

16-11-24 – IPOR Oshawa

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Pamela Grant: Well good evening everyone. It's six o'clock, and with respect to everyone's schedule I'd like us to start on time. My name is Pamela Grant, and I'm the facilitator for this evening and Strategic Advisor to Justice Tulloch and his team.

Welcome to our 14th, you are the 14th public consultation that we've had across the province of the Independent Police Oversight Review. What I'm looking forward to tonight is candid and open conversation. And we have those of you who have been at previous public meetings will recognize this as a different configuration. We're sat in a circle because we are a more intimate group this time. And I hope that what will happen tonight is that we will work through the questions but also have that opportunity and time to have a good and full conversation, and perhaps drill a little deeper into some of the questions and recommendations that you would have.

Without further ado, I'd like to introduce Justice Michael Tulloch, leader of the review, to say a few opening remarks.

Justice Tulloch: Thanks, Pamela. Good evening to everyone. Some of you I've seen before, others for the first time. Welcome to our 14th public meeting. My name is Michael Tulloch. I'm a judge from Ontario Court of Appeal.

Before I say very much more, I want to begin by acknowledging that we are gathered on the traditional territory of the Mississaugas Scugog Island First Nation. These lands were the meeting place for several Indigenous nations in the area. By acknowledging this, we're acknowledging the importance and the significance of the traditions of Indigenous peoples of this country.

By way of background, on April 29, 2016 I was appointed by the provincial government to lead an independent review of three civilian oversight agencies, which oversee police conduct in the province of Ontario. They are the SIU or the Special Investigations Unit, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director or the OIPRD, and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission or the OCPC.

Since my appointment I have assembled a team of experts and lawyers, policy advisors and other strategic advisors to assist me, and a number of them are here with us this evening. We've held a number of public and private consultations across the province. Now I intend to draw on what I've been learning through these consultations to write a report with recommendations, which in the end should enhance the transparency, accountability and efficacy of the oversight bodies that

we are currently reviewing. That report will be submitted to the government and to the public at large no later than March 31, 2017.

Now as mentioned, the focus of this review is on three civilian police oversight bodies, the SIU, the OIPRD and the OCPC. 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. In addition, the OIPRD also has the power to examine issues of a systemic nature that may arise from complaints about the police, and after make recommendations addressing them.

Now finally, the last body is the OCPC, and this body is primarily an adjudicative 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, as well as disputes related to the provision of police services. The OCPC can also conduct investigations into the conduct of police services boards, their members as well as police officers.

Now with that background in mind, I want to take this opportunity this evening to hear from you. The review, as indicated, is an independent review. And what this means is that I am free to critically examine how these oversight bodies operate.

Now meeting with members of the public such as yourselves is a crucial part of this independent process. I am therefore grateful that each of you have taken the time out of your schedules to come here this evening, and to meet with me today. I appreciate that some people may find it difficult to speak about some of the issues that they have experienced, but 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 exactly that. Therefore, so long as each of you that are here participate and offer your perspective, your voice will be heard.

So again, I want to thank you for coming out tonight to share your thoughts, your experiences and your recommendations. And what I can assure again is that this process is not going to be in vain. It's not just going to be another review that produces a report. This is a very meaningful process, which I am extremely hopeful will result in some concrete recommendations and actions. Thank you very much.

Danielle: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for coming out. So I'm just going to run really quickly through the agenda for this evening, and then we'll get started.

So just as our disclaimer, we would like to hear the stories and experiences that some of you may have had with any of these oversight

bodies. But so that you know, we will not be looking at past cases or revisiting past judgements, reopening cases and making new assessments. That's not what the review is about, but the context that you are able to provide for recommendations is very important. So while we do want to hear your stories, we just want to make it really clear that we will not be reopening or re-judging or reassessing those cases.

So the way that this works, we are in the introduction right now. We're going to go right into the discussion. It's not a roundtable. We've got a semicircle today, and I believe we're going to run through the process just a little bit differently than we normally do. And I should probably actually just turn it over to you, because it's going to be very different this evening. We're going to have more of an open discussion with everyone around the table. So thank you all so much for coming out, really appreciate you taking the time this evening.

And just so you know, we are on social media. So we're on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram and also on YouTube. On our website is where the YouTube videos of these meetings are stored. You'll see a camera at the back of the room. There's Dylan. So this meeting is being recorded, and it'll go up on our website. So for people who weren't able to come, they're able to see all of the consultations that we've done so far.

We're also live tweeting the meeting. So myself and Matthew Parker, if you see us taking pictures, taking your picture and you don't want your picture taken, just let us know. It's not an issue at all. But we do try to live tweet all of our meetings for those who are following along on social media. And also, Peter Rehak at the back of the room, you'll see him around taking photos. He's with the team as well. And the photos, they go up on our Instagram account and also on our website.

And that's the other thing. So this meeting is being recorded. If you are speaking and have a point to make and don't want to be on camera, just let us know and we'll make a note of that, and Dylan will also make sure to not capture you. But otherwise, you're going to be on camera and then the video will be on our website. Okay?

And for the French speakers here; [Speaking French] Thank you so much.

Pamela Grant: Thank you Danielle, and thank you Justice Tulloch. What we're going to do this evening is I just want to make sure that everybody has in front of them the list of 11 questions. We are going to ask that you take a look at them. You can choose if you want to work in sort of groups around the table, for the next 40 to 45 minutes, through those questions. And then at the end of that period we will pass a mic around to the different groups or individuals and get your feedback on each of the questions, and also any points that you would like to make.

In the interest of time and in the interest of the best use of our time, or strategic use of our time, because we will be done by eight, or before if we've completed our conversation, please, you don't need to read the questions, nor do you need to repeat anything that you may have heard another group or another individual say. It's really important that you use the opportunity to speak to those issues that you haven't heard yet, or comments that you want to make or recommendations that you want to make that haven't yet been voiced.

So on that, I will start our 45 minutes soon. And I also want to make sure that everyone has signed – there are two foolscaps passing around. So please ensure that you fill this out. It's important because, when the report is released at the end of March, everyone who's participated in these consultations will receive a link to the report. So you'll have a soft copy that you could of course read, and of course share with your own networks and colleagues. So it's very important that you do that.

And there is information on the table that speaks to the three different oversight bodies, some background information about the process that you can read and use through the 45 minutes. I will give you some time checks through, and we'll be circulating the room. If there are any points of clarification that you need we'll be happy to answer; Matthew, Danielle, Jamie and Justice Tulloch and I, and Peter as well, and Armand Labarge at the back, hi. So there are enough of us to go around and we're looking forward to hearing your comments. Thank you.

Okay, could I have everyone's attention please? We are going to start the report back, and we're going to start with P.J., but P.J., I'm going to get you the mic – P.G. P.G. See, I'm determined that you won't have the same name as me, determined. P.G. All right, just one second.

P.G.: All right, so my name is P.G. and I was in a group with these lovely gentlemen here. We discussed the fact that we had a bit of an idea of what these agencies are, however we don't have an in depth knowledge base of their functionalities. So when we discussed certain things when it came to whether or not we would report any incidents, it was very difficult for Michael and myself to say that well we could actually go to these different agencies to say 'Okay well we've had our different run ins with the police'.

It's a pretty good dynamic with this group, because we have three young black gentlemen and an older, mature white gentleman, seasoned gentleman. And we definitely see the compare and contrast when it comes to lived experiences. And one thing that Dave shared with us is that when he first moved into the community, an officer came to his door with his son, and was like "We need to speak".

And they went inside; they spoke and said "You know what? Your son were around friends that just got arrested however we brought him home." And for myself, I look at that and I see that as community

policing. It's the police officers and the community coming together and there's a sense of openness.

So they know that 'Well these people just moved in, but yet the son is with someone who they shouldn't be around, so let's give him a by, or let's give him an opportunity to stay clean', and then bring him home to the parents to have that discussion to say 'This is who your son should be hanging out with, and these are the ones they shouldn't'. So I think that's a very positive story to hear, because I think that sometimes, based on what I've seen and what's going on in today's day in age and in the media, we have lost that sense of community and that sense of embrace between policing and the community.

Michael and myself, we'd had total experiences, especially as young black men, where we've either had a weapon pulled on us saying that we were either... what?

Male: Fit the description.

P.G.: Fit the description, yes that's the word, fit the description of someone who jacked a car, however we're there walking home with a group of friends, or being accused that – for myself, being accused that I had a weapon in my pant leg while walking home. So these are situations or circumstances that has transpired over the years, that in the sense kind of engrains a negativity between young black men and the police officers.

Did we ever report it? No. One is because there's that sense of growing up in a family where it's like you respect the authority. And if you are being approached, it means that you must have been in the wrong some way, somehow. But now that we've grown older and we're more seasoned, we know that there's just certain things that are not right, you know. And to think that the colour of your skin makes you more of a target, that's the word; I don't want to say victim but a target to certain inclinations that you fit a stereotypical identity or a group of people, right, that's wrong, you know.

And I think that just for us, we think that there just needs to be a lot more of community policing, where police and the community, no matter what race you're from, right. I think that it's just that whole embrace of policing and community just needs to be a positive reinforcement; that we feel that we can actually talk together and have forums such as this, right.

Just to kind of go off, we did have something called Speak Up Durham recently, when the community and the Chief of Police and his staff, they were able to have an open [community] forum. So I think that's a start, and we're just here to continue that.

Pamela Grant: Thank you very much, P.G., could you pass it over to Jamie at the head of you?

Jamie Bramma: Good evening. My name is Jamie Bramma, and we're the men in blue here literally. And figuratively we are members of the Durham Regional Police Association, which is the police union for lack of a better term.

I'm going to start off by just offering a quick apology. We actually have our annual general meeting this evening at 7:30, so if you see us leave early, the food didn't make us sick or whatever, just we do have to go, okay?

So our experience with police oversight is obviously going to be different than some of the experiences in the room, based on our vocation of being police officers. One of the talking points that we like to get across is we are not opposed to oversight. In fact, we support it. But the current system right now as it exists is broken. We support oversight that is competent, efficient and accountable.

And one of the problems with the current system today is the investigations, they take way too long. And I'll just focus specifically on the SIU investigations. And I'm not talking about one of the more urgent investigations like a shooting or a death, but even something that in the policing world would be a simple traffic accident. It takes almost a year for that officer to receive closure. And it's also very taxing on the victims' families as well as the general public. It sort of disappears into the dark and nobody ever hears anything about it. So, one of our visions of a more efficient oversight system is that they conduct speedier investigations.

The other thing that we've noticed, just through our discussions with the stakeholders in the community, is that these oversight bodies have done a very poor job of communicating to the public what they do and who they are. And that sets off a discussion right away based on sort of confusion and mistruths and misconceptions. So it would be great to see better communications [police] put forward, educating the public on what it is these oversight bodies do.

One of the issues that we feel very strongly about is that we do not support the identification of identifying officers who are under investigation by the SIU, until charges are laid if that may be the case, for a couple of reasons. The first one being it's a safety issue for some of our police officers. We have concerns it could lead to vigilantism. And if an officer's charged with an offence, that's different. He's now charged and the name goes on public record. But there's no other area in society where somebody who is under investigation and not facing charges is publicly named.

And another thing that's come up that just is I think is worth pointing out is that we don't have a problem with former police officers working for these various boards, simply for the fact that they bring with them the type of experience and background necessary to conduct these investigations, okay. If you're an SIU investigator and you're

called to an officer-involved shooting, that's a major case. And the only area of law enforcement where you're going to receive training and experience in that area is going to be the policing vocation. I just can't think of any other line of work where you're going to have that sort of experience and training necessary.

I'm going to pass the mic along to the next group. I just wanted to thank you, everyone for coming out here, okay, because it speaks to your engagement with the community. It shows us that you care. And if anything – we've been to a few of these, and we've always come away richer for the experience of having learned through different people's perspectives, and I hope you can say the same about meeting us tonight. Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thanks very much, Jamie. Can you pass it back this way back to Andrew please?

Andrew: Hi there. Okay, I'll try to make this quick because it sounds like we're limited on time. My name is Andrew. I'm 27 years old. My political philosophy includes libertarianism. And my background, I come from a broken family, divorced parents. I hold two diplomas. My first was one Police Foundations. My second one that I recently got is Food and Farming.

And I'm here today because I currently have an OIPRD investigation that's ongoing. I had an investigation with the ombudsman because of the OIPRD. They're not following their processes, and that's what led me to this event. Basically, I went through the questions and I made the complaints. I did the research. I read some law – the Police Services Act – and I've read the OIPRD's Rule of Procedure and their general overview of their complaint processes.

So yeah, I mean obviously I initiated the complaint because I had a bad experience with the police. I can tell you that on the off time, but today we're talking about the OIPRD so I'm going to move on from that.

What I have a problem with the OIPRD is there's a contradiction in their Code of Procedure. They have a section that's called 919 that's contrary to their Section 13.4. So the process is I make a complaint, and either the OIPRD can review the complaint, find it substantiated or unsubstantiated or less substantiated, and make a decision on there. Or they send it to the police themselves, which that's ultimately what happened in my case. And my problem is, I have a question here, number eight asking about former officers investigating. I'm having a problem because actual officers are investigating my case. That's to me a conflict of interest in what I have experienced.

So basically, the process is, yeah, so the police make the investigation. That takes a while. I initiated the complaint February. I met with the investigating officer from the DRPS Professional Standards Unit. And he interviewed and two other civilian witnesses and then three officers

involved. And that was in around June or July. I had to initiate an Appeal Complaint Request because they found my complaint unsubstantiated.

And my problem too is I never received full documentation from the investigative report. I actually received – what I mean by that is I never received officers' notes. I think that was important because...

Male: You never received officers' notes?

Andrew: I never received officers' notes. I got officers' notes from a separate court proceeding, which is another thing I went to court for, but I got Crown disclosure basically, and that's when I got officers' reports. I think that was an incredible – that was negligent. I mean when I'm a complainant and I'm not getting officers' reports on the incident, I mean like they're just denying, and the investigative report, it's just a he-said/she-said. But to their mistake, I believe that they are contrary to what the report said and what the investigative report said from the DRPS.

