MASS CASUALTY COMMISSION
COMMISSION DES PERTES MASSIVES

The Joint Federal/Provincial Commission into the April 2020 Nova Scotia Mass Casualty
MassCasualtyCommission.ca

Commission fédérale-provinciale sur les événements d'avril 2020 en Nouvelle-Écosse
CommissionDesPertesMassives.ca

Public Hearing

Audience publique

Commissioners / Commissaires

The Honourable / L'honorable J. Michael MacDonald,
Chair / Président

Leanne J. Fitch (Ret. Police Chief, M.O.M)

Dr. Kim Stanton

VOLUME 66

Held at :

Halifax Convention Centre
1650 Argyle Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 0E6

Wednesday, September 7, 2022

Tenue à:

Centre des congrès d'Halifax
1650, rue Argyle
Halifax, Nouvelle-Écosse
B3J 0E6

Mercredi, le 7 septembre 2022

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.
www.irri.net
(800)899-0006

II
Appearances / Comparutions

Dr. Emma Cunliffe	Director of Research and Policy / Directrice des politiques et recherches

Table of Content / Table des matières

IV
Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
	None entered	

Halifax, Nova Scotia

--- Upon commencing on Wednesday, September 7th, 2022, at 9:31 a.m.

COMMISSIONER FITCH: Bonjour et bienvenue. Hello and welcome. We join you from Mi'kma'ki, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq.

Please join us in remembering those whose lives were taken, those who were harmed, their families, and all those affected by the April 2020 mass casualty in Nova Scotia.

Today we will hear a roundtable conversation looking at Contemporary Community Policing, Community Safety and Well-being. Participant representatives will join roundtable members this afternoon.

With facilitation from the Commission's Director of Research and Policy, Dr. Emma Cunliffe, today's roundtable participants will talk about best practices for community policing; necessary considerations for inclusive community policing and safety that are responsive to diversity and diverse needs; and police approaches to community safety that are grounded in community engagement and community mobilisation

As with our earlier roundtables, our hope is that these conversations will include thinking on potential recommendations to inform our work heading towards the Commission's final report.

I will now ask Dr. Cunliffe to begin. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Commissioner Fitch.

--- ROUNDTABLE: CONTEMPORARY COMMUNITY POLICING, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND WELL-BEING:

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: As the Commissioner has indicated, my name is Dr. Emma Cunliffe, and I have the honour of serving as the Director of Research & Policy for the Mass Casualty Commission.

Today, we will focus on best practices for contemporary community

policing, community safety and well-being. We'll consider factors, such as inclusivity and responding to diversity and diverse needs, and how police services work with and engage the communities they serve. Our roundtable participants will share both their expertise and their experience with these matters.

A package of materials has been prepared and shared with both roundtable members and Participants. Commissioners, these materials will be tendered this afternoon, and so exhibit numbers are not presently available for them. We will do our best to identify them by author and year for the benefit of the record.

The core themes of this roundtable are: best practices for community policing; necessary considerations for inclusive community policing and community safety that is responsive to diversity and the diverse needs of communities; and police approaches to community safety that are grounded in community engagement and community mobilization.

Based on these core themes, I am going to ask a series of open-ended questions that we hope will give each of you the opportunity to share your unique perspective, experience, and expertise with us.

As facilitator of this roundtable, I will be directing the questions, asking follow-ups, and moderating the dialogue. I would ask that you please speak slowly for the benefit of our accessibility partners.

Roundtable discussions will form part of the Commission record. They are being live streamed now and will be publicly available on the Commission's website. The Commissioners may choose to pose a question or ask for clarification at any point.

The Commissioned report produced by Dr. Chris Murphy and Carl Corley provides important information about the history of community policing in Canada and its role in rural communities, particularly with respect to police reform, community policing, and the RCMP. Dr. Murphy and Mr. Corley's report, titled Community-Engaged Rural Policing: The Case for Reform and Innovation in Rural

RCMP Policing, is at COMM0063515.

We are fortunate to be joined today by Dr. Murphy, Mr. Corley, and other experts who bring deep understanding of community safety and community policing to the table. In a moment, I will invite these experts to introduce themselves to you, and to share a little more information about themselves and their experience with the matters that we will be discussing.

As with all of the Commission's roundtables, today we won't focus specifically on the mass casualty of April 18 and 19, 2020, nor seek to interpret the evidence that is before the Commissioners about the specific circumstances of the rural communities that were most affected by the mass casualty. This work is being done in other aspects of the Commission's process.

As with every roundtable discussion, the intention is to provide the Commissioners and public with a deeper understanding of the core themes of our work so that everyone is well-positioned to consider challenges and barriers to change and to move towards making effective and meaningful recommendations.

So to get us started this morning, I am going to ask each of our roundtable members to introduce themselves and their work in and with community policing.

Cal, if I can please start with you today.

MR. CAL CORLEY: Certainly. Thank you, Emma, and good morning, everyone.

My name is, as Emma mentioned, is Cal Corley, and it's an honour to be here. I'm the CEO of the Community Safety Knowledge Alliance. CSK is a non-profit. We support governments, police agencies and others to develop, implement, and assess new approaches to improving community safety and well-being outcomes. Our offices are in the national capital region and Saskatoon. Our Ottawa office is on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinaabe Nation, and our Saskatoon office is on Treaty 6 territory and the homeland, of course, of the Métis.

I'm also a former member of the RCMP. In fact, I spent a significant part of my life, some 39 years, in fact, 39 years to the day, in the organisation, retiring at the rank of Assistant Commissioner. My career included several years working in small towns and remote parts of Alberta, Northwest Territories, and what's now Nunavut. I also had occasion to work in such areas as drug enforcement; General Investigation Section, or GIS; Criminal Intelligence and National Security Investigations.

I also had the pleasure, beginning in 1990, to work in Ottawa, first in Operations and National Security Investigations, and then on into more corporate roles, including as a Staff Relations Program Officer, that's the interface between the then Staff Relations Program elected representatives of the organisation, the Commissioner's Office and the Executive. I served a term as -- as the head of the Executive Officer of Development and Resourcing, and various other roles in a Headquarters context.

Notably, in terms of my understanding of policing, was two secondments I did, one to the Privy Council Office and the other to Public Safety Canada. These certainly helped shape my thinking, and in fact, see the RCMP and policing from very, very different perspectives.

For almost two years, in the late 1990s, under Commissioner Phil Murray's leadership, I co-led an organisational-wide transformational alignment initiative within the RCMP. That initiative aimed to align organisational culture, systems, and processes, with the needs of an organisation dealing with a rapidly changing external operating environment. While we were successful in some respects, we faced enormous challenges in bringing about much needed change.

My last six years with the RCMP were as the Director General of the Canadian Police College, which, of course, is administered by the RCMP, but provides advanced and specialised training in areas of organised crime and multi-jurisdictional crime to all police services in Canada and internationally. It also has an

executive development program as well.

During that time, I was also the RCMP Senior Envoy to Mexico and the Americas, which was related to supporting Canada's capacity building efforts with police services in our hemisphere.

Shortly after the global financial crisis in 2007 to 2009, roughly. I was intimately involved with the successive presidents of Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Bill Blair, succeeded by Dale McFee, together with Geoff Gruson, who at that time headed up the Canadian Police Sector Counsel in Shaping a National Discourse Around the Economics of Policing.

Since my retirement from the RCMP in 2014, I've spent much of my professional time working with a small group of progressive police chiefs who are determined to position their organizations and meet the complex challenges facing policing and community safety more broadly. These leaders are working tirelessly with others within their communities to shape the future of our community safety and well-being services, or organizing to learn. They recognize to be relevant and responsive to community needs, their services must operate at the intersection of law enforcement and public health and not just as gate keepers to the criminal justice system.

So in closing, it's these experiences, among others, that have provided me with practical insights into issues of police leadership, governance, and organizational culture and how these can either serve to modernize policing within a broader community safety well-being context, or impede progress.

So with that, Emma, I thank you, and I look forward to today's roundtable and doing my best to answer any questions colleagues might have.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Many thanks indeed, Cal. We're very pleased to have you with us today.

Chris, if I can please turn to you next? I'm so sorry, Chris. You may be on mute.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Good morning, everyone. My name is Chris Murphy. I'm a retired professor of sociology at Dalhousie University and the University of King's College.

I'm here today because I've been researching, studying, teaching, and promoting research and programming on policing for the last 40 years, or more possibly.

I became involved in study of policing because of my experience growing up in a small town in Nova Scotia called Antigonish, where the local police force that I had grown up with was replaced overnight by the RCMP. It was replaced for a variety of internal problems which soon became apparent afterwards, but this was not just replacing the police force, it was the only way of policing a small community and it was a shock to the community and the system, probably an overdue one, as the first year the RCMP took away 350 driver's licenses. Among them were lawyers and judges, et cetera. So this was a new style of policing, not one that simply enforced the local community norms and selectively enforced it according to social status, et cetera.

That experience stuck with me so that when I went on to the University of the Toronto to do my PhD, I decided that this would be something worth studying. Nobody else was interested in small town policing. And this comparative study of RCMP and municipal policing occupied me for five or six years. I went to over 40 small police departments, rural police departments and detachments, approximately 10 RCMP detachments and 30 municipal departments, interviewed, and did some data analysis, and also spent several months in the RCMP community, policed community and a comparative municipal policed community.

As a result of that experience, the federal government at that time was interested in this thing called community-based policing, which was happening in the United States and transforming, or at least attempting to transform policing in the U.S. This would be the late '60s, early '70s. And they assumed that because I'd done this work on small town policing, that somehow it must be the same thing. Well it

wasn't. The irony was that community policing was intended as a reform of urban policing, not rural policing.

In any event, for the next -- first couple of years, I did a major piece of work with a RCMP constable for my Masters in Criminology. And it was, in theory, for the RCMP.

When we finished this review of community policing, the RCMP politely accepted it and -- but basically said they'd been doing this for 100 years and they weren't that interested.

Fortunately, the federal government at the time was, and although it had no official role in promoting policing and police change, it funded research and demonstration projects throughout the country, and conferences, which I was fortunate enough to be responsible for.

So for eight years, I was involved in a variety of programs and projects from one end of the country to the other, promoting and evaluating community-based policing.

I left government in the late 19 -- I guess it was 1990 and returned to university. And my studies moved beyond community policing, but I watched with some dismay as community policing slowly kind of faded into -- lost its zeal. It seemed to be replaced by other newer ideas and remained kind of in place in name only, or at least in a very limited way, not in the way that it was envisaged in the '80s and '90s.

So and I've been involved in a variety of ways, published on a variety of issues, and consulted on various commissions, and was involved with the Brown Commission on the RCMP and Police Culture, et cetera.

I retired a few years ago, and frankly had to be persuaded to get involved again in this discussion on police reform, but I did so because of the shocking events of Portapique. And what I thought when the information came out that there were issues surrounding community policing, I thought I could make a valuable

contribution to this discussion, and particularly the degree of knowledge that seemed to be in the community about the perpetrator and issues of access, et cetera.

So I did, and I was fortunate enough to go up to Cal Corley to balance off my academic and research background with somebody who had been there and done that and had a lengthy experience with policing and the RCMP.

So that's where we are today and I hope our combined work has made some contribution to this discussion. I look forward to hearing from the rest of the panel and having this discussion.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed, Chris. And welcome. And thank you both for your excellent report.

Sulaimon, if I can please turn to you next?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: Good morning. My name is Sulaimon Giwa and I'm an Associate Professor of Social Work at Memorial University in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I'm also the Endowed Chair in Criminology and Criminal Justice at St. Thomas University in Fredericton, New Brunswick.

I work in the field of forensic social work, where I apply a social work lens and perspective to understanding the criminal justice and legal systems, particularly policing and corrections.

I have been in the field of community policing for 15 years, beginning in the City of Ottawa, where I worked with community partners and the Ottawa Police Service on the issue of police racial profiling.

And most recently in 2020, I was commissioned by the Independent Civilian Review of Missing Persons Investigations to Examine Systemic Bias in Police Investigations Involving Racialized 2SLGBTQI Trans Persons following the serial murders of several gay men of colour in Toronto between 2010 and 2017. And I believe

the commission of all these occurrences leads me to be part of the MCC today, so it is a pleasure that I'm here with you this morning.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Sulaimon, we're so glad you can join us. Thank you for taking the time today.

Amy, if I could please turn to you next?

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Thank you very much. My name is Amy Siciliano and I am the Public Safety Advisory for Halifax Regional Municipality. My role within the municipality is to oversee the municipality's public safety strategy, which in a nutshell is both a long-term goal and a practical policy framework for putting community at the center of safety and foreseeing all of our municipal services and programs and policies as capable of assets of building safer communities.

I would say that the public safety strategy takes, or aspires to take, an ecosystem approach to community safety and wellbeing, with police as one layer in a much more holistic approach to building safe communities.

I can give you a little bit of background about how I'm here, and it started about 14 years ago when the Municipality made a commitment to developing a more holistic understanding of an approach to community safety; it convened a Mayor's roundtable, which was led by Dr. Don Clairmont at Dalhousie University.

Dr. Clairmont, back in 2008 submitted a report called "Violence and Public Safety in Halifax Regional Municipality," and it was a report on how we could do things differently within the Municipality, and really focused on the role of municipal government and community partners in the area of violence and community safety, and specifically talked about organizational changes that could enhance the Municipality's ability to create safer communities with community.

Acting on a key recommendation in the report, the Municipality established a public safety office back in 2009. That office originally was located within HRP and led by a police officer. In 2014, it was moved into the CAO's office, where Dr. Clairmont had recommended it sit, and a civilian was hired to lead the office. And now,

since 2018, I have been in that position. And I'm not an expert in policing but I believe I bring expertise in ways we can take a more holistic approach to community safety and wellbeing, with police as one of many partners.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Amy, thank you so much for sharing that history, not least Dr. Clairmont's work on community policing and policing in Nova Scotia, of course, has made a huge contribution, particularly in Nova Scotia, and one of his articles, one of his many articles, forms part of the roundtable package for today.

Amy, may I just ask you by way of follow-up before I turn to Hugh, when you describe an ecosystem of community safety, can you elaborate on what that means to you in your office and to the work that you're trying to do?

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Certainly. By ecosystem I think that what we're trying to do is really decentre the approach that we take to community safety. So traditionally we would think of police at the centre with partners around that kind of centre. And how we like to approach it is really putting community at the centre and looking at all of the different assets we have, resources we have, that can contribute to safer communities, with police just being one part of that equation.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Amy.

And Amy's office has produced an infographic that really provides a graphic representation of that idea, and that, again, forms part of the roundtable package and will be tendered today.

Hugh, if I may now, please, turn to you. Welcome.

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much, and good morning, Commissioners; good morning, colleagues on the roundtable. It is truly an honour to be here, and I appreciate the work all of us are doing together.

Your comment, Amy, about the ecosystem are a nice place for me to start in introducing myself, insofar as I've made the same trek and ended up in the same place.

About 50 years ago, I took my credentials in social psychology into a number of community-based issued around the world, and I only mention that broad

context insofar as it informs the robustness of some of my conclusions and opinions that I look forward to sharing today, dealing with such issues as poverty and addictions; systemic barriers like racism and so on, ending up about 30 years ago focused on crime and social disorder, and working with police agencies across Canada, in the United States, and some military establishments as well. Leading to, in Ontario, development of something called a community mobilization model, which was an effort to help police services redefine community policing and figure out what their role is in something that is much bigger than the ability of police to affect by themselves.

And, ultimately, just a few years ago leading to the Province of Ontario mandating that all municipalities in this province must plan for community safety and wellbeing and if they don't, the Province will step in and plan for them. That mandate is fairly new, and municipalities are struggling with it, as you might imagine. And, of course, the Province will have to struggle with those struggles too in designing appropriate follow-up.

It's -- again, it's an honour to be here and I look forward to serving today, and the richness of the conversation we'll all have. Thank you so much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Hugh, we're thrilled to have you with us today. Thank you so much for taking the time to join us.

Professor Denise Martin is joining us today from Scotland.

Denise, thank you very much for joining us to contribute to the conversation. I'll invite you to introduce yourself now.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Thank you, Emma. And good morning, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here today.

My name is Professor Denise Martin, as Emma says, and I'm a Professor of Criminology at Abertay University in Dundee.

My background is that I've been a researcher with -- on issues of policing for over 15 years, but specifically on the topic today my interest lies in partnerships and partnership working, specifically about trying to kind of look at reducing antisocial behaviour and violence in communities.

I've been involved in a number of evaluations that have been looked at, preventative initiatives where police have worked together with partners to try

to tackle these issues, but also take into consideration kind of local communities' needs, and thinking about integrating them into kind of police community strategies.

I also have an interest in law enforcement and public health and the intersects between these two disciplines, and have written on this subject, but specifically looking at collaborations and partnerships and how we sustain partnerships over the longer term.

I've looked -- I've done work on emergency service collaboration, so looking at how, you know, agencies work together effectively but also how there are challenges and barriers to this type of work, particularly around organizational culture.

I've directed many research projects that have brought a combination of partnerships, culture, specifically in relation to policing to try to look at change and reform.

So that's a bit about my background. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much again, Denise, for joining us today.

Professor Jamie Livingston is joining us today from Saint Mary's University.

Please go ahead, Jamie.

DR. JAMIE LIVINGSTON: Good morning, everyone. My name is Jamie Livingston; I'm really grateful to be here with everyone today.

I'm a criminologist and associate professor in the Department of Criminology at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. I study issues at the intersection of the mental health, substance use and criminal justice systems, including how social processes and structures contribute to people's criminalization and stigmatization. So this includes examining how police are involved in the lives of people with mental health and substance use issues, and how this affects matters of equity and justice, and also how it could be different.

Over 10 years ago, I led the first study in Canada to examine how people with mental illnesses experience their interactions with police. The study was done in Vancouver, British Columbia. The questions at that time, over a decade ago, were largely around how to reform and better train the police to improve interactions with people who are in various forms of distress and crisis. The questions have shifted

recently around, rather reforming the police, but rather how to find alternatives and other ways of addressing the needs of people and communities who experience mental health, substance use, and social crisis.

So, with that, I'm bringing to the roundtable a perspective of someone who's setting the rapid growth in services that respond to people in mental health crisis using unarmed civilian teams rather than the police. More than 100 of these programs exist that now divert calls from police, and they've been established in communities around the world, largely within the last two to three years, and largely because of the advocacy and activist efforts of the Black Lives Matter and Defund the Police social movements.

So civilian community-based crisis services are recognized as an important approach for building community safety and for contributing towards racial equity and disability justice.

So I look forward to sharing my perspective and my work with you today, and contributing to the discussion.

Thanks.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Jamie, thank you so much for joining us today.

And last but certainly not least, we're fortunate to be joined by Chief Mark Kane of Annapolis Royal Police.

Mark, if I can invite you to introduce yourself, please.

CHIEF MARK KANE: Yeah, good morning, everyone. Thank you for allowing me to be here today. I was there last week as well, so I'll keep it very short.

I'm originally, as you can tell, from the United Kingdom, but Scotland. So I did police in England for many years, and then I came to Canada. I've had the fortunate of being able to police in three provinces, a Chief in two of them.

I was also the officer in charge of a multi-agency taskforce which was largely on a collaborative approach to policing, which was very successful, and it culminated in me actually giving a keynote guest speaking point at the National Health Conference on collaborative approach and partnerships, and then I also took part in a

worldwide webinar on Seattle when it looked at its nightlife initiatives. So it was about looking at different ways of policing nightlife.

On top of that, I also helped go down to Los Angeles Police to look at how they had implemented community policing in many of the areas that they were facing in economic and high crime rates. It's especially more at their youth programming, to try and intervene that way to break that chain. And since then, I am now working on the Restorative Justice Panel in Halifax this year.

So this is a subject that's very close to my heart, community policing, and I believe it's fundamental for all types of policing order as we go along.

So I'm happy to be here today. I am a participant this afternoon. I am here if required to ask a specific question, but I'll leave it to the panel this morning to have their time because I believe their input is going to be valuable for this afternoon. So thank you again.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mark, thank you so much for joining us this morning. We're looking forward very much to this afternoon's conversation.

And for the benefit of those who are joining us from outside the Commission team, I'll just share a little more information about this afternoon's proceedings, which will look a little different from roundtable processes if you've been following them until now.

This afternoon, we'll be joined by a number of representatives of the Participants in our process, and so the -- those that you've just been introduced to will stay with us and be joined by around eight or nine additional representatives for a broader conversation of many of the themes that we'll be discussing today. It's an opportunity for the Participants to have a direct conversation with the subject matter experts that we have brought together today.

So if I can turn, then, please, to our first topic, and thank you for the -- for the very rich introductions that you've each shared. I think it's given a good sense of the role that community policing and approaches to community policing has played in

each of your career trajectories, and it's very interesting to hear the diverse paths that you've each taken into those questions.

But I think it's worth pausing briefly to talk a little bit about what community policing means to each of you, and to acknowledge that it may be slightly different from one person to the next. And so I'm going to begin by inviting each of you to explain or define what community policing means to you and what you think the core attributes of a -- of a community policing approach entail.

Sulaimon, if I could please begin with you for this question.

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: Certainly. Thanks for that question, Emma.

So community policing, I believe, is one of those buzzwords that get used a lot in discussions about the work that police either do exceptionally well or fail to do at all. There's an implicit assumption that the concept has a universal-shared meaning, which is not true. The fact that its meaning changes depending on the surrounding environment contributes to the words' complexity, and may also be one of its strengths. An understanding of the term in one context will defer in another, and this variability, I would argue, enables the diversity of approaches that are rooted in the experiences of people and communities to which the concept of community policing has been applied to.

Although there is no universally accepted definition of community policing, there is some agreement among police practitioners, researchers, and to some extent the general public, about what community policy aims to achieve, amongst which is community safety and well-being. It is a different question entirely whether or not police leaders reach their goals through community policing, and if they did, I would suspect that maybe we would not be here today.

So for me, community policing is a nexus or a meeting point where police professionals and community partners engage in the deliberate and intentional work of identifying aspects of community life where things have not worked or are not

working, and leverage each other's expertise and knowledge to arrive at solutions that can restore the community's sense of safety and well-being, and also enhance the legitimacy of the police in the process.

And I think when we're thinking about the -- you know, some of the core attributes or elements of community policing, I will proffer that some of the things that we might be looking at are things like partnership, prevention, problem-solving, and power-sharing, the four keys as they are typically referred to, and I guess we can discuss a bit more about that later on in later questions that I believe that you might have for us.

But that would be my definition of what community policing is and what I see as being some of the key attributes of it as well.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Sulaimon.

Hugh, if I can please turn to you. Of course, you and Sulaimon have recently, I believe, finished collaborating on a second edition of your book, Transforming Community Policing, and so I'd love to hear from you if there is anything that you would add to what Sulaimon has shared so far, or anything you disagree with for that matter.

DR. HUGH C. RUSSELL: Thank you very much, and thank you for mentioning the work that Sulaimon and I are collaborating on.

The key in that, and the key in my answer to your question is in the first word of that title, "transforming". To go back to Sulaimon's comment about the word itself and some of its misleading aspects, one of those misleading aspects is it puts police at the centre of the whole process, and hence, the rest of us who are not police have expected police to do far more than they have proved able to accomplish.

What I'm suggesting is that the research on the effectiveness on community policing has not turned up positive results. Police are generally too late, after all something bad has already happened, people have been victimised; police oversimplify the problems by virtue of their perspective. This is not a blame game, by

the way, this is necessary by the way we restructure it. There are cultural barriers brought to the whole equation by police. Police are unequipped to deal with the profound conditions that lead to crime and social disorder in the first place. We don't train them well enough, we don't resource them well enough to do this work. And of course, treating community policing as a job for a police means that we expect them to accomplish all this, and yet we have a system that does not accommodate that.

Hence, Sulaimon and I are talking about transforming the word. Take the phrase itself, "community policing". We're suggesting that a new approach to this would be to look at how the community deals with those very profound problems that lead to crime and social disorder in the first place, and that gets back to Amy's comment about the ecosystem, Sulaimon's comments about collaboration and partnership, and all of which there are huge roles for police, of course, but not the kinds of roles we have expected by imposing on police the expectation that they will do community policing.

I'll stop there for now. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Hugh, thank you so much.

Commissioners, the publisher, Emond, of Transforming Community Policing, has kindly made available an extract from the forthcoming second edition, and that will be tendered and posted on the website.

Jamie, if I can turn to you and to build a little, I think, on the remarks that you shared about the work that you've done and the ways in which your approach and your thinking has evolved. Given -- given the trajectory you have described from thinking about how can police work better with those who may be experiencing mental health crisis or substance use associated crisis, to thinking about non-police approaches to those problems, what would you say about ideas about community policing and ideas about an ecosystem of community safety to build on what we've heard so far?

DR. JAMIE LIVINGSTONE: Thanks for the question, and thanks for the folks that came before me in providing such great answers.

In relation to community policing, I think some of the kind of dangers of models such as that, and some of the worries and anxieties around that is how police resources are distributed within society in ways that -- that they -- their roles and responsibilities creep into all sorts of domains for which they're not adequately equipped, trained, or have the capacity to deal with. And that's largely what I'm seeing in relation to these community crisis teams, in which issues of homelessness or housing and security issues, of substance abuse or overdose, or mental health crises, and all sorts of social problems that were previously addressed, mostly inadequately by police, are being diverted to other community services and social programs that are resourced to specifically attend to these calls.

So we see these in places like Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Alaska. We're seeing them crop up in Alberta. And largely, it's to, again, reflecting on some of the previous comments, to envision community safety and meeting community needs that we know contribute to people's lack of safety, to address those things in ways that decenter the police and ensure that community services and programs are sufficiently resources -- resourced, rather, to attend to those issues in ways that are effective, appropriate, and don't contribute further harm.

And from a sort of social justice and equity lens, this is certainly an important goal in relation to people who have histories of individual and collective trauma stemming from police violence and systemic racism discrimination around police practices, in which they don't find the police to be particularly helpful and won't reach out for help for situations in which they're feeling themselves in distress or in crisis.

So recognizing all of this, this is why many communities and municipalities are turning to other solutions and other ways of addressing sort of root causes and so-called social disorder, and problems that people are facing within the community in order to enhance wellbeing and the health and safety of communities.

And this is an important goal, going back to what Sulaimon said earlier, around -- so one of the goals of community policing is to promote and strengthen the legitimacy of police. And I think the -- an important way of doing that is recognizing what police are capable and not capable of doing, and for what they're not capable of doing, ensuring that those who are capable and well equipped to do those jobs are doing them.

And I think that's an important sort of model to use in relation to proving trust, legitimacy of police, but also enhancing community safety.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Jamie, thank you. And we will turn, in the course of this roundtable, to questions about what the police are well equipped to do and the tasks that they're presently being asked to perform that they may be less well equipped to do, just as a taste of what's coming.

Amy, if I could turn to you next, within the spectrum of thoughts that you've heard about community policing and community safety approaches, where would you position the work that you're presently doing with HRM. And what would you add to what we've already heard?

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this really rich discussion.

And I think one of the first things that I would -- that we're doing and that I would, you know, suggest in this discussion is that we reframe the question that's asked to, you know, what does community safety mean to each of us and how would we define it? And I think that that's kind of the approach that we're taking with -- we're at the point right now where we're renewing the Public Safety Strategy and I think, you know, starting from that point where you're kind of trying to reframe the question is really important because as we've seen even in the trajectory of this office, police are traditionally seen as the center for responsibility when it comes to first response or community safety responses, and we focus the discussion on the strengths and weaknesses within that response, rather than kind of reframing the question, stepping

back, and allowing us different definitions of the problems that we face related to community safety.

So for instance, you know, one of the things that we've done with the new Public Safety Strategy, which I'm happy to talk about in more detail a bit later, is asking, you know, why would there -- why is there an absence of other responses related to violence in our community and what would a more wholistic community-centered approach look like? What strengths do we have to build on? Where are the gaps? What are the barriers? And I think most importantly for the discussion we're having with the renewal of the Public Safety Strategy is, you know, what is the infrastructure necessary to build an alternative response or a more wholistic response, to really build up that eco-system approach so that, you know, in the future, we're not asking the same question, we're looking at it, you know, when things do go wrong, looking at it in a more wholistic way and trying to refine a more wholistic approach.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Amy, many thanks indeed.

Chris, if I could turn to you next? We'll turn in a few minutes to a more complete conversation about the report that you and Cal have prepared, but for the time being, I'm wondering what you would add to what we already heard about what a community policing model looks like and some of the challenges of implementing this kind of model. And I'm interested particularly given, of course, your work and background and contributions, and your thoughts about what it might look like for rural communities specifically.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Yeah. Well my -- you know, my sense goes back to the whole creation of the public police, again where with Peel's notion was that policing could only be effective if it was by the consent of the public and that, you know, in it's various -- policing the public, public aware of the police, and that the emphasis should be on preventative police activities, et cetera.

But it meant, to him at least, and I think it should in any community policing model of police and policing, that the community has a significant -- and it's the

purpose and the point of policing and that the service out of the police is organized around that basic principle, that you have to gain consent, you have to gain trust, you can do it collaboratively, you have to be accessible and accountable.

But I guess, you know, the report we wrote is police centric in the sense that it is what should the police role be in terms of relation to these various community agencies and institutions and broader context or alternatives to police. I guess I still think it's important that the existing police role be reformed and reconfigured in a way that it can interact with these new developing alternatives to community -- to the police, sorry, and that ultimately the police have a critical role in this web of community safety and security. And we may be now redefining that role, but also the relationship between the police and these agencies. I mean, people call the police for a reason, and it's usually because there is no one else available or appropriate for -- to respond to this issue.

So in rural policing, you know, it's slightly different, in a sense. The issues I think we outlined in the report, we'll get into that later, are an absence of policing, not a kind of an excessive amount of policing or police moving into areas and issues where perhaps others might do better. So it's a slightly different set of issues, I think, in rural policing.

But I'll just leave it at that. We'll no doubt have more discussions about what the appropriate role of police is in relation to community safety and security, and whether that should be limited, or expanded, or reconfigured. We'll have that discussion probably.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: We will indeed pick up on those threads down the road. Thank you very much, Chris.

Cal, if I can turn to you, in your introduction, you alluded to the notion of progressive policing and progressive police leaders. I wonder how -- I wonder if you can please define that phrase and what it means to you for our benefit, and also

talk a little bit about how those ideas relate to some of the ideas that we've heard shared by other participants in this roundtable?

MR. CAL CORLEY: Certainly. And first I'd just to say that -- and I agree with everything I've heard from colleagues and Amy's, you know, characterizing this as an eco system with the police no longer at the center I think is really apt.

I'd just like to start by saying that community policing was certainly appropriate as an organizing principle in its day and the term was right, I mean we had come out of the professional era of policing, you know, paramilitary command and control system structures and everything, as George Kelling put it in 1988, you know, the police were at the centre of the model and the public were near passive recipients of these services. We've come a long way from there. In fact, I'd suggest that there's ample evidence today and I think of, you know, some of the works of Michael Campa and others that were in between eras of policing or, in a contemporary context, were between eras of community safety and well-being, probably the fifth big shift since 1730.

And this one here seems to be going to be characterized by the practice of collaborative community safety that goes well beyond community policing for all that we've -- all we've heard, and it's one that requires a police culture that (a) embraces a collective approach, which is an acceptance that they're no longer at the centre of the model, and, secondly, police culture places as much value on prevention and community building as on enforcement and criminal investigations.

And why this distinction's important, I think, is because across Canada, if you speak to most of the major city Chiefs, they'll say that much of day-to-day policing is really -- relates to social problems and not crime, and these are adaptive problems. Fixing one part of it won't make much difference unless there's corresponding changes in other areas.

So just I think we're moving in that direction and your question's specific around progressive police leaders. There are -- I mean, let me step back for a moment.

Canada is blessed with outstanding policing when we look around the world, and police leaders across this country are doing tremendous jobs leading their police organizations. The distinction I make when I talk about the real progressives in the context of moving towards more of a collaborative approach, the consistent approach that's been discussed, is that these are truly working with their teams, working with others within the community, whether they're provincial, federal, local agencies, non-profits, community groups, et cetera to really reshape along the lines that we've discussed. Many police leaders in Canada are tremendous at dealing with today. There are -- there are fewer that are really trying to position their organizations for the future.

We think about, you know, the backstopping and the sort of broad-based calls for social change, direct line of sight on policing around issues of social equity, social inclusion to begin with, a period of severe government austerity that's likely looming. Some recently in the States characterized this as about 40 times the magnitude of the global financial crisis, so we need only do the math that should be a driver towards more collaborative approaches because we can't afford policing as it is today.

So what distinguishes these progressive leaders is they've got a vision for the future that fits precisely within that ambit that Amy and Hugh and Sulaimon and others have described and they're actively working with others to position their organizations there to build that internal capacity to inspire their teams towards that, and certainly not to dismiss or discount the important role the police have in enforcement and criminal investigation but, rather, a balance where the community building, preventative work is valued as much as the other.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much, indeed, Cal.

Denise, if I can turn to you, as you alluded in your introduction, Scotland has moved towards a prevention first approach that emphasizes a public health perspective and a collaborative holistic approach to policing.

I wonder if you could please provide us with some examples of how the Scotland police have worked in this way and some of the successes and perhaps some of the challenges that the Scottish police have encountered in the course of their work.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yes. Thanks, Emma.

And just before I start on that, I would say that I'm in general agreement, actually, with some of the, you know, previous comments and really interested in some of the reflections and certainly that idea of kind of ecosystem and change in the focus in policing is certainly something that, in Scotland, has been driven forward and actually changing the model towards focusing on community safety. And I was quite interested in Chris' comment about the police as the public and the public as the police because it's something that when, you know, you think about kind of community policing, the principles are still, I think, relevant specifically to that idea about community engagement and welfare.

And certainly, you know, I think that's the approach that's currently driving forward Scottish policing where there is a real shift towards changing the thinking and working collaboratively. I mean, that was driven forward by the Christie Commission that was published in 2011 about setting aside a national framework for all agencies, not just police. It talks about that.

You know, I think that Amy's point about police not being at the centre is actually about all public services, you know, working collectively towards them -- you know, those kind of goals about kind of making Scotland a country which was focused on welfare, kind of human rights, social equality, social justice, so that ecosystem is really set up by that Commission.

It has taken some time, I think, for strategy agencies to work towards those goals, but you can certainly see evidence of it in some of the practical solutions that are now being taken by agencies like the police.

So you mentioned prevention first, so prevention first is just one example of the types of programs that are now being implemented to deal with sort of community issues. Prevent first was an initiative that myself and a team evaluated. It was adopted from principles that were taken by the New Zealand police and it was approached where prevention -- it was about prevention rather than cure, so actually trying to resolve community issues like antisocial behaviour and violence in areas where these problems were increasing and they were having a huge impact on the community.

So the prevention first approach meant agencies within local partnerships working together to try and prevent issues from escalating against -- yeah, I think it was Jamie that mentioned about trying not to use a criminal approach, not criminalizing people, but actually trying to kind of deal with it.

So I'll give you an example that maybe try to illustrate this well.

So you might have a problematic neighbour or, you know, in a community or a neighbourhood, maybe a young person that has come through the care system. They've then been placed in a community. It's the first time they've kind of been in a home on their own but, as a result of that, they're not really used to, you know, understanding what it means to be part of a community, so you know, they're having parties all the time, what we could call a party flat within the community.

And the sort of previous response by the police would probably be to, you know, give that person an antisocial behaviour disorder that would then criminalize them. They maybe get a police caution. But through the prevention first approach, it was very much about actually working with housing authorities, social work to speak to the young person, put a plan in place and also working to, you know, develop community relations with that person, putting them in touch with maybe community representatives so they could understand what act their action was causing or the problems their action was maybe causing for the local community.

So it was much more of a partnership approach to those types of issues, and that was just one example where, you know, there's many of those issues

again around trying to support people through a partnership and community approach. That's what prevention first did, and it led to reduction in antisocial behaviour, improved community relations, and certainly it's now those types of initiatives that are being driven forward with police in Scotland with a priority on prevention and the intersection between law enforcement and public health.

I hope that answers your question.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: It sure does, Denise. Thank you.

And I've got a follow-up, which is about the evaluation that you and your colleagues conducted. One of the things that's often observed about the challenges with the implementation of community policing is that outcomes can be difficult to measure, more difficult than the kinds of KPIs that more traditional policing is associated with.

How did you go about evaluating prevention first?

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: So I think you're right about the outcomes. I mean, for us and for previous sort of initiatives that I've evaluated, it's also -- it's always about not just understanding the KPIs or reductions in crime, but also trying to understand why things worked and why they worked in specific circumstances, so taking a very, what I would call realistic evaluation approach. I mean, this is an approach that's supported by people like Nick Tilley, who's quite a famous British academic, who has worked extensively in crime prevention, and the idea that actually it's not just about understanding why crime's reduced but about understanding why it's happened at that specific time.

So a lot of what we did within our evaluation was try to kind of capture these case studies. So I don't -- I don't think they're important to the file, but the report is about 200 pages long, and there's lots of definite kind of -- what we did is we tracked case studies. So yes, we looked at quantitative data, but we also used qualitative data and case studies to try and understand and unpack why things have

worked for, you know, specific people and in specific communities, and that also included consulting with the community to look at the changes they had experienced.

So the evaluation probably could have actually been longer. And I think that's one of the things that I would say about, you talking about outcomes, is I've learned from engaging in this type of work is there a need to actually evaluate these on a longitudinal basis. I think often, you know, we put changes or look at different ways to prevent, you know, issues within the community, but what we don't necessarily do is think about the longer term outcomes, and I think that's what we need to look at. And again, referring back to some of my colleagues comment about understanding how that changes relationships, understanding how that improves trust.

So something like public confidence, which is, again, something that we tend to look at in Scotland now, is actually trying to kind of measure public confidence, but again, not just by looking at data, but by gauging that with actually interacting with the community in different ways. So -- but I think that has to be sustained and it has to be done over the longer term.

So again, I hope that answers your question.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: It does, thank you, Denise. And Denise's report was not part of the roundtable package—you're quite right, Denise—but Commissioners, it will be tendered before you. It is part of the package that will be tendered.

Amy, if I can turn to you. The challenges of measuring program successes when you're engaged in community mobilisation and community engaged safety programs is something that you alluded to in our preparatory conversations. I wonder if you can elaborate on those challenges and perhaps build on some of what we've heard from Denise if you think it's appropriate.

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Sure. Thank you for the opportunity.

Yeah, I think one of the things that we have struggled with as we've tried to do things differently in the municipality is how do we demonstrate to funders,

sometimes, because a lot of this work is funded externally by grants, but also to our elected officials, that we are actually making a difference. And I think, you know, the fallback is often around using police-reported crime data, which we know can be useful in some situations, but definitely not for all situations.

And to do the kind of approach that Denise is recommending I think is the way that we need to go. I think it's also very difficult in the world we live in where, you know, whether it's funders or elected officials, you know, want to be able to see that what we're doing is actually making an impact in real-time.

So I do think it's -- I mean, I don't have the answer, but I think it's something that we really have to consider when we are looking at, you know, first, I guess, why we tend to rely on police for a response. I think because we can measure a difference in an acceptable standard. And secondly, you know, if we are doing things differently, what can we use as an acceptable way to demonstrate that we are really making a difference in community.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Many thanks, Amy.

Chris, in a section of the Commissioned report that you and Cal wrote, you refer -- you refer to community policing efforts or efforts to move towards community policing models between the 1970s and about 2000, and you note that one of the challenges was that community policing outcomes were vague, they were less tangible, and harder to measure than things like arrests or crime rates or calls for service and clearance rates. And you suggest that it was in part, this difficulty of measuring outcomes, that led to a decline in support for community policing models. Amy has obviously described grappling with similar challenges almost 20 years later, and Denise has offered us a, you know, model for thinking about those things, perhaps in a more holistic way.

How would you propose, on the basis of your work on community policing and your studies over many years, that we should review or seek to assess

program success in a way that might resonate with the elected officials, the decision-makers who provide direction about community policing or policing models?

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: That's a tough question. You know, one -- you know, measuring arrests and charges and clearances are not just -- I mean, they do represent important indicators to the public and to local officials of things that they place a priority on, so it's not simply an arbitrary kind of measure, but the less tangible aspects, such as community confidence, community safety, security, the collaborative efforts of the police tends to be something that isn't kind of documented. It isn't -- it's hard to measure, but it's possible to measure.

Doing community surveys, for instance, simply kind of paying attention to these activities and validating them within the culture of the police organisation gives them a certain legitimacy, and accepting the fact that, you know, these activities are good in themselves in the sense that meeting with the community, being involved in community programs, having a presence in the community outside of law enforcement activities, these are things that matter, and I think quantitative measurements is not relevant. You just have to establish those as values in the model of the police service, and when they are established and accepted then it seems to me when you kind of fulfill that mandate that's enough.

I mean, I don't know if that's a very strong answer, but it's just that the culture has been so narrowly focussed on enforcement, measurable kind of crime data, that these other aspects of what the police do, which is actually, statistically, in terms of time and effort, far more prevalent than the narrow focus on crime and enforcement, but is simply not kind of validated by the way police talk about what they do or the communities', you know, discussions around these issues.

So it's -- I don't have a really great answer to that, but it's expanding the culture beyond, like, the narrowness and the focus that it has now.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's a very helpful answer, Chris, thank you.

I think we have a couple of others who want to weigh in on this, but before I turn to them, I'm just going to ask you a follow-up because I want to make sure I hear you -- I'm hearing you correctly, Chris.

In a certain sense, I think Amy and Denise's responses were focussed on external evaluations of the success of approaches, and I'm hearing you also talk about the internal culture and the idea that that cliché, that what gets measured gets valued and that gets done.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: But you can't count it, it doesn't count.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Right. Yeah, yeah. And so do I hear you saying, you know, it's as much about changing that internal culture of what police internalise their role as being and how they measure them, how they get promoted, as it is about changing the external political culture of how we assess police performance? Is that a fair ---

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Yes. No, I think that's really what I was trying to say, and also, to some extent, changing the expectations. Because I think to some extent municipal government and police boards have also bought into that rather narrow notion of what the police should be doing, and they often hold the police accountable. Crime data and clearance rates are used to evaluate their impact, when in fact, if they do invest and energy in other activities that are not related to enforcement, it tends not to get the recognition or the validation that it needs from -- to whom they're accountable to.

So yeah, you're right, police need to expand their notion of what they do, actually to reflect what they do, hopefully. Yeah, so I'll just leave it at that.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you.

Cal, I understand you'd like to weigh in on this one too.

MR. CAL CORLEY: Yeah, just on this question of measurement, it's a recent rapid evidence review that I was looking at in another context, but it was looking at what works in terms of reducing fear of crime in communities. And this

looked at, you know, off the top of my head, probably 45 or 50 different significant reports. And surprisingly, it wasn't hotspot policing, it wasn't directed at patrols, it wasn't any of those really, you know, police action-oriented issues that were working. What they found worked better than anything else in reducing fear of crime in communities was community -- was communicating effectively with those communities.

So they talked about the importance of town halls, sitting down with community groups and having coffee, listening -- actively listening to their concerns. Whether there's any police response as a result of it didn't matter, but there was a direct relationship with reducing fear of crime and, correspondingly, what I found interesting, it also enhanced public trust and confidence in the police.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you.

MR. CAL CORLEY: Emma, I'll see if I can pull that up and I'll send it to you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank so much, Carl.

Yeah, I just made a note to follow up with you on that. We'd love to see a copy of that rapid evidence review. Thank you.

Hugh, do you have suggestions about how best to measure a program's success when it comes to community policing?

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. And thank you, all of you, for the comments you've made so far on this one.

I think one of the more important questions here is what are we measuring, and if we are truly trying to achieve the goals of safety and well-being in community, I think we have to get well beyond measuring the number of incidents to which police respond or the types of incidents to which police respond.

Beyond that, I would say that the data we have from all emergency responders, including Halifax's community mobilization teams, for example, are wonderful indicators of the broader problems we should be dealing with in a more preventive strategy, a more holistic, collaborative strategy. So that data is very

important less for evidence of effectiveness of community policing than indicators for what we should be dealing with in a much broader scale.

I want to go back to Cal's comment about progressive police leaders, and I certainly agree with him. I've met, talked to and appreciated the value of so many progressive leaders.

On the other hand, I think their goals of collaboration and, to pick up on the very recent comment about communication and so on, while admirable, are stymied by a broader structure that we have set up in society that means other agencies don't really collaborate well. After all, why do you think all agencies and technical areas use acronyms? It's so that nobody else will know what they're doing.

The thought of collaborating, of partnering, of sharing information, not just competing for scarce resources, but melding those resources for a common goal for Amy's community at the centre of this whole thing is anathema in the broader context that we have established.

One other point, and this goes to the Police Services Board comment that Chris made. I believe it's the scholar -- the legal scholar Kent Roach, who was just published about it's not enough to impose the expectation of reform on police. We have to get beyond police to governance, for example, in municipal governance, Police Services Boards, where we are outlining the expectations that we have of police.

And those groups have defaulted on this one forever because who wants to deal with all that stuff. I'm oversimplifying and perhaps not being just in reflecting on them, but I am suggesting that we have to now bite that challenge and say, "How would we govern policing differently? What new descriptions should we prescribe for what police do?". And even more significantly, "How do we engage all those other agencies, organizations, community groups in a constructive collaborative to reduce the causes of crime and social disorders so that police response is more appropriate and affordable?".

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Hugh.

And you've just set us up beautifully, I think, for a couple of roundtables we have coming up tomorrow on the structure of policing in Nova Scotia. And on the 14th of September we'll be joined by Professor Roach and others to talk about oversight, including governance, in Canada.

Mark, if I could please turn to you. I understand you'd like to weigh in on this one.

CHIEF MARK KANE: Yeah, I -- you know, collaborative policing has always been at my heart because I really do believe in principles that we are the community and the community are us.

And I look at the -- you know, when we talk about programs where we're -- we say do we measure success because we get to a number, and I'm one of those that said I've seen many early intervention programs where you take a youth who's been involved in crime and you suddenly get them involved in an education course so they're no longer involved in crime. Had they stayed in, we would have had numbers that went look how much the crime's gone up because this person's involved, but we can't measure the success of that program when you see a young person getting involved, getting into the community, becoming a successful career and we forget that.

So when I look at -- when I look at these programs, we have to look at it from a different aspect.

We might not see the effects of a very successful program for five to 10 years. That's where the measure of it will come in because we'll see crime figures drop, and I think the investment of early intervention is a key aspect in this, having this be part of any sort of community group and having that discussion and sometimes handing over -- not having the police being the centre of all, having that handed over but we're a partner. And I think that's the key word here, is partnerships.

And I said it last week. One of the things I said last week was presence and visibility equals accountability and trust. And that doesn't mean presence and visibility on the street. I'm talking about presence and visibility at meetings, at the table when we're talking about roundtable discussions on the future in an area.

Another example I can give you is the task force that I run was very different because it was different aspects of different levels of government, different community groups where the police were being called to a nightclub for six months, six months before this group was up and running.

We as a group went in and this place, we found, was running illegally. It was shut down, so the police were no longer responding but, more importantly, the businesses that it impacted were able to go back to having their normal business days and the community that it impacted around because the police were always there, there was disorder and everything else, it relaxed down.

So you can't measure the success of that group based on the fact that the police weren't going back. The success was that the businesses around had a greater environment to work from, there was less time because seven different agencies are looking at the same problem business but not speaking to one another, but what we discovered there was the key aspect, which is the governance and operational piece.

I think a lot of times when we look at the community programs that we do, we put people in there to run in a group but they can't make an operational or a governance decision because they're not the decision-makers, so I think if we are involved in these things we need to have the governance piece and the operational piece and we need to talk together to make these programs successful and to make it successful in the community.

So that's where I'll leave it. I'll leave it back to these subject matter experts, but I just wanted to sort of put some context in it for what I've seen as success.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing that example, Mark.

Commissioners, I'm about to move to a new topic. I wonder if this is an appropriate time for a break.

Shall I suggest that we regroup at five past 11:00 Atlantic?

Thank you.

--- Upon breaking at 10:48 a.m.

--- Upon resuming at 11:06 a.m.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Welcome back, everybody.

We're about to turn to the expert report titled "Community Engaged Rural Policing and the Case for Reform and Innovation in Rural RCMP Policing" that Chris and Cal have co-authored. Before I do so though, I'd like to remind the round table members that our proceedings are being simultaneously translated into French and sign language as well as subtitled, and so just invite you, if you can remember to do so, please, to speak slowly for the benefit of our accessibility partners.

If I can now turn to your report, Cal and Chris, and I'll just pick up on a few highlights or aspects that we may want to expand on in our proceedings today. Cal, if I can start with you, in the report, you and Chris recount the history of uptake of community policing in the contract policing business line of the RCMP and the manner in which that decision was taken and implemented. I wonder if you can share your perspective on how the RCMP's approach to leadership and internal structure influenced the rollout of community policing when it was first embraced by the RCMP?

MR. CAL CORLEY: Yes, certainly. I can remember when that happened, and it was a policy statement, or a directive rather, that came out of the Commissioner's office in Ottawa announcing that henceforth community policing would be the philosophy. One of the directions at the time was that detachment commanders were to establish -- like, one of the -- part of the directive was the detachment commanders were to establish community consultative groups. And I know locally,

during that period, there was a lot of concern. A), there was the sense that what's this about, we've been doing this for -- you know, as Chris pointed out earlier, we've been doing this for a hundred years so to speak. And really, a lot of angst in terms of how to go about this. So there was little by way of support as I recall came with that.

It wasn't until -- so it -- there was pockets certainly where things went well, and communities were engaged. It was highly dependent on the characteristics or the -- particularly leanings of the detachment commander and key personnel therein. It wasn't until a few years later, I believe it was around 1993, Assistant Commissioner Cleve Cooper was appointed by the senior executive to assume the roll of rolling out community policing in a more rigorous and thoughtful way. And so Cleve assembled a team of some very passionate, committed people. There were pilot projects. Burnaby was one of them. I just forget the other locations off the top of my head. But they really set out with a thoughtful process of trying to inculcate community policing into the culture and roll it out.

In terms of training, it wasn't until I believe 1995 that the training at Depot Division, the cadet training, recruit training, was adapted to the community policing realm, and so began that.

In terms of some of the challenges with it, and I go back a number of years now, I can remember being at Depot and a particular conversation with, you know, some senior people there, and a question I asked was, you know, what are we producing here. And, you know, the answer was, we're producing, you know, community-oriented police that are going to go out and practice community policing. And interestingly, you know, one of those evenings, I happened to be finishing dinner and a group of five or six cadets were around, and by virtue of what they were wearing, I could tell that they were close to their graduations. And, of course, in the RCMP, unlike the Ontario Police College, you don't have an immediate sense of where all they're going, so I was interested where are you all going. And then my next question was, so what are you looking forward to when you get there. And the answer invariably

was we want to get out there and put bad guys in jail. So it's that disconnect between organizational institutionally what sometimes the organization believes -- and this isn't unique to the RCMP at all. I've had these same conversations at some of our other learning institutions, you know, cadet programs. But the rollout of community policing, I think as Chris would attest and certainly Hugh and Sulaimon, was something that as an organizing philosophy has never really taken root in most police organizations. I think most will say, absolutely, we -- you know, that's our central organizing philosophy, but it hasn't engrained in the culture. Police culture in Canada largely, and certainly the RCMP, is one that places much greater value on the functions of criminal investigations, criminal intelligence and enforcement than on those other aspects, the softer aspects. There's Angela Workman-Stark, a former RCMP chief superintendent who went on and did her PhD characterizes it as there's a disinclination towards these "more feminine" aspects of policing.

So, yeah, I think that can get us started anyways, Emma.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Yeah, it certainly can. Thank you, Cal.

One of the things that you and Chris reflect on in your report is the importance of engaging frontline police and those police who are tasked with delivering policing services in a transformative change of the kind that community policing entails. And I wonder if you can speak a little bit actually to the transforming project that you were involved in in your time at RCMP, but also and why that's so important. Why is it important that a change like this not simply be talked out?

MR. CAL CORLEY: Right. And first, and I should acknowledge, right at the outset, the thousands of men and women, you know, both today and over recent decades, that are and have served their communities with absolute pride and devotion. This is about the institution and the leadership culture within the RCMP, about its need to reform, so that those men and women that are serving at the front lines are equipped to organize and supported by 21st century organizations. So I just

want to make that clear, this is absolutely in support of those men and women, I think our paper, our thinking on this, and we just want to acknowledge that.

The alignment initiative I think what you're speaking about was approximately 1998 to 2000. And the objective of that was to really align the culture, key systems and processes within the RCMP to respond and adapt to a rapidly evolving external operating environment that had lagged over time. And, in fact, you know, the RCMP at that point had seen, you know, probably a decade and a half of significant changes they were outpacing its ability to adapt. And that particular process built on previous reform initiatives. There was one called project renewal. There was another that was about engaging. And in fact, out of the, you know, then approximately 30,000 employees in the RCMP engaged actively, close to 6,000 of them in a shared mission vision of values initiative that was -- that culminated in a meeting of the staff relations reps, the senior executive and senior managers from across Canada.

And really, that was a very bottom-up process. It was very engaging. So this alignment initiative was acting up on these previous parts.

It wasn't about the finances, although those that, you know, the parochial interests, let's say, or some of the parochial interests inside certainly tried to turn it into this. It was all about finances, but it was very much about -- and the vision, I think, that Commissioner Murray of the day had was an organization where there'd be more shared leadership. It was a recognition that the command and control culture, the vestiges of that that still remained in many of the systems that keep processes and practices and of the organization, indeed its culture, were incompatible with where the organization needed to go and that while command and control systems, et cetera, were very necessary for about five percent of, you know, what police do on a day to day basis, it was incompatible with kind of problem solving and collective problem solving that the police needed to do, not only amongst themselves, but those community partners and other agencies.

The initiative involved, I believe it was eight key working group. We had about, as I say, there were about six or seven hundred employees across the RCMP that were actively engaged at all levels and ranks and such. We had a corresponding -- so if we thought of this as an accounting book, the right-hand column would be these, you know, eight committees doing tremendous work around issues like the role of headquarters. The role of headquarters in an organization the size and scope with a broad mandate such as the RCMP, what was that role in contracting policing versus federal policing? There was another which was around the role of federal policing, should it be something that was removed from ambit of our responsibility of the commanding officers in a more centralized federal service.

As it pertained to contract policing, was there an opportunity to decentralize much, much more in support of that? And there were others, human resources, staffing, et cetera, et cetera.

So that was on the one side of the equation. So it laid a sense of a vision of a sense of urgency around those and certainly was visible.

On the other side of the equation is work that we did and both internal or some external key players. Edward Aust, formerly with Stikeman Elliot in Montreal was a key advisor to the Commission and senior executive. And there was a lot of work done with the senior executive of the RCMP in terms of what was the role of a contemporary executive cadre in leading an organization of the size and scope of the RCMP.

And so this was the work that was less apparent, but very important.

I thought it was interesting, I can recall some of the challenges, and one Deputy Commissioner in particular who -- and the openness that he came to have amongst colleagues around the table where in, you know, an intimate setting, and he shared that he really struggled with this, you know, directional executive level function to the extent that the strategic elements of that role ran counter to what he'd grown up to

do, which was what gave him satisfaction physiologically every day. As he put it, he liked to make 15, you know, red snapper decisions every day, and that gave him a level of satisfaction. recognizing that that's, you know, something that belongs lower in the totem pole of the organization and that at that level it's more directional, it's more about engaging, et cetera, et cetera.

So these two bodies of work came together. There were a lot of significant challenges. The culture, the culture of the RCMP is certainly one of them. It's been an organization that's been historically very slow to adapt to its external environment. There's an institutional culture that has been rather closed over many years.

As Christian Leuprecht noted in one of his reports in 2017, he had an annex to it with 41 pages of recommendations, external recommendations for change in the RCMP over the last decade or two, many of which, both he and others have acknowledged, have not been attended to.

The alignment initiative, as I said earlier, we succeeded in some things in terms of opening a lot of eyes, but I would say in the main, it fell short of its objectives. The institutional culture is more powerful than any single leader, any single group of leaders. And I think the central question that, you know, we tried to address in this report was why has the RCMP not adapted more? And we really tried to focus on that because looking forward, that's at the heart of all of this.

So I'll maybe leave it with that in answering the questions.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Cal, thank you very much for sharing your experience in that regard. And, Commissioners, for your benefit, the Leuprecht 2017 paper that Cal refers to is a report for Macdonald-Laurier Institute. It's cited in Corley and Murphy and we'll make sure that a copy of it is made available.

Cal, if I can just pick up on -- I know it's present, of course, within your report, but before I turn to Chris, just one last question for you. What are the key lessons that you would share on the basis of your experience with the Commission and

the Participants about the things that should be accounted for in any efforts to change the institutional culture to which you have alluded?

MR. CAL CORLEY: I mean, that's the $99,000 question. You know, back to, you know, why has this organization struggled to adapt? In fact, it hasn't struggled. It's actually been quite successful over the years, given its closed culture, given the power of the police, so to speak, vis-a-vie those in governance. There's that inside knowledge, et cetera, inside baseball knowledge that helps sustain that.

There's a multitude of factors that I think are at play, but at its heart, number one, it's deeper in paramilitary culture that continues to permeate the organizational culture today.

Secondly, I'd say would be a lack of transformational leadership competence. That would include the ability to work with others to develop a shared vision, to assemble a change capable team, develop a sense of urgency, and ultimately to execute on strategy.

Thirdly -- and I'll come back on that one in a moment. Thirdly, I'd say it's a lack of diverse experiences upon which the organization can build and enhance problem solving and decision-making capabilities.

And it's not that the RCMP, historically, at least in the last, you know, 20 years, has lacked diversity. I mean, we look at the organization. There's more women, there's more people of colour, more Indigenous Canadians involved, et cetera. But -- the organization has tended to hire a good cross-section of these folks, reflecting diversity in all its forms, including critical thinking skills. But it's been -- it's also -- and again, something that's not necessarily unique to the RCMP, but it hires that diversity and then we train it or otherwise culturize that diversity out of them.

That doesn't happen just at Depot. It happens over the course of one's early career. It becomes abundantly clear very early in one's career that to succeed, one should, above all else, conform with the existing cultural norms.

So there's been a lot written about that, but it's an issue that, you know, I can recall at one senior management team meeting where the Commissioner of the day talked about, you know, the aim is to hit a target of 50 percent representation of women. And part of the discussion that a few of us tried to bring forward was it's not about numbers, it's about is this an organization that people, you know, representing diverse communities, whether it's gender, race, or otherwise, can come in here and be who they are? That's where the value of diversity comes in.

So the RCMP has, for various reasons, been very successful over the years at lot of these demands for deeper change, whether we look at the Brown Task Force or others. And largely they've been successful, I'd say for two reasons, I'm going to come back to governance on this. One has been that there's a tendency in the organization to outline a list of all the things that need to be done, and take on those that are low key fixes, and combine that series of low-key fixes that tend not to interfere with the prevailing culture of the organization, combine to do very little to address these more deeply-rooted issues and practices.

So in the main, I would say that the RCMP has also tended to focus too narrowly on refining some of its outdated structures, procedures, systems rather than, you know, work with others to reimagine and transform how the organization's structured and organized so that they can meet 21st century challenges and exigencies that are being demanded by communities around them.

I do a lot of work today with -- and in discussions with a few Mayors that have contracts with the RCMP that are, you know, quite concerned about these issues and that desire to have a different relationship with their local police service, but it all hinges on these issues, I think, just to discuss there.

I hope in there somewhere, Emma, I've answered your question.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: You did indeed. Thank you, Cal.

Chris, if I can turn to you, and I'm changing gears a little bit here. One of the things that you address in the course of your report is the social, political,

economic trends and issues that represent challenges in terms of the delivery of community engaged rural policing in Canada, and specifically for the RCMP.

I wonder if you can provide us with a summary of the trends that have made delivery of community engaged rural policing a real challenge for the RCMP, saliently to today, but more generally.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Well, I think it starts with the basic challenge in rural policing, and that is you're policing an environment that geographically is broad and population is relatively distributed throughout that area, which makes the whole issue of being visible, present, available and timely challenging for any police service.

Now, in the past, small towns and rural police services have been located in and from the communities they police, but over the years, because of the cost and also because of a desire to modernize, perhaps, local policing, we've moved to more amalgamated or regionalized policing and, in some cases, replacing local police with detachments of larger organizations, whether it's the OPP or the Quebec Provincial Police or the RCMP, extensively.

Now, that has also complicated the issue in the sense that we're now, in many cases, dealing with police who are not from an area, don't necessarily -- and in the RCMP's case, don't spend a lot of time in that area, and in a sense, in order to -- because it's also, frankly, more expensive to police rural areas to deliver the same level of police service. You have to, in some cases, have more police officers or, if you don't and can't afford them, then you have fewer police officers, which then makes the whole issue of resources critical in the delivery of police service.

The consequence for police is that they've started to centralize and withdraw, in a sense, their physical presence to more centralized areas and deliver those services more efficiently from their point of view to the areas with the resources that they have.

Well, this has led to, I think, a decline in their -- this ability and their presence in the area. People complain about slow response times. People don't know who the police are. You know, one argument is it's policing -- strangers policing strangers. And they tend to be limited because of the nature of policing to -- answering calls to service sometimes can take half an hour to an hour, which means you have limited time or interest, frankly, in spending time in this dispersed community of people so that you become more detached from the policing environment which you're responsible for delivering both not only enforcement, but preventive services.

So my argument, I guess, the argument I suggest is that we've got a limited kind of police service in rural areas as a result of all of these factors and the lack of physical presence and accessibility has meant people are less likely to report things, particularly issues of domestic nature or violence. They're less aware. Local knowledge is not -- doesn't inform police response and so the argument, I think we're trying to make here, is that we need to reorient some of those rural policing to be more community connected, more engaged, more present and more available, and there are various ways we've suggested that be done.

So I guess that's, I think, the answer to your question.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Chris.

And Commissioners and for the benefit of Participants and those who are viewing the roundtable, Chris and Cal, at the end of their report, go through three possible models of delivering rural policing in Nova Scotia and evaluate the pros and cons of each of those potential approaches.

For now I will move on, though, rather than asking you to speak to those, to the topic of community policing in marginalized communities.

So the next set of questions will really focus on the -- those communities that have historically been described as over-policed and underserved by policing agencies and the -- both the challenges, but also the possibilities of a

community policing model perhaps to address challenges with relationships with those communities that have arisen as a consequence.

Sulaimon, if I can please begin with you. In your research, you've explored both issues of systemic racism in policing and police relationships with 2SLGBTQ+ people as well as, of course, the overlap between those two communities, racialized, 2SLGBTQ+ people.

Can you please share with us what your research can tell us about the sources of stresses and strains in the relationships between those communities and the police who serve them and how models of community policing or other models of community safety might better respond to the needs and the community safety of those communities?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: Certainly. And please forgive me if I miss any part of your question. Perhaps you can repeat whichever part I did not answer.

I think that, yeah, you know, the issue with policing vis a vis racialized communities or indigenous communities and also 2SLGBTQ+ communities have been long standing, particularly when you think about the history of these communities' experiences vis a vis the states and how the human rights and the role that those individuals play within the communities are, for the longest time, being stymied by policies and regulations that have essentially curtailed their ability to live life freely, so I think a lot of the incidents that we've seen in the past have really shaped the ways in which these communities have come to experience policing in contemporary times.

It wasn't too long ago that we recently saw the Chief of Police -- the former Chief of Police in Toronto was apologizing for the police raids that happened back in the eighties and here, but we also saw that kind of cascading across the country in other places like in Montreal, even in Ottawa and also in ours as well, too.

So these have been incidents that have been long standing, and I think that all those experiences have shaped the ways in which the communities that

have come to either rely on the police or not rely on the police to offer a sense of safety and well-being for those communities.

And I think part of the challenges that we see, particularly when we think about community policing vis a vis how police interact with those communities, speaks back to the piece that I alluded to earlier, the notions of partnership, prevent, problem-solving and power sharing. And we see that, you know, again, the idea of community policing -- I mean, it's certainly been -- it hasn't necessarily taken hold firmly within police organizations to the extent where they can actually roll it out effectively within communities and in terms of their relationship with those communities, so when we're thinking about, you know, problem-solving as an example, again, when we link back to the historical experiences of racialized communities, when we link it back to the historical experiences of 2SLGBTQ+ communities, we can see how policing have been a detriment to the ability of those communities to be able to be themselves in authentic and in real ways that they want to be, and where that is not possible the logic of those communities reaching out to police as a -- as a resource and as a certain influence to be able to offer those kind of support is limited. And oftentimes those communities don't feel comfortable doing that because they see themselves as being likely victims of police perpetrations, of of enactment of power that, again, reinforces their -- those communities' sense of insecurities, reinforces those communities' sense of a displacement that in the sense that they don't belong in those community spaces.

So problem-solving has been -- has been a real issue. Even when we see concerns around, you know, violence that has been perpetrated against those communities, policing doesn't appear as a recourse or as a -- as a mechanism that those communities can actually rely on as a way to solve those issues. So we have an issue in terms of problem-solving in that regard.

We talked a lot about earlier around partnership, and the idea of power-sharing as also being possibilities that could emerge from quote/unquote, "community policing". But I also suggest that, you know, particularly when we think

about those two communities that I've been -- that I've been alluding to, these concepts or these ideas are also put into disrepute because of the fact that, you know, the idea of power-sharing requires on some level a commitment and a willingness on the part of police to be able to take stock of their own privileges and their own power and how that actually cascades and manifests itself within the community around. And it also means for police to be able to take stock of what kind of power are they prepared to give up to the community to be true actors and players in the game of community safety and well-being.

And I would suggest that I think that there is still this tension in community police relations in terms of negotiating how much of those power police are committed -- are willing to give up and how much they're not willing to give up. And I would even argue that I think that police, particularly when we think about it in the realm of -- in the sense of community policing, that police necessarily see themselves as being committed to or willing to give up power because then again it brings into question of their own place and role within the idea of community policing and community safety.

And similarly, partnership I think goes hand in hand with the notions of, you know, power-sharing, and then also the prevention of crimes that, again, these communities are subjected to, that, you know, there isn't a sense of a commitment on the part of police again to be able to want to partner with community-based organisations or partner with community groups that may have different opinion and perspective to the ways in which police have traditionally worked. And then that this also creates a bit of a tension within the relationship between those two groups that policemen maybe stuck in their old ways or traditional ways of doing things and not necessarily open to the possibilities of actually moving themselves beyond just the way they have envisioned, you know, providing safety and security to communities.

So I think that answers -- perhaps answers one part of your question, but ---

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: It does, Sulaimon, thank you. And I'll jump in with a couple of follow ups if that's all right.

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: Okay. No worries.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: The first is what would a robust model of power-sharing look like for you?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: For me, I think that the beginning point of having a conversation about power-sharing would be to have a meaningful discourse or a dialogue between community and African -- between the police and African communities around what the issue is that is bringing those two parties together, and I think from that point we can begin to identify some of the commonalities or ground that -- or commonalities or ground that police and the communities can begin to actually identify some of the important activities and work that needs to be done to begin to address those issues that have been -- that have been identified, both on the community level, but also on the part of the police.

Because I think, ultimately, community policing is not so much about shifting the pendulum to one side to, say, community, for example, and then all focussing on policing, as an example, but it's actually the meeting ground, the nexus, as I said earlier, the meeting ground where police and community are coming together to find commonalities in terms of what they can do collectively to be able to address a -- an issue. And I think what we -- once we have a sense of that clarity of the issue and -- that is important to the community but is also important to the police, we can begin to develop ground rules or expectations in terms of what the police can do and what the -- and the community can do in terms of beginning to develop a sort of a social contract that will guide the activities and the work that will need to happen, and I think there's a element of shared responsibility that also flows from that social contract in terms of how we go about doing that work.

So it really begins with having clear, transparent conversations between police and community around what the issues are, and then beginning to also

devise some strategic framework or practices that would also guide the work going forward in terms of what the police are prepared to do and what are some of the, again, the power that the police is willing to also divest to the community. And similarly, what are some of the responsibilities that the police -- the community is also willing to shoulder in terms of making sure that they are able address those issues collectively and in a way that moves the agenda forward, but not necessarily burden the community beyond some of the challenges and the concerns that they are already going through, but similarly, doesn't necessarily centre police as being the arbiter or the -- or as having the monopoly over, you know, crime and social disorder and control in the communities.

So I think that's for me what a community, safety, well-being kind of plan would look like.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you. And if we can turn to the example provided by the case or the series of murders that led to the Toronto Missing Persons Inquiry and your report in that Commission. Your report details challenges in the relationship between police and racialized communities, with police and 2SLGBTQ communities, and those who are racialized, and 2SLGBTQ, that made -- that were significant in the way in which that case was handled and the rapidity with which the serial killings were recognised as serial killings and responded to as such. What are the lessons that you drew from your work in that Commission about the potential for a different relationship, a different way forward?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: I think the lessons that I drew from the -- from my work with the Commission and the report that was produced was really about trying to get police to recognise some of the longstanding issues that the communities have been facing. To recognise that the enactment of policing has been done in a way that have not been responsive to the needs of community members on an equal footing. That there are certain community members, community groups within our society that have the benefit and the privilege of policing in ways that responds completely to some of the challenges and the means that they have identified, and when it concerns groups

that are on the periphery of society that are marginalised within societies and mainstream, that the same level of accountability and responsibility in terms of how we ensure safety and security for those individuals are difficult to combine. And I think that the report was articulating quite strongly the need for police to take accountability for that, to be responsive to that, to those challenges, to see in a -- in an intersectional fashion, you know, the complexities of the communities that we are dealing with.

You know, we might think of the LGBTQ2S+ community as being just that, but within that category are also people whose lives and identities are also cross-intersecting, you know, they are overlapping in significant ways that I think that the murders of the gay men that were really leading that Commission -- Commission's work were actually really pointing us to, you know, particularly when we think about the cross-sections of immigration status, when we think about, you know -- you know, some of them engaging in perhaps sex works as well, the precarity of the -- of the lives that those men were living put them in a situation where they were then become -- they were -- there was -- they became victims of an individual who really wanted to do them harm and to do that community harm.

And I think that the lesson that we were hearing -- that the report was trying to gesture us to was that, you know, we need to be doing better in terms of, one, how we communicate to communities that are marginalised and are at the periphery of society, how we communicate to those communities that we actually care about, the issues that are of importance to them, and that we want to pay attention and we want to know more about how we can effectively work with those communities. That we recognise that as an institution that we haven't been esponsive for the longest time on this issue and we are prepared to do better. And then also articulating clearly and concretely what better means in terms of how police go about making sure that what we've seen since 2010 to 2017 does not reoccur again in the future going forward.

So really, the report is about providing a voice to groups who are historically, and I would argue contemporarily, feels that their voice haven't necessarily

been heard in ways that they want police to hear them. And I think many of the community safety, while being kind of notions that we are pointing to and, you know, some of those activists, community activists are pointing us to are a result of this longstanding sense of being ignored and their voice not being really heard. And I think that that's really the -- for me, anyway, the ultimate lessons that I think that the report tries to bring forward.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much.

Commissioners, Professor Giwa's report for the missing person inquiry is being tendered before you. And the Honourable Gloria Epstein's report, which is poignantly titled "Missing and Missed", forms part of our environmental scan.

Jamie, if I can turn to you, your work considers the experiences, the lived experience of those who have experienced mental health crisis or substance use challenges, including their relationships with police and their experiences with police. What would you say to build on what we've already heard from Sulaimon about the challenges of these populations who are disproportionately likely of course to be criminalized as a result of their health conditions, and the impediments that that produces with respect to building healthy and constructive relationships with police services?

DR. JAMIE LIVINGSTON: Thank you for that. I think it links also to the previous two questions that you have. And so one of the earlier questions was about measuring police effectiveness and police outcomes. And certainly, trust and legitimacy are important things to attend to and confidence in police, especially the things that erode trust and police and the legitimacy in policing. And certainly, on the top of the list of things that erode those things are discriminatory police practices, excessive use of police force, fatal shootings of police, and these things are important to kind of acknowledge and to recognize. But more importantly are the steps that police take to work with community to create a plan to address those -- the harms that are created through things like fatal police shootings, which disproportionally involve people

who are in mental health crisis, and especially if those people are black, racialized or indigenous.

So how have police acknowledged and taken accountability for the harms that have been created? So we've been talking for most of this round table as police vehicles for safety, but that's not always the case and not always the experience for many people in community. So taking accountability and then what steps have they taken to collaborate with community to create plans to address the harm and prevent it, but also creating transparency to report on the progress that they're making in relation to addressing those harms and improving the relationships with communities. In my own work around people who are in mental health crises, you see decades of dozens of coroner's inquests after the fatal police shooting of someone in distress, and what you see is a lack of action of policing in relation to addressing the recommendations of coroner's inquest, whether or not that's on the municipal level or on the RCMP level. And that clearly affects people's willingness to reach out to police or reach out to services that have embedded police in their -- the help that they provide.

So, for instance, it makes people reluctant to call 9-1-1 if someone has overdosed, or if someone is in mental health crisis, or themselves are in mental health crises, out of worry and fear of what might happen during the interaction. More often than not, and especially in rural communities, it's police that's attending to these incidents. And often in rural communities, it's police that are not well prepared to de-escalate crisis situations. And so with all of that, it really has, certainly after the killing of George Floyd and the subsequent, you know, energy from the Black Lives Matter Movement, has caused communities to think hard around how to properly meet the needs of people who are in crisis in ways that don't escalate the crisis and in ways that don't cause further harm for people. And for me, it's a matter of, like, health equity, so creating services in which everyone, regardless of their experiences with the police, have -- feel safe in accessing services including healthcare services. And those are kind of the principles upon which these programs are being developed, these

community response programs for mental health crisis programs in which communities are being refunded.

So I should mention that it's been over several decades that communities have defunded in relation to their ability to meet the needs of community members, whether or not that's housing, family supports, recreational opportunities, or healthcare services. And so all of these initiatives are about refunding communities and helping reskill communities to address the needs of members within their communities, especially the needs of people who -- and are in various forms of social crisis have different types of social needs, but also people who are in mental health crisis.

And some of these programs have been around for a few decades, very few of them, but most of them have been developed since 2020 and are really demonstrating the ability, if you provide the right support of communities, and police kind of find their own role in relation to these community programs, the ability of these programs to attend to crisis situations and to people in crisis that are very constructive and align with the best practices of how to meet the needs of people in crisis. So there's a lot of, like, opportunity and promise in relation to these new models.

A recent research study out of Denver, Colorado has shown how the program they developed in 2020 has led to a 35 percent reduction in crime, low levels of crime, and the communities that are served by the civilian -- these civilian teams. And what that shows is the potential for these types of programs to reduce criminalization, tying to some of the other comments, in which police play a role in criminalizing certain events and situations and certain groups unnecessarily and in inappropriate ways, when those needs can be more appropriately met by community members.

I believe the Defund the Police report that was tabled eight months ago at the Halifax Board of Police Commissioners was shared as part of our package, and that highlights a chapter on mental health crises, but it also highlights a number of

other areas in which communities are trying to kind of build capacity to meet people's needs in ways that doesn't depend or rely on the police.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Jamie. And just to pick up on you're quite right, for one thing, that the Halifax Regional Municipality Defund Report was previously tendered in our process, Commissioners, in relation to our critical incident round tables in early June and is -- forms part of the round table package again today.

Jamie, if I can pick up on -- I want to make sure that I understand and am accurately characterizing one aspect of your reply, do I understand it that part of the dynamic that you and others are recognizing is that the shrinking of community mental health services and responses has, to a certain extent, driven police as first responders in circumstances of mental health crisis, and that many of the programs that you allude to, which have sprung up all the more so since 2020 are attempting to alter that balance, to provide an alternative which means that it's not the police who are necessarily tasked with first response. Is that a fair characterization?

DR. JAMIE LIVINGSTON: Yeah, absolutely. It's kind of -- it's about redistributing resources but also power, so empowering communities such that they are -- they build capacity to respond to people who are distressed because of housing instability, because of poverty, because of mental health crises, because of they're in a family conflict and that sort of thing. And so communities are -- municipalities are finding different ways to allocate more resources. In the mental health space, this has been existing as a kind of product of the institutionalization movement in which rapid closures of psychiatric hospitals led to people being pushed into communities and those communities not being sufficiently resourced or prepared to meet the needs of people who have mental illnesses and mental health needs.

And that's -- and then not only was that the state 50 years ago, but through austerity measures and various policies, those services are even more slim

now, such that people have to wait months and months, even years to access mental health services.

Meanwhile, there -- a crisis is percolating and that crisis isn't being addressed early enough or in a sufficient or appropriate way.

So that's what these programs are about, it's about, like, the primary prevention piece. So how to get two people who have needs that -- mental health needs that require some support, and bringing those people who have the skills, like crisis workers, and clinicians, and et cetera, to those people in a mobile type of way, and to link them to appropriate services in ways that the police don't have the capacity to do.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much. And I'll follow up with you after the roundtable today about the Denver study, as I think it would be interesting for the Commission and some Participants to see it.

I wonder if we could bring the conversation home though for a moment to Nova Scotia and to the approaches presently being taken in Nova Scotia?

Jamie, what's your sense of the quality and robustness of Nova Scotia's approach to mental health crisis response? And particularly, I'll turn to Amy in a moment on the HRM front, but actually I'm particularly interested in any reflections you might share with respect to the rural and small-town parts of Nova Scotia?

DR. JAMIE LIVINGSTON: Frankly, it's terrible. When you look at what's required for a functional and effective mental health crisis service system and the components that are required within that system, hardly any communities have one element of that continuum of services that's required. So what that means is that people are in situations with no support and very little access to support.

So in our rural communities, it's -- police are our mobile crisis response and our emergency rooms are a mobile crisis system. And that's not a functional continuum of crisis services and it really puts people who have mental health

needs in really terrible situations that escalate -- and can escalate into criminal situations, when that's unnecessary.

I'm working with a group in West Hants to develop a grant in which we're looking to increase the capacity of their community to build civilian services to meet the needs of people -- young people who are experiencing mental health crisis in a way that's trauma informed, that follows harm reduction principles, and all of those goods sorts of things, and in ways that don't involve the police.

And other rural communities in other areas are doing this sort of thing. P.E.I. even established a mobile crisis service that involves clinicians being dispatched to mental crisis calls, rather than the police.

So quite frankly, we're really far behind here in Nova Scotia compared to other jurisdictions in ways that create a whole bunch of terrible situations for families, for young people, and for adults with mental health issues.

I guess one of the strengths that we have is that we have access to a provincial mental health crisis line that's province wide and accessible to anyone, where they can get phone-based services by mental health professionals.

There's some questions about the quality of services that people receive when they call that crisis line, but beyond that, there's very little that exists within our rural communities for people with mental health needs.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for explaining that.

Amy, if I could turn, please, to you? Of course, we were just discussing mental health services, but Sulaimon also referred to examples of other marginalized communities who may feel somewhat alienated from police services.

How is your office working to engage marginalized communities in your public safety strategy and what's the role of communities in really leading this work?

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Certainly. Thank you for the question.

So back in 2016, HRM saw a spike in gun related violence, in particularly communities in the north end of Halifax, but also in the Preston communities. So these are marginalized communities primarily made up of African Nova Scotian folks.

And so some of my colleagues, this work predated my work with the municipality, but some of my colleagues went door to door asking community what we could do differently, what we needed to do differently, and out of that came this concept: Initiative Public Community Mobilization Teams. And so my office has taken a lead on that and the work is funded through a grant from the Department of Justice and locally, provincially.

And really, what it is, is based on the premise that when a violent or traumatic incident happens in community, it not only impacts those immediately or directly involved, but it impacts the whole community and we need to respond accordingly. You know, what traditionally happens is something happens in a community, police come in and do their bit, maybe other first responders come in and do their bit, and then everyone goes home, but the community is left with the trauma from that incident.

And so that's really what the community mobilization team is about, is working with community at that level of addressing the trauma. And so there's three ways we try and do that. and the first is through crisis prevention. So here it's about developing and enhancing those local safety networks to really build resilience. It's also about community -- sorry, communication. One of the things that I heard in the previous discussion was, you know, this differing world view between what police see as truth and what's happened and what community is experiencing and happening.

And as a convener of those two groups over a few years now, I really see the disconnect between those two world views. And a part of that work that we do with community mobilization is really trying to break down the different ways of knowing and experiencing the world and helping those sides to see each other, and

also, you know, recognizing the power imbalances. You know, this was alluded to before, but, you know, some of the ways that police knowledge is seen as more truthful would be in the ways that it's validated through statistics, and measurements, and outcomes in a way that community knowledge and community worldviews aren't. So trying to rectify that.

So that's the prevention stuff. The preparation is really around -- you know, Jamie talked about rescaling communities. So we work with our CMTs doing things like critical incident stress management training, because we know that often it's community that's the first to respond to an incident and they don't have that training that allows them to process, you know, what's happening, what happened, the vicarious trauma, the compassion fatigue. All of those things that come along with those types of violent or traumatic incidents.

Also things like mental health first aid assist. So applied suicide intervention training, non-violence crisis intervention. So kind of working with the community on training them to have some of the skills that we know help better prepare when an incident does happen.

And the third thing is response. And so we work with community and with other partners to develop a protocol on how we would respond to an incident. So recognizing there's a role for different players in a response, but some of the things -- and it's very, you know, focused -- led by community and focused on what that specific community's needs are, but, you know, some of the things we would do is we would invite police to provide a briefing to community. So, you know, we know there's things you can't share, but what can you tell us? A lot of the anxiety that community experiences in a critical incident comes from not knowing, and even not knowing what kind of response to expect from police. So, you know, talking about, you know, "We're bringing in carbines because this is the protocol that we have as police," so community expects that kind of response and they're not thinking that, you know, they're getting

that response because they're marginalized, because they're racialized, that that's how police would respond in any community given that incident.

So a briefing, and also importantly, a debriefing. So coming together as a community to talk about what happened and how it made us feel, and making sure that there's -- that police -- but other members of community are present to hear that, and then working with, you know, the information that we gleaned from those debriefings to help address, you know, the trauma that emerges from those incidents.

So, you know, it's a work in progress. It's funded by a grant that will end and, you know, we're working on trying to measure how we can show that this is, you know, a promising way to address community needs in the wake of a critical incident, but, you know. We've had good feedback and, you know, a lot of things that we hear both from police, also from community partners, is that it really is working to rebuild and repair some of the harms that have come from, you know, some of the things that Jamie and others have -- had addressed this morning, so.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing that experience, Amy.

And for what it's worth, your comment -- your passing comment about the grant funding which will end resonates with something we've heard a lot and particularly, actually, more so with respect to rural communities and initiatives in rural communities that the resources and the human capital necessary to apply, to report, to ask for more money, you've acknowledged that money will go away.

In our preparatory conversation, you compared that approach to the funding model for policing. I wonder if you can elaborate a little bit on how that can create a challenging dynamic in the work that you're doing.

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Sure. Thank you.

Yeah, I think, you know, it's difficult when we have maybe more creative or local approaches to community safety that are project-based, not core

funded-based, and rely on a specific set of metrics sometimes in order to demonstrate their effectiveness because, you know, there's a number of problems.

One is that, you know, it's -- well, I'd say the most important problem would be that when the funding ends, if it's coming from an external grant unless we can demonstrate the need, the program will -- or demonstrate the effectiveness, the program will often end and regardless of who's responsible for bringing that money to community, the folks who are working in community like myself are -- you know, it's our problem because we are the ones with the relationship and the -- we're working right alongside with community.

And you know, community shouldn't be expected to know which funding comes from what stream or what level of government, but they -- I believe they should -- you know, if they're coming to the table and working with us that they should know that we're committed for the long haul in this work. Much like, you know, police are core funded, community-based safety needs to be core funded in order for it to, you know, sustain those good relationships and work effectively.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's tremendously helpful. Thank you very much.

Denise, if I can turn to you, one of the core commitments, as I understand it, of the Scottish government across government, not only for policing, is a commitment to equality and to advancing equality and to measuring advancements in equality.

How has the approach that's been adopted by Police Scotland to a different mode of policing contributed to those equality objectives?

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Sorry, Emma, I'm just trying to -- could you just rephrase the question? Sorry.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Of course. Absolutely.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: It was quite a long question.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: No, indeed, and it's quite a long session, so.

So really, I'm asking you for some examples or some illustrations of the ways in which the model of policing that Scotland Police have now moved to has helped to advance equality and inclusion within Scottish society so, for example, for marginalized communities such as those that we've heard about, those who suffer from mental health challenges, racialized communities and so on.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yeah. I mean, I think for the -- I mean, again, I'll use the example of kind of prevention first.

And I think -- I mean, it's probably easy to see like all police forces -- I think Scotland, you know, has, obviously, experienced very similar issues with -- and challenges of working collectively with marginalized communities, so you know, those issues have certainly been raised in the past. But I think for the intention of some of the -- or the shift in thinking underpinned by the National Performance Framework is about equality and social justice, and that informs or underpins everything, I think, that, you know -- not just policing, but agencies overall are trying to achieve.

So I think it, you know, incorporates a state of kind of core values within the National Performance Framework that then all agencies, including police, have to adhere to. And I think that's the shift of thinking.

And again, I think that informs the way that initiatives are directed. It's incorporated into learning and development and -- of police officers.

So again, an example I was given in -- just last week, I was actually at the police college and I was invited to be part of a panel, and this was really to training for critical incident management. And it was actually based around equality, diversity and inclusion.

And as part of their training, I think what they've recognized is the need to ensure that community participation and external voices are heard even in the

development of kind of, you know, learning and development for officers, and particularly where they're involved in kind of critical incidents.

So I would say that's one way, and I think, again, embedding it within community engagement strategies, so a lot about some of -- like some of the examples that Amy was giving, ensuring that there's a community voice.

So again, for example, when there's a critical incident, not just making assumptions about what that approach should be, but ensuring that there's clear community engagement strategies from the outset to recognize the local context, you know, to ensure that there's an inclusive approach to all those communities.

So one of the examples that we were working on an incident the other day where there had been a murder -- quite a violent murder of an elderly lady who was really engaged in the community. This was a diverse community, students, you know, a high Asian population, but this incident had created a lot of fear.

And the Divisional Commander within that area had recognized that there was a need, you know, not just to deal with the investigation, the criminal investigation of that incident, but actually there was a need to think about the community. They brought the community officers who knew that local community from the outset, so I think -- and that was very similar within the prevention kind of first approach, was making sure that those on the front lines or the frontline practitioners who would engage with the community are brought in from the outset, but also an awareness that they have a critical role and that they are the ones that have the local knowledge.

So you know, you have people who are experienced in the investigation -- the criminal investigation part, but actually, you do need to value those members of your team who have those local connections and can be included within the community.

So I think it's taking a more holistic view. Rather than just being focused on the kind of operational investigative part of policing, it's actually thinking --

again, going back to what we started off the conversation of, taking a much more holistic approach and thinking about those broader ecosystems. And as the participants in this sort of suggested, not just throwing their yellow jackets at it and then withdrawing them when the investigation's done, but actually they planned on a sort of 12-month, you know, community engagement strategy so it was post-incident, and it continued where community officers, you know, continued to meet with the community and then, you know, at critical times where there might be vulnerabilities due to this incident, you know, they remained in that community to work with them to make sure they kind of go over the trauma of that, that really kind of violent incident that happened in their community.

So I hope that gives you a concrete example of the ways that I think Police Scotland are changing their approach and thinking more holistically.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: It certainly does, Denise. Thank you.

It's -- and it's very helpful to hear you articulate the ways in which that commitment to equality underpins the strategy and the training. And striking, I must say, from the perspective of other evidence we've heard in these roundtables to hear that you as an academic are invited into a dialogue in the police college to talk about how equality, diversity and inclusion can be factored in even to critical incident response. And so it's a great example.

Very helpful. Thank you.

Can I just clarify one thing? Is yellow jackets code for operational police?

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yes, that is code for operational police.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Great.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: So I think, you know, Mark's -- Mark's nodding his head, so that's good.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's great, Denise. Thank you.

I wanted to make sure that I had that right and that it wasn't the community officers, which was my understanding.

If I can turn, then, to finish our discussion on this point to Hugh, Hugh, in Jamie's response -- in the beginning of Jamie's response on the questions of inclusion of marginalized communities in community policing, he alluded to police legitimacy.

And of course, police legitimacy is one of the core objectives and values to be gained, as you articulated, of adopting a community policing strategy.

I wonder if you could speak a little bit more to what you understand police legitimacy to entail and how community policing can help to secure it?

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, Emma. Yes, indeed. But let me tie it to this line of questioning you started since our break. I really like the direction it's gone, because it begs questions about how we started this conversation first thing this morning when we discussed what is community policing.

Namely, we're discerning that community policing has to be different things at different places with this, what we're calling now marginalized neighbourhoods, or rural areas. We wouldn't do it the same way in all of them.

So it's very simple for some police agency to say, "We do community policing," but the real question is, what are you doing in this neighbourhood? What are you doing in that one? And what are the outcomes that are reducing, ultimately, the risk factors that lead to crime and social disorder in the first place?

So it's a much more difficult question to answer, that first one you asked this morning about what's community policing, then the kind of answers we gave.

The second thing I'd like to point out is that there's a connection that I'm hearing between what you've named marginalized neighbourhoods and what Chris was talking about policing in rural areas. And the connection that I'm seeing is something that is named by the scholar Shawn Ginwright as persistent trauma stress environments. The fact that there are persistent sources of stress in these

neighbourhoods set up very critical and special dynamics for dealing with it in a constructive way, which dynamics don't exist in other neighbourhoods where police are also responding.

So I'd encourage our colleagues around the table today, and certainly the Commission, to look at that.

There is a connection that the stresses in rural areas are different from the stresses in an inner-city disadvantaged neighbourhood, of course, police are responding in both of them. You can't take one model of community policing from one and apply it to the other. But we do have to deal with those stressful conditions.

Now to your specific question, thank you for that, about legitimacy, Sulaimon and I are defining it in the book as people approve of what police do and approve of how they do it. To which I would like to add a critical component.

Policy legitimacy has too often been treated as one perspective, the perspective of those who receive police services about the police.

We would like to suggest it has to include the other element as well, the perspective of the police that the police have of the people whom they are serving, to whom they are responding. And we have to have police respond in a fashion that indicates they fundamentally respect and approve of the people they're serving and they're anxious to engage with those people in ways that will be constructive for that relationship.

And that critical element is the one which has broken down police legitimacy so significantly.

What we're now seeking is, of course, to get community policing away from the notion of public relations for police to just improve police legitimacy and get community policing to mean more profound effects on reduction of the risks that lead to crime and social disorder, and ultimately 9-1-1 calls in the first place.

And that's our challenge. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed, Hugh.

Commissioners, conscious of the time, the last topic I had planned for this morning, but I think it's actually a really nice holdover for this afternoon is the question of what are the roles or the tasks that police are uniquely suited to do and which are the ones that may be better -- the subject of either de-tasking or power sharing of the kind that Sulaimon describes?

And so I'll plant that seed for now, but suggest that we loop back to it after the lunch break.

For the time being, I wanted to reserve some time for you, Commissioners, to ask questions of our panelists.

COMMISSIONER FITCH: First I want to start with a huge thank you for the participation and the information that you've shared, and to Dr. Cunliffe for your excellent probing questions.

So with that said, I don't have any questions for our panelists right now. I'll reserve them for later today. But I do want to thank you very much for the questions that you've asked today.

COMMISSIONER MacDONALD: Yes, thank you so much. I echo the comments of Commissioner Fitch. And I've greatly enjoyed the rich discussion so far and look forward to more this afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STANTON: Thank you. One question that I am a bit preoccupied with is the fact that we have heard from many from you, and we have read about plenty of community-based solutions of ways to de-task, recenter, decenter, defund. There are a lot of wonderful programs, models, ideas. We've seen hundreds of recommendations from past reports, many of which are not implemented, as has been noted today.

One of the things that we've tried to do as a framing for this inquiry is to look at past recommendations and consider what are the new ones that this Inquiry provokes, but what are the ones that have been created or presented many times

before and have not been implemented, and therefore what are the barriers to implementation, and trying to identify those?

But one of the things that comes up for sure is the lack of political will to implement recommendations.

And I wonder if any of you have some experience or insights into what might create the political will to implement solutions that do make sense and that the solutions that we're hearing about would make sense for everyone concerned? We've had front-line officers tell us that they would have so much more time to be in the community doing the kind of policing that they wanted to do if they weren't spending 12 hours in the hallway of an emergency department because they were on a mental health call and the statute requires them to stay until -- we've heard that from police leadership as well, that they're -- that they're not the right folks to turn up to some of the calls, that there are other people and other services that would be better placed to do that.

So there's a clear desire across the board to implement some of the things that have been suggested, but yet we don't see the receptivity of it, sometimes internally in police institutions, as Cal has noted, because of longstanding cultural norms within the institutions, but also sometimes because politicians don't exhibit the courage required to say, "We're going to approach this differently for our communities."

And I just -- I know it's a huge question, but I just wondered if any of you have -- and perhaps it's the Scottish example, because it does seem as though there was been a country-wide approach that has been adopted. And I wonder what prompted that or what enabled that circumstance that you would have a national approach that includes substantive equality as a marker of the way forward and social justice as a marker of the way forward?

So Denise, perhaps you might want to start?

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yes. I think it goes back to the Christie Commission. And it has, I think -- one of the things that probably needs to be recognized is it's taken a lot of time to arrive at that position, so it's not, you know, happened overnight. But I think really, the Christie Commission was what drove it and it, say, I -- really, the principles that they wanted, I think, not just policing, but really in terms of trying to tackle the wicked issues or social problems within society. And what the Christie Commission recognized was a lot of the problems and issues that I think that, you know, have come out today and that people are grappling with just now about, you know, people working in silos, the difficulty of culture, so the Christie Commission really set out those principles of not -- I think in quite a broad sense. So it was about kind of, you know, ensuring equality and, you know, sort of the community welfare, and children, you know, experienced less poverty. So it thought about those in a broader sense, and then I think it set in motion then principles that I think that local services have then been trying to adhere to. And that has led to a number of changes within Scotland in the way that I think -- not just Police Scotland, but I think numerous agencies have approached trying to deal with welfare and community safety.

So I think it's having those overarching principles that everybody has to work for or towards, and that's -- if you look at the document I think that's been added about the national framework, this is key, you know, national performance targets, but they're really holistic. They're not just about reducing crime. They're not just focussed on very kind of narrow indicators. They're actually, again, thinking about people's welfare, people's -- improvements to people's lives fundamentally underpinning this approach. And it drives a responsibility, it drives responsibility across all agencies, that all agencies and government are responsible for meeting these targets. It's not just one agency.

So I think it's having those underpinning values, but it is a journey, but what you've seen I think within the we that police protect -- the police is my area, so it's who I work with, and so that's my area of expertise, so that's probably why I'll use

the police as example. But even having sort of crime as their key organizing principle is gone. Community safety and welfare is now their organizing principle. So they've changed the narrative. So, you know, it's actually changing the narrative and that's what's driven it forward is they've completely changed the narrative of what they want to achieve as a government and as organizations, and I think that's been part of it, so adopting a set of values that cuts across all organizations.

And even now, so the Police Scotland actually have a partnerships and community prevention division, and it's not located in any sort of geographical sense. It's a division that cuts across the whole of the organization, you know, with that desire to ensure that they address community safety and wellbeing. Does that answer your question ---

COMMISSIONER STANTON: It's extremely ---

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: --- sufficiently?

COMMISSIONER STANTON: --- helpful actually, yeah. And then just in terms of how that came about, I assume there were social context factors, but I assume there also must have been the -- sort of the right people in leadership positions across different agencies and different political structures that sort of came together to make that happen. Because as we've seen, and as the report that Cal and Chris provided shows, just having one very progressive leader in place won't do it because once they're out, then, you know, things tend to go back to what people knew before, unless there's someone driving it, and unless the motivation for change or renewal is more broad than just that one person in that one role. So I just wondered if there was sort of a happy confluence of people in leadership positions that change that, or if there's some sort of factor that would account for that.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yeah, I mean, one of the things the Scottish government have done has set up sort of -- they're attached to the government but they're still kind of independent. So, for example, we've got Collective Leadership Scotland, so they're a body who, again, have journeyed through that, so they've brought

leaders from across different organizations together with a view to tackle issues collectively. So it's not driven just by one organization. So the focus is also breaking down things at the hierarchy and the cultures and actually, you know, bringing leaders together through -- in that space.

So, again, an example of one of the things that I've been involved in recently was a -- it was a pilot to look at shared leadership where you actually bring middle managers specifically, who are the ones that are often having to deal with, you know, these kind of wicked issues in a collaborative space and local areas and come together. There's a pilot program that police got their part of just now where it's about shared leadership where you have local authority, you have education, you have health, and Collective Leadership Scotland are working with them to try to create a much more kind of collaborative and shared leader approach. It's not a single agency. And then it's about how they learn. And they're given sort of a wicked issue to unpack and deal with, and then they work with that, you know, coming from the different perspectives, but also thinking how they could, you know, tackle it as a collaboration.

So that was just one example of different programs and it's just that they're trying, but it's very much about trying to break down those organizational barriers, the silos, and taking a different approach. Again, it's changing the narrative and the thinking, that it's not just one agency that's responsible, but it's much more about a collective endeavour. And I would say that's the thing that's really informed, you know, Scotland's approach. But again, it's not that, you know -- I wouldn't say that it's without its challenges and it takes time. And I think partly politically, obviously, Scotland was devolved many years ago from the UK, so the Scottish government as an administration, you know, felt that equality and social justice were sort of key principles that they wanted to be at the heart of Scotland's agenda. So I think also, you know, the political shift towards a devolved parliament also kind of helped set the tone to drive that change. So there's lots of different kind of factors I think that came together to ensure that that shift happened.

COMMISSIONER STANTON: Thank you so much.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: If that helps.

COMMISSIONER STANTON: Yeah, it does, and, I mean, I guess, you know, in our context, often it -- what tends to motivate people is if a good business case is made, and it always devolves to what's the -- you know, what's the financial -- sometimes doing the right thing combines with the financially best way forward as well, but often that is what is required for political action is to see the business case. And as everyone said that it's difficult when you -- when measuring is difficult to assess outcomes to create that even though anyone could sort of look over the longer term and see that money may be better spent on prevention than on carceral solutions, for example, but making that case is difficult because the markers are difficult to measure.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Yeah, and I think, you know, Scotland are still kind of grappling with those issues, so there is a sort of philosophy and a sort of, say, approach, but it's not happened overnight, and it's taken time, and there's still things that, you know, are not changing in the way that they should or as quickly as they should. So but I think the well is the urn. I think that's what you see, and you do see the narrative change in terms of especially at top level the strategy and the approach and adopting a different sort of language around what needs to be done. And I think that's helped.

COMMISSIONER STANTON: Thank you so much. And I'm conscious of the time and perhaps others may want to feed some of that into their answers this afternoon. I won't keep us from lunch any further. I'll be the least popular person at the Commission. So thank you so much, everyone, and for the paper too, it's very helpful for me as a non-police person. It really lays things out in an extremely helpful way, so I appreciate that very much. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Commissioner Stanton. I do indeed have a bit of a speaker's list on your question, and we'll loop back to it after

lunch. And so can I suggest that we take a break now, and that we return at 1:35 Atlantic.

--- Upon recessing at 12:35 p.m.

--- Upon resuming at 1:37 p.m.

COMMISSIONER MacDONALD: Thank you so much. Welcome back, everyone.

Dr. Cunliffe?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Commissioner MacDonald.

Welcome back to the afternoon session of today's roundtable, which is focussing on contemporary community policing, community safety, and well-being.

This morning, we heard from a panel of subject matter experts to discuss the core themes of this roundtable, and this afternoon we are taking a step away from the format that we've used for roundtables through Phase 2 in recognition of the fact that we're now in Phase 3 and focussed on recommendations.

And so this afternoon we'll be joined by a group of representatives of various Participants within our process. In a moment I'll invite them to introduce themselves and remind you of who we had at the table this morning.

Before I turn to that, though, a couple of housekeeping matters that arise from this morning. The first is Professor Martin's response to Commissioner Stanton's question just before the break this morning referred to the Christie Commission in 2011 in Scotland. Commissioners, Participants, I would like to confirm that a copy of that report is indeed being tendered. I wanted to make sure of that before I said so on the record, we do have that in motion. As is Professor Martin's evaluation of the Prevention First approach that Police Scotland has adopted.

The second matter, which is more than a housekeeping matter, it's an important principle of the -- of the Commission team, the Research & Policy team. I would really like to acknowledge the contributions made by my colleagues, Nichole

Elizabeth, Katie MacLeod, and Selena Henderson, as well as Laura McEnaney to today's roundtable. They are all absolutely integral parts of the planning and of making sure that everybody's in the right place at the right time, and thank you to each of them for their contributions to today's proceeding.

So without further ado, what I would like to do is to provide the new roundtable members with an opportunity to introduce yourselves, and those who joined us this morning with an opportunity just to remind those who might be joining us for the first time this afternoon of your essentially name and title. And so we'll keep the introductions a little briefer today in light of the number of folks that we have at the table this afternoon.

So if I can begin with the Participant representatives. Can I ask you, please, to introduce yourself by name and title, to mention which Participant nominated you to be included in the roundtable today, and if you can just say a few words about the work or the expertise that brings you to the table today I think that will assist with the conversation this afternoon.

Hayley Crichton, if I can begin, please, with you.

MS. HAYLEY CRICHTON: Certainly. Thank you.

Hayley Crichton. I'm currently the Executive Director for Public Safety and Security Division with the Nova Scotia Department of Justice. One of the mandates of our division is for policing oversight for the Province of Nova Scotia.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thanks so much, Hayley. And just for the purposes of the record, Hayley's participation today was nominated by the Department of Justice Nova Scotia.

If I can turn now to Dawn Ferris, please. Welcome, Dawn.

MS. DAWN FERRIS: Thank you very much. I'm Executive Director at the Cumberland County Transition House Association, and as a member of THANS, the Transition House Association of Nova Scotia, and a member within the

grouping with Be the Peace Institute and Women's Shelter Canada. I'm not sure who nominated me. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's fabulous, Dawn, thank you very much. We're very pleased to have us with you today.

Kristina Fifield, if I could invite you to go next. Kristina, I'm sorry, I think you may be on mute. We can't hear you. Perhaps what I'll do, Kristina, is I'll move on to the next person and loop back to you, if that's all right. I'll get one of our tech support folks to reach out and assist you.

Dr. El Jones, welcome.

DR. EL JONES: Thank you. Good afternoon, I'm El Jones. I'm here with East Coast Prison Justice Society, so we work variously on prison justice issues, police policy, and other issues of carceral and punishment policy. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you. And El's participation today was suggested by B.C. Civil Liberties and East Coast Prison Justice.

Mukisa Kakembo, if I could invite you to introduce yourself, please.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Thank you. Good afternoon, I am Mukisa Kakembo. I am an article clerk with the Elizabeth Fry Society...

(TECHNICAL ISSUES)

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mukisa, welcome. We're very glad to welcome you today. We're having a little difficulty hearing you.

If I could please ask one of our tech folks to reach out with respect to the sound, thank you.

And I wonder if I can loop back now to Kristina Fifield and see if we can -- if we've sorted out those sound issues.

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: Can you hear me?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Yes, we can. Thank you.

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: I'm Kristina Fifield. I'm with Avalon Sexual Assault Centre. I'm a trauma therapist, and I'm in a coalition with LEAF and

Wellness Within, and I've been doing gender-based violence and intimate partner violence work for 13 years.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Kristina. We're thrilled to welcome you today.

Inspector Kurtis Kamotzki, please.

INSP. KURTIS KAMOTZKI: Good afternoon, Inspector Kurt Kamotzki, like you said. I'm the OIC, Officer in Charge of the Kings District RCMP here in Nova Scotia. I come to the table with 25, 26 years' experience in the RCMP, having worked in multiple provinces in the west, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Nunavut and the Yukon, as well as experience in indigenous policing and National Headquarters, and with the MMIWG Inquiry.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Welcome, Kurtis. We're very glad to welcome you today.

Hubert Martin, please.

MR. HUBERT MARTIN: Good afternoon. Hugh Martin here. I'm with the National Police Force -- or Federation, sorry. I'm actually still a member of the RCMP right. I'm kind of in between roles.

I've been a police officer for almost 20 years now, had the opportunity to work in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and New Brunswick, mostly frontline policing as a general duty member, as a police dog handler and a member of the Emergency Response Team.

I'll soon be taking over the Director role for the National Police Federation for Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Welcome, Hubert, and thank you for joining us today.

If I can turn now to Steve Mills, please.

MR. STEVE MILLS: Yes, good afternoon. My name is Steve Mills. I spent 31 years with the RCMP, 20 of those years was in rural policing and all of that 20 years was in Nova Scotia.

I've also had many other roles within the force, as is typical with an RCMP member, plainclothes, Emergency Response Team. I was also an Incident Commander for seven years and the Critical Incident Commander Coordinator for Nova Scotia for the last four years of my service.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Steve, thank you for joining us today.

Steve was nominated for today's participation by RCMP Veterans of Nova Scotia, who are Participant in our process.

Inspector Ray Moos, welcome.

INSP. RAY MOOS: Hi, everyone. My name is Inspector Ray Moos, as said, an Inspector with the National Crime Prevention Services out of the National Headquarters. I oversee that unit.

National Crime Prevention is a support service and policy centre that provides national coordination and leadership on effective ways to prevent, reduce, intervene on crime by focusing on risk factors before they happen and by promoting and implementing effective crime prevention practices and programs.

So really excited to be part of this conversation. Thanks for having me.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Inspector Moos. And I apologize for mispronouncing your name in your introduction.

Inspector Moos was recommended as a Participant today by the Department of Justice Canada.

And Superintendent Kim Tecklem (phon.).

Superintendent Tecklem may not have joined us after all, and that's just fine.

Mukisa, I'm wondering if we can leap back to you and give you another opportunity to introduce yourself. Hopefully the sound issues have been sorted.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Hello. Can you hear me now?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Sounds really good now, Mukisa. Thank you.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Awesome.

I'll just introduce myself again, but my name is Mukisa Kakembo. I'm an articled clerk working for the Elizabeth Fry Society of Mainland Nova Scotia.

We work with criminalized women from the point that they contact -- have first contact with police all the way to when they're reintegrating back into society after having been sentenced. I've also worked with women who have been victimized by the police, and that is who nominated me to be here today. So thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Mukisa, and welcome.

And now if I can turn back to the participants who joined us this morning and invite you briefly to reintroduce yourselves. For the benefit of the record and the Commission, Dr. Jamie Livingston is in first week, of course, of a new term and so was unable to rejoin us this afternoon, but we have everybody else from this morning, I believe.

So Cal, if I can please start with you again.

MR. CAL CORLEY: Certainly. Thanks, Emma.

Hello, folks. I'm Cal Corley. I'm the CEO of the Community Safety Knowledge Alliance. It's a non-profit. We support governments, police and others in developing, implementing and assessing new approaches to community safety. I'm a former member of the RCMP. I spent 39 years -- actually 39 years to the day in the organization and looking forward to this afternoon's conversation.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Cal.

Chris Murphy next.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Hi, I'm Chris Murphy. I'm a retired professor in sociology and social anthropology at Dalhousie University and University of King's College. I've written and researched extensively on policing for the last 40 years, having done my PhD thesis on small town policing, a comparison of RCMP and municipal policing over 35 years ago.

So I'm also co-author with Cal of the report on community policing and change and reform.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much, indeed, Chris, and welcome back.

Sulaimon, if I can turn to you now, please.

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: So good afternoon, everyone. My name is Sulaimon Giwa. I'm an associate professor of social work at Memorial University in Newfoundland and Labrador. I'm also the Endowed Chair in Criminology and Criminal Justice at St. Thomas University in Fredericton.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much.

Professor Denise Martin, welcome back.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Thank you, Emma.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Professor Denise Martin, and I'm a professor of criminology at Abertay University in Dundee, and I specialize in police research. I'm also an Associate Director for the Scottish Institute of Police Research, and I've done a lot of work about the intersection between law enforcement and public health, and also evaluating community initiatives to resolve social issues within societies in Scotland.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thanks so much for joining us, Denise. I'm sure it's getting late Scotland time, so we're very grateful for your continued participation.

Hugh, welcome back.

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, and good afternoon, everybody. I'm Hugh Russell, a social psychologist.

I am a co-author with Dr. Sulaimon Giwa on the second edition of a book I wrote about "Transforming Community Policing", and that originated from about 25 years of work with police agencies and communities, the whole theme of the process being it's about community and police role in helping communities solve the problems that police cannot solve and they cannot afford to solve.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much, indeed.

And Amy Siciliano, welcome back.

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Good afternoon, everyone. Amy Siciliano. I am the Public Safety Advisor with Halifax Regional Municipality.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Amy.

And last, but certainly not least, Chief Mark Kane.

CHIEF MARK KANE: Good afternoon, everyone. Chief Mark Kane. Obviously I'm representing Nova Scotia Chiefs of Police today.

I've also been a police officer in Manitoba and Calgary Police. And obviously, from my accent, I was a police officer across the pond as well, so I look forward to this discussion today and continued participation.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much, indeed, Mark.

So the norm that we adopt at these roundtables is to use first names, and I invite you to do the same.

In the conversation that we had this morning, we focused on the core themes of discussing best practices for community policing, the necessary considerations for inclusive community policing and safety that is responsive to diversity

and the diverse needs of communities and approaches to community safety that are grounded in community engagement and community mobilization.

From our morning participants, we heard a wealth of great ideas about ways in which police services can work more closely with communities, about community-led initiatives and about the possibilities of transferring some of the tasks that are presently performed by police to agencies or individuals or communities who may be better situated to perform those tasks. A key example in Jamie Livingston's absence was a discussion that we had with Jamie with respect to those who were experiencing mental health crisis, for example.

Towards the end of the session this morning, the Commissioners had some questