

**16-10-26 – IPOR Ottawa EN**

Pamela G: Hi everyone. Hello Ottawa, thank you for your warm welcome. We've been here since Monday. My name is Pamela Grant. I'm the facilitator and strategic advisor for the independent police oversight review. I'm very, very pleased to see so many of you here this evening as we have seen over the course of this week with the different stakeholder groups that we've been meeting with.

Tonight's process is going to be a little different I think for you but it's our way to ensure that everyone is able to express themselves and that we're able to hear, [unintelligible [00:00:42] is able to hear and the team what you want us to hear and in a candid and an open and a safe space. I want to also take the opportunity to thank the Wakanow Centre, the staff and the caterers and all the staff who have been so supportive and welcoming of us during this week and who've availed us of this wonderful space to have a very public but important, profound conversation about police oversight and the three police oversight agencies.

I'll in a minute or so hand it over to Justice Tulloch, who will give an introductory statement and my colleague Danielle Dowdy will take us through the proceedings and then we will move onto the group work and then the feedback session. But it'll all unfold.

I'd just like to remind everybody who needs a headset, we have an interpreter, a French interpreter in the back, Pierre. So, when you speak in the second session I want to remind everybody to speak into the mic and only the person with the mic is able to speak and speak slowly so that Pierre can interpret en Francais or en Anglais. Merci and now I'm going to hand you over to Justice Michael Tulloch.

Michael T: I want to thank you Pam. And thanks to each of you that are here and, you know, it's great to be in Ottawa. As Pam has indicated we've been here since Monday and Ottawa's a very important city, not only in Canada because it's the capital of Canada but certainly, you know, it's one of the great cities in Ontario. I want to acknowledge the MPP for this area, Minister Yasir Naqvi and all the other dignitaries in the room.

As indicated my name is Michael Tulloch and before I get into my introductory remarks I would like to begin to say that we're gathered on the traditional Indigenous lands of the Algonquin nation. These lands were the meeting place for several Indigenous nations in the area and by acknowledging this we are acknowledging the importance and the significance of the Indigenous people of this country. During my time with you today I want to hear from you, this is a consultation. It's not for me to speak but really for you to speak and to tell us what your thoughts are with respect to the issues that we're here to discuss.

I will begin by discussing some of the civilian police oversight agencies. Then we will break into the small groups that are in the room and you will discuss among yourselves and then we will come back with your views later. Now, oh sorry, can you - I've got this PowerPoint but I'm actually technically challenged so you've got to bear with me.

Okay, so just to give you a background, a sense of the background of this review on April 29th, 2016 I was appointed by the provincial government to lead an independent review of three civilian agencies that oversee police conduct in the province. They're the special investigations unit, the office of the independent police review or the OIPRD, sorry the office of the independent police review, director or OIPRD and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission or what is called OCPC.

Together with a diverse and expertise team of lawyers, community works and police personal, a number of them whom are here, I have been charged with reviewing the oversight bodies and making recommendations to enhance their transparency, accountability and ethicacy. To date we've been actively engaging in public and private consultations with a variety of stakeholders across the province including police, people who have had experience with the police and the oversight agencies and members of the public. I've already had a number of consultations in the Toronto area, in the north of Ontario such as Thunder Bay, Sue Saint Marie as well as Sudbury. And this week my team and I have been consulting with stakeholders here in Ottawa.

Now in the addition, in the weeks ahead we will also be holding additional meetings more in the Toronto area as well as London, Windsor, Canora and Kingston. We're consulting broadly and intend to draw on what we learn to make recommendations to enhance the transparency and accountability of the provinces three police oversight bodies, while at the same time ensuring that these agencies are carrying out their work as effectively and efficiently as possible. Now by March 31st, 2017 my final report will be submitted to the government and to the public at large.

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

The SIU is a civilian law enforcement agency independent of the police that conducts criminal investigations into circumstances involved in police and civilians that have resulted in serious injury, death or allegations of sexual assault. When an incident fallen within the SIU's mandate occurs, the SIU is notified and conducts an investigation into it to determine whether there is evidence of criminal wrongdoing on the part of the police. In the course of its investigations, the SIU gathers and assesses evidence and the SIU director then determines whether or not

criminal charges should be laid against the police officer and reports the results of the investigation to the attorney general.

Now the second civilian police oversight body that is subject that is the subject of this review is the OIPRD. Now the OIPRD's mandate is to receive, manage and oversee all public complaints about police in Ontario. These complaints can be about the conduct of the officer or both the policies or services of the police department. When a complaint is received, the OIPRD receives, reviews it to determine whether it may be suitable for early resolution through customer service resolution. Now if a complainant or a complaint is not suitable for customer service resolution or if customer resolution is not successful then the complaint enters the screen in process. The OIPRD has the discretion to screen out and pose complaints for a variety of reasons, such as the complaint being frivolous or made more than six months after the incident.

Now if a complaint is screened in, the OIPRD may maintain it or refer it back to the affected police service or another police service for further investigation. Following the investigation if the complaint is substantiated, a disciplinary hearing may occur or if the matter is less serious it may be resolved by informal resolution. Now finally in addition to dealing with public complaints, the OIPRD also has the power to examine issues of a systemic nature that may arise from complaints about the police and make recommendations about addressing them.

