

16 10 05 IPOR Mississauga

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Pamela: Good evening everyone, and welcome. My name is Pamela Grant and I am a member of the team. I'm the facilitator and strategic advisor for the Independent Police Oversight Review. Over the course of the next few minutes, through introductions, you'll be introduced to the rest of the team.

This evening, what we'd like to do is to make sure that we have every opportunity to hear from each and every one of you, as we have been doing, as we've moved across the province. There are nineteen of these public meetings that we'll be holding across the province, and this evening – last evening we were in Brampton in Peel Region and tonight here we are in Mississauga.

We've had a series of stakeholder meetings during the course of those two days and I see some familiar faces, so thank you again for coming. I know that everyone has a very busy schedule, and we're going to try as best we can this evening to make sure that we're able to wrap up by eight o'clock. And I would appreciate your assistance with that, to make sure that we are able to do all the listening we need to do and hear from everyone, and be out by eight.

Before I start, I just wanted to make sure that everybody knows that the washrooms – where the washrooms are – out the door and along the hallway, and it is an informal meeting, so if you have to get up and help yourself to the wonderful meal and desserts and drinks at the side, please do so. And if there are any questions throughout, we'll be here to answer those in terms of logistics.

But before I take too much more time up, I'd like to introduce you to Justice Michael Tulloch who is leading the review across the province, to say a few words.

M. Tulloch: Thanks Pam. Good evening to everyone. I want to thank you for coming. Well, before I say anything, I want to first acknowledge that we're currently on the traditional territories, so the Mississauga of New Credit First Nations and the meeting place of several other indigenous nations.

As you're aware, I was tasked with conducting an independent review of three civilian oversight bodies for policing – the SIU, the OIPRD and the OCPC back in April of this year. And as a part of the process for this review, we've decided to have a number of consultations across the province, and as Pamela has indicated, we've booked about nineteen, if not more – I think between nineteen and twenty one public consultations.

We also have had, and will continue to have, a number of private stakeholder consultations before the process is completed. So at the end of the consultation process, I'm very hopeful that we will have a full

picture from everyone that has an interest in civilian oversight of policing.

And I'm also hopeful that the recommendations that we will have will be useful to us moving forward with our final report.

As Pamela indicated, I don't want to spend much time speaking to you, because we want to really hear from you, and I want to hear your perspective, I want to hear what your experiences are and I want to assure you that whatever you say will be considered by us as a review team.

Now last night – I just one to correct one thing – one of the issues that arose last night was that the Chief of Police was not present with us in Brampton. She had inquired prior to that meeting, and I thought well, the meeting is really for the public participation and I'd suggested to her not to come, you know. So what I can say is – and we do that with all the police stakeholders and chiefs. You know, it's really the public meetings are for the public to hear whatever their perspectives are, and we also recognise that a lot of these – you know, a lot of their perspectives may not be freely given if a strong police presence is in the room.

So that was a decision that I had made earlier and so I take full responsibility for that. But it's to ensure that we have full and free voices from all our citizens in Ontario, right.

So before we start, I'm going to ask Danielle Dowdy to come and to just give you an overview as to how the process is going to proceed.

Danielle: Good evening everyone, thank you for coming. So right at the back of the room there's a table there with some materials. Hopefully everybody had a chance to pick up the questions and there's also a page that just outlines the three bodies. These are the bodies that we are reviewing and these are the bodies that we're going to ask you to have the discussions on this evening.

Just as a disclaimer and for your information, our mandate is not to revisit any past cases or any past judgements or any past findings. We do want to hear your stories and we do want that for important context for the review, but we just want to let you know – set the expectation that we will not be revisiting specifically any past or individual cases.

So just so you know, so this is the introduction here from Justice Tulloch and Pamela and myself. We're going to go right into a round table discussion, so everybody should have questions at the table, and we're going to ask you to work through those questions for about forty five minutes. Pamela, our facilitator, she'll be timing it and then when that time period is up, we're going to spend about an hour doing a report-back.

So if you could just share with us your feedback on how you feel about the questions and anything that it is you want us to know.

[French language]

And we're also on social media, so we are actually live-tweeting this evening, and also so that you know, this meeting is being recorded. It's going to go on our website. If you don't want to be on camera, if you could just let us know, and just ensure that you're not – like the back of your head is captured by the camera.

So we're on Facebook, we're on Twitter and Instagram, and we're also tweeting tonight with the hashtag #BeHeardON – ON for Ontario, but we also generally tweet with #IndependentReviewON. So please share your thoughts, send your questions, we view it all. I'll be tweeting and Matthew as well at the back of the room, okay.

That's all, thank you.

Pamela: Thank you Danielle and thank you Justice Tulloch. I see that we've done a better job of being in rounds. I may ask this table of three to move up here so that we have a nice group to work with. Has everybody made sure that they have questions at the table? I know that we perhaps put only one or two sheets with questions on, but just to make sure that each table has questions.