And I don't see any oversight with the OIPRD itself when they're promoting on their web page that they are doing this in a fair and effective manner. I sent them an e-mail communication, because I did not know they had to inform me that I had a breach of privacy on my file, because someone in their organization sent an e-mail to someone that was part in my case. And I received a signed letter from the Director of the OIPRD because of that. So I launched my own kind of query, investigation, trying to figure that out. And I realized that that's when they're breaching their processes.

By law they are supposed to receive the investigative report within, I believe it's a 14-day timeframe of when they complete, the DRPS completed it. They didn't [unintelligible 00:28:53].

Pamela Grant: Andrew, I'm sorry. You're five minutes is up. I'll give you a couple moments to wrap up so we can pass it on. We can come back, okay?

Andrew: Okay, then I'll just skip right to what I think should be added to the Police Services Act. I think a complainant in law should be given a reasonable timeframe to the completion of this entire process. I think approvals for extension must be included, because I see a lot of that in the law. It should be included with the complainant itself, so the complainant has the power to say 'Okay well if you need more time, no I don't think you need more time, I think you guys have it now'.

I think from the get-go you should have automatic legal representation provided, without cost and without restriction. Because when I received legal advice for this process, when I was deterred was based on a financial matter because it would cost too much. It's not really worth my time.

And then I think hearings should be adjudicated by either members of the public or ex-police officers, investigators or justices or lawyers. I don't think it should be adjudicated by someone from the police organization.

And I think for the removals from the Police Officers Act, I think Section 68.214, I don't think that if there's no complaints within a two-year timeframe of police officers, that all records should be expunged. I think that, when I was growing up in school I was told 'No, if you do something wrong in school now it's on a permanent record for life.' I think absolutely for someone that's with badge and gun should have their record for life, even if it's for a minor service complaint.

I think 71-2, "Endeavour to complete request for review within 30 days" should be removed and replaced with must be completed within 30 days. I started that process August 10th, and it's now November 20 or so, and that's 90 days. That's unacceptable.

And yeah, that's pretty well it. I think Section 76 of the Police Services Act; I think we should give more powers to good officers. I hear all these talks of there's good officers in the system. I think we should empower good officers to bring accountability to poor officers. And that's basically what I've gathered. Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thank you, Andrew. Could you pass the mic please to Rochelle and Jeff beside you?

Rochelle: Okay so Jeff is passing it to me and I'm definitely passing it right back to him, because we got to like question two and then we skipped to question 11. But I think it was an exercise in the reality that we have a different lens.

Pamela Grant: The gentlemen behind you. I'm just asking those who've just come in to come up and sit at the table please. Thank you.

Rochelle: We have a different lens and perspective which is really good, but we don't often have the opportunity to have dialogue, because maybe if someone has, you know, a gun or a badge, I don't know if that regular officer is going to have that type of dialogue with a different lens.

I have a unique lens because of the counselling that my husband and myself do. So we counsel a lot of police officers that kind of share a lot of their stories, and it's really stories related to humanity. Perhaps they lost a loved one or they're dealing with separation and divorce. And we kind of recommend 'I don't think you should be holding a gun right now, and be in work based on the trauma that you're experiencing.'

But then they say they're really struggling with even showing the human side of who they are in the workplace, because it's almost like they feel – I don't know if it's the system that conditions them to feel like this, or their own feelings, but they feel like they can't be human in

this environment, and they're just kind of taught to be tough. And then on the other end, we counsel a lot of people from the black community that actually says the police interaction is actually very traumatizing. And once again, we will hear their stories as well.

And I believe – this is what I believe, from my perspective, I believe sometimes privilege is given to the person who might have... We debate this thing called power, but I know when I worked in child welfare, just by virtue of being a child welfare director, supervisor, manager, there's power that came along with that. So when we wrote whatever we wrote for the judges to read it, the judges automatically believed us and not the others.

So I do think that's what happens a lot of times with police interaction. There's an automatic bias that the police officer, who's also human, that is actually doing some things that are very wrong sometimes to the black community. No, no, no we believe them because of the, I would say the privilege that comes along with the title versus the others.

So I'm going to pass it to Jeff because he has a unique lens as well. But I just think that it's very interesting that we got to question two, and I don't think anyone who has police interaction has an opportunity even to get to question one.

Jeff: Thank you, Rochelle. So I'll introduce myself. I'm a police officer from Peterborough. For those who don't know, it's about an hour north of Oshawa, small community of about 78,000 people.

So as a police officer as well as the President of the Peterborough Police Association, not to be confused with the folks that just left from Durham, I've had very in-depth involvement with both the SIU, OIPRD and specifically OCPC in regards to our Mayor and the Police Services Board, and the lack of action by OCPC.

So when Rochelle and I spoke, to use her words, we each have our own lens that we look through, not to say that my lens is right and hers is wrong or hers is right and mine is wrong. I think we had good dialogue. And the...

Rochelle: [Unintelligible 00:35:54]

Jeff: Yours is as right as mine. The gentleman down here who said that these types of forums are good for communities, I couldn't agree more. I think he's 100% bang on. I think these types of meetings with different groups and different race and sex and nationalities is a good learning experience for everyone, and I would hope that they would continue. And I know I will probably take this back to my own police service and maybe suggest that we have some of these town hall if you will kind of meetings within our own community, and hopefully have a better understanding of each other's point of view. Back to you.

Pamela Grant: Who's next? Are you done? You have time, but I'm not pushing it. We have time to come back, so...

Rochelle: We were talking about recommendations. We definitely didn't agree on the recommendations. But I've actually been married for 12 years, and I don't know if my husband and I agree on anything except – anything. So I'm okay with disagreement, but...

So I actually believe that when we are investigating, which all of these oversight bodies do, I think the paper and the laws and all these things that we write on, they're as good as the paper that they're written on. It's actually people that implement things. And I think when the person who is deciding guilt or innocence, or if the person should get off, I think if they don't have a lens that is trauma-informed or culturally sensitive or things of that nature, I think that is very, very, very dangerous.

And last of all, I'd probably say in terms of recommendations, I think sometimes it's easy to accept the good things that come along with an inheritance, but not necessarily the challenging things. So example, if you got property inherited to you, we would love it. But then if you heard that maybe there's some debt that's owing on the property and you owe it now, you might say 'No, no, no. I didn't know I'd have to owe the debt that comes along with that'.

I do think when it comes to racial privilege there is a debt and an asset that comes along with it. So when you inherit things like, oh, a lens of who's guilty or innocent, or you have the job, or a former officer is the one that's doing the investigations, I actually think the former officer could have actually been your dad's friend, your best friend, your grandfather's friend. You could have had the same country club. So all of those things actually impact how I'm actually going to have the outcome here.

So I think if you don't have maybe a black person who was your friend, your grandfather's friend, all of those things will impact your lens. So guilt or innocence, you actually think – you don't know that there's an unconscious bias of who's guilty and who's innocent before the procedure even starts. So I believe we need to talk about some of the things that have been passed down to us racially, privilege wise and some of the debt that is owed because of it.