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

Now with that background in mind about the review and the civilian police oversight agencies, I want to take the opportunity this evening to hear from you. This review is an independent review and what that means is that I'm free to critically examine how these oversight bodies operate. Meeting with you members of the public is a crucial part of the process. I want to reiterate how grateful I am that you have taken the time to meet with me today and I appreciate that speaking about some of these issues may be difficult for some of you. But it is essential that a review of this kind be as thorough as possible and as independent as possible. Now as the independent reviewer I consider all relevant information from a variety of perspectives.

And I will, so long as you participate and offer me your perspective, consider all of your recommendations. So again, I want to thank you for coming out tonight to share your thoughts and your experiences with

our team and I can assure you that in this process you will be heard and your reviews will be reflected in the final report. Thank you.

Pamela G: Thank you Justice Tulloch. I'll call on my colleague Danielle Dowdy to take you through tonight's proceedings.

Daniele D: Good evening everyone, bon soir tout le monde. [message in French [00:13:52] So, I just have a couple of items that I want to go over with everybody. Just as our disclaimer upfront our review we're not looking at past cases or revisiting judgements. We do want to hear your stories and your experiences 'cause they're very important to our review and to our context that we're looking at this review but we're not going to be reopening or revisiting or reassessing. So, we just wanted that to be really clear for everybody.

The way that this is going to work this evening, brief intros then there's going to be roundtable discussion. Everyone should have questions at their tables and we're going to ask you to deliberate over those questions and think about, talk about, share what you can. And at the end of that that takes about 45 minutes and then after that we're going to do a report back session. So, after that we're going to ask from you all what was discussed at your table and what your answers were. And Pamela's going to get into a bit more detail about that.

And just so you know we are on social media, we're on Facebook, Twitter Instagram. We do have a website, we're webcasting tonight so you'll see the cameras here and at the back of the room as well. That means two things, when you're speaking if you could speak clearly and loudly because this is being webcast. But also if you don't want to be on camera, if you could just let us know and make sure that you kind of don't face the camera or turn your back to the camera. Like I said they're there and they're there.

We're also going to be live tweeting from our Twitter account. So, myself, Matthew and Chioma there, if you could just wave, so, if you see them roaming or taking pictures and what have you, if you don't want your picture taken, just let us know that's perfectly fine. But if you see them taking pictures that's what that's about and you can go on our website, you can go on our Twitter account. We will be tweeting under the #BeHeardON, "ON" is for Ontario. So, feel free to join in the conversation and ask us questions there, post your comments and participate. Thank you so much, bon soir.

Pamela G: Merci Danielle and thank you. So, I want to make sure a couple of things before we get started. I want to make sure that everyone at each of the tables has signed the sign in sheet. It's important because when the report is released in March we will email the link so that you will have your own copy. So, everyone that has participated and who signs these sheets so please make sure that you do that.

I want to make sure as well that everyone on their table has the 11 questions that we're asking you to discuss and deliberate and record during the next 45 minutes. I'm also asking that each table think about and assign the person who will give feedback after that 45 minutes. And we will be passing a mic around the room to each table and of course they'll be an opportunity for there to be any additions to what is said at each table.

But given the size of the room and the numbers of you and to ensure that everyone is heard and that we are able to record all of the diverse responses, if the six tables before you have indicated the same thing you are able to say you agree and highlight and emphasize the points that you made at your table that no other table has emphasized or made before.

So, does every table have questions that they can see and identify? Okay. What also will happen during the 45 minutes is the members of the team that have been introduced, including myself, will circulate and listen in if you don't mind to your conversations. Not necessarily there to present or - but they can answer some questions or clarify for you as you have the discussion. I will give you a time check throughout so that we're ready to report back at the end of 45 minutes.

Leanne:

Alright, so first and foremost we talked about making sure that the SIU reports are made public in their entirety. We'd like to know how decisions are made. How do we know that when recommendations are made that they're implemented and followed up on? We would like the definition of serious injury to include psychological injury. So, we'd like that to be opened and defined more clearly. We also have some concerns about the six month time limit. We recognize that for individuals who are traumatized by certain events may need longer than six months to pull themselves together and be able to participate in a process.

We feel that all of the oversight bodies should have the ability to review the police data. We'd also like that police data made public. The oversight bodies should be able to review, to determine if appropriate charges were laid and if they weren't, why not? And then we would like them to be able to report back to the community on a quarterly basis.

We'd also like to note that currently, certainly here in Ottawa, that the present complaint's process is not very accessible, especially if you're someone that has a language barrier or a mental health issue or of low socioeconomic status or of differing abilities.

We, as I said, would like that data that's collected be made public but we'd also like to know the demographics of people who are making complaints and have concerns about how the police are doing their job. We'd also like to - I think there were some at the table who identified that the SIU has a specific timeline around how soon investigations need to be completed but we know that's taking a longer period of time

and we'd like to know what the criteria for extending those timelines are.

Ultimately we'd like the oversight bodies to ensure that the police are held accountable and lastly but not least we'd absolutely like to see police services across the province implement the Philadelphia model in relationship to women who are experiencing violence and sexual assault. Thank you.

Pamela G: Thank you Leanne, can you pass it please on to Sylvie?