And what will happen next is that you'll have forty five minutes as a group to discuss, as Danielle said, the questions, as well as formulate any additional thoughts that you would have, that you'd like Justice Tulloch and the team to hear about. And each group will have just a few minutes to report back, and of course there's an opportunity if your reporter – and I am suggesting that each group designates someone who will report back – that of course you can always help your reporter if they've missed something or you've thought of something since you agreed upon what you were going to report back out.

And just to remember that we want to hear from everyone, so manage, please, the amount of time that you take to report back.

And the other thing that I did want to add is that as much as you have an opportunity here and you are here to contribute to the conversation, if over the course of the next few months, up until mid-November, there are other reflections you have, you're able to give written submissions by e-mail at info@policeoversightreview.ca at any point, to add to what you may have spoken about tonight, or to encourage others that you know who have something to say, to do the same. Okay?

So it is now just before twenty after six and we will have the opportunity to have the discussion groups with the questions for forty five minutes. I'll give you some time checks over the course of the period, and the rest of the team and I will be rotating around the room to facilitate, answer

questions, listen, if that's okay. And we're going to have a good time; we're looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

So the forty five minutes starts now.

We're reporting back now, thank you.

Joanne: Good evening everybody. My name is Joanne MacIsaac and the reason I'm here tonight is, my brother, Michael MacIsaac was shot and killed by police a little over two years ago.

So my views on the SIU and the oversight divisions for the police, are not very positive. We'd spoke around the table to see what the general consensus would be, and I think we all agree that with the SIU there should be no former police officers. They cannot be independent. The investigations are done through blue coloured glasses – there's no impartiality with that.

Three of the people here at the table, who are friends of our family, had not heard of the OIPRD or the OCPC. Just the SIU and prior to Michael being shot, they had never heard of them. And to be completely honest, none of Michael's family had heard of any of these agencies.

We do think that drug testing of all officers should be mandatory, whether it's done on a six-month intervals, but definitely when an officer has been involved in a shooting or discharged his firearm, he should be drug-tested immediately.

We have a small transportation company. We randomly will check our drivers, especially someone who is involved in an vehicle collision, automatic drug-testing. I think that someone who has such enormous power and carries a weapon and has the ability to kill any of us, we should be drug-testing these people. [Applause].

And I can pass this on to who?

Pamela: Is there anybody else at your table that would like to say anything before we pass on?

Dan: Hi, my name is Dan [Rayo], friends of Joanne and her family and lived through her experience. It's interesting that you go into this thinking that, you know, when you bring things forward, that justice will absolutely be served. You always feel that there's some moment where the victim, for lack of a better word, deserved it, that they did something wrong.

And it was interesting that this was not the case in Michael's situation. So again, it puts a different spin on what you feel about these investigations that happen. And I think when you think about investigations, most of the time it comes back where there is no charges being laid, so it almost feels like the police always have an out and that there's never going to be an opportunity to charge any of these officers, or really hold them accountable for what they actually did.

And then we talked a little bit about the question number seven – should the names be made public. We talked about the fact that at most organisations and most businesses and any other role that anyone else plays, there will always be a moment where that person's name becomes public. It feels like the police is the only scenario where they don't actually become public.

Anytime there's a financial investment banker who swizzles somebody out of money, whenever anything else – like think about any other role, any other job that anyone pays at the end of the day, or plays at the day, they always bring – that name ends up getting out somehow. And it always feels like the only group that never actually gets pulled out is the police officers when they're put in this scenario. So I think there's a bit of an unfair standard being – in that particular scenario as well.

Yeah, and then there's always, one of the things that we saw too, just kind of from our friends looking in at this family that went through this, was the amount of money that was spent on not only the investigation, but the – call it support for the police officers involved and presumably the things that went on behind the scenes and coaching, whatever you want to call it, of that group.

And then therefore on the flipside, the lack of victim services for the families, and the amount of time and effort that Joanne and her entire family have put through on this. And you know, the fact that it's costing them an awful lot of money to do it. There's really nothing that allows them to kind of recoup some of that, or really at the end of the day, you know, give them the power to keep going or the financial means to keep going and battle something which really feels like a kind of unfair situation that they've been put in front of right now, so ...

Pamela: Thank you. Wayne?

Wayne: Good afternoon, everyone, I'm Wayne, just here to participate in the speech and discussion today. And from looking at the sheet here, I'm not familiar with either of these oversight agents, apart from the SIU. And not really knowing much about it, but from the discussion that we've been having here, it's where the SIU is supposed to be investigating the police, I think from talking to my peers, it seems like there should be a group that should be out there policing the police for protection against the citizen.

I myself, I haven't run into too much issue – any issue at all with the police, so I don't have any much negative input on this, or positive. But my colleague here will probably give you more discussion on what he has been involved with and more experience in it.

Chezlie: Hi, my name is Chezlie Alexander. There was a few more people at our table and a couple of them had to leave. We didn't work through all the questions; we really sort of just worked through the first and second questions, and you know, consensus for most of the folks around the

table, except maybe one, didn't really – they knew the SIU and had a general understanding of the role of the SIU, but didn't have much – we didn't have much of an understanding of the other two bodies.

