has never done that, either. And we know that. And I'm talking about Oversight, not police. We got started on police, we got a lot to talk about. But all investigators should be non-police staff. All of these Oversight agencies should be non-police. It's not hard to investigate when you've got a forensic person there.

It's not hard to investigate when you've been trained properly. We'd like to see out of the 54 investigators, that 47 of the investigators are not ex-police, at the SIU. That would be really nice. The SIU needs to stop threatening witnesses, which they do. They threaten witnesses, they threaten people, they misinform people. The SIU's Affected Persons Coordinator, Nickie Buchok, is useless – and I won't complete that phrase. However, she has misinformed a lot of families. She's tried to counsel families. She has not passed on the Victim Services People like she promised to do at the meeting with the Victim Services of Ontario. They need better staffing for support for families. The SIU just needs better supports for families.

They say they own duty of care to the public - they do. We pay their wages. We should have a bloody big say in what the SIU does. The SIU needs to have power to drug test police as they do non-police under MTO laws, if only that. They need to drug test police when they've shot somebody. Yes, they do. All police names should be released if they're involved in a shooting. Right? They really should. And I mean, in serious injuries, have we actually adopted the Osler definition with the SIU? Have they adopted any of that as a serious injury? I don't know. Mr. Osler was the first director of the SIU and he defined that any

serious injury that somebody would have by a police officer should be brought to the SIU, and it's not. That needs to be fixed. And I think that's just about it.

Facilitator: Matt, can you go to table 14? John S, please. Right behind you, over this way.

John: Hello. So yeah, I guess what I'm going to focus on is just primarily our recommendations with respect to question number eight – should former police officers work as investigators at the SIU in particular? So should we have police investigating police? And initially we sort of collectively answered, “No,” in order to ensure that we're conducting an unbiased investigation. That all investigators should not be part of an organ or an agency that could perhaps hold the bias in favor of the individual that's being investigated. But as we began talking more and more, we sort of came to a more detailed, or we sort of changed our minds in regards to allowing police officers because they are trained with respect to investigative techniques and processes and this would be important.

However, in order to ensure accountability, transparency, the investigative team would now consider individuals from various other public or potentially public services, concerned citizens, citizens that were involved within the act itself. Just in order to really ensure that the investigation is conducted to ensure accountability and transparency within the entire process. And with respect to if several investigations are conducted towards the same police officer, we collectively sort of agreed that this demonstrates a flaw or – yeah, this demonstrates a fundamental flaw within the investigation agency rather than just sort of focusing on the individual police officer and how that officer deserves to be or has to be... or there is a reason why there is a constant or several investigations being conducted to that particular officer.

It's a bigger problem that sort of is within the investigation agency. So in this context it would be the SIU. But yeah, those were our two main points to bring to the table.

Facilitator: Thank you, John. Table four, Mona? Matt, Mona is in front of you, so if she stands up, then you can – here you go.

Mona: Hi, my name is Mona. Bonjour. So I'm going to cover only some of the questions, as a lot of the stuff that we had discussed at our table has already been said very well. So one of the main questions or, I guess, main point that we would like to make is that, for number eight - should former police officers work as investigators at the SIU, OIPRD or OCPD? And we strongly believe that no, they should not. As a matter of fact, we don't think that anyone who has previously worked with the police, whether even as a volunteer – because that can demonstrate that they, perhaps, have aspirations to become a police officer and, therefore, will have a bias opinion – should be investigators. We think that investigators should be members of the public, and these members

should be diverse in their background, their ethnicity, their language, their age, their income, in order to stay as objective as possible.

Another point that we wanted to make was – if you look at number three – sorry, number two – have you had any good or bad experience with the police? We want to also add the SIU to that line. Yes, here at our table, we have the family of Michael MacIsaac who was a young man who was shot, in Ajax. Frankly, based on my experience, as well as some of the comments that we heard in our table, we came to the conclusion that the SIU clearly does not work in the best interest of the public, and that the same public that is asking for assistance and support in finding answers are often faced with various obstacles, they're left with no answers. And this is when the victims speak English or have been in the country and understand the process.

But what about the victims who are newcomers, who do not understand the language or don't speak any of our official languages? What about members of the public that are marginalized? Where do they stand? And so we don't think that any of these agencies are not only transparent, but are actually there to assist the public. We want to also include the fact that when a family or loved ones decide to follow through with their investigations in finding what happened, often, they find themselves having to pay for these expenses on their own. There is no legal aid certificate that we know of that assist these members of the community. There is no other help, as well. There's no advocacy groups, there's no office for the victims that can get answers.