Pamela Grant: Thank you so much, Rochelle. So [Wazir] is next. So Wazir, if you can get up and...

Wazir: Hi, good evening. I actually came here of an open mind to just listen to other people and to learn, but I was given the task to just say a few things by my group. And I think one of the things that we have arrived at was that the Special Investigation Unit and the other units, that is the Police Oversight Agencies, should be more open to the public in terms

of what they really do, you know the kind of job they have to do, and be more connected to the public in that regard.

Because for me as an individual, I don't really know much about what they do in terms of how they arrive at their decisions and all these kind of things. But there's a common consensus that if you want to make the public trust you in terms as these agencies, right, you should be more accessible to the public in terms of information.

The other things we discussed was the point number seven where the names of police officers who are investigated by the SIU should be made public, was that in the interest of public safety for the police officers, initially their names should not be put down. There was a common consensus with that. But if they should be charged eventually, yes that would naturally come out, right. So that was the one that we touched on.

And whether police officers should work with these oversight agencies investigating police officers, the answer was that you should have a mixture of both civilian and police officers on these boards or these committees, right, that should investigate police officers. So that the decisions that are coming out of these committees, or these oversight agencies, should be more balanced in a sense, and be more trusted by the public.

You know, they don't have to question it in a sense that 'Okay you know what? We have 12 police officers on this board investigating police officers, and you know, ex-police officers investigating police officers. And how can we trust these police officers, ex-police officers, that they are doing a good job in not being biased towards, you know, these investigations?'

And we didn't get to touch too much on point number nine, but in my opinion, I don't agree with these agencies having, collecting data on things like race, gender, age and so on. What I have a little bit, in my personal opinion, a little bit about mental health, in the sense that I've seen cases on the national TV where a lot of people has been injured, shot or whatever, because of they will be mishandled in the sense that maybe the police officers did not know that they were suffering from mental health problems. And I think this would have been very helpful. I don't know how it will be, but I think it will have been very helpful to have this information.

But the other part of it where your race and your gender and your age and all these kind of things, I don't think this data should be shared or should be collected. You know, I don't agree with that one at all. But I speak for myself here on this point. We did not really touch too much upon this. We didn't get the time to do that.

And I think question 10, really it's the question number nine in some way, so it all depends on how you look at question nine. In terms of the

improvements and recommendations of the SIU and the other two agencies, which I have not much information on, but if they want to – we didn't touch upon this neither but in my personal opinion, if they want to show a better light on these agencies, they should be more open, in my initial discussion, they should be more open to the public and share more information to the public as to get an input as to what they do and all these sorts of things.

And in final conclusion, I would like to say that I am very thankful for being here today because I think I have learned a lot, looking at these paperwork that's been handed out. And I wish more of this could be done that the community could be more aware of. And I'm very surprised there was not much more community member input into this. There seems to be more police officers here around than community members.

So that's my little bit input I had to make. I hope I spoke for the other persons that we have in discussion, I didn't differ from anything. Thanks very much.

Pamela Grant: Thanks very much, Wazir. I think the next speaker is Bill, all the way at the end of the table.

Bill Clancy: Good evening. My name is Bill Clancy. I'm the Executive Director of the Durham Regional Police Services Board. And with me this evening are three board members, Ms. Rose Rockbrune, Mr. Allan Furlong and Ms. Bobbie Drew. We're in attendance tonight to actually just listen, to hear members of the public express their views and their stories, and their concerns about policing in our community.

We have developed a written submission to Justice Tulloch that if anyone would like a copy of I'd pleased to give it to them. These types of events, as a few people have noted, are very beneficial for the board to actually have direct engagement with community. And we certainly appreciate the thoughts that were shared, so thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thank you, Bill. Are there any other – I'm sure there are. There are some newcomers that have been here to my right. I don't have your names, but if you wanted to give any feedback. I know Gloria. And then we have some, yes we've got a few people so, Matthew, did you want to speak to anything perhaps?

Gloria: My one was around the police officer who give the, I think SIU. And it was his oversight, he think that his oversight is comfortable.

Pamela Grant: Can you put the mic up?

Gloria: Sorry. He felt that his oversight was comfortable. Yeah, he found that his oversight was comfortable with him, and he thinks that it should be doing more oversight. And I sort of question that in the sense of it's good to have an oversight, but the oversight for me, so how I felt about

it was a bit uncomfortable, in the sense that most of the oversight is more target to the black community than really a balanced oversight. I think that's what I was getting from him.

Yeah sorry, I sort of kind of got chewed out for that. Yeah, I think... I felt a bit uncomfortable with how he was like expressing that. And I wish that he could have elaborated more to where his oversight was really target to, yeah.

Pamela Grant: So are you going to say your next point? We're not going to answer, so just speak to...

Gloria: I'm not sure how the meeting is going tonight. It's quite different to Toronto.

Pamela Grant: Yes, it is.

Gloria: And for me, I was brought to the attention and had actually organized the Durham Action Committee group. And my problem pretty much was based on my daughter being arrested back in 2008. And it had to do with the over – this is the way I go – over policing in the schools. And the over policing in the schools in Durham is very dangerous I would say.

I'm not saying that... There is different levels of kids that you have within the schools, and I got that. And there should be some discipline and it should be some control. But the heaviness of the police hands within the school is pretty much used against the blacks. And this is a very concern, and it is a very painful experience within the Durham district.

We have tried to address it with the Superintendent of School Boards, and you know they way how we believe that they should look at the policing in the schools. Just as the sister had said, and I think I did mention that I work in mental health, and I brought up that. And I'm glad you brought that up, because I think a lot of times, from how the African-Canadians see things to the white Canadians is quite different.

In mental health I have control. I have control to make my case known, to when I call the police, when I call 911 I can give a story. I can tell the story of how this client behaves, that he could be escorted to the courts or wherever they have to escort him. But at the bottom line, you need to treat this individual as you would have loved yourself to be treated in a situation.

So if I write a story and said this client blah, blah, blah had a fight or became engaged in a battle or whatever, whose story would the police believe? Not because I'm black he going to say 'Okay, now I'm going to believe...' he's going to believe my story, because my story gives weight. We are standing here right now with weight. The client becomes the victim.

And that is how the African-Canadians feels. When we are in a school and our children are being hunted, like you have kids, you have the black kids in a group, you have the white kids in a group, you have the Filipinos, the Indians in a group. But then the main target in that school becomes that black group. And this is what takes place in the Durham.

I cannot go into all the details of my daughter's story, but it has been a painful story. Even though it's over seven to eight, nine years ago, it becomes a nightmare for her in the way that the school, the principal especially, and the police dealt with that case and that matter. And she was charged for something called bitch slapping. I did not even know the name bitch slapping, until the police officer was able to tell me my daughter was bitch slapping.

The evidence of that, when I asked the officer I said "Could you just show me?" I want to believe the officer that that did take place. And I'm here to tell you Judge, that that never took place. We looked at the camera. We looked at the video from every angle. And because of a story that was put together between the officer and the Vice President, my daughter was arrested in front of 75% of her schoolmates, and the teachers, and brought out of that school in handcuffs.

So I'm here to say that there is problems in the Durham area. That needs to be changed. I'm not talking about every officer, because I have known good officers. I have known excellent teachers. But it just takes one person to simulate wickedness. So I think you really need to pay very close attention in this Durham area. It's very subtle.

We have like, again, 95 of the male students – the girls has joined the list now – are being kicked out of school very early; very early. There is simple things that the VP or the principal can make some decisions, like assess the situation. Assess it carefully. Even if you have to suspend that child, be very cautious in how you're conducting your investigation. Because an officer charging your child from school, that's a record. So I mean I really need for you to deal with it in the Durham Region area.

And it's very serious. I mean we can sit here tonight and talk all the golden talk, but it's very serious. You can check a lot of the schools. Right now we are working on getting the data, because the data speaks volumes of how many black kids are being kicked out of the schools, and from a very early age.

Pamela Grant: Thank you, Gloria. There's a gentleman; Rochelle and then, pass it to Rochelle and then down to...

Rochelle: Thank you. I just want to concur with my sister. I really believe, and I understand the hesitancy around race-based data, but I strongly support race-based data. I went to an event with Minister Michael Coteau, and he said "If you have no data then you have no problem. And if you have no problem then you have no solution."

So I think sometimes numbers tell us a story, although it's a story we don't want to hear. And I shared it with my friend here, Jeff. I don't know if Jeff is still my friend, although... I shared it with Jeff. If someone had an overdraft at Royal Bank, if we had an overdraft of \$2,000, say we, just hypothetically... this isn't my story but hypothetically if we had an overdraft of \$2,000, and every month for six months you see in your account minus 2,000, minus 2,000, minus 2,000.

When you see that number, essentially you have to say two things to yourself, either 'I'm not making enough money' or 'I'm not managing my money well'. So there's only two things you can do as a solution to that. So that I think is the strong support I personally have for race-based data, because if we don't see the numbers then we won't see the story. And if we don't see the challenges in the story then we will never arrive at solutions.

Pamela Grant: I'm just going to say, if you would like to speak I just need to see a show of hands and we'll get the mic around to you, okay? So I've noted Jennifer. Do either of the two women who just came in? No? Okay, go ahead.

Female: Well I'd like to mention something to everybody here. There's someone going around taking photographs, and you can refuse to be photographed if you don't want to be in the newspaper or whatever. Because I remember when I was... Does anybody remember the FLQ Action in [unintelligible 00:55:37] Prime Minister [unintelligible 00:55:39] he called that a The War Measures Act...

Pamela Grant: Ma'am, we actually announced that at the beginning of the meeting. You were not here at the time. And so everyone knows...

Female: [Unintelligible 00:55:49] Sorry, I was at a friend's funeral.

Pamela Grant: Okay, I'm sorry, my condolences.

Justice Tulloch: Okay, so we won't take your pictures.

Pamela Grant: So we won't take your picture. Okay, can we go...?

Justice Tulloch: Okay, that's the end of that. Thank you. Sorry about that ma'am. Okay, Dave?

Pamela Grant: Could you [unintelligible 00:56:02] please?

Dave Mitchell: So my name's Dave Mitchell. I'm speaking as a resident of Durham; so two pieces with respect to the collection of race-based data. I think that in terms of the whole issue of amelioration that we should collect the data. And the data should not only be collected with respect to individuals that are the subject of uses of force that would invoke the mandate of the SIU, it should also be of the officer, whether it be by experience demographic, whether it be by race, gender, in order to get

a better sense systemically of what's going on there in terms of training, selection and oversight.

So it's not just about the individual that is subject to a use of force that would trigger the mandate, it's also about the officer. And it's no different than some services now that use early warning systems around use of force. If you put in too many reports, or you put in reports and your reports are not in step with the sort of general line, right, and you stick up, somebody has a conversation with you. So it shouldn't be any different. So we're not talking about individuals. We're talking about systemically.

With respect to the composition of the SIU and the hiring of former police officers, the way to get – the presupposition with respect to hiring is that police officers are the only ones that are qualified to investigate, especially if it's a lethal use of force that results in a death. Part of the difficulty there, Your Honour, is the fact that you can't just go out and take a criminal investigation course at a university or a college, right? If you're an accountant, you can do forensic accounting and you can be an accountant anywhere. You can't just be an investigator.

So part of unlocking that systemic issue is being able to create the conditions that allow for people that wish to go into that line of expertise, or have other expertise on which to build on or build their capacity from an investigative perspective, to be able to get that formal training in different settings. So an investigation is not, it's not rocket science. There's complexities to it, but it's no different than the scientific method, right? You have five questions to ask; who, what, where, when and why, and if you know how.

Then there are processes in order to validate and test that information, whether it's the whole issue of segregating witnesses in order to get a pure version of what took place, or the forensic pieces and how you analyze in totality what you have in front of you to tell you a story, depending upon what the threshold or burden is that you use, whether it is a balance of probability – more likely than not – or the criminal threshold where, in this case, where we're going to be laying criminal charges as beyond a reasonable doubt in terms of what's there in terms of convictions or reasonable probable grounds and all these other things.

But the base to all of this is, is that the general public, unless you have that stream, the ability to take an advanced or very technical criminal investigation course specific to the types of issues that would invoke the mandate of the SIU. So for instance, a vehicle pursuit that ends badly, where there's injuries, right? Where are you going to get reconstruction courses and understand those pieces in terms of the investigative pieces? You know fatal use of force by firearm, where are you going to get those?

I mean certainly the policy context, any investigation starts with a legal or policy context, is there a law that governs the action that led to the end results. So a lot of this stuff we try I think that has been over mystified. But the reality is the opportunity to get the types of education, experience or training that would qualify people to do those things is absent.

Female: Thank you. I'm new to all this. I just came for information, but I [unintelligible 01:00:14].

Pamela Grant: Could you hold the mic to your mouth please?

Female: I do work in social services, and I came to Canada 40 years ago and was absolutely aghast at the Donaldson case in Toronto. And then the Sammy Yatim case just blew me away. And there were charges laid in those two cases.

But the criminalizing of the under privileged, the criminalizing of the mentally ill, the criminalizing of people with developmental disabilities is absolutely unconscionable. It shouldn't take place in a country and in a province of this nature. So this investigation unit, these investigation procedures, things shouldn't come to the shooting of people who have mental illness.

So whatever system there is in place here, I would like to tell the Justice it just ain't working, and it hasn't worked for 40 years. And I mean it's appalling. I mean it's just appalling. And obviously you can tell I come from Britain. There was a British police officer that saw the Sammy Yatim killing and just his breath was sucked out of his body. It was unbelievable. And it's gone on 40 years,

And you know I deal with a lot of... actually, I've got a couple of chaps who are, you know, coloured chaps who also have developmental disabilities, and they're terrified of the police. And I'm terrified for them, because not only do they have the race issue but they have the developmental issue going on. They have the mental health issue. And I can't tell them to look at a police officer as their friend and their saviour, and a place of refuge in a time of their peril. And they're the most vulnerable people in society.

So anyway, thank you so much.

Pamela Grant: Thank you.

[Female]: Hi, good evening everybody. My name is _____, and I have mixed feelings about police. Sometimes I like them. I like them out on the street when I'm saying hello, and otherwise... A long time ago my son was diagnosed as schizophrenic. He was misdiagnosed from the age of 19 until the age of 48 when he took his own life, having been hounded by the Durham police for five long horrendous weeks.

And I grew up in a very white world with, you know, people coming to clean the house and sent off to boarding school, and I didn't even know cops existed for the most part. But I started having to deal with police because of my son. And the first couple of years my son was mentally ill we had real Oshawa police. They lived in the city. You knew somebody who knew somebody who knew him.

And they were great. I mean they would come to the house when my son was just cycling way out of control. And I still remember four cops running down Adelaide Street trying to chase [Shawn], because he did not want to go to the hospital. You know, they wouldn't even bother today. They'd pull their gun.

I just want to explain that when Shawn was about 19 or 20 he was spiralling out of control, and this is one of my first experiences with the police, because Shawn had pulled a door off the threshold and was trying to keep me trapped between the door and the wall. And I was frightened, got away, got to the phone. A police officer came. He just wanted to take Shawn in. I wanted him taken to the hospital. Anybody here who knows anybody who has a mentally ill child, you go over and over it in your head 'Do I want to phone the police'. The last time I phoned the... What is it? There's a something distress centre.

Female 2: [Unintelligible 01:04:07]

Female: They're closed on weekends.

Female 2: [Unintelligible 01:04:10]

Female: They're closed on weekends.

Female 2: [Unintelligible 01:04:13]

Female: That is... Well we used to have a crisis centre. Well at that point they – in any case, I just want to say what happened then, I needed to go upstairs... Oh, Shawn had taken off. So I needed to go upstairs to get some information. I turned around; the cop was in my bedroom with me, right up close. I knew I was dealing with a dicey situation, and I sort of just kept talking and got around him and went down the stairs as fast as I could. And I don't even remember the rest of what happened that night, but that was like my first experience dealing with them on a very personal basis.

We moved, we moved and I was in a lovely new home, and we had a security system. And the door was sucked open by the wind and security system went off. And I just closed the door and turned it off, phoned the security company. And the next thing, there's this pounding at the door and I'm thinking 'God, something awful is happening in the neighbourhood'. I run and open the door, and there's a cop at the door and there's a gun in my face. And I mean right at my nose.

Now after my last experience, I don't feel comfortable with him. I had to prove that it was my house. Okay, this went on for 15 or 20 minutes while he had a gun in my face. I bet he never reported that. When they pull their gun they have to report it, and I bet he never did.

You know what? People always say "Why didn't you do something about it?" Just spend day... You know the people who work at what we used to call Whitby Psychiatric, a lot of the workers have nervous breakdowns. Working with the mentally ill makes you crazy. You're hanging on by your fingernails day and night. You don't need friends saying 'Well you just have to do something about it.' And that was my second experience.

Now, when Shawn was 15 or 16, before he was diagnosed, and he had what are called prodromal symptoms, early symptoms, but to me, I thought it was adolescent problems, which is very typical. Shawn was with his sister and another friend who were older, and they were all smoking pot at the City Hall which has, outside it has wonderful acoustics, and they were all singing loudly.

So of course somebody calls the cops. Cops come. The two girls hand the stuff to Shawn; because he's underage they think he'll be safe. He's taken in. They think he'll be safe, he won't get a record, blah, blah, blah, slap on the wrist. He is taken in, and I don't know how this works but he winds up in the hands of a man who kept telling Shawn to call him Officer Bob.

And I don't know how this happened, how it is, what the... I suspect my husband was told, and he didn't tell me that this had happened. But I didn't know until years later when Shawn had his first complete breakdown. He was misdiagnosed as schizophrenic from age 19 until 48 and given the wrong medication etcetera.

So he was 15 and he was in the hands of the police. Officer Bob gives him a complete strip search. I don't know if you all know. I bet black guys here know what a complete strip search is. The kid has pot. Drag him home to his parents.

Years later I met a woman who had a husband, Robert so-and-so, who was a cop, who left her because he was homosexual, and committed suicide, I suspect because of his many sins against boys. And I think that that was the Officer Bob, her ex-husband. And I found out about this when Shawn was 19 and he just...

First of all, that experience – when I look back at, he started to change and change and change. The actual correct diagnosis five weeks before he died he was cycling into... And I was doing a Masters degree when he was diagnosed with schizophrenia. So I changed all of my Masters program to the education on schizophrenic and had vast information, and did not know...

And we had him forced into the hospital like four or five times, and they would give him medication for schizophrenics. And he would always say “It makes me feel a lot worse, and it never makes me feel better.”

It turns out I finally called five weeks before he died. I called the distress centre and was really disgusted. Well there was a distress centre then because I called it. And they just told me it’s not open on weekends.

Female 2: [Unintelligible 01:09:29]

Female: Oh whatever they call it, you know.

Female 2: [Unintelligible 01:09:33]

Female: I have a background in linguistics overall. Anyway, I had called police. I had no choice...

Pamela Grant: We actually have a speakers’ list and I’m just concerned. It’s about twenty to eight. So if you can wrap up.

Female: Okay well what happened was I called the police, they came. They stayed in my – my son had run away. They stayed in my house for about an hour, and circled me and circled me through the dining room, the living room, kitchen, dining room, trying to get me to say that I would charge him. What I wanted was for them to take him to the hospital. I couldn’t cope with him anymore. What was I supposed to do? And there was no distress, anything to help me.

And finally, long story short, they went away. And they came back and Shawn was in the house. And they got him down on the ground because he was not going to go peacefully. They were not going to take him to the hospital. They were going to take him to prison, which they have done before, where he was beaten up and beaten up and beaten up.

There were three of them, two women who got down – they kicked him and did all kinds of things to get him down on the floor in my dining room. The two women got down on their knees in supplication, so that they could comfortably punch him. And the man just stood up and kicked him and kicked him and kicked him.

When they arrived at the house, because I’d been waiting and waiting and worried, I checked the time. And when they finally dragged him out they had been kicking and punching him for 25 minutes. I remember yelling at them “He’s mentally ill! He’s mentally ill!” And they told me to get out of the way like this. It was my house, my dining room. I had asked for help. My son was bleeding. When they pulled him up, his full face, his T-shirt, entire body was covered in blood. They were helping the mentally ill.

About two weeks later there was this bull-roar article in the local newspaper about how they have this wonderful unit that helps the mentally ill. In Hamilton they have six. Here we have two. You know when they turned up?

Well first of all, long story, they hounded him for the last five weeks of his life anytime they saw him. They knew he'd be doing drugs. He did street drugs, which most mentally ill people do, because the drugs made by the billionaire companies are a farce. They dumb these people down, but it usually does not make them better. And all the mentally ill do... So they're seen on the street changing drugs with the – so they're charged with carrying and selling and all kinds of stuff. They get you for that.

