

## **16-11-30 – IPOR Thornhill**

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Pamela: Good evening everyone. We're about to get started. My name is Pamela Grant. I am the facilitator and strategic adviser for the team; the Independent Police Oversight Review led by Justice Tulloch who you'll be hearing from in a few minutes. I'd like to welcome you all to this public consultation. It's actually our second last of 18 that we've done across the province. Justice Tulloch will give you a little bit more information about that but I do realize that this is a busy, middle of the work week evening and appreciate your being here and taking the time to be here. We have started a little late but we'll try to end as closely as we can to 8 or shortly after 8 with your indulgence and without further ado, I'll just ask Justice Tulloch to come up and give a few opening remarks. And after him, my colleague Danielle Dowdy will take us through the evening's schedule. Thanks.

Justice Tulloch: Thanks Pam. Hey, good evening to everyone. Thanks so much for coming. So, this is our second to last public meeting. We've had – so this is our 17<sup>th</sup> of these particular meetings. And I want to thank all of you for coming out. Some of you may have been paying attention to our previous meetings through the website. The video feeds. We've, you know, it's been a pretty exhausting process so, you know, we really appreciate your presence here tonight. As you've heard, my name is Michael Tulloch and we're here to talk about civilian oversight of police; policing issues. Before I get in to describing why we're here, I must first begin by acknowledging that we're gathered on the traditional indigenous lands of the Mississaugas of New Credit and other indigenous nations. You know, these lands were the meeting place for several indigenous nations in the area and by acknowledging this, we're acknowledging the importance and the significance of the traditions of the indigenous peoples.

Now by way of background, on April 29<sup>th</sup> 2016, I was appointed by the provincial government to lead an independent review of three civilian oversight agencies. And they are the Special Investigations Unit, or the S.I.U. the Office of the Independent Police Review director, or the O.I.P.R.D. and the Ontario Civilian Police Commission, or what is called the O.C.P.C. Now the S.I.U. is a civilian law enforcement agency, independent of the police. And it conducts criminal investigations into circumstances involving police and civilians that have resulted in serious injury, death or allegations of sexual assault. The O.I.P.R.D. the second agency, it's a conduct investigations body and it receives, manages and oversees public complaints about the conduct, policies and services of police in Ontario. Now in addition, the O.I.P.R.D. also has the power to examine systemic issues in policing and make recommendations on how to address them.

Now the other body; the third body, is the O.C.P.C. and this particular body is primarily responsible to adjudicate matters. So it'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 as well as disputes related to the provision of police services. Now the O.C.P.C. can also conduct investigations into the conduct of police services board members as well as police officers. Now I just want to talk for a minute about the overview of the process. Now since my appointment at the end of April this year, I have assembled a very diverse and expert team of lawyers, community workers and police personnel to assist me. A number of them are here, some of whom are seated at the front. Others are not here tonight. Now over the summer and fall, we have been engaged in a number of public and private consultations across the province.

And what this entailed was meetings with police and stakeholders including police chiefs, police services boards as well as police associations. Meetings with community stakeholders, racialized communities as well as members of the indigenous communities, both in urban areas and in the northern part of Ontario. And other interesting organizations such as the Human Rights Commission, the Ombudsman's Office and a number of other agencies that are involved in some of these types of issues. Now as our consultations draw to a close in the coming weeks, I intend to draw in what I've learned, to write a report with recommendations to enhance the transparency, accountability and efficacy of the oversight bodies. That report will be submitted to the government and to the public sometime in the spring. Now it's really important that we have the public's input. This review is an independent review and what that means is that I am free to critically examine how these oversight bodies operate.

Meeting with you, members of the public, is a pretty critical part of that process. I'm grateful that you have come out this evening. That you've taken the time out of your schedules. You know, it's a rainy afternoon and it's sort of – well, for me it's kind of out of nowhere. But, you know, it's really important that you've come out to meet with us and I appreciate that some people speaking about issues relating to the police may be difficult but it is essential that a review of this kind be as frank and as open and thorough as possible. And that I, as the independent reviewer, consider all relevant information from a variety of perspectives. What I can assure you is that I will do exactly that and my job can only be effective if I hear from members of the public. And I will be relying on your input and your perspectives for that. So again, I want to thank you for coming out tonight and to share your thoughts and experiences as well as your recommendations with us. And I assure you that in this process each and every one of you, both individually and collectively, will be heard. Thanks very much.

Respondent: Can I just clarify you yourself and every one of those – are you writing the report or you just getting from others in the community to do that.

Justice Tulloch: No, I am writing it with a team of people that are assisting –

Respondent: Have you been in every –

Justice Tulloch: I've been in every meeting. Yes.

Danielle: And there will be a lot of time for questions at the end as well. But thank you for coming everyone. Good evening. Just before we get started, I'm just going to run through a few things and then we'll get right into why you're here this evening. Just as a disclaimer, before we get started, just want everyone to be clear that we're not looking at past cases or revisiting past judgements. We do want to hear your stories. They're every important and we do want to hear about your experiences either with the police or with the oversight bodies. However, any case that's been decided on, it'll remain that way. We're not here to look at and re-open, revisit or reassess any cases. Okay? So the way that this is going to work, we're in the introduction right now. Everyone should have questions at your table. There's about eleven questions that we're going to ask you to work through and talk about. Those questions are based on our order in council. The order in council is just the mandate that we've been given by the government.

So we've been asked to look at some things and we want to get your feedback and hear your thoughts, recommendations on what we've been asked to look at. So that's what the questions are based on. So we're going to ask you to work through the questions. There is a foolscap lined paper there if, you know, you guys – whoever it is that's going to be taking notes, and then we're going to go into a report back where we ask you to share your thoughts or your conversations, recommendations and anything else that you'd like for us to know after you do the round table discussion. Following that, there will be some time for an open mic if there's anything that you want to share with us that wasn't captured at your table or if there's any thoughts or ideas that you want us to know. Just so you're aware, we are on social media. We live tweet all of our meetings. Matthew, who's there tweeting right now actually, and myself, we generally take pictures and we tweet out comments or questions that we may have heard for people who are following along online.

And we tweet under the hashtag 'BeHeardON', ON is for Ontario. These meetings are also recorded. Dylan, you'll see him at the back of the room there, he's actually working the camera and he'll be focussed on whoever's speaking. So, if you don't want to be on camera, if you could just let us know. Not an issue at all. And the same goes for Matthew or I. If you see us taking your photo and you don't want us to take your picture, it's not a problem. Just let us know and we won't do that. Peter Rehak is also at the back of room. He's got a camera and he takes fancier pictures and they're for our website and for our Instagram account. So you can also follow us on Instagram and see some of the photos there. And I think that's it. Oh, and for the French speakers who are here [foreign language]. Okay, so thank you so much for coming and I'm going to turn you over to Pamela.

Pamela: Thank you Danielle and thank you Justice Tulloch. So before we start, we'll give you about; and I'll test the room, we'll give you between half an hour and 45 minutes as a group or in groups, to go through the questions. So I'm looking at the gentleman that's at the table all by himself and I have a couple of suggestions. There are three other tables that I would ask you to please join. Your pick. So that you can work with the group of individuals who are at table. Or you can go there. Either way –

Justice Tulloch: Or why don't you guys come up to the front.

Pamela: It's better to come to the front because then you're closer and – yes, it's a lot easier that way. Anyway, so what will happen is that I'll give each table, when we're reporting back after the 30 or 45 minutes, about five minutes to just go through the discussion and the conversation that was had at your table, prompted by the questions that are asked and suggest that it would make some strategic sense, not necessarily to repeat responses that another table has given, but take the time to hi-light those conversation or those items that just your table discussed or has not, at this point been raised. There is also, just to remind you, the 14 inch; I said foolscap the other day and people said they hadn't heard that word for a while. So, the 14-inch piece of paper at your table, there may be two at some tables, I'd like to ask you please to complete that document. Your name in as clear and as legible a way as you can, and affiliation and e-mail address.

When the report is released, we will send you a link to that e-mail address that you can click on and you'll have your own soft copy that you can read and share with others as you see fit. So it's very important that you remember to complete that form. I will start the 45 minutes shortly. If we don't need 45 minutes, as I said earlier, we'll stop at 30 and get right back into the feedback. And we will be around to answer any questions during that period. Okay? 45 minutes starts now.

Pamela: Okay, can I have your attention please. We will be starting right now. So, Kim.

Kim: So at our table, the general consensus was that the S.I.U. was pretty much the only one we were really familiar with because it's really the only one's ever discussed on the news. So we kind of learned tonight from each other about the two other organizations and we also learned that they kind of like investigate themselves. So we're happy that this table is up here. The number 2 question; we've all had bad experiences with the police. Everyone at the table, pretty much, except for one. So the general consensus was the majority of us have had trouble with the police and we would recommend other people to contact the police if something were to happen. That we felt very strongly about that.

Pamela: I'm sorry, I didn't hear. Did you say 'would' or 'wouldn't'?