And so we believe that this adds another obstacle to the community because we are unable to get the answers that we require. Additionally, we think that there is not only a lack of transparency, but there is clearly a lack of fairness where the members don't feel that... Not only are their questions answered, but they are not also able to find a route as to who to ask questions, where to get answers, how to get support. They become, essentially, the adversary. So they find themselves fighting a second battle and being traumatized yet again, after the death of a loved one. So those were essentially our findings.

Facilitator: Thank you very much, Mona.

Mona: Thank you.

Facilitator: Table five, Christina? Is Christina? If you stand up, please. Yeah, way over there. Sorry. I'm looking around, I was looking – it's been a long day.

Christina: Okay. I actually just came just out of interest, so... But sure, the views of some of the other people here, they definitely have strong opinions and have had bad experiences. So I'm not sure exactly what this one meant, but... He wants to share it all, he thinks all the information, like, number six, all the information should be shared with the public and anything relevant. For example, how many charges. And one of the

things that we thought – we don't actually hear if the police were cleared – all we hear is if the police are cleared for any wrongdoing. We never hear of what the investigation details are. So that was one concern. One other thing is – should the names of police officers who are investigated by the SIU be made public even when the SIU decides not to charge them?

I think one of the things that we've heard from other people too is that many times there is repeat occurrences with the same officer, so I think that's why the public wants to have more transparency and more accountability as far as that goes. The important thing is they're there to serve and protect and they need to be at a higher standard than the rest of us, so we really have high expectations. And we want to have trust. And they should be above all of us. I mean in respect of transparency, and accountability, and honesty, and ethics, and all of that – that's what the expectations are. So it would be really nice that they understand that and realize there should be no conflict of interest. They should follow everything that's out there above and beyond what is expected.

I guess that's what we're looking for. The public wants to trust them. We want them there to serve and protect, but at the same time the expectations are very high. Some of the other things that nobody really touched on because they didn't get to is collection of data. I guess the biggest concern is that – and this was just reported on the news, recently, with the Government Agency – it is in contravention to the Privacy Act. And, I guess, it depends on how they're going to hold on to all this data. And you could see, like, there is a lot of people there very upset that media, et cetera, in Quebec when they're being spied on – I guess it's a nice way of saying it. You know, it is in contravention to the Privacy Act, in a number of different acts, and especially mental health – that has a special thing, too.

And I know there's a lot of issues with people with mental health and their relationship with the police. And there just isn't enough understanding as far as the police side is. There needs to be more education and I think that would help alleviate some of the major concerns and some of the major things that have happened in the news. We've seen some people getting shot because they were mentally ill. There is a little bit of overreaction, but I think it's because they really don't understand. So there definitely needs to be more education in that respect. And then the comment here is for number 10 – they should destroy the info after one year because they shouldn't really hang on to the data for a long period of time.

And again, that comes up with what just was recently in the news with the Government Agency holding on to people's personal data. And it was like who you phoned, and it was very detailed information. And I don't think they spy on us that much, or I hope not. And that's all, I think. Do you have all your answers?

Facilitator: Thank you, Christina.

Christina: Thanks.

Facilitator: Now, Matt, you're all the way over there for John, at this table.

John: Good evening, everybody. Much like the speaker before me, I came here out of genuine interest myself. And I've met three amazing people – don't know them from Adam, but we'll walk you through this. We didn't answer all the questions. Only one of the four was aware of – or two of us were aware of the various bureaus that investigate the police. One had involvement with the SIU. So what's the experience? Have you had any good or bad? And nobody in our group can identify with what we've heard from some of the others. That is the most tragic, gut-wrenching scenarios. Just hearing it again – I can remember reading it in the paper, I've seen some people at Queen's Park when I've been up there for other reasons.

So on a day-to-day basis is what we looked at. And what's a lot of the interaction with the police? It's got to do with the traffic related issues. How were you approached? What's the demeanor of the police officer? Is he looking at you? Is he more concerned about the accident, an injured worker or injured people at the scene? But the feeling was that it's a strange environment dealing with police, a lot of the time. It's very strange. And the other thing that came up – and I'll say this without reservation – police officers lie. That was referenced in our group. And when you have photographic evidence... When you have photographic evidence of the scene of an accident or a stop sign and various things that relate to the situation, you know, these were used post-charge and shown to somebody – let's go with X cop.

You went there for some advice, some insight, and the individual who was previously a police officer said, "You're 100 percent right. You've been convicted wrong. It's been an injustice that's happened to you." We've also talked about what we see. I've walked down the street – and it doesn't have to be King Street, or Main Street, or Cannon, or Barton. And I have seen people being physically manhandled who didn't need to be physically manhandled and/or hurt. So if we jump to question three – would we report it? The answer was no because it was concern of retaliation, potential retaliation, and the wheels have cover up may kick in. Question four – if someone we knew had a bad experience, would we ask them to report and then follow up?