But I think what folks talked to more about as we got into the second question and you know, what interaction with police, whether they were positive or negative. And some of us shared different stories, right.

I shared personal stories about my – you know, I've had a number of interactions with police officers, some of them positive, but generally with police officers who are in my family, right. And truly, and I've had a number of negative interactions with police officers, from you know, the time I was ten until a few days ago, right.

And in those interactions, I think what is relevant – and in some of the other conversations we had – like we had conversations talking about folks who were – you know, had been police officers in the past, former police officers, what have you – and they talked about –

Because to us, you know, I think the conversation around transparency and around oversight, folks need to be able to feel empowered that if I feel that someone has transgressed against me, that I have recourse, right.

When I was a kid, when I'd had these negative interactions – again, I grew up in Rexdale, there was a particular police officer who terrorised my neighbourhood, and terrorised my friends and I as ten, eleven year-old kids, until finally I told my uncle, who was a really big cop, right. To say like, we need some help, right.

And it stopped. But that was the recourse. I'm like, you know, I didn't think about – my mother would never have thought about reporting, you know, like putting in a complaint. I think folks – there's the fear that you and the wrath of God will come down on you, you know, in one way or the other. And you know, having conversations with friends who are police officers, having conversations here at this table, understanding that you even, as a police officer on the force, and you know, you understand that there are some folks – police officers – whose actions reflect negatively on you as a good cop.

And you still don't feel – like you might separate yourself from them, you might avoid them, you're not going to hang with them, you're going to turn away, because you don't want to see what they do, but you know what they do. And within the police force, if individual members find it difficult to hold each other accountable, how can you – how can any of us – you know, how can we expect that members of the general public will be able to come forward and hold people accountable?

I think as we talk about having a civilian oversight body, if it can't happen inside, then it has to happen somewhere else, and we just have to figure out how that happens.

Male: [Unintelligible 00:20:25]. [Applause]

Pamela: Thank you, Chezlie. Can you pass it up to Sarah here, please? Thanks.

Sarah: Thank you everyone. My name is Sarah. I'm going to echo a lot of the concerns that have already been shared. So our table, you know, in dealing with question number one and whether we were familiar with any of these oversight agencies, a lot of us felt confused; we had maybe never heard of them.

The SIU again, because it usually makes the mainstream media, a lot of us were aware of what they did. But for the most part, we weren't.

So around the table we felt that if we weren't aware, then obviously the public wasn't aware, and as you heard from the other tables, you wouldn't be aware of where to go, should you face a concern or issue and needed to report that.

So the next question in terms of whether we had had any experience with them at this table, not directly. However, we did then get into that discussion around our interactions with police, many of us having very positive interactions with the police being there when we needed them in times. But others experienced some very sort of traumatising experiences with the police, myself included, directly and indirectly. And so as a result of those experiences, we have a lot of concerns.

So in those experiences, in my personal experience, at that point in time, I did not feel comfortable reporting what I had experienced, because in the situation that I was in, it included not only frontline officers, but supervisors coming forward, whom I should have felt comfortable in reporting the frontline officers' behaviour with. I did not feel comfortable, so obviously I would not feel comfortable then going to another agency as a result of that experience. And many other people echoed that experience around the table.

We also felt that the police, in dealing with situations with vulnerable people, including those experiencing mental health, lack training, as a result of experience we around the table have had. We realise that maybe there's a gap that needs to be addressed in how our police handle situations where vulnerable people are at risk or experiencing a mental health crisis.

I will not share the details with you, but I have seen firsthand situations where police officers inappropriately respond and escalate individuals in situations of crisis, rather than de-escalate them.

And so with all of those factors put together, citizens do not feel safe reporting the situations. They feel helpless, powerless and not empowered, regardless of what reporting agencies are in place.

We went into a little bit around the transparency and accountability – most of our discussions really centred around the first part. We got really

caught up in trying to understand who did these agencies report to, how are they governed? Who did you report to, under what circumstance? Was it the SIU? Was it the civilians – where did you go?

So we felt that if there were these agencies in place, they should not consist of only former retired police officers, and should contain members of the population or public. We were not aware of the hiring process for these oversight agencies. The individuals at the table from the sort of review panel, were not entirely sure with the information either, so again, there's miscommunication with respect to that, and a lack of transparency.

We also felt – there's mixed feelings around whether this information should be made public if an officer is involved in an incident. Some of us feel that that information should be made available to the public, there should be a database made available to the public, where officers who are in some sort of incident, that information is collected and made available to us. And once they are charged, that information should be made public, as it is – that is current practice and that should continue. But there should also be a database that does collect these incidences, just as there are with teachers, just as there are with, let's say for example professors and other professionals in the industries, right.

There is a code of conduct that they are upheld to, and when they break any element of that code of conduct, there's recourse for that and the public is made aware of that.

So at the end of the day most of us felt as though we were not comfortable reporting. We feared reprisal or recourse should we do so. We felt there was not enough information being made available to the public on how to report, where to report and when to report. And we felt there was an overall lack of transparency in the data that's being collected and how that's being shared with the public.