Sylvie: Good evening. We also had a lively discussion but we'd like to just touch on three issues. Number questions five, number eight and number 11. We feel that for police oversight agencies they're not open enough with their investigations and my understanding is in one case that was revealed to the public for SIU in the last few years and it was a case in Toronto. We feel that every case should be made public. It's just more a freedom of information for everyone, the tax payers. And every case should be transparent and accountable.

And then number eight, we feel that former police officers should not be working as investigators. And it's more a conflict of interest than anything else. We recommend that background checks should be done for all potential candidates so there's no police background for these. So, it should be just civilians. For example, I'm just giving you an example, SIU has civilians but also has former retired police officers and we feel that's a conflict of interest. So, we're recommending that it should be just regular citizens.

And then number 11, if there's any wrongdoing police should be suspended without pay and for example put on administration leave. Because if you and I, regular Joe Shmoe working in the general public suspected of any kind of - actually it happened to me personally. I have a former co-worker at a hospital who was suspected of activity and he was suspended for two years before the case finally got thrown out. We feel that police officers should not be paid while they're on suspension for suspected activity. Thank you.

Pamela G: Thank you Sylvie, so, over to William and Patricia at the next table. Thank you.

William: Thank you. Our discussion centred around the SIU and we think there should be more public information about how they operate and particularly in the investigations that go on. Some information gets published but a lot of it doesn't. And considering the rights of, the human rights aspect, we think there should be more information.

The process of police complaints should also be made a little more public so people know what the process entails. And this should also be put into the curriculum of the education departments across the province.

The SIU and the various other police complaint organizations should have access to liaison persons I think. We feel that the cultural communities that are being served by the police can come up with liaison persons. And the police themselves can better utilize those persons that they employ with respect to those cultural representations. There needs to be consultation with the community and the police and training can be utilized to make it a little more comfortable for those persons to be proper representatives of their community in the police service. At present a lot of the police officers that are employed are simply utilized as regular members and not as persons who can make inroads into the communities in particular cultural communities that they represent. Okay, I'll pass the microphone over.

Patricia: I just want to see we do have an insider. William was a former insider as he was a former police officer himself for many, many years. So, we did talk quite a bit about SIU, we spoke about data. I'm not going to repeat what other people said but we spoke for example about needing data on how many cases that the SIU looks into that involve people who are racialized for example. That's just one example. We also spoke about the perception. So, there was a discussion around the table about the fact that people have actually never used the complaint process and why. And there was discussion about how there is a perception that the police do not listen when you do call to try to complain 'cause they don't think you're credible.

Pamela G: I'm sorry Patricia. The cameras are asking for you to stand up. You can continue but please stand up.

Patricia: Okay, I understand that but I'm not going to stand, please respect that thank you.

Pamela G: Alright, I respect that.

Patricia: Thank you. So, we spoke about that perception, whether it's people calling to complain about historical sexual assault or people calling to complain about criminal harassment etc. not being considered credible, not being believed etc. So, there is that perception out there and we had, we spoke about the need to build trust with equitable communities and how that work can be done.

And William mentioned the issue of liaison office and I just wanted to mention the example the model in the public school system, Ottawa Carlton Public District School Board with multicultural liaison officers. You could have something like that, a liaison officer with, who assists the police in liaising with equity communities.

Pamela G: Thank you. R. J and Laila?

R.J: Okay so first of all there's no respect for holistic ingenuity so within the structure of the police institution there's no cultural safety within the [unintelligible [00:28:59] context. And we had two Cree members in

our group who brought this up continuously within their experiences with police.

Next is representation versus tokenism. We just heard about representation, I just want to make sure we're not tokenising folks within our marginalized communities as representation so it doesn't look like having one member from one marginalized group on the board or within your institution. Structure of agencies, who's involved, that needs to be made more transparent and that needs to be made more public, SIU shouldn't be compromised, or sorry comprised, of a majority of police officers and police should be selected based on required skills, qualifications and passed records.

Agencies that collect data and identify trends are certain communities being disproportionately impacted? And data should be reviewed by experts in the relevant fields. Individual SIU investigation reports should be made public, annual reports should be made public and archived online. Currently I believe with the SIU it's not being archived but you can see their previous year.

Increase awareness in public outreach, so oversight agencies need to be more proactive and again making those public and keeping us up to date with those processes. Names of police should be made public and police should be suspended during investigations and opportunities to give online feedback towards these three separate organizations would be more accessible to many folks.

Pamela G: Thank you. Go ahead Laila. No actually it goes to Marie Christine over at our table, thank you.

Marie: Hi. I'm not going to go over what a lot of people said but I'm just going to have a few point. The first question when they got asked if people know the three organization, it was brought up that the third one, the Ontario Civilian Police Commission, is either unknown or very, very just, I don't think I've heard of it. So, that might be one of the problem just right there.

And the other thing too is people don't know the organization but certainly don't know the process for complaint. I work at the legal information centre and we ask often people coming in and say okay where do I start, how does it work? We need more indication, more place where the public can understand the process and can understand that it is independent and that they can be heard. People often think that why should I complain? The police will win, I will not be heard. So, that is a big problem. We need to [over side] that stigma and make sure that the general public and the organization know the process.