We gave that a bit of thought and that is driven by the specific situation – situational-driven. But behind all of that lurking is the same answer to number three. It would be no. There's all kinds of perceptions and friends, family, right? And there's a lot more direct involvement with the police. And as somebody said earlier, I think, if you get involved, it's not for a day or a week, it can carry on and on and on and it can eat up a lot of your time, be very stressful. We then jumped to question seven – should a police officer who's being investigated, should it be made public? We said no.

Facilitator: John, your time is actually up. If you can wrap up, please.

John: Yeah. We said no because that officer or that person could be subject to retaliation. And I have the example of where I worked – even the security guards don't wear names on their shirts because there's the possibility that somebody will go follow up on that. Question number eight – obviously a contentious one, but we took this opinion. That it's okay if certain criteria are met, meaning they have to be ethical, non-bias, knowledgeable and objective. And if any of them are remiss, they should be removed and replaced. Question nine – should they be allowed to collect data? You know what, I think the question answers itself here. Some of it is so very obvious. But the issue around mental health, as the sister here referenced earlier – very, very sensitive issue.

But if that information was collected, is there a possibility that it could help if there is another incident somewhere down the road? And we'd like to think it probably could – for the positive, not the negative aspect. Question 10 – if data was collected, how should it be handled? It should be extremely limited access, extremely limited information; nothing that would allow the person viewing it to start to try to profile a situation. All right? And again, as the sister mentioned earlier, limited life of that data would be a good thing. Thank you.

Facilitator: Thank you. Matthew, we're going to Elizabeth, right at this next table. Thanks.

Elizabeth: Hi. Hello. So I'm going to break it down into three sections. The problems that we've identified in the system the way they are, some of the systemic flaws that make that so and, finally, our recommendations. So first off, access to reviewing agencies is both limited and slow. And the roles of these agencies are not well-known to most people. These agencies need to be more publicised so people understand their rights and how they can work with these agencies in the future. People don't report problems because they feel like they won't be heard and because they feel like there is no point. And that's a theme that you can see in a lot of the comments that we have heard here, tonight. People need to feel like they're being heard. Events like this, they do further that goal, for sure.

The SIU, in particular, doesn't share enough information to cause public confidence in the process. They have to be more transparent. They can't have the goal of transparency. They actually have to achieve transparency. And based on what people are saying, that has not been achieved. It might be the goal, but it hasn't been achieved. Next, people who have been victimized feel suspicious. This should be really obvious, but it needs to be looked at. People who have been victimized are less likely to have good, positive interactions with the police. They need to be aware of that going in. So next, looking at systemic flaws in the process that we identified. The SIU can find that someone acted in self-defence, but that doesn't mean that they acted with sound judgement.

That doesn't mean that they acted with compassion. It doesn't mean that they didn't do something that increased the likelihood that a negative outcome would occur. They could have caused the escalation that they then defended themselves from, right? That's extremely important. Listen to the applause, that's extremely important. Self-defence doesn't equal sound judgement. Next, there is currently no public education about how to deal with police officers. No one ever really teaches you in school, "How should you approach a police officer?" If that's something that people need to know, then that should be public education. Right? If we're acting like this isn't just common sense, you can't just have a normal conversation with somebody – if this is a special situation, it needs to be educated like it's a special situation.

And next, the way victims are represented in the media – again, that is not necessarily the Police Department's fault, but that is something that needs to be considered. That was another systemic flaw, the way victims are represented in the media. But moving on to recommendations, a lot of great recommendations have been made here tonight, and I'll try not to repeat things too much. The names of officers who are even being investigated should be released according to what we discussed. That even those investigations, even if they're cleared, if they were under investigation, those names should be released because those can add up. Even if they're cleared, those can add up. And I think that it's important that we have, again, transparency at all points.

Next, let's look into what civilian agencies can actually investigate. Let's not just pretend that only police can investigate. One agency that we came up with right away was the NTSB. They investigate plane crashes, right? They can learn how to investigate these instances. Education is a thing. People can learn how to do this job. You don't have to have necessarily a background in police work in order to be a good investigator. So let's look at what other agencies have overlapping skillsets, for example the NTSB, although I'm sure there are many other ones. Let's look for overlapping skillsets. Let's also make it really, really easy to report problems to the police. There needs to be a link prominent at every police service website.

It needs to be easy to report problems. It should not be difficult. It should be very simple. And finally, the Provincial Government should run PSAs, if necessary, about a number of different topics that we talked about. But the Provincial Government should be putting forth this education that evidently people need to have. It should be their responsibility. Thank you.

Facilitator: Thanks. Thanks, Elizabeth. Kerry is right across. Kerry? Yeah.

Kerry: Okay. So, our group had, unfortunately – but probably not surprisingly to most people in this room – universally negative experiences with the police. So, when it came to the question of would we recommend to somebody to report, we pretty much said a non-committal "it depends." One of the things that concerned us is that the most vulnerable people,

the people who are most at risk, are the people who are at least likely to report a crime or to want to engage with any of these supposed oversight agencies, because there is so much mistrust and fear. One of the things that we wanted to highlight is that the second largest complaint against police officers on duty is sexual assault. So just take a minute to let that sink in, if that's something that you didn't know already. And if you think about that and add to that the fact that we know that sexual assault is grossly underreported, I think that might go from number two right up to number one. Our main concern about that is when we are talking about a group of people who are in the position to detain, arrest, and charge people, they have to be held to the highest level of accountability. And we know that doesn't always happen. They have to be held to the highest possible standard. We know that the police cannot be relied upon to police themselves, yet we frequently hear about situations where officers are being investigated – there's no follow through, there's no repercussion. We've heard stories where officers are allowed to retire with full pension benefits, and nothing ever happens to them.

That's not okay. Or maybe they get a mild reprimand. We want to see a better balance of police to Government and citizen participation in oversight, something that's fully diverse and culturally sensitive. One of the last questions about should agencies collect data? We agreed that they should collect data on both victims and officers, but we think that information should be analyzed independently and academically, that information should be shared with the public and the media, and there should be full efforts to maintain the anonymity of the parties involved. I think the final thought that I'll leave you with is one of the conversations we didn't get that much into. It was just this idea that we're very concerned about the fact that we don't believe our police forces are taught restraint and self-control.

There's so much – I was about to say the word “overkill,” and that's an insensitive word. Forgive me. I don't mean that... Somebody help me with a better word than that. They just overdo it. They can't control themselves. There's this – sorry?

Female Voice: [00:52:10]

Kerry: Self-discipline, lack of de-escalation – yeah, absolutely.

Female Voice: How about ego?

Kerry: Ego, yes. All these things. Absolutely. And I think that's it. Two of our group members had to leave, so I hope that I've done our conversation justice. Thank you.

Facilitator: Thank you, Kerry. Corinne, Justin's right behind you with a mike. There we go.

Corinne: Okay. I don't have a lot to add to what's already been said. A lot of the discussion at our table would echo a lot of what's already been said. I definitely believe personally – not to push my ideas on the rest of the people at my table. It might just be me, but I think they would agree that really they should be held accountable and seen just as other criminal offenders and be treated as such, largely to follow with... she just said. And also it might be a little bit outside of the scope of this study, but it's true that we do have really high expectations for people in police enforcement. And as such, I think that we also need to acknowledge that they're still people, and we need to be looking at maybe more of preventative measures as well, like stress management and de-escalation, crisis intervention skills, education on mental health issues and other related topics of poverty, and how that affects people and how we need to interact with them.

And building that better judgement to have when they're making those split-second actions because I think a lot of it – what you see in the media and everything, a lot of it is a lot more reactionary. Oh, and just to mention that a lot of us actually didn't have a lot of knowledge about these oversight bodies probably – what's your name, again? Anyway. [Shack] is going to be speaking later, so I – but yeah. So dealing with stress and trauma, I think. And maybe as part of dispositions in regards to people or officers who are held guilty of misconduct in any shape or form, maybe a part of their disposition should be part of those training and you know, that sort of things is to, you know, related to what I just said. But I think that sums it up, unless anyone has anything else to say.

Facilitator: Thanks, Corinne. That's fine.

Corinne: Okay.

Facilitator: I'm actually going to switch over to Frances because I know, Frances, you have to leave, right? Thank you.

Frances: Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to present tonight, and thank you to all of you for coming out. My name is Frances Jewell, I'm the Executive Director at Mental Health Rights Coalition, in Hamilton. And I do know some of you from the city. I'm so pleased to see you here. We talked a lot – sometimes we sort of struggled with answers. People had a broad knowledge of the SIU and less knowledge of the other oversight bodies. One person dealt with the SIU. The concerns were taken seriously and in a very timely manner. And in general though, the SIU appears to be not transparent with information. People had some good experiences and some bad experiences. With the good experiences were around aboriginal and indigenous rights activism, and bad experiences around mental health and addiction issues.

We've come to the point where we feel that the SIU is not transparent. This comes up over and over again. It's a theme. We've heard that over and over again. And this is important, in particular the family members

that are left behind. Persons involved and family members should get details of what has happened. The public needs enough information to feel confident that a thorough investigation has been completed. Officers names should be made public. And the police should stop carting people. Like, stop. Enough is enough, really. If you need to collect data, find another way to collect data, and that is not stopping people on the street. So some of my other comments here may also be directed – some of the comments that I have here really are directed at Hamilton Police Services, as well. The police appear to target vulnerable populations.