So I'll just kind of end. I don't know if anyone at the table has anything else to add. I'll pass the microphone over to Elizabeth. Thank you.

Elizabeth: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. My name is Elizabeth Philip. I came to Canada in the seventies. I'll make a long story short – I was working for \$2.10 at that time, because I was doing [unintelligible 00:25:57] back home and I was not sure in here yet. \$2.10.

And I managed. I was at my workplace from 1974 to 2010 and when I was ready to leave, they still wanted me to hold on. I said no, I have to retire, I'm tired. I worked at a part time job from 1974 until I got a stroke in 2013.

The issue is, I got some money from a company. I went to them on the 26th of September 2006. The money was deposited in my account on the 28th September 2006. I have been going to the bank, bank statement at

the end of the month, no money. One evening I went to the bank, the manager said to me, your file went missing.

I said, how could it go missing? They gave somebody my file? And shortly after, she left the bank. So the new manager came on, so I started asking him about my file and the money that should have been deposited.

No, let's all face it, we are not kids. If somebody – you give somebody a cheque to deposit in your bank, I close account, which a teller advised me to close. And I've been looking for that money, never seen it. When I found out about that money, was 2014, because I had somebody looking for the money for me, and the letter which everybody knew – some people here would know too.

Anyhow, 2013 when I went to the bank, the manager says, oh, we don't have no money for you; the person looking for it, they're not here anymore. Take the bank to court, and he started to carry on. I was working and shortly after I got a stroke. So after I came out, I sat and said, what am I going to do? Fifty thousand dollars, and they'd just shown me the front of the cheque – there's no back – and they tell me I took it.

Whoever it is, the signature looks like mine, so the manager said oh, you took it out. I said really? We're all – everyone of us had a time that we needed some money, so when I am short – one time the manager says, you know, when you are short, you could skip a payment, and that's what I did one time. He knows that.

I have – that money went into my account. When I found out the person who told me to close the account, the money was in that account.

Pamela: Elizabeth, you have just one minute left. Is there anything specific about police oversight you'd like to mention?

Respondent: Yeah, what I want to know is that when I told the police, they did go to the bank to make an investigation, and the bank manager stopped them and told them, I'm confused, and everything stopped. Because I believe that the police is law and order. I don't know what to do.

Pamela: Okay, thank you. Elizabeth, can I just ... So Mister Singh, you're next, thanks.

Harkirat: Thank you. My name is Harkirat Singh and I'm a school board trustee for Peel, also a part-time lecturer at Lambton College. I was asked to come here and share my experiences.

I haven't had the prep that everybody else has had, but just going through a few of the questions. I did not know the roles, or except SIU – SIU – I had not heard about the rest of the organisations.

Have you ever had any good or bad experiences with the police? I have had lots of negative experiences. My peers have had lots of negative

experiences. Instead of delving into the details, it was from verbal to physical. But I will say that in my community – I'm just referencing my friend circle and my family – it's to the point where it's normalised, like it's expected, which is horrible, because it's reached that point.

So it's something that we just come to accept as a part of life. Maybe it's being Punjabi, I don't know, but it's just an expectation; you're always careful around police officers, you're always – you know, back then I didn't dress like this, so I pull up my pants, you know, change the way I walk. So you know, it's just what we're conditioned with at a young age.

If someone has had a bad experience, would you encourage them to report it? Our reality is, probably not. It's our word – and we were younger then, so it's young individuals, you know, coming from – you know, at that point we were at a different lifestyle, and you know, it's our young individual's word against police officers' words. You know, I wouldn't expect them to go.

I'd also – you know, it's about security; you don't want to have any repercussions at that age. You see the same police officer then over and over. They're at the parks or whatever, so yeah, I wouldn't do that.

Should former police officers work as investigators at SIU? No, I don't think they should. It doesn't make any sense, to be honest. That one I've always been puzzled with. I don't know why that was. It's obviously – you know, when you work in an institution, you get deep roots, everybody knows each other. There's an inherent camaraderie, so it just doesn't make sense. I don't think you can objectively investigate peers or someone you've known, or, you know – so I don't think that makes sense.

And should SIU collect data? Absolutely. I think police officer – it's just like teachers, just like other employees of public institutions, whether you're a municipal governor or whatever, you should reflect the community you work in, you operate in, whether it's language, sexual orientation, whatever, right. It's important – that's how your service delivery will tailor to community needs, so it's fundamental.

So I do think we should collect [data] and police officers, I think, should be extended to all public – you know, levels of government, right. Thank you.

Pamela: Thank you. Could you pass the mic over to Roger at the back table please? Roger?

Dwight: Good evening, everyone. My name is Dwight Campbell. I'm a part of P-Card, but I'm also a publicist. So we were actually here yesterday – well, not necessarily here, but we were actually at the meeting in Brampton. So we thought that rather than just reiterating the same things that we said yesterday, we wanted to kind of just focus on some of the things that we didn't necessarily get to address.

So one of the things I wanted to just address briefly was just the lack of discrimination on the police force. I feel that considering Peel – or especially like Brampton, where two thirds of the population is a visible minority, that the police force should at the minimum be reflective of that, you know. We're not asking for much as far as that goes.