For that we need a better transparency. We need to make sure we report are made public in both if there is wrongdoing but also if there was no wrongdoing made 'cause that police office is also a member and a person who deserve to be recognized if nothing really happened.



For the question about should police officer work in those organization? We think that a best of a mix of both should be done like civilian people and former police officers because they do have the knowledge of those groups. However it should not be only former police officer.

[Instead] of the data we think it is important to collect it but only if relevant. Data must be protected and regulated. Only people who need to have access should have access because we want to make sure that those data is not used for prosecution but could be used only for study and research and such thing like that and not for prosecution. The data must be protected and limited access. And the rest has been said by other people.

Pamela G: Thank you Marie Christine. Could you pass the mic over to Jackie [Bakos] please?

Jackie: Hello good evening. So, I too will not repeat what others have said. But to give the collective a little bit of background of the people around my table, we have many, many years of experience working with the community and working with the police. So, in terms of our experiences with the police they've been both good and bad.

Speaking from personal experience my experience with the police seem to have changed once I acquired a legal education. And when I was young it was generally bad. And one I came to Ottawa and went to law school, my interactions with the police had a very, very different tenor where I had more education and was able to assert myself a little bit more and the police seemed to respond to that. When I asked them questions they sensed a certain amount of information coming from me so they knew that I was not somebody who was easily afraid and that seems to make the difference.

One educator at our table, a former educator, expressed that in terms of advocating on behalf of our communities and our children we would encourage the people who are having negative interactions with police to come forward, to complain. But we would be there with them to assist them through that process because an initiated person going through that process alone is not aware of all the difficulties and perception in dealing with these complaint mechanisms. The SIU and the other two agencies is that either you're not going to be heard, you're not going to be treated fairly, you're complaints are going to be easily dismissed or at the end of the day the officer is going to be found with absolutely no wrongdoing. And the complainant has to be prepared for the process and ultimately what may happen is persecution and possibly threats or harassment along the way and the person needs to be prepared for that.

In terms of the composition of the agencies there was a recommendation made that it be one third police offices, two third civilian. We recognize that the police officers do have experience and should be on the Board but that the civilians need to be there to oversee the process and be part

of the process as well. In terms of the publication of officer's names, should they be investigated, we thought that absolutely they should be because if members of the public are released to the public when they're arrested, so too should the officers when they're being investigated. If they're cleared then again that should be made public.

In terms of - oh yes, one of our recommendations was to put the SIU under the OIPRD so that there's further oversight. We would like the police officers to examine models of police training at all levels. Once the police officers are implicated in community policing, and these are not recommendations specifically for the agencies but generally, policing in general. Once officers are put in place in the communities to encourage community policing, to encourage those relationships, not to be so quick to switch those police officers out, once those relationships have developed, the relationships are there for a reason and they should be fostered.

We would like the police agencies to [unintelligible [00:37:11] use of force protocols. Increased independence from the police to lessen the affect of police policing themselves and one recommendation was made that the chief of police should be able to deal with officers without interference from the unions.

Pamela G: Thank you Jackie. Can you pass it over to Melissa? Thank you.

Melissa: Okay, so before I even got to the point about talking about the questions our table expressed the concern about whether or not this is a safe space to be having these conversations themselves and there may be more that may be done to make the space more accessible to, you know, participation from all of our community.

So, a lot of has already been said of what we discussed. A further comment that was made at our table was that the pen and paper system for making complaints is antiquated. And there's a concern that because there's a pen and paper system that there might be an opportunity to disappear these complaints. So, the use of technology may be a means to improve the process.

So, there's a lack of transparency around how the system works and in terms of which complaints end up being dealt with through the informal resolution process. Our table also agreed that former police officers should not be used as investigators. You should get a complaint number when filing a complaint and the police shouldn't have anything to do with this process. So, again that's making sure that complaints are disappeared.

There is a comment about how complainants should be able to see the officer's response to the complaint that's made. And it's not just about the officer seeing the complaint but also the complainant seeing the officer's response. Complainants should be given more time to respond when complaint bodies ask for further information. And the general

consensus was that the time frames aren't long enough. Again, repeating the fact that the six month timeframe is not long enough.

And regards to question number nine we had a long conversation about this. The general feeling is that if you're going to collect things like race data there should be a means by which to make sure that it's data with integrity or a built in system to confirm that the data that's being collected is accurate. So, there's a general concern that it shouldn't be based on individual's perception on another person's race for example.

I would also say that the disciplinary decisions that are on the OIPRD's website should be integrated into a searchable database. As it stands they're all in PDFs and you can't just go onto the website and look for specific key terms for example and that makes it very awkward. Another thing is that the police should have their own insurance and their own lawyers. We shouldn't be paying for their representation.

Pamela G: Thank you Melissa, can you pass it over to Peter please, the mic?

Peter: This is not a consensus document, this is - I'm going to go to 11 to start. And so, we have, we should have a provincial ombudsman who should be able to review or examine the SIU's work [and] report if the need arises.

We have noting that The Toronto Star's report came out with 3,400 reports on the incidents in the SIU and then, which lead to 16 charges and six police in jail. It shows a system which is designed to fail. So, one suggestion at least is that we have separate dedicated service with its own investigators, with its own forensic team, with its own prosecutors and if possible that that be national service.