The police may escalate situations as opposed to deescalate situations. Crisis intervention, which is run by the Hamilton Police Services does not work – does not. If they're going to get together three times a year and do crisis intervention, then it better start to work, and it's not working. If it did work, we wouldn't have people dying in the streets. Crisis intervention must be updated. Police must be trained in de-escalation techniques. They are not trained in – they're trained in some, but very, very few – obviously not enough. Persons with lived experience of violence, poverty, mental health and addiction issues must be part of the SIU, including members of the broader public. All police in Ontario should be wearing body cameras.

The use of tasers must be monitored. Every police officer in this city now has a taser. And apparently they have been trained, and I suspect that they have been trained, but that can't be now the way that we deal with people in crisis, by pulling out a taser. We must monitor that, the use of tasers. And the final point that we have is that we would like to give the Ontario [00:58:30] power to review all Police Oversight Bodies and Police Services Boards. Thank you very much.

Facilitator: Thank you, Frances. Justin, we're going to go to Leo, at this table, here. Leo, could you stand, please, so that Justin see you? Great. There. Thanks.

Leo: I also hope I can do our conversation justice as I've been [00:58:54] to do this, but... A lot of our conversations center around the issue of just [sparings] and lack of information, as well, almost to the point of saying, "Why are these bodies operating like some voodoo agency?" Like seriously, because the shock and all you hear from the people and some of the questions that people have have been very interesting to know that in such an open society where information should be as readily as available, you can't get your hand on some of this information. So we did a quick run around our table of who knew of these bodies and what they knew. Obviously, there were some gaps in knowledge of people. And most of the people around our table have engaged these bodies at different levels, so some of them knew of them, but not necessarily the specific details of how they work.

One of the things that came out about the issue of transparency in the context of our conversation – we talked about... Public knowledge

should be increased on each bodies, their roles and responsibilities. It's amazing how the police agencies will go as far as Facebook when they're trying to create a narrative about certain things, but then all of this information gets buried in ways that no one can even find them, but they tell you it is available, right? So people are saying we should have more transparency around where this information is being shared, how it's being shared so that it is easily available and not difficult to obtain. We talk about the issue of conflict around who to communicate with the complainant. The lack of sensitivity of these bodies realizing that when someone is a victim, it's not as simple as just walking up to somebody with someone sitting in a seat or picking up a phone and saying, "Hey, this happened to me. That happened to me."

So the people that are even communicating with these victims – what are their backgrounds? How are they trained? Do they even understand some of the situations they're walking into? And the issue of pre-submission of information and criteria that has been established by these bodies. So how do I know what's going to be accepted and what's going to be thrown out? We had a specific case of one of the members at our table where a lot of evidence was submitted with a complaint, and every one of it was thrown out. So basically we don't know what the decision had been when every single evidence was actually thrown out. However, there's no information around – how do I know what will be accepted and what will not be accepted? Nobody has that information.

So you're going to submit it and – you just submit and guess that something will happen. We talk about transparency around selection of the people in these bodies. How is a voodoo that nobody knows how people get selected on these bodies? How come? It should be very open, and to the point where whether they're police, ex-police officers or not, I think the first step for us was – we need to know exactly what is the process. In that way, we'll be educated enough to either critique it or make recommendations on how to make it better when we understand what it is. As that is, as it is right now, we don't know. So even the recommendations we're making, we're just taking a shot in the dark, in many cases.

We also talk about – do not use [FIPPA] against public or complaint victims. So this whole FIPPA thing being used against people who take complaints as victims – we can't hold people as victims at the same standards as if it was just a mere accusation between two people. People lives are at stake. Some people have been killed or injured seriously, and they're trying to make a complaint. Instead of just hearing a complaint and knowing what to do, we are throwing all kinds of rules at them to make their lives difficult in trying to submit the complaints. Increased public knowledge of data, that already... Now, another thing I would talk about would be the issue of senility on emerging needs. Our community has evolved. Unfortunately, our police systems have refused to evolve with our communities.

When we look at newcomers that are coming in our community, especially new Canadians –

Facilitator: Leo, your time is up so if you can wrap up.

Leo: Oh, just wrap up quickly.

Facilitator: Thanks, thanks.

Leo: - most of them come to this country with a lot of mental health issues and other situations they are dealing with. And we are seeing them increasingly being representing our criminal justice system only because no one has decided to take up that issue, realizing that the police needs to be educated. Lastly, my last one I'll make as a wrap up will be a around the use of technology. Just as the police agencies use Facebook and Twitter to construct their narrative, they should use the same sources for young people to make this information available via social media and all possible technological platforms so we all can have access to it.

Facilitator: Thank you. Ken is next. Ken is right there, at this table. Thanks.