And just in addition to that, a lot of the police that sit on the force, for example, or that work in Peel, most of them live – or they're from Barrie or like Kitchener, or somewhere where they have no vested interest in the improvement or as to what really takes place in the region.

You know, I think that at least if we actually did have officers that were from the Mississauga, the Peel – or at least the Greater Toronto Area, you know, policing our areas, that they would have a much more vested interest to see genuine improvement in that area.

As far as data collection, I thought that that was one of the most important questions on here, because again, without data collection, it's very difficult for you to gauge progress. You know, at least – and one thing I have to say, between – because I actually did do my undergrad in Northern Alabama – and one thing that I would say, that I notice between policing, or even just the things that happen in America versus Canada, is that at least they acknowledge their biases, or they acknowledge their racism, or their issues. And they collect data on that, so at least they can track whether there's progress or not.

Whereas here, we live in this like bubble of disbelief, where we're just so ignorant to the fact that it exists, you know. It's not as upfront here as it is in America of course. Over here it's a lot more systemic, a lot more subtle, but it still exists, nonetheless, and it's somewhat difficult at times to say which approach is necessarily better.

And lastly, I just wanted to speak on just accountability. Until there's a system set up where the police can actually – and agencies – will actually acknowledge or take more accountability, eventually we will reach a point of no return, similar to like Charlotte or like some of these places in the States.

It's been, as you've seen in America, obviously, it's been so much – I mean, the police have been taking such a lack of accountability, and that's what's basically led to the issue that we have in hand. And obviously I know that as for myself and no one in this room, or probably no one in this country for that matter, wants to see it get to that level. So I say that prevention is better than cure and it's better that we try to stick it out now.

And in addition to meetings like this, they're very important; I think we need to do a much better job of promoting it. I think that meetings such as this should be much – I mean, better attended. Thank you.

Pamela: Thank you. Roger? LaTanya?

LaTanya: Hi, my name's LaTanya Grant. I'm sure many of you already know who I am? The first thing I want to speak about is – are these meetings. This is the second one that we've attended, like my friend Dwight said. There was one at the JCA in Toronto that I had no idea about, a lot of people had no idea about, and I feel that you guys have these meetings because you want to hear from the community. So maybe it should be pushed more in the community, maybe it should be on CP24, maybe it should be in the Toronto Star, in the Toronto Sun, in every single newspaper.

If you guys want people to come out and you want numbers, you have to promote it better. I mean, I Facebooked it, but I wouldn't have been at this meeting if it wasn't for Ranjit who told me about it two days ago, that's why I came to the Brampton meeting.

And I feel that a lot of people still don't know these meetings are happening; no one just goes and says, I'm going to wake up today and go on your website and find out what's happening; you have to come out to the community and let them know, we want to hear your voice, as well as you want us to go onto the websites and look for that information. So that's just what I have to say about that.

In regards to the SIU, the transparency of the SIU needs to change. We feel that the full investigations should be made public. As I mentioned yesterday, Ontario is the only province that doesn't make their investigations public, and I feel that we shouldn't have anything to hide, we should be like the other provinces.

I feel that there needs to be family updates; if there's an investigation going on, they should make it their duty to be contacting the families, letting them know what's happening, the progress with the case. We shouldn't have to be running them down – I mean, I've been in the situation – I'm sure Joanne MacIsaac and her family have been in it too – we have to be pressing for information; it's like we're trying to find a needle in a haystack. And it shouldn't be like that if these people are doing the proper job and the proper investigations.

We also feel that autopsy and toxicology reports should be released to the family, not after the investigation is done. My family had to wait ten months for Jermaine Carby's and we don't feel that was right.

In regards to the SIU there should be an overhaul – I agree with what everyone else is saying, that police shouldn't be a part of it, not even 10%.

The turnaround time on investigations, there needs to be a limit – there needs to be a time limit. Someone is killed, how long people need to be working. Our tax dollars are going out and I feel like people are doing nothing. I've showed up at the SIU office and seen them having a big food party, and I don't understand, when people are getting killed and they should be taking care of that.

Accessibility to the SIU after an incident. In June I was actually hit by a car, because the police – the TAVIS unit – were chasing a man – they tried to say they weren't, but my phone recorded everything. They were chasing a guy, he hit me and he hit two other people. People got injured, as well as myself, and there was no number to call.

I waited from six o'clock till about quarter to – no, it happened about five – till about quarter to ten for the SIU to come, to give my report, and no one showed up. And when I kept asking officers where are they, you know, give me a number, can I call, I would call the SIU's phone and it was saying, you know what, we're closed right now. There should be accessibility where if something happens, we don't wait for them to conjure up their story and figure out how we're going to lie to the media and to the family.

I should be able to get – I should be able to see something and say, hey, SIU, you need to get here right now; it shouldn't be someone has to call them for them to come; everyone should have that number, it should be accessible to everyone. And if they have nothing to hide, then it would be accessible to everyone.