Kim: Oh, 'would'. We strongly recommended that anybody would – I guess, not go to the police necessarily because we know in some situations it works

against them. But we would strongly advise people to report if they had anything happen to them. The police is not – going to the police is not always the right avenue to take. We’ve noticed tonight. But we recommend that people, if you’re living in a situation where you’re experiencing violence, sexual violence, they should definitely report it to somebody. Not to remain silent. That was the bottom line. The police aren’t always there, so that’s what we came to tonight. The general consensus as well. “Do you think the police oversight agencies are open about” – no. We felt there should be more transparency and accountability. That they weren’t really public about who they were. It’s like in a G20, a lot them cover their name badges and I know a lot of my friends who go to activist – who protest and police show up and they have their name tags covered up.

So, I think we all agree there was more transparency and accountability was necessary. “Should foreign police officers work as investigators?” We agreed absolutely not. I mean we went back to the first one; we don’t think police should be investigating themselves. That’s why I was really happy tonight. I personally I spoke with Danielle earlier and it’s really nice coming into a space where we have people who are representing people who don’t represent themselves. Who – oversight – who work in the oversight team and just look beyond what the cops do. The police. I personally don’t feel safe. In my situation I do not feel safe going to the police. In the past I have and it’s worked against me. And I know it’s going to work – even here tonight speaking publicly, I’m going to get harassed by police tonight on the way home. I know that for a fact. Because the last time I spoke publicly –

Justice Tulloch: You won’t. I can guarantee you, you won’t be. There’s no police officers.

Kim: No, no. I know. What I’m saying is though, the last time I spoke publicly, when I left the venue and on my way home, I can’t tell you how many cop cars followed me on the way home and stopped me in the middle of the street and stared at me and . . . because tonight, after I’m going to be talking about stuff that the police don’t want me talking about. Anyway, that’s my personal stuff. So I’m going to get to the question here. The last question; “If you think they should collect data, how should that data be handled?” We were kind of –

Respondent: We skipped over on that.

Kim: Oh. I’m kind of nervous.

Respondent: Number 5.

Kim: Number 5.

Respondent: Go on to number 6.

Kim: Number 6. Number 6 was about the accountability and transparency. “If you think they don’t share enough information” . . . we believe on

accountability and transparency that anybody – any police officer’s who’s investigating, who’s met with somebody, who needs legal help or . . . should be known to the public. Number . . .

Respondent: Number 8.

Kim: Yeah, we said ‘no’. Police. Yeah, I already said that. I just skipped ahead a few. I’m sorry. Number 9. “Should the S.I.U. – should they collect data on things like race, gender, age and mental health?” Our conversation went back and forth. Some agreed that they shouldn’t and some said they should. Me, if I’m in a situation, I just give my personal example, I can’t speak for everybody. When I’m on my balcony and three cop cars show up and they’re at the bottom of my balcony and they’re just staring at me. Intimidation. And my anxiety kicks in and I get on my phone right away. It’s my friends and say like “There’s cops here and I know they’re going to arrest me something I didn’t do because I’m speaking publicly about stuff”. When they see me being really anxious, they going to probably, you know, miscommunicate that for something else and then they’re going to come and do something and diagnose me immediately. So, in that sense, I would want them to know that I’m feeling anxious.

But I also read a story a while ago about black man – really sad story, who was walking down a street, who lost his mom. And he was really upset. And the cops saw this and they thought he was violent and they threw him to the ground and were violent with him. And he just suffered a great loss. So I think in situation – I can’t speak for him but I think in situations . . . yeah, we felt –

Jake: If I may interrupt. This is a general, more general, this is more general question and we agreed that they can collect data as far as race, gender, age and so on which is obvious to everybody and it’s available. But mental health shouldn’t be really collected data and used as part of the things that they trying to get to do to any people or stigmatize them or anything like that.

Kim: Yeah. So of the same –

Pamela: You need to speak into the mic because it’s being recorded and translated, so we need to hear it on the mic.

Kim: Some of us felt it should. That mental health should be brought up in that situation to protect them. And some people felt it wasn’t an issue. I can’t speak about race because I’m white and it’s clear and I don’t have – I can’t speak for my friends of colour either but for – we were kind of mixed on the whole question. Some felt it should be brought up and some felt it shouldn’t. I guess it depends on individual cases maybe. I don’t know. I don’t want – for my – I don’t think it’s, I guess, necessary if you want to know someone’s age, race or gender. It’s really not, you know, it doesn’t really matter in the situation. So that was the general consensus. Sorry folks. I’m going on and –

Pamela: You've actually overshot your time but if there are any additional pieces that you want to add before we pass on the mic? Knowing that any recommendations that you had?

Kim: There was a list of recommendations but the recommendations were quite listy so I don't know if we've got – we've exceeded our time limit so . . .

Pamela: Okay, why don't you go to those. That's important.

Kim: Okay. So, the militarization – like less imperialism, less police involvement. A new independent review body. So the police doesn't really investigate themselves. So we have a whole body, collective team that investigates that side of police. Police – a process in place to deal with multiple intimidators. Trained personnel to deal with different issues regarding mental health. I can't read my own writing. Eliminate police – police devices from being used in Israel? Here, so you can elaborate on that.

Jake: Basically, that our police force everywhere in North America but we're talking about Toronto perhaps, should not be trained in Israel. Should not be equipped by Israel because what they representing is totally against what Canadians want or believe should be done. But I can talk about it later when I have the mic for individual cases. Thank you.

Pamela: Okay. Could you pass the mic over to Elizabeth and Larry please? This is the table behind you please. Thank you. They're right there at the table. Thanks.

Larry: Table number 2. We concur with the table number 1 that the only organization that we know of, is the S.I.U. We were not aware of the Office of Independent Police Review nor of the – one or two of us were aware of the Ontario Civilian Police Commission but we were not aware of what they did or how they interface with the police force and the public. Number 2; most of us here has had good and bad experiences with the police force. Number 3; we had – none of us were able to report the incidents that we had, if they were bad. And in many cases we weren't aware that we could report them. All of us were in agreement that we would encourage anybody that had had a bad experience with the police force, to report it to the necessary bodies. In the past it was not very clear to anybody where we would report this because most people felt that if they reported anything to the police force, it would be covered up and ignored.

So the feeling was that it is important for the public to be aware of where they can report this information to and have a safe place in order to report it. So that leads me to number 6, is it? Or number 4. Number 5. Okay. We felt that, no, we do not know – those agencies are not open to the public enough and there was a lack of shared information in regards to the information that they have. Number 6; the public should know the findings of investigations. And the details of the investigations be shared with the public. Also, there should be an explanation shared to the public when the

charges are laid on the officer. And, you know, we should also know whether the officer's actually cleared or if he's found guilty of the investigation. I'll pass you over to Elizabeth.

Elizabeth:

I'll speak to the transparency and accountability part by expressing myself through my health care worker's perspective. We can often learn from a different industry and improve the practices and outcomes of our own industry. For example, in healthcare, we've learned from the aviation industry in order to improve the safety of our patients. And in particular in O.R. in surgery. Perhaps as far as the transparency and accountability of these oversight bodies, a lesson can be learned from healthcare. Every regulated healthcare worker in Ontario is mandated to be a member of their respective regulatory colleges. Think of it as a regulatory body. It's an oversight body. The sole purpose of these regulatory colleges is to protect the public. Why does the public need protection? Because we serve the public. And in serving the public in healthcare, we're affecting people's health. Therefore, their quality of lives. Similarly, the police, they're serving the public. They also have a power imbalance just like we do in healthcare but theirs is much greater.

They're able to preserve or take lives, therefore irrevocably changing lives. So with that great power imbalance, in my perspective, my opinion, comes a greater need for transparency and accountability. So one of the ways that we do this in healthcare; our regulatory colleges have a public register. So our full names are there, our place and address of work, any issues regarding our practice, if there were any restrictions, any upcoming disciplinary hearings, the dates and times are there. The outcomes of those hearings are there. And it depends on the regulatory college, for example, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, C.P.S.O. they just give a summary of the disciplinary hearing's outcome unlike the College of Nurses of Ontario, the C.N.O. They give full details, so you know everything that happened. And that's important. It's not only important because the public has a right to know this information because they're being served by these people, but also because of that power imbalance, right?

And also because it serves as a deterrent. So most people don't want to be named and shamed in public for bad behaviour. And so perhaps by knowing that you will be named and shamed so to speak, publicly, police officers will adjust their thoughts, their decisions, their actions. So that's my piece on increasing transparency and accountability. I'll give you back to Larry. For the data collection.

Pamela:

Actually, Larry. Do you have your recommendations? Are you going to work from that? Your five minutes is actually up.

Larry:

So just basically, in regards to the collection of data. Data is important. I think the police force wouldn't be a police force without the collection of data. So we know they collect data. The issue is that we should be able to have access to this data because this data is important for us to understand what is happening in our community. And community organizations



cannot make strategies unless they understand how the police officers interface with the public and what is the results of those interfaces. So data is very important. Access to the data is even a priority for public organizations. Thank you.

Pamela: Thank you Larry. Could you pass the mic over to Charles? Charles could you just let them . . . thank you.

Charles: Thank you. You've heard my name; Charles. I found the group to be rather interesting. Initially before we were involved and then we had the two fair ladies who came a little later. We concur quite a lot with the group number 2 in terms of their report. And just to go quickly, in the interest of time, as a group we were more acquainted with the S.I.U. The other two, we were not really acquainted or our knowledge of such was limited. We've had good and bad experiences with the police. May I say something? It was interesting. I know this it is a very open forum, but it's interesting that more of us of colour had bad experiences with the police than others. At least in this group. I just found that interesting. They did not ask me to say that. But I found out just that. So in terms of the help, we don't really want to elaborate on the really good experiences but especially in York region, the [unintelligible 00:32:20] group had had quite a good response especially from the chief in helping different organization.

For me as a church pastor, I have partnered quite a lot with the police in speaking with young people in my church and in my community. So I've had good experiences. We've also had challenging experiences. Especially being stopped against – and not being charged and being asked certain questions. So we know that. So we've had both good and bad experiences. Question number 3; “If we had to report the bad experiences, would we report it?” For some, yes. Others, they thought that it was just a waste of time to do that because of the experiences they have had. Question number 4 – question 3 and 4, they're very similar. Question number 5; the matter of transparency, “Do you think the oversight agencies are open enough about their investigations?” There was a ‘no’ more so on the part of this group because it is felt that some of these organizations are covered by unions and top lawyers and there seems to be a lack of honesty.

Question number 6; instead of spending money on Tasers, there's a need to spend more money on cameras in an effort to verify the facts. Who did what in circumstances, where, why, identify the problem, why it took place etc. That's for number 6. Moving right along, number 7; “Should names of police officers who are investigated by the S.U.B. made public even when the S.I.U. decides not to charge them?” We were divided on that. Some said ‘yes’, others think well ‘no’, so there was a division in that particular area of number 6. Number 7; okay, should former – number 8; “Should former police officers work as investigators?” Some definitely said ‘no’, others of us thought “Well they have some experience once and if they could be consultants”. That may be a good thing to have them but not giving them the power to make decisions because there's some there who might be experienced but only as consultants. But most of us thought that should never be.

We're at number 9; "Should these organizations collect data on things like race, gender". I think a good answer was given over here. We concur that these organizations, they do need data. The question is; what is done with the data. It was felt that if someone broke the law; yes. And there's the need for the data. But the matter of 'why' the collection of the data, that was very, very, important question that was asked. So come on to number 10; "If you think they should collect data, how should the data be handled and what should be done with it?" Of course, it should be handled professionally. It is felt that only a particular group should – not everybody should have access to this data and it should be handled professionally. In terms other recommendations, there was a big piece on the matter of confidentiality and the matter of education. In fact, I have here for number 11 for recommendations is, education, education, education. Training is very, very important.

An awareness on the part of these organizations especially in the area of culture, cultural idiosyncrasies, how people function and not only that, it is felt that these organizations should reflect the society. And the same people should not be on these organizations again and again. There are lots of qualified people in our societies. It is felt by this group that other people should be given an opportunity to lend their expertise and their inference to help society. Not having the same people to become entrenched. But they key here was education, education, education so that we could fairness, equity and everyone could really have a chance to develop in a whole way.

Pamela: Thank you Charles. I'm just going to [unintelligible 00:37:06]

Charles: Did you want to say something quickly?

Pamela: To Galena and Joshua.

Joshua: So I came here to discuss this issues as a member of the Toronto Individual Community. My opinion represents the general opinions of that group. So that group is not familiar with many of these oversight communities. The only one it's familiar with is the S.I.U. thanks to the frequent news coverage. The members of this community have had many bad experiences with the police and we're here reporting it now. I would encourage other members of the community to come forward and I did that. I got them to come here. So, what's our views? "Do you think the police oversight agencies are open enough with their investigations? In particular, do you think that the S.I.U. shares enough with the public about their investigations of police officers?" Well our interest is in how the police treat us and the police use the mental health system to hide their lack of action in regards to targeted individual cases. So, "Do you think they share enough or do you think they could improve?"

I think they can improve by stop using the mental health system to escape their responsibility. To investigate cases brought forth by targeted individuals and members of our community. Yes. "Should the names of police officers who are investigated by S.U.B. be made public?" Yes, they

should be made public. The public needs to be able to defend itself. And to defend itself it needs to know who's committing these crimes. If the S.I.U. doesn't come forward, there might be several suits. There might be further action, we can't come forward through their action if we don't know who we are suppose to [unintelligible 00:38:40], who going after. "Should former police officers be investigated? Should former police officers work as investigators?" No, there's possible bias towards former fellow officers. So, "Should they collect data". Well I don't consider race, gender or age private information. That's on your driver's licence so I don't think there's a major issue in collecting that but we need to stop using the mental health to escape responsibility.

They do not need to know that information. It should not be affecting their decisions. They should not be able to use that information to not act in a responsible manner and help the people who are contacting them for assistance as is their duty and what they are paid to do. So, "Should they collect data?" If they have to collect data; you know they have the suspects, they need to collect data. They can so it for their case and then discard it. But don't collect unneeded data, don't use data you should not have collected and deal with little data collection as possible. Do I have any recommendations? Don't allow the police to continue to use the mental health system to escape their responsibility to these victims. That's what our group wants to say.

Pamela: Thank you Joshua. Can we bring it back around to – which I know that everybody didn't get a chance to speak. Yes? Okay. Over here, thanks.

Terry: My name's Terry Parker.

Female: If you let me know, I'll acknowledge you. Yeah, okay. Go ahead.

Terry: My name is Terry Parker. As a victim on authorized covert human experimentation at the Toronto Sick Children, the patient advocate has encouraged me to disclose, report the issue of unauthorized human experimentation on children. Despite several attempts of reporting to the police, I am subject to major damage control and concealment in respect to medical child abuse at Sick Kids. In the past I did submit a complaint in respect of lack of the criminal court enforcement to the Toronto police 42 division where as an officer who received my complaint, assured me that if I withdrew my complaint, there would be investigation to child abuse at Sick Kids. I complied to withdraw my complaint only to discover afterwards my concerns were ignored. Experience dictates our police failed. Lack in good faith when aiding and abetting child abuse at Sick Kids. I'd like submit that only by independent, impartial review body can we have police complaints fairly scrutinized and fairly treated. This matter also might put you your Honour; I have attempted to address matter to lawyers in Toronto. I've been informed that there is a risk of assassination when addressing in covert operation at Sick Kids hospital. So I would like appreciate some sort of a total and complete impartial body that someone can turn to if you're trying enforce a criminal code and where police are aiding and abetting the child abuse at Sick Kids. That's it.

Pamela: Thank you.

Galena: Hello. My name is Galena [Kurdina], a victim of covert neuro experimentation as well. Full mind and body control. I have medical records from the United States of America that I am a victim of specific electromagnetic effects and have [unintelligible 00:41:58] materials in my system that sends signals to my mind and body. I have records from private investigator from the United States of America. She confirms the same issues. And I have records from some psychologist and psychotherapist from the United States of America that I am a victim of mind and body control. Just to make my long story short; I went to police, RCMP and other government institutions may be around one hundred times. Ten times to police. They sent me to psychiatrist, psychologist. They asked these questions “What government is doing such things to you? Maybe Russian”, I’m from Russia. I was sure that Canadian government covers this experimentation. Does nothing. And this doing nothing means sanctioning of such experimentation.

And for the last time, maybe for the twentieth time, I went to police. The 43<sup>rd</sup> police division in Toronto. And there was a conversation with a mobile crisis group in this police division. They listened to me and at long last said – that I provided them with my medical and other records and they promised me to put this records in my file and that’s it. They refused to start investigation. “Why?” I asked. Their answer “We do not have knowledge. We do not have equipment. We do not have trained personnel”. But I have a question; why private companies in the United States of America have all this equipment and may examine victims of mind and body control? Why they, just one person or a small group of person, can afford buying this equipment? And police in Canada do nothing to help us. Is Canadian government and Canadian police so poor that they cannot find and buy this equipment? Of course, no. Maximum price, for example, spectrum analyzers that they use, from \$20 000 to \$50 000.

It’s absolutely affordable to buy this equipment and to train personnel and to start investigation of such complaints. My last conversation ended with total refusal to do anything to help me. With all my records, with all my proofs; even I provided them with names of people who I believe, I am absolutely sure, were involved in this experimentation because it started in Scarborough. I was absolutely sure that people were, first two three months of this experimentation, experimenters were in this house, so I knew names –

Pamela: Galena, your time’s up, Galena.

Galena: And I provided them with names and addresses and they did nothing.

Pamela: Thank you.

Terry: Can I say something real quick. Targeted individuals are victims of implanted devices that affect the brain that are implanted unwillingly. The

police have used the mental health system to escape their responsibility to assist these victims. They have referred us to the Mobile Crisis Response Unit instead of actually investigating. What can you do to assist these people? Justice?

Justice Tulloch: We don't ask – we don't answer your questions. We're here to hear –

Pamela: It's on the record. Thank you. I saw a hand.

Justice Tulloch: Well that's what this whole process is about, right? You're giving us your comments, your issues. We will then consider them and make recommendations.

Jake: Thank you. My name is Jake [Jevonshir] and I'm here to talk about something that I believe most people are not aware that those things taking place. In particular, what I'm talking about is all police forces of the larger cities in North America being trained in Israel as to how to control people, how to shut off demonstration, how to imprison people, how to gather information which borders on tortures and so on. And also supplying equipment to all the police forces in North America. The idea is that our police and others are saying "Well they know how to do things". Yes, of course they know how to do things by using 50, 60 years of experimentation on people who are totally defenceless and they're using all kind of equipment and information and investigations in order to come how to control those people, to eliminate. Absolute no resistance is tolerated by Israel from the Palestinians. But this is totally different when we coming to places like Canada. And with our laws and we are a democracy and so on, we cannot abide by anything like this to say "Well, they know what they doing".

This is absolutely incomprehensible to go there, to learn those things and then to equip ourselves and to do things for example like what happened in G20. That was direct result of what Israel taught our police forces. Julian Fontino, Bill Blair, all of them were in Israel to learn how to do things. And we saw what happened because in our case it's different. We don't have to oppress anybody, we don't have to take the land off anybody, so we should not go to Israel to learn those things. It's totally should be abandoned and against anything that we stand for.

Pamela: Thank you Jake.

Vernon: I'm going to very brief actually. My name is Vernon Hendrickson and I am here – I can be very outspoken in this respect. I am here approaching 50 years and I live in Thornhill. And I happen to have a good knowledge of how society works. And it shouldn't in fact – I am – the S.I.U. is a good start for the investigation of the police department. It should be investigated by impartial committee, of course. Secondly, I could recall accurately – just about Mike Harris time when he actually took over government in Ontario. You had 99 down at Queen Street. You have a lot of mental people there and they were given treatments and so forth. When he took over, those people in the mental facilities, they were more or less

thrown out on the street. And that put a burden on the police department. Mind you, I'm not defending them but I tell you what, the police is not in our society, in a democratic society, to deal with mentally ill people. The institution should be able to take care of these mentally ill people. Give them the treatment that are needed so that society can function in a normal way.

This is very essential. We are putting too much of burden on the police to correct our ills in society. This is very important. I think in a democratic society, we are responsible to make sure people are treated equally regardless of race, colour or creed. And these are very, very important factors in our society. I would say, in all fairness, I have a lot more to say but I think dealing with – I will say this for the last, in regards to adoption of Black kids, the investigation should look into the adoption of Black kids because there again, there are certain ills that are taking place. That's all I would say for now.

Pamela: Thank you Vernon. Could you pass the mic to this gentleman here and then there's one more. Okay? Kim we can talk. Go ahead.

Kim: I just have two questions. I'm not sure if it's going to be easy to give Vernon exact answer but if we could have an indication of a direction kind of to go in. Basically I think a lot of people here are curious about how to deal with a similar kind of situation. I think we've already gone through a little bit of what that is. Maybe just want to know, you know, how would the police like members of the public to report these events? What can we do to make your job easy? What types of evidence are you looking for? What types of forms? What types of processes? I know, you know, nobody wants to live in a place where we're just running around investigating everything by everybody. That's not where anybody wants to go but there's got to be something – so who, given that might not be that easy to answer on the spot, I get that. If then, who do we talk to? How do you even find out what's the process? What do you want us to do so that you can do your job? It's a very different question –

Jamie: What you're saying is a reflection upon the need for more information from these agencies as to how the public can interact with them. And we're not here to answer that question but we take that from your questions an important point. Something that [unintelligible 00:52:04]

Pamela: Yeah, the overarching view is education. Public education about what the agencies do. Thanks.

Janet: Janet Johnson here. I'm just looking at the agencies. I went to the police with my issue of being a targeted individual. At the time I did not understand I was a targeted individual. So they eventually told me I needed to go to the O.I.P.R.D. to put in my complaint. My computers were being destroyed so trying to get evidence together was a challenge. I actually got my notes, my complaint all written up, saved it on a DVD, went to put it in with my complaint. It turned out you had to fill in a specific form. You had to list every police officer, every officer you dealt

with and it was not clear, it wasn't online so could look it up. So here's a communication issue with evidence. So my DVD and information came back that no officer was identified therefore their investigation was closed. So I had documents, I had proof and still it was useless because it didn't fall into their holes. Okay.

Pamela: You got a long list?

Janet: No, it's real quick. Because I only got –

Justice Tulloch: Your issue is access to the actual complaint agency, right? Like and the fact that –

Janet: Yeah. I actually went Downtown Toronto to the O.I. office and they said “Well, you want to put in a complaint, you have to fill in this form”. Well all my stuff was on the DVD.

Justice Tulloch: Okay. I understand. So that –

Janet: So I couldn't fill in the form.

Justice Tulloch: Right. Got you.

Respondent: So therefore they dropped my investigation. And then the other one on data; I went to the police station asking how many people had put in complaints about multiple harassers and how many of those people were identified by the police as M.H.A. mental health associate. And they said to do that was over \$2000 because it's minutes of investigation to compile this report for me.

Justice Tulloch: Who said that? The police or –

Janet: I actually have an e-mail from them.

Justice Tulloch: From who?

Janet: From the Peterborough police station that I was at.

Justice Tulloch: Oh, the police service.

Janet: Yes.

Justice Tulloch: Not one of the oversight boards?

Janet: I didn't know who to go to, so, yeah.

Justice Tulloch: Alright. Okay.

Janet: And the very last thing is the mental health; if the police are making a file instead of investigating multiple intimidators. You are a possible mental health making the data of all these mental health people is not a valid data.

Pamela: Kim and then just the final speaker. Okay?

Kim:

I'm a targeted individual as well of organized stalking. I deal with constant break and enters, damage of property. I had people threaten me. My stalkers threaten me about a fire going to happen and two weeks later my parents' vehicle caught on fire with my 7-year-old niece inside. They were safe but I deal with death threats. I've had a gun to my head. Sexual assaults. Physical assaults. Torture of cat. I have threats of eviction because of speaking out publicly for being a targeted individual of organized stalking. Electronic harassments. I deal with slandering campaigns. False campaigns. I'm unable to get work. I went to [unintelligible 00:55:19] for social service work and every time I get a job, I'm dealing with slandering campaigns. Phone hacking. My computer was destroyed. Broken into. Hacked into. Police investigating. With the stalkers; interacting with stalkers so when I would call the police to get help, the police would actually come and speak to the people who are harassing me. So I found it really difficult to get help.

I deal with constant noise campaigns. Knocks on the doors, banging on walls, 24-7 surveillance. My home gets broken into every time I leave. I deal with mail thefts and personal items. Stalking by neighbours and by neighbourhood watch campaigns. Tampering of locks. Electronic harassment, 24-hour surveillance I just said. Followed by police constantly. Nonstop. And data collection as well. I'm also a victim of – this is really second – I'm also a victim of directed weapon attacks. Electronic harassment as a result of government harassment. Then [unintelligible 00:56:18] speech. Numbness on your body parts. Burning sensations all over your body. Pins and needles in your heads, all over your body, mostly in the head. Sharp head pains and really intense headaches. Muscle spasms. Loss of muscle control. Sleep deprivation, induced sleep. Forced orgasms. Shocks of pain directed at specific parts of my body. Loud buzzing sounds and high pitched sounds. Swelling and bruising at different parts of my body.

This is a result of government torture by a directed energy weapons. People in our group have decided that because we're activists, we're whistle blowers or we're somebody who knows something. I am in the category of knowing something I'm not supposed to know. So a lot of people – there's hundreds of people across Canada that are living with this. So my question is when I go to the police, when members of our group go to the police to discuss these issues; they try to get legal help, we're often incarcerated or institutionalized. They use the mental health D.S.M. against us to silence us. Like I said, after speaking here tonight, a lot of people know who are stalking me and who know I'm going to be speaking about this. So I'm going to get harassed with the intensity tonight when I get home. This is not a mental health issue. This is government torture that we live – I've lived with for ten years. So when I go home tonight, I'm going to receive shocks to my body and I'm going to be harassed.

My question is, how we really – like how do we go about the steps of resolving this and how we – when we go to police to complain, we get locked up or we get put into the hospital. So my question is, what steps can we take. What can we do to – I don't want to be enemies with anybody. I



want to work with as many people as I can, even including police. I want to work with people to help resolve these issues. So I just want to know what steps we can take as a group to address these stalking and individual torture campaigns. Thank you so much Pam for letting me speak.

Pamela: Thank you. Justice Tulloch. Over to you.

Justice Tulloch: Just wrap up. Maybe you could address . . .

Jamie: I'd just like to thank you all on behalf of our team for coming here tonight and for speaking with us about these issues in a deeply personal way. And we want you to know that this part of our process is very important to us. It's hearing stories from real people like yourselves and their experiences that informs this process in the most meaningful of ways. And we want you to know that we value your time and we're very grateful for your coming here and that we hope that you will read the report when it comes out and that you'll have a sense that your voices were heard and reflected in it and that we can move things forward and see some progress in this area. And that would not be possible without your assistance and input. So thank you very much.

Pamela: Thank you everyone and good night. And thank you very much. If you could please make sure that everyone has signed the tall sheet. Thank you.

[End of recorded material 00:59:55]