Ken: Thank you. It was a general consensus at our table that the Civilian Oversight Process in this province is not working, is remote from the public, it's not civilian in personnel, and it doesn't get justice for Ontarians. And it doesn't get justice so often that the worst part is that most people no longer even try. I'm going to skip to question 11. We have some experience with the OIPRD, which is about the process of filing complaints against police. Let me give you some history. Years ago, before the OIPRD, if you had a complaint with the police, you had to go in front of your own Police Service Board which was Judge, Jury and Executioner of your complaint – obviously a very bad system.

So in 2004, the Province had established the [Lesage] Commission and the Community Coalition Against Racism, of which I'm Chair, presented to it. And we were hoping for a real civilian oversight process in Ontario. Regrettably, we were disappointed. And I'll tell you from a recent experience of walking someone through this process just how bad it is. So first of all, a person has a complaint about the way he or she was treated by police. Then the next thing you have got to do after you file the complaint – which takes a lot of time and a little bit of skill and help, and we help the people along. You got to go to the Police Station during business hours, take a number, wait in line, and try and get the incident report. And you've got to pay for that incident report.

And if you ask for an FOI about your personal background with the police, you got to pay for that. You got to wait for it, you got to come back during business hours, you got to take a number, you got to get in line, and you got to wait to get it. It's a lot. It's a really imbalanced experience, a great disparity of resources between what the police have at their disposal and the average citizen. So then your complaint goes to

the OIPRD. Well, the OIPRD has turned out to be just another level of bureaucracy on top of the local Police Service Board because the OIPRD sends your complaint at the first level, if they decide to... to the Police Service. Police Service against whom you are complaining. It's ridiculous. So you wait, you wait, and wait, and you get a date, and you'll go to a police station or a police office building, on your own time, usually during the day, and you meet a member of the Professional Standards Branch.

Let me tell you, Justice Tulloch, in case you don't know, that the Professional Standards Branch, in Hamilton at least, is a career path to promotion to Senior Management. And the way it works is the more complaints you're able to dismiss, the faster you'll get promoted to Senior Management – not a good system, I would say. And so you're sitting there in front of the police, the Professional Standards Branch person, and that person tells you to reveal everything you know about the case. But does the Professional Standards person reveal anything about what the police have done? Not a word. Not fair, again. So at the very least, in your recommendations, if you decide to stick with this bad system of going to the Local Police Service Board, at the first level, the very least we could have is a neutral arbitrator at the first level instead of the Professional Standards Branch person.

So then, after that, the police make a decision at the local level. And if it's turned down, you'll have the opportunity to appeal to the OIPRD itself. And the problem with the OIPRD itself is there are too many ex-cops on the board. We asked for civilian oversight, in 2004, to Justice [Lesage], and we never got it. We need to have real civilians on these civilian oversight boards. The real civilians could be recruited from such people as former lawyers, paralegals, mediators, arbitrators, trade union executives, former prosecutors, academics. So there's quite a body of people to choose from in this Province, not just ex-cops. And something nobody's mentioned yet – these people should be trained to be culturally aware and sensitive to all issues including age, race, sex, and disability.

Furthermore, you should also be aware, Justice Tulloch, that in Hamilton the police have a very defiant attitude towards being disciplined. If you are disciplined in Police Service Board as a result of a complaint – and I'm referring to, right now, specifically to the notorious case of the racial profiling of Michael Dixon. If you harass, intimidate, and make life miserable for a black person in this town, and you get your wrists slapped in the complaints process, what happens to you is you get promoted. And so I think that if the police officers are disciplined as a result of complaints, they should be barred from promotion for a period of three years. Furthermore, with the OIPRD, one cannot file a third party complaint.

In the case of Po La Hay which many of you – a case you may remember. A Burmese refugee who was the victim of a butch drug raid, in which the Hamilton Police burst into the wrong apartment and beat

up a person who had nothing whatsoever to do with the crime – of course, the police shouldn't beat up anybody. Period. But they beat up somebody in the wrong apartment. And then we, as the Community Coalition Against Racism, tried to file a complaint because Po La Hay was not going to file a complaint. Nobody in his family was going to file a complaint. There were no witnesses to file a complaint, but there was not third party process to file a complaint. So what happened was Police Chief [Decare] filed the complaint, as he's required to do, and it went right to the OPP and was never heard from again, as far as I know. That process needs to be changed.

Facilitator: Ken, you're about two minutes over. Just so you know.

Ken: I'll try and wrap up, madam Chairman.

Facilitator: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

Ken: There's another issue. It was mentioned before – you know, as a way to reduce complaints against police, police should be wearing lapel cameras all the time. I wanted to respond to some other questions, but if I –

Facilitator: We might have a chance to go back around. I just wanted to get to Charlie, and there are a couple of other speakers. Thanks.