In regards to the names of the officers, we definitely feel that it should be released. If I was to shoot my friend Dwight, you would know about my name – I wouldn't do that, he's my friend – but you would know my name, you would know about my background, you would know what I – you know what I mean, what I did in the past, all of this information about me.

So why is it different for an officer? We should know their track record, whether or not they're charged. We should know this officer has a track record for being disciplined, or for harassing people in this area, or this type of race of people. That information should be public.

Male: Unless the officer is a minor.

Latanya: Yeah, exactly, unless the officer is a minor, then you shouldn't be an officer.

But I feel that our tax dollars are what pay their salary and the community has a right to know what's happening with these officers and what they're doing in the field. [Applause]. If they're not conducting themselves properly, we shouldn't have to wait until an SIU agency that doesn't do their job in the first place, charges them so we can find out their name.

And the family shouldn't have to wait to go to a coroner's inquest either to find out half of this information. If they are conducting themselves properly, this information should be given out freely, because they know that they're doing the right thing. When they hide information, it makes us as family members or as the public think, what's really going on behind the scenes, and can we really trust the system?

And that's pretty much all I want to touch on for today. [Applause].

Pamela: Thank you, LaTanya.

Roger: My name is Roger Love. I'm a legal counsel with the Human Rights Legal Support Centre. I don't have too much to add in light of what Latanya has stated, but I will say this: as a lawyer, if somebody has been the victim of an instance of police misconduct, they may come to me and they may ask me the question, what should I do, right. And it's my job to lay out the options and to guide them through that process.

I think it's a real problem that, when people come to me and come to other lawyers who do policing work, that we can't wholeheartedly recommend that they file complaints, right. You know, if I were presented with a human rights claim or a civil claim, part of my job is to recommend, you know, what I think the merits of that case will be; you know, do they have a chance of being successful?

And far too often members of the legal community are of the opinion that OIPRD complaints will not be successful, right. That, you know, the SIU investigation may not provide you with the answers that you want to see.

So to be a bit more concrete, or things that I think can improve, I think that the OIPRD should also engage in the collection of statistics, disaggregated statistics. I think we need to know what types of complaints are being filed against the police to determine whether or not there is a problem, whether there is, you know, too much scrutiny being placed on one community as opposed to others.

I understand that the system is supposed to be accessible and user-friendly, but in terms of transparency, I mean, perhaps they should move towards a system where decisions are reported. For most - I know it would be impossible to do all - but for most of the complaints that come forward, just so that the public gets a sense of what's going to happen when I file my complaint? How is it going to be handled? So again, I would say transparency with respect to decisions, with respect to statistics.

In terms of the SIU, I think it's pretty difficult to advocate on behalf of individuals who are going through the SIU process. I mean, the way it's designed, the thought is that, you know, you give the SIU the information that you have and they sort of take care of the rest. You don't know the extent to which the witnesses that you provide to the SIU have been questioned; you don't know the content of those investigative interviews. You're only given a report at the end of the day, with the conclusion.

So the scope for even members of the bar to advocate on behalf of clients and dealing with SIU investigations, seems to be very limited. And again, I'll just preface it by saying, I don't intend for it to become

something that only lawyers can access. Having a lawyer will help, but what I'm saying is, if it's difficult for me to advocate on behalf of a family in that system, imagine a self-represented individual.

I think I'll leave it at that, yeah.

Pamela: Thank you, Roger. [Applause]. Is there anyone else that hasn't spoken? The gentleman at that table over there, perhaps?

Amrik Singh: My name is Amrik Singh Ahluwalia and I have the privilege of being elected Chair of the Regional Police Board recently, and I want to recognise my colleague, Mayor Crombie here, and also the President of the Association, Paul Black, and his colleagues here.

First of all, I want to empathise with the family of Michael. I heard what you've gone through. It's a tremendous loss. I don't know the details, but every time a life is lost, it hurts all of us. We as parents can see – relate with our kids. So I feel that we have to do everything in our power to eliminate that – to reduce the possibility.

I've heard, and I respect and I've heard the comments made and we accept it. Our board is moving forward with the help and cooperation of the Chief, towards more openness, more accountability, more transparency, towards better governance and community servicing, because our number one aim is to serve.

Who is our recipient? It's 1.3 million people of Peel, and the 3000 employees of our police service. We have one of the finest police services, but there are things that happen. What we are trying to do is ramp up the training. We talk about de-escalation. We recently hired a professor from University of Toronto and Chief Evans very aggressively, is giving training about de-escalation. I've seen the video, they do a good job.

I also attended the very first session on Implicit Bias. The first thing of any problem is to recognise, and Chief Evans has decided – and the board has decided – that it is mandatory for every employee to go through that implicit one-day, one and a half day training. And the Board Chair and the Chief of Police were the first ones in the first session. This is how we feel it is so important.

So we are moving forward and this board is very committed to listen to this thing, all the complaints, all the issues you have suggestions, you have – the Mayor and I have attended several sessions, we organised three sessions about guarding and you folks know that this board fought very aggressively to eliminate guarding, because it was affecting – we heard the community say that it's affecting disproportionately a segment of the society, and we acted on it and the government acted on it, and as a result, Peel is the first one to eliminate that and replace that with the new regulations.