We found that there was too much pressure on the police, that they're not our enemies, that they're public servants, they're members of the public and they're members of our community. We have to note that. There was a strong feeling that the police were overloaded. They can't handle all the things that are being thrown at them and a lot of the things that they're carrying is unfair and inappropriate. And so there needs to be a better streaming and separation. So, the SIU is an attempt towards that but it's certainly inadequate.

Accountability, we mentioned and we're completely in favour of that, transparency, a higher standard of practical suggestion that 360 body cameras, so you can see all around the system to see what's happening around the police officer who's [unintelligible [00:42:56]

The police should be defunded, disarmed, disbanded, demilitarized and the idea that somehow we're talking about civilian oversight presumes that the police are not civilians and that that essential understanding has to change. There's also something saying that the police in Ontario follow the lead, or should follow the Vancouver police and not

criminalizing sex works while not using existing laws to target and deport migrants.

Regarding bad experiences, we had mixed. Some people had good experiences, some people had bad experiences, some people have been beaten up, most people have not. But it's very mixed. Some people have been advised by senior police officers not to report because it's too cumbersome and it's ineffective. So, if the senior police officers are advising members of the public not to report, it tells you that something must be wrong.

So, as far as police oversight questions five and so on we talked about the requirement for statistical analysis. We need to have the equivalent of hockey cards so we know who's shooting who, who was the shooter, what were they numerically if you like, count it up and who was the shooter and who was shot? We have to have a complete picture. But not everybody agreed in that, that wasn't again a consensus. Some people said no, no I'm a Canadian, I don't want any of that. You know, keep that out.

So, it wasn't a complete agreement at all but there was a general agreement that transparency of police is required, we should have comprehensive reports by the [SA] for example with the idea of cordially or interim reports, comprehensive reports, open data essentially being default and then going for classification, rather than the other way around and saying everything's classified. So, openness I guess is the key here if you're going to have credible system.

Pamela G: Thank you Peter. Could you pass the mic to the table beside you please? Thank you.

Audience: Okay, so our table was really two people. And my dear friend is visiting from Alberta so a lot of this is really perspective in addition to research done and the community organizing that I've done. So, I'm going to focus mostly on recommendations. Broadly speaking a lot of us have had good and bad experiences with the police. And being in this space with so many cops we did not feel very safe.

And also police abolition is the way that we think we should go. But before we get there these are some recommendations. We do believe that the data gathered around should be race based, should be gender based, it should be desegregated and it should also consider class backgrounds if possible.

The Ottawa Police Services Board must carry out a comprehensive review of the Ottawa Police Services interaction with people in crisis, especially those who are racialized and Indigenous and develop a policy on how the police should interact with mentally distressed civilians. Police officers as mentioned before should be removed from the SIU and they should be removed as investigators when complaints are filed

with the ORPID. Police officers should have to undergo mandatory implicit bias awareness training.

The police officers should track the results, well the SIU should track the results of charges laid based on its investigative work. This came out of conversations out of last night's gathering, there should be a whistleblower policy that's in place that will allow for police officers to anonymously report cases of violence and discrimination. The SIU, whoever, should work closely with the police union to explore - this one I'm not entirely sure about coming from labour so I'm going to not say it actually.

The names of people killed as a result of police violence in addition to people who commit suicide in the presence of police should be automatically released. The OIPRD should undertake a systemic review of policing and carding. The reliance of the OIPRD on police professional standards with police services should be reviewed. The use of lawyers and adjudicators and professional standards carings also needs to be reviewed and rethought. And finally the OIPRD should not automatically screen out any complaint that is older than six months. This time period is way too short and we have already acknowledged that there are limitations with the OIPRD.

Pamela G: Thank you. Can you pass the mic to the table in the back please.

Audience: Alright, so I guess being here tonight I'll start off by saying there's clearly a lot of smart people in the room today and you guys have hit the nail on the head on pretty much everything that we have sort of come up with in our group here. So, for the sake of time we won't repeat them but what we'll do is highlight a few key points that came up. And it really centred around training for cultural competence. We said that there needs to be a commitment to the funding for that training. It's one thing to say that it's important but it's another thing to commit to that funding.

Education and awareness campaigns regarding issues of anti black racism, anti Indigenous racism, anti Islamic hate crimes, those are all things that are happening and they're real today. So, building in awareness and training campaigns that acknowledge some of those biases and ensure that they're being run by individuals that can speak towards what it means to be racialized and ensure that that's a top down approach. So, that at every level of the police services there is representation of our community on all fronts.

We also focused on proactive deterrents. So, build in a cycle that ensures there's accountability. These police oversight reviews and consultations are not new. They've been going on for a very long time. So, build in a pulse check to ensure that we're not having the same conversations every five years. There's been enough bloodshed, I think it's time for us to hold each other accountable by coming here but also for the next generation to ensure that they don't have to take the time

out on a Wednesday to talk about some of these issues that have been plaguing us for a really long time.

So, in addition to that we said that it's important to track the data. For questions, it was number eight, data collection is super important. It allows us to ensure that we're accountable and we can make decisions through the data that is collected. So, all things considered that was really one of the main things that came together and we wanted to ensure that legislation policies are put in place to address the systematic problems in relation to the vulnerable and racialized communities. If you could put those policies in place and hold them accountable over the course of the generations, my kids won't have to have these same conversations. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you. Do you mind if I just make one quick comment? Yeah, I just wanted to make one quick comment that I know that there's folks who have talked about being comfortable in safe spaces and there's folks who have been silenced after they've shared their thoughts. And it's really important, especially within our communities, that we encourage critical thought and we encourage people speaking [truth] to power. So, I hope that we really think about that and internalize that and there isn't any silencing that happens laterally or within our communities.

Pamela G: Thank you. The mic can stay there. The next speaker is Trevor [Hull] over here. Thank you.

Trevor: So good to see each and every one of you this evening as we come to look over and we see how we can better improve recommendations for police in the Ottawa area. From our discussion most of the things that have been discussed tonight, we have gone over them. And so I will not reiterate those.

But question number two, have you had any good or bad experience with the police. I've had a bad experience but that experience was outweighed by the good relationship that I later developed with the police chief [Vince Bivens] and we developed that at the church. He would visit us, we would put on special occasions for people like in the fire department, ambulance workers, the police and we would have an appreciation day and invite them and celebrate them instead of putting them down. And so, that was a big deal. Each year we would celebrate people in the community who would render assistance to us. And we developed such a relationship that even the [youths] get to know the police officers and they were doing a good job.

Do you think the police oversight agencies are open enough about their investigations? I don't think so. In particular do you think the SIU unit shares enough with the public about their investigations of police officers? I don't think everything is shared. There's certain information that are kept back from the public and the public needs to know what is happening. Since the police officers are there to protect and to serve we

need to know what is taken place. We need to be transparent to them also and their investigation of us.

If you think that they do not share enough, how do you think they could improve? What information do you think the public should know after an SIU investigation? I believe everything that is done in the community with a police investigation, they should have an independent board working with the police also to make sure that the citizens are aware of whatever has taken place. Sometimes we have situations in the community, say there is somebody, a prisoner that is, that has done something evil and is place back in the community and you do not know. People need to be aware of that. They need to be updated as to who lives in your community if that person has done something wrong.

Should former police officers work as investigators at the SIU, OIPRD or OCPC? I think that this would be a conflict of interest and there could be favouritism. Police officers, it's a family and once a family is hurt, others could be hurt too. And sometimes protection could be given there because you have bad police officers and you have very good police officers. And I think the good police officers sometimes they ache when they see a bad police officer does something. And so I think they should not be investigators in these units, thank you very much.

Pamela G: Thank you Trevor. Trevor, could you pass the mic or can someone pass the mic to Tamika please?

Tamika: You guys don't mind if I sit. So, we all agreed tonight that data should definitely be collected. So, going to question 10, we believe that, as per one of our recommendations, that an independent body should be established and this body would receive the data from the agencies and they would be also in control of the data. And they would be the ones who could kind of administrate how we receive access to this information.

And some of the data that we think should be collected is really police perception, how they perceive the actual incident as it arises. And we need to find out, you know, how they're getting the information they have, whether it's from dispatch. We need to know how they received it and we need to know how that plays out in the call. So, we need to know how that affects the use of lethal force and we need to know who is bringing in the complaints.

Another thing that we discussed was increased openness and transparency. We want to know the number of years officers who were involved in incidents around the force. We want to know the particular department or unit the officer is affiliated with. We want to know how many officers are present and we want to know the type of weapons or equipment they have 'cause we know sometimes, you know, the more militarized the officers are, that actually increases the use of lethal force. So, we want to be able to get this information so we can draw, you know, causation there.

And we do agree that the names of officers who are being investigated should be released. Now while we were split on when that information should be shared, we do believe whether it's either at the beginning of the investigation or when the SIU reports are being released, that has to be shared. And particular when victim's names are released, we think the officer's name should be released as well.

And we also talked about in terms of when SIU investigations are initiated oftentimes when press releases are given they often contextualize the incident to try to influence public opinion before the investigation is complete. And what we all agreed on is if any information is shared at the beginning of the investigation it should be the basic facts that A,B,C,D happened and there's an investigation underway.

And one of the things, sorry you guys covered a lot of the things we discussed so I'm trying to pick out some items. In term of independence on these oversight agencies, yes we do agree that there should be a higher percentage of civilians who are on these agencies and we do believe that these civilians can be trained and empowered to do investigations. So, we talked about, you know, people from universities, the media etc just because we talked about kind of the danger of only having, you know, former police officers and talking about the police culture that's involved there. And we need to have these agencies be more representative of the public that they're serving.

And I'm just looking really, really quickly. I think those are the main items. And I just want to thank you guys for a lot of the things you shared. We're all on the same page and the biggest issue right now is not just making these recommendations but seeing them implemented and seeing them actually have teeth with the agencies and the police services in Ontario.

Pamela G: Thank you very much. It is 7:59 and we've received feedback from every table. What we'll do now is I'll just put a quick question and I'll test the floor to ask if everyone is okay to see if there's any more information or feedback that anyone would like to give and then we will close off. Go ahead.

Tamika: There is just one more item that I had forgotten from our list and that was when the investigations are completed, the information needs to be released to the community almost immediately.