Charlie: Hi. I came here with a different interest than what I was exposed to. I don't really have very much to add. I mean it's been so eloquently addressed by people in far, far, greater, dire straits than my [mental] issue was. We had a gentleman who stated he lost his son through improper police training that shot him. And I would like to address that in a second. The police need training in mental health issues, without a doubt. Police shouldn't get paid leave when they're being under investigation. That's unbelievable. You get paid to mess up. If I mess up at work, I get sent home. I don't get paid for it. I mean who does that? Nobody does that. Why wouldn't you mess up? It's an incentive to screw up.

[01:12:11] police that have been off – I hold no malice towards the police, but you have had police that have been off for over a year –

Male Voice: Five.

Charlie: - getting full – five years – getting full wages. Who does that?

Male Voice: Hamilton Police.

Charlie: Even the Hamilton Police Chief has expressed, [01:12:27], has expressed concerns about that aspect of their system, about how the cops are just abusing the system. How come there's never a follow-up? How come you hear from the SIU that they're investigating this incident regarding this behavior, and they can't speak to that situation because it's under investigation, under their investigation. And then everybody

just forgets about it and it fades away. And over next week or the month goes by, and everybody's just forgot about it, including me. And it never reeves its ugly head again unless – I don't know. I don't think it's ever happened. It's a common phrase, "We can't speak to that right now, sir. It's under investigation. It's before the courts," there's the other kicker. And as long as that exists, they don't have to say anything. So they don't.

And eventually, like all human beings, we forget about it, and away it goes. But it didn't really go away, it just never got resolved. I think that – should former police officers be part of the SIU, et cetera? Yeah, why not? They should be part of the team. As long as they're rational, normal people, why not? I mean they have insight, they have experience that I may not have or you may not have or he may not have. I mean you need both sides of the coin. I think every cop should have a chest camera that works. We already heard that from the States, I mean he forgot to turn it on, blah-blah-blah. I don't want to go into what the States probably said. I had a question about my own situation. I'm not going to get into personal. When you have a concern and you want to raise a concern with the OIPRD, and you can go online and fill out a form that then goes to the Police Chief.

And I'm going to go on there and name officers, Sergeant [Leishman] and [Constable Brown], who's just in the paper about drugs. I'm going to name their names and what they did to my wife and I, held us at gunpoint, and I'm going to tell their boss. And nothing is going to happen to me or my wife? Seriously? I don't frighten very easily, but the thought of that hanging over my head gives me pause. I mean who would do that? Who would go and tell the bully – never mind. You know where this is going. It doesn't have a good outcome. It doesn't have a good feeling. And I'm not a shy guy, by any [01:15:01] United Nation. Normally, I'll stick my face anywhere, but to go and tell the Police Chief that that bozo and that bozo did something egregious, I mean did something absolutely stunning, illegal and wrong, and they're getting away with it.

And I'm going to go tell on them. What's going to happen to me? And I'm just going to leave it there because I'm going to do it. I'm going to get this gentleman's help, right there, because he's shown his soft underbelly and told me that he knows how to do it, so I'm going to address it. I'm not going to name anybody's names. No, just him. As far as cops collecting data – no, it doesn't really bother me if they collect data. It's going to be used to get proper findings, and then destroyed when it's no longer needed. My wife and I have criminal records from a year and a half ago. As soon as you're charged, like somebody said, or investigated, or ask for help, then apparently your name is on the record forever.

If that's true, and I have no reason to not believe that, I have to hire a lawyer now and go to the court system and have my record expunged, even though when it got to trial the court said there's, "There's no

evidence against these people. Get out of here. You're fine." But is there a record now?

Female Voice: Yeah.

Charlie: And I know there is. And now, to get rid of that record, if I go across the border, am I going to be in some kind of trouble? Anyways, I don't want to talk all night. This gentlemen here has something really important to say, and I know you're going to give him the time so I'll shut up.

Facilitator: Yes. Thank you, everyone. I really appreciate your discipline in keeping us to – we're only at 8:03, and I do want to give – or 8:04 now – Robert and this gentleman here a minute each.

Robert: My son was Andreas Chinnery. He was cut down at the age of 18, actually just turn 19, by two hollow-point bullets fired by a Hamilton police officer on February the 2nd. His shattered arm was quickly and cruelly handcuffed behind his back, as he laid dying in his own blood. His body was later sliced up in an autopsy. This victim was later vilified and his reputation ruined, and my family and my children's reputation ruined by a subsequent inquest to save the face for all involved. This was all over a noise complaint. There were no visual witnesses besides officers McNaughton and Spencer. They were witnesses to each other.