We are moving forward and I can tell you that this board is very committed to listen to the issues and keep working with collaboration with the police service to move forward so that we become a very potent service-oriented police service. And I can assure you we are – myself and my colleagues on the board are very – and so is the Chief – is very committed to move forward.

And listening to you here, as – I think this is probably the fourth and fifth session like this I've listened to in the last six months – and our heart goes out to people who have suffered. And all I can assure you is that we are working, we are listening and we are moving forward, and make our deliberation more open.

Just to give you a small example: for the first time ever, we opened up our budget meeting. We also have decided that the key work that is done is in the committees; we're going to open up committees so that you can come and participate. The board is your board; we belong to you.

So I want to encourage you to come, help us, give us feedback, tell your friends to come, attend the board meetings. We just hired today, somebody to revamp our website so that it becomes more user-friendly, because it is a window into the public – into our audience and the people we serve.

So in the next three, four months, you'll see a tremendous amount of easy accessibility to our deliberations, what the committees are, what the mandates are, who is member there, what their minutes are, what is their next agenda for next time and so on, so that you can come and listen and we require your input.

So that's all I'll say, that we are moving forward and we keep on looking forward to hearing your comments to help us do a better job, so thank you.

Pamela: Thank you very much, for that one. [Applause]

Dwight: I've just got a quick question: This is [unintelligible words 00:51:03] pertains to [unintelligible words 00:51:06] in ---

Pamela: You need actually to speak into the mic so that it can be recorded.

Dwight: [Unintelligible words 00:51:14]. Now just pertaining to – just pertaining to what you had said about Police Evans and you are working very closely, you know, to try to put an end to various things. But how do you feel about the fact that last year, in fact, Police Evans had acknowledged that – well, basically she went against what John Tory and what Mayor Jeffrey had said when they said they wanted to put an end to carding, because carding is one of the most destructive practices.

But then Chief Evans then spoke out and said that she doesn't work for the Mayor, and not only that, that she has no intention of putting an end to a practice that's proven to work.

So for me, being someone who's been time and time again a victim of carding, as a young black male who's grown up in Peel, and similar to as the young gentleman here had said, most of the people within my circle don't really have many good encounters with the police officers.

So I mean, I think – it's easy for you – I think it's good that you're speaking for yourself, but I don't know if you're necessarily accurately sharing with us the sentiment that Chief Evans shares. I'm not sure if you guys are on the same page, because from what I've seen, she's very much content with carding, so please just elaborate on that for me.

Amrik Singh: It's an excellent question and it's tough one. So let me try to – one of the things, when we talk about diversity, we also have to talk about diversity of opinion. We have a fundamental value system in our board – we value diversity of opinion. That's what makes us strong.

Who says change is easy? Change is hard, very hard, and we are trying to bring people along with us.

Now I agree with you, what happened in September last year, but also, I would point out to you after all this thing, we worked very collaboratively – I worked with the Chief between the months of November, even before I was the Chair, and up till March.

So Peel became the first – very first – Ontario has 170 boards – very first one to adopt it. I think that is quite remarkable for a chief who had a different point of view of serving people, and eventually we were able to prevail and reach the same consensus that this is the right thing to do, move forward, and when the province came, we started implementing on April 22nd, eight months before the target deadline. Most of the boards haven't started yet, I can assure you.

So yes, it is hard, and yes, she had a different point of view, but we come together – we come together. Same thing on the audit. The part of this thing is, you know, when we talk about openness and diversity, I want you to remember, diversity of heart, diversity of conversation is very important. And we want to have everybody come together so that we can solve the issues with diplomacy.

You know, she's a very senior officer and she's entitled to her view, but in the end, I would say 95-99%, she shares the vision of the board. There are issues that you have with the police and I can assure you we are working towards it, but the ship moves very slow. But we are working – but we are working collaboratively, cooperatively and hopefully you will see the changes come through over time.

And frankly, the evidence is what I just mentioned – the Peel Police Service is the first one to implement the new regulation introduced by the Ontario government, and I think that is something to celebrate.

Thanks for your question.

Bonnie C: Good evening, I'm Mayor Bonnie Crombie, Mayor of the City of Mississauga and I'm delighted to join you and I apologise for being late – I had another function to attend before arriving and I'm sorry, I didn't hear all the input, but what I did hear was very telling.

I wanted to address your question as well. It was a very difficult time. I moved that motion. Yeah, I also moved the motion on the equity audit. So the board is a little more progressive – we're a little bit ahead of the Chief and PRPA, but they're coming along. It was a very difficult time and we all had to de-escalate tension at the time and realise that the province was stepping in with new regulations.

And even though – even though the board had asked the Chief to suspend carding and street checks – we call them street checks – we knew that in due course, in very shortly, the province would be demanding it. And so we did step back, because it was a time that perhaps we aren't so proud of, that there was a little too much acrimony and too much tension.

And we're a new board and we were a new board. We elected a new Chair. We're very proud of that – he's representative of the diversity that is Mississauga, that is Peel. And we have two very progressive mayors, and so I think maybe we were working too fast – maybe.

But we have a goal and that goal is to increase openness and transparency and accountability, and to take a good look at ourselves and to determine how can we improve, how can we move forward. And that's why we had called for the equity audit.

I mean, Ranjit came forward and gave a very compelling case, but we had already decided before Ranjit came forward that we were going to move forward and call for the audit. Because we wanted to test ourselves, you know, where were we strong, where were we weak? How could we improve, what are other forces doing that we should be doing too, particularly on the diversity issue.

Why doesn't Peel Regional Police represent the community? What are those obstacles to recruiting officers from different communities? You know, why aren't there more black officers? Why aren't there more Sikh or Muslim? What are those obstacles, why haven't we been able to overcome that in Mississauga? We're 56% visible minorities born somewhere else, Brampton even more, so what were those barriers?

Now listen, Peel Police are trying. Certainly even our firefighters, they're not very reflective of the community either. Our job is to push them to find out what more we could be doing.

So we thought this equity audit would help us take a look at what else is going out in the community and other municipalities, in other police forces. What are they doing differently, you know, what milestones have

we achieved and where can we go? So those are some of the things we've been doing.

You know, my job, as far as while I'm on the board - and I'm only on the board another short while then we're changing over and Mississauga will have a new rep - is really to modernise policing. You know, less about enforcement and more about dealing with the issues that are really curtailing policing today, like mental illness. How are our officers dealing with that on the street? Are they prepared, are they trained, are they funded to deal with it?

And you know, looking at equity, looking at diversity and so it's - I came tonight to listen, and unfortunately I'm taking up too much of your time right now, because I want to hear what the rest of you have to say. And I'm just sorry I couldn't be here with you earlier, but let's continue on.

I have a lot of confidence in Justice Tulloch - he's going to do a great job in his review, and I have confidence that we're moving forward, even as a board. You know, we're asking for change, it comes slowly. It's hard to change the ship, right. They're an organisation of 3000 people and we've got a small board saying, you know, let's look at to see what others are doing, because they're making more progress than we are - but let's get there. And we're with you, we're trying our best.

Pamela: Thank you, Mayor Crombie. Thank you. Actually that is a wrap, and I'd like to call on Justice Tulloch to give some closing remarks. We can speak - we have ---

Elizabeth: [Unintelligible 00:59:21] just for a minute, because like ---

Pamela: We can't hear you, Ma'am, we need the mic.

Female: Because I like to be gratuitous. Often now the police in my area, when I call, they would come to my assistance, but the whole idea is that why would they listen to the bank manager and I'm looking as a thief. That is my worry and I don't know what I should do to get this settled.

So I found the officers in my area.

Pamela: Thank you very much.

Female: Thank you very much.

Pamela: All right, thank you again, everyone, for your contributions. There was a lot to hear, we heard a lot of diverse opinions. And just to remind you that there is still a lot of food on the side to eat, on a lighter note, and I will call on Justice Tulloch to give some closing remarks. Thank you very much.

M Tulloch: Okay, thanks Pam, and Mayor Crombie, thank you for coming out. Chair Ahluwalia, I appreciate your comments. I listened very carefully again to

all the comments of the individuals who spoke and represented the various tables, and like I said last night, and I will reiterate that tonight, we're listening to you, we've heard you loud and clear, and we will be considering all of your recommendations. And you know, the report will be reflective of what I've heard in all of these public meetings.

I'm about to catch a plane to go to Sudbury for tomorrow, where we're going to be holding other meetings. But Peel is important; it's one of the larger cities in Ontario and I believe that, you know, the citizens of Peel need to feel that they're being served by these oversight bodies and by the police. And I am very hopeful that at the end of this process we will have a better, more transparent, more accountable system that is reflective of what the community and our society wants.

So again, thanks. And I also heard the comment about the fact that a lot of people are not here, and we're trying to – we're hopeful that we will do better at getting the word out. We're utilising – we have advertised, by the way, in all of the local newspapers, we're on the radios. We're not in all of the media obviously, but we're also trying to get the word out on social media. But we will continue to do that and there's going to be a number of other public meetings in the Greater Toronto Area.

So I would encourage you to go on our website and, you know, spread the word by letting others know where the meetings are, because they're all – the dates are all set and in most cases locations are there. And you know, if you know other people in London, Kingston, Sault Ste Marie, Ottawa, we're going to all of these cities and we're going to be holding public meetings in all of these areas.

Because each locale or each jurisdiction has different issues, but I think in order for this to be an effective process, it has to be reflective of all of what we hear in all of the particular communities throughout the province of Ontario.

This is – you know, this is a real opportunity for us. The government has, for the first time, as I understand it, been doing these consultations at will and they're prepared to open up the Police Act to make it a better and more effective and more accountable and transparent act. So you know, at the end of the day your voices will not be wasted, but it will be meaningful at the end of the process.

So thanks a lot, thank you again for coming. [Applause]

[End of recorded material 01:04:17]