And so anyway, so he was up for charges like that. And they would see him on the street and he wasn't supposed to be there, and he wasn't supposed to... So they kept taking him into possession. It was an easy collar, really easy collar. Good for those guys.

Justice Tulloch: Thanks so much, ma'am.

Female: And then... No. No just a minute. Anyway, after five weeks of that he took an overdose. And I want to thank the Durham police for that.

Justice Tulloch: Okay ma'am, we heard you. Thank you so much for your story, and we will certainly be considering that. And I know how difficult it is for you to relay the story, thanks.

Jennifer French: Thank you. I really appreciate the honesty, frankly, in this room. And I'm glad to hear, when we talk about community policing and we hear that this is a safe space for such personal journeys, I'm glad to be here. I will introduce myself. I'm Jennifer French. I'm the member of provincial parliament for Oshawa. I'm here with Andrew Lauer who works in my constituency office.

And so as we have heard before that there are a lot of different perspectives, and we have an interesting one in our office, because our office is right downtown across from the liquor store and the cop shop and the John Howard Society. And we see people in crisis. We see people in need. We see people who come in just to say hi. Sometimes they come in to our office with, you know, one concern, and then as they start to relate it turns out there's also a complaint against police as a piece of it. Our staff has been trained by the OIPRD to help people complete the reports and kind of help them navigate that, which I think is an important piece so that people know what their options are if they come into our office.

But I'm not going to weigh in on too much, but I've had the opportunity, when we're talking about data, I think that's a really, that's a massive conversation that has to be had by everybody. Because when I've had the opportunity to debate a piece of legislation about

what to do with background check data, you know, and we're talking about that data has been used or ends up in, you know, the CPIC system. It ends up, you know, in American databases and sort of where does the data end up.

Any time we're talking about data, whether it's looking at our students in school so that we can best serve and support them or identify need, or whether we're talking about carding data, whether we're talking about background checks, what is the purpose? Like how long is it going to be held? Who has access to it? Who is using it? Who could use it? All of that stuff. It can't just be yes collect data. It's got to be what happens to it. Where is the end in sight? So that's a piece of it.

Also, the fundamentals of justice I think have to apply to everyone. If we're going to say that people are innocent until proven guilty, you know we need to take a hard look at every one of our systems and how they connect, whether it's those who are, you know, filling up our jails, and two thirds of those who are incarcerated, you know, have not – they're on remand, you know. So there's that side of it.

There's if we're having interactions in our community, are we presuming innocence in that interaction? But I'm going to extend that as well, that when we're talking about SIU and we're talking about release of data – or excuse me, release of the reports, pieces of reports, all of the reports, some of the reports, identifying information – I think the innocent until proven guilty piece has to be extended to everyone, to officers, to those in our communities. Okay.

And I had another thought. Oh, this has been something that's interesting for me. I wear a couple of different hats; one is the Critic for Community Safety and Correctional Services, so I meet with different stakeholder groups, community groups. And I've had to learn a lot about the oversight bodies along the way, and coming out of – I was a teacher in a classroom, and coming out of that world I didn't know, I didn't have a background in, you know, police oversight.

But I used to watch the news or have an understanding of what I thought the SIU was, and so I bring that into the conversation, even while it's being explained by, you know, those in the know. The common public perception has to be factored in that, you know, investigation after investigation after investigation, survey says the SIU appears to not ever – if you were picking sides, it always looks like the SIU is siding on the side of police, when in fact that isn't what is at stake at all.

And public perception doesn't trust the SIU. Officers have, you know, take issue with the SIU, as we heard earlier about the process and how long it takes and those different pieces. But I think it comes back to what we've heard around the room, which is we need to have basic understanding of what the heck these things are for, frankly, and for that to be clear. Because if the SIU is only investigating leading to

criminal charges, then if they find that they're not criminally responsible they might have opinions on what happened or how it could better have gone down so to speak. But that doesn't come out.

So the public doesn't have an understanding of what they do. I think that that should be clear. Well, and as we talked earlier about trust, I don't know how you build trust if people don't have an understanding of what it's supposed to accomplish. Because if it does accomplish it or doesn't accomplish it, who gets to decide that? And if it isn't clear then you're always back to the public perception, and that perception is reality absolutely, and it...

Anyway, I'm going long but you gave me a microphone, I'm a politician and I was a teacher, so that's what you get. But I'm very glad to be here and really appreciate the authentic input in the room. It's refreshing.

Justice Tulloch: Thank you.

Pamela Grant: Thank you, Jennifer.

Female: Good evening, everyone. I was invited here as a guest by Rochelle, and I'm so glad I actually came out tonight. It wasn't what I was expecting. But I just wanted to touch on something as I'm hearing everyone speak, just regarding a friend of mine that I met probably about two or three years ago who was shot in the spine, three bullets, from a police officer mistaking him for someone else at a high school, and he's crippled, in a wheelchair.

Not only did that happen, but then they charged him for murder because they were looking for someone who had committed murder. And based upon the information that they got, I guess the ones who committed the offence or the murder thought that this person was dead. So they told the police officers that it was, or in court, that it was him that committed it, not realizing that this person was still alive in a coma in the hospital.

When he came out of a coma, the officers, or the investigating units went to the hospital and cuffed him, while he's crippled, and brought him to jail. He spent seven years in jail without therapy, without rehabilitation, possibly had the opportunity to walk again. But because he didn't get the chance to get therapy he's crippled from the waist down. They call it inconclusive injury, meaning that he can still somewhat move his legs, not necessarily being able to physically lift it up but twitches his toes and he actually still feels pain through his spine.

The reason why I'm saying this is because we evidently have issues that we need to address. We can sit around a roundtable and talk about it, the question is what are we doing about it. People are still suffering, and these incidents are still happening. Young children are dying. I had

my daughter coming home from school one day crying, saying that she was just talking to her friend and only to know that before the weekend was up this 17 year old was dead.

You know so there are things happening within the city, and you know what? I'm from Toronto. I'm not from the Durham Region. But you know what? City is city no matter where you go, once there's still problems that are happening.

Going back to my friend, it breaks my heart to see this individual every day, every second of the day, every increment of a second this person is in pain; nerve pains, pain shooting through his body every, every single second. And there's nothing no one's doing about it. There's nothing that – no one's even listening to him. He's, again, bound to a wheelchair, living on his own. This happened when he – this is like 20 years ago this happened to him. But he's a grown man now, can't get married, can't have children, living by himself, taking care of himself with little support from the government.

So if we're going to sit here and we're going to talk about things, again, you know if you're not a part of the problem, or if you're not a part of the solution you're a part of the problem. So that's what I have to say.

Pamela Grant: Nicole?

Nicole: Hello, good night everybody. I lived in Pickering for over 15 years, and I love Durham. There was an incident that happened last year with my daughter that really traumatized me, to the point where she's still going through a situation. There was a young girl that was in school, and apparently she was... She would come home and say to me "There's something wrong with this girl."

But I wasn't really, I was paying her that much attention to really get into what she's doing with at school. I just wanted to know "Are you good with your schoolwork? Everything's okay? Is there any problems?" There's no problems. But she just trying to share with me that there's this girl that looks a little bit like she needs someone to talk to.

And I was thinking 'Okay, then why don't you guys go and talk to her?' But it was to the point where she kind of realized that I wasn't really understanding where she's coming from, or I'm not really relating to... She wasn't able to express to me what she really meant about this young girl.

However, she was walking – she went to school in the morning time, and something told her not to go to her actual locker right at that time. This is what she shared with me. And she was there and she hesitated, and she was like 'You know what? I'm going to go to the washroom first and then head towards my locker.'

And as she turned the corner to walk to head towards the washroom, a whole bunch of kids started screaming, running through the hall. And they're saying "She has a knife. She has a knife."

And apparently – this was Dunbarton High School. So, my daughter, where there was this... The young girl apparently came into the school and she attacked a few students, also including teachers, and the school ended up to go on lockdown. And once I heard of this...

Prior to this there was also situations where they say don't have your phone on within school. And when I found out, started to go viral, the school, Dunbarton High School was on lockdown because there's an incident that took place there, this young girl that's stabbing. And when I went to the school to go and find my daughter, it was barricaded, there was like taskforce, the yellow tape. There's some students that are outside, some students that were still... Actually, it was almost half of the school that was still inside of the school that was inside of classrooms, but because the students were scattered and running for their, like scared.

By the time I reached the school to ask them if I can find, to go to the front of the door, because it was already yellow taped, they said no one can enter. And I wanted to know okay I understand, but who's there to speak to me to help calm me down, so I know where my daughter is? I just want to know where my daughter is and if she's okay, because I can't get to connect to her on the phone.

And so I'm injured. I walked through. I said you know what? No one's giving me any answers. So I went towards the front door. I went underneath the yellow tape. And as I went to the door to see if I can get to the principal, there was over, there was more than a handful of the taskforce that came towards me.

And I understand that it's a situation, everybody's, you know, a little bit like overwhelmed, but I felt that in that time, due to training, that they should have handled the situation a little bit more better when they approached me. When they approached me it was more of in 'You're not supposed to be here. You need to go back.' I just wanted to know where my daughter is, if someone can please tell me.

From what I heard – I spoke to another teacher and she said that you guys had her in the back room in the cafeteria. You guys kept a few students that were right by the incident, and you kept them as witnesses. And those who are kept as witness have to stay to the very end.

So I said to them, "You know, do you have a class list of those students that you kept as witnesses?" And they said no. So I'm thinking again, protocols. Where's the background of, you know, training that can state, you know... Even the teacher in the class, there was someone that's been sort of did follow up to say how much students left the

school property and how much students are still inside of certain classrooms.

Long story short, I removed my daughter and I no longer live in Durham. And I came up with... I do a lot of work within the community and I work a lot with youths. And I find that just looking at this oversight body, I feel that we can talk. We can vent. We can share emotions like how I just shared my story. It can make me feel good when I go home. But at the end of the day, if you're really trying to implement something, then that means that the Code of Conduct and the protocols end up having to change, because there's something else that is added new to the table.

So sometimes you know I understand, you know, within the... There's red tape, there's fine lines and there's funding that pretty much oversees different departments. And I think that – I've come up with a solution that eliminates... I don't want to hear about the funding. That's the reason why we can't look about finding more resources or situations that can help to eliminate what everybody in the community is overwhelmed about.

So what this solution is, I've created volunteers that implement professionalism. And within these volunteers there's a lot of students that are in school, high school, college, university, and they try so hard, finish up all their schoolwork, and at the end when they graduate there's no job. So I'm like there's...

In the meantime, while they have this aspiration and this desire and they're in class, might as well utilize that focus that's driving them to reach to that dream of that desire which they want to achieve by volunteering their time within that sector or that program that they're enrolled in. So for instance, now we see those who, for SIU, investigate, I understand, you know, you have to get a diploma or degree in order to be hired to get a job within this field.

But now you can actually use students that are actually within the field learning, and have them... because you already have your job description. You can't put on extra wing. So utilize these individuals, and have them as an assistant but as a volunteer assistant to support you.

So now back again to when I was at the school, if there was a CYW social worker that was assisting the officer that was standing there at the front with the gate, they would have been able to humble a lot of parents, a lot of students. You know it wouldn't have reached to escalation where there's more trauma, more depression. And basically, by having more volunteers that can help to support every different organizations and the police force, it will help to make the community respect the officers more, and kind of derail what has been happening for so much years of individuals losing trust within the community, and the officers that state that they're serving to protect.

And I can't really – like at the end of the day, we're all human. So we'll always have an issue or some form of emotion. But how to bring forth comfort is just don't make the knowledge that is given go to waste.

Pamela Grant: Thank you, Nicole. I think we're just about at 8:05, and I think I've noted everyone who's indicated that they want to speak. So what I would like to now, if it's all right with everyone, is to call on Justice Tulloch to wrap up for this evening. We'll be around if you'd like to chat a little after, but I'd like to close officially.

And thank you again for coming and for sharing very painful and deep stories. And we understand that it's an honour, and we appreciate that you have shared these intimate stories with us. And they have been heard and they will most definitely inform the report and the recommendations that we make, but Justice Tulloch will speak to that. Thank you.

Justice Tulloch: Great, thanks. Again, I want to thank each and every one of you for coming out, and for speaking as freely and as frankly as you have about your varying experiences, as well as offering the perspectives and the recommendations that you have.

Now some of your stories were very personal, and as a result for some it was very difficult to relate these personal experiences in a public setting such as this. I have absolutely no doubt of the authenticity of the experiences that we've heard here tonight, and I want you to know how appreciative we are to hear your experiences, and to hear them in an unfettered way.

I want you to know that we are listening. And I can assure you that you have been heard and we will reflect on your experiences, your recommendations. And we will reflect on your individual as well as your collective perspective in the ultimate report.

This has been a long process for us. As indicated, we have been, throughout the province we've started these consultations back in July, and this is our 14th public meeting. But in addition to the public meeting, we've held I would say over 100 private and stakeholder meetings throughout the province of Ontario.

And these are complicated issues that we're dealing with. It's an opportunity for us to actually make a difference, to change, you know to change the atmosphere of police and policing responsibilities, policing accountability, and their interaction with the community, and to ensure that there's public education as to the oversight bodies that are here in Ontario.

I think that we can be leaders in North America in policing relationship with the community. And that's one of the, you know that's the only reason I should say why I undertook this task. And you know I'm

extremely serious about this undertaking, and so is the team that I'm working with.

And so what I can say to each and every one of you that are here, your time and your sacrifice has not been wasted, because I don't believe that what we're doing is a waste of our time either. We believe that we're going to make a difference. And I believe that we have the ability, each and every one, to make a difference.

And you know, the systems, they only work because they have the consent of the people. All of the organizations, all of the institutions, they only function because of the citizens that give them their consent to function in the way that we... That's what our democracy is all about.

And if there are broken pieces within the institutions, then I also believe that we have the ability to fix them. And that is why we've undertaken this process, and I assure you that we will complete it and at the end of the day it will be a better system. So thank you very much for coming out.

[End of recorded material 01:38:56]