Here are some of the justifications given by the SIU. First of all, he was a rap/hip-hop musician. Second, he had a Wu-Tang Clan locket around his neck, which I didn't even know actually. And basically there was a story about him coming after them with a baseball bat, which was not visually verified by a camera or anything else. I feel that the SIU is structured with former [01:18:22] attorneys. There's an influence from the Ministry of the Attorney General. The Executive Director, Fine Officer for the Guelph Police for 22 years is Mr. William Curtis, and there's a whole military and police subculture as defined by sociology seeing through the police and military eyes with people. Their victims are not even human beings.

Facilitator: Robert, you're over a minute. So hopefully you can wrap up in about 10 seconds, please.

Roberts: One page. There were no gun or knife in any of the incidents in 2011, in Hamilton, and yet there was four people killed. All people were exonerated, including Officer Tocher who beat Po Hay and shot two other [Haitian] people. The subject officer does not have to give an interview or provide notes at the present time, so they're not really independent. And I'd just like to leave you with a couple of thoughts. Most religions say, "Thou shall not kill," and I agree with that. Archbishop Romero, just before he was murdered at his mass, said, "Stop the killing. I ask of you. I implore of you. I order you," as a bullet went through his heart. Thank you very much.

Facilitator: Thank you, Robert. Okay. One minute, please.

Male Voice: Just give me five minutes.

Facilitator: We don't have five minutes, sir. So you're really going to have to condense it, and I will –

Male Voice: I'm going to ask you to limit it to one minute. I'm giving you the courtesy to allow you to speak.

Male Voice: Okay, thanks. This panel is not an [01:20:12] panel, not a civilian panel, not elected representatives. This is judicial panel where Chief Justice listens –

Facilitator: Can you speak into the mike so that everyone can hear you?

Male Voice: - just listens both sides of the argument, and then there's the judicial [01:20:37]. With that one, I say Chief Justice, I take a vote. I tell you the truth and actual statement with very viable document. My questions – I heard police. It's a singularly referred police. It is unfortunate because our first line police office are terrific people. They have to take orders for the Police Board, Police Chief, and deputies and premier command. And they are doing their job. They are dedicated people. I want to express my sincere, deepest thanks to that.

Facilitator: Your time is up, sir. Thank you.

Male Voice: I have been following police since five-six years. I've never seen minority police member. And as you can see, we have lots of minority people. And the Chief Appointing, I give you – and secondly, the same [01:22:03] is not in question. Did not tell us information Police Chief submitted to that is the question. It is the response from them. And the [01:22:22] CBC Hamilton produced a report, police officer listening to our cellphones. As you know, Montreal is in trouble. Everybody's in trouble. And Richard Nixon got out [01:22:41]. And what happened to dear friend Mike Duffy? And you got [01:22:52] mayor got – And the policy, former Police Chief, walked away with computer and the cellphone with all information.

Chief Deputies, how do you know he's not having all of our document and [01:23:21] from all the police work. They explicitly state nothing would be given to him. In some instances, they say before he retires, they go and delete all the information and give it to them. And I have produced –

Facilitator: Thank you. You have all that documented here, right?

Male Voice: Yeah.

Facilitator: So we actually have it.

Male Voice: I'm going to read – I'm going to –

Facilitator: We'll read it, and that will be –

Male Voice: Just for you to read this.

Facilitator: Yeah. If you can just leave it with us.

Male Voice: No, no. No, no. One minute.

Facilitator: Thank you.

Male Voice: And here I have a –

Facilitator: I actually need to wrap up, if you don't mind. Please?

Male Voice: I have been waiting for this for four years.

Facilitator: Yes, okay. Oh gosh.

Male Voice: We have a code of conduct, and we have attorney journalist, chairman of the police [port] exerted physical force. And then we have [01:24:30] Commissioner giving the ruling. He found it was wrongdoing, but without the Council Members that supported him. That's not right. And secondly, mister... And then –

Facilitator: I'm sorry. I think that we're losing the other people in the room, and I'd like to say thank you to them.

Male Voice: Just one moment.

Facilitator: I respect their time. Okay. I think you can speak with Justice Tulloch after. Yes, you can – yeah.

Justice Tulloch: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for all your comments, your submissions, your recommendations. I can indicate that we were listening very carefully, both myself as well as my staff. They have been taking copious notes, and all of your recommendations will be considered. And you know, we will reflect a lot of them in our final report. You know, Hamilton, you know, you are a real credit to the Province of Ontario. You came out and you participated, and this is a part of the democratic process. That is why we live in such a great country. And so, again, I want to thank each and every one of you for taking the time to come out tonight and to share your views with us so that we can make this whole process, Civilian Oversight of policing a better system for the Province of Ontario. Thank you.

[End of recorded material 01:26:22]