And when an incident happens that gives rise to the SIU we would like to see that the investigation, the officers being investigated be divested of authority over whatever happened to cause the incident and their reports turned over to the SIU immediately not months after they've had time to reflect and collectively, you know, go through the evidence and the information and give the SIU whatever their collective brains come up with. We would like it to be immediate upon the incident and being referred to the SIU.



Pamela G: Thank you.

Audience: So, my question is about community outreach. Is there any representative of the SIU here tonight, anyone representing the Special Investigation Unit? Thank you. So, my questions is what is your community outreach strategy because we've tried to work with your organization, we've tried to engage you to come to the community, to share exactly what it is your mandate and we didn't get any response. So, my direct question is what is, you know, your strategy and what can we do as a community to make you want to come work with us basically? What can we do?

Audience: Sorry, that's a great question. I appreciate you asking it. I'm here to listen tonight on behalf of the SIU to hear what the community has to say. But what I can do afterwards is give you my contact information and we can talk about collaboration. Well, I'm sorry, but that's what we can do at the moment. This here is Justice Tulloch's consultation to hear what can be done about the oversight agencies.

Pamela G: Justice Tulloch, how many more minutes do we have, [unintelligible [01:03:34]

Michael T: Okay, just let me see all the hands that are up and want to say something now. Okay, so one, two, three, keep your hands up please. Okay, I understand that. But just let me see, one, two, three, four, five, six. Okay, where's the seven, oh seven, sorry. Okay so all of those seven people and no more will be able to speak.

Audience: I'd would like to draw attention where there needs to be on both sides between police and the general public. And I want to recall a terrible tragedy that occurred in [Nunavut] [unintelligible [01:04:23] the name of Douglas Scott who was on his first - Douglas Scott on his first appointment on a little community called Lake Harbour. There was a drunk driving around in the middle of the night and he, Douglas Scott, came out to see what has happening and the young man took a shot at him and killed this young mountie, 20 years old, Douglas Scott.

CBC went and did an interview in the community and there was a teenager who said I really liked that man, he was like a brother to me. That's the kind of relationship that there ought to be. But sometime later I was talking to somebody who knew well the guy that did the shooting and he said it's not surprising really, he hates cops. So, I said why would he hate cops? He said well, the police in [Ecowa] had been called to his home several times and he'd be severely roughed up. So, he hated cops. He didn't know how to respond to the police, the police didn't know how to respond to him.

We have too many tragedies on both sides, we need to know how - non police have to know how to respond to police and police have to know how to address people. It's so easy to say to somebody walking the streets suspiciously in the middle of the night, excuse me, what are you

doing? I'm just checking that everything is alright. If you get an answer [well taken] give him a ride home. Don't just treat him like a piece of dirt 'cause he has no business to be out on the street. Similarly, there has to be a response, good evening officer, what are you up to? So, as I say it's really, really vital on both sides that there be a communication and an understanding between the two sides.

Audience: [unintelligible [01:06:35] I think whatever this committee or [community body] does, it should deemphasize shoot to kill policy. Police should be trained either to shoot to immobilize somebody or to disarm, not to disable somebody. And unless the police officer's life is in imminent danger I really don't see the point in shooting to kill. I come from a country where police officers are trained to go for the knees or the lower body so to prevent the criminal from escaping or to disable the person. You only go for the bulls-eye if the criminal is threatening police, that's one point I would like to emphasize here.

The other point is in taking down a suspect it doesn't make sense to put the suspect's face on the concrete 'cause then you're preventing the suspect from breathing. And if somebody cannot breath and he has two, three, four, five police officers, some sitting on him or that's punching, the person ends up in the ICU or the morgue. Thank you.

Audience: [unintelligible [01:08:28] when the report is out. A couple of days ago The York University report came out. The media got it wrong, the people in the room got it wrong and the general public got it wrong. It was a perception that this was about racializing and profiling. It was nothing like that. It was completely different.

And I would suggest that as and when the report is ready, the dissemination process, the [unintelligible [01:08:58] process is to be very well articulated, it needs to be very well designed so that we get you and we get the report right. The other thing along the same line are the recommendations. Some of the recommendations that came out from the York are just [unimaginable]. They are general, a lot of them were not really specific. So, what we would like to see from your reports is practical, doable recommendations so that the report does not get shelved for no value. Thank you.

Audience: So, I want to speak, I prefer to sit if that's okay. I want to speak specifically to some of our work looking at the violence against women and the reporting on violence against women at policing services. We've talked a lot tonight obviously about SIU and OIPRD and how to strengthen those systems, although we know that women don't access them generally.

But I do think that we need to think about transparency in advance. And what I mean by that is we don't always have to wait until there's a problem when the person gets into the complaint system to start thinking about being transparent with them. So, if somebody goes and files a police report or has an encounter with police, I think it's really

beneficial to consider making sure that that citizen also has a copy of that documentation. Because one of the things that's most difficult for people when laying complaints is they have no documentation, whereas there's a huge police file that's documented on them, information is power and if people don't hold their own information they have difficulty bringing their complaints forward, proving their complaints, proving that what was said to them was said, proving their experience was.

And so you can waste years doing freedom of information requests trying to get police files and all kinds of stuff rather than getting to the heart of the concern. So, let's try to think a little bit proactively how citizens leave police encounters of all kinds with their documentation in hand and in advance.

The second piece that I want to raise, and I know that it hasn't been said outright tonight, but one of our concerns is that we know that with the SIU, the second highest complaint that the SIU receives is a sexual assault by police officers. We need to have having this conversation openly about what's happening to people both in the course of strip searching all kinds of different components. But then also sexual violence that's targeted at marginalized communities and the barriers to marginalized communities and marginalized women being able to report and be transparent about that experience are incredibly high. I will say that many of them chose not to be here tonight.

So, I think it's really important that we not lose that in the mix and not drop it off the slide, where you're describing the SIU part of your slide ends. Sorry, incidents involving police officers and civilians that have resulted in serious injury or death, that's what it says on this page. On your slide it says injury involving police officers and civilians that involve serious injury or death or allegations of sexual assault. So, let's please always keep that on the slide, thank you.

Audience: I have two quick comments. One of the things I'd like to really encourage is somehow to foster a culture of self criticism of police rather than a culture of secrecy and protecting and clamping down whenever an allegation is made.

And even when the results of an SIU investigation don't - whatever has happened doesn't rise to the level of charges under the act, that doesn't mean that there aren't lessons to be learned by whatever happened. And in my experience what happens with that report is it just stays there, that that information isn't taken and yes we could learn something from this interaction, we may not have charged those involved officers but there are things we could do better next time.

The other thing I would really encourage is that there be oversight into how the outcomes of SIU investigations are reported to police services boards because I know that the way they're reported can [leave] out

critical information and I absolutely have evidence of that. So, thank you.

Audience: I feel like someone is missing in the audience and maybe sent some representatives but where's the police chief? And my basic question to him would be the cross culture training that police go through, I think it's important for the police to understand the community that it's serving. Many of us are running away from countries or, you know, pointing guns at us to get here so we do not know how to communicate with the police and I feel like if they understood us a little bit better and through communication we could make good progress.

So, it's sad that the police chief's not here 'cause I think it would make a huge difference. I'm just interested to learn. Maybe my good friend [Floyd] could teach me what they go through, the cross culture training they go through, 'cause I think that would make a huge difference and I'm interested to provide some ideas as well. So, some question, but thank you for being here, I really appreciate it.

Audience: [There are] many good comments and questions that are asked here tonight. Yesterday in the meeting there were many good comments also. I did mention the importance of recommending in the reports that there needs to be judicial procedures, like jail, taken for cops who commit such mistakes, such - grave areas as to kill someone like [unintelligible] [01:14:55]

Today in my community among the many people that I talk to about yesterday's meeting, one of the common comments that came actually was the fact that among these report the ability of police to clearly say racial profiling despite the very obvious statistic that they collected themselves with York University is a problem of trust.

So, when we come here tonight, and I know I came late, but from what I heard and clearly saw, when a question is asked to the SIU and they're unable to clearly layout a strategy and just come here to observe and listen when we're talking here about life situations, there's a problem of distrust and we have to be honest in recognizing that the police as an institution, I'm not talking about an individual cop but police as an institution, is not helping its own case.

Because things like baseball parks or basketball clubs for youth, they don't mean anything. I was the teenager who played in the police league as a youth and I am now an adult who basically has to deal with my family, my friends and other people in my community, an organization that I work with, who absolutely do not trust the police. Here in the U.S and France, where I come from, it's pretty much the same. There comes a point where you have to wonder Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto just to give you an example here and even when we take Winnipeg as for the native population, the general distrust of police is not just [unintelligible] [01:16:28] a problem of the civilians. It's a big problem for the police and they're not helping themselves just as we saw the member of the

SIU today giving his card as a contact instead of answering a question. There's a big problem. I'm sorry, I just wanted to mention that.

Pamela G: Well, thank you everyone. I'm going to pass the mic over to Justice Tulloch to close. But I do before I do that want to remind everyone to complete the sign in sheets so that you can get your copy of the report when it's released in March. And also leave any notes that you have made, we'll collect them and add that to our report file.

And remember that you can make written submissions and tell your friends please they too can up to mid November by going to - the information is there but info@policeoversightreview is where you can actually send emails with written submissions. So, again info@policeoversightreview.ca Thanks.

Michael T: Okay, I just want to thank everyone again for your input. You know, thank you for taking the time to come and to be a part of this consultation. As I've said before you're very important, an integral part of not only this community but of Ontario and your voice is important to us within this consultation process. We've heard you very, very carefully. We've heard you loud and clear, we've listened to each and every one of you very carefully. And I can assure you that your voices will be reflected, your recommendations will be reflected in the ultimate report.

I also heard that, you know, the comment that, you know, our recommendations have to be practical so that they will be implemented. And I assure you that as a team we're going to be taking all of the recommendations that we've heard in this room and throughout all the other consultations that we're doing throughout the province of Ontario. We're going to synthesize them and ensure that they are reflected.

So, again thanks so much. It was a pleasure to meet each and every one of you and to see your interest and your concern about these issues. And I absolutely understand how real they are to each of you that came out here tonight. And with the same level of seriousness that you have attended to this process, I can assure you that we as a team will attend to the ultimate report that we will be crafting for the government. Thank you.

Pamela G: Good night everyone.

[End of recorded material [01:19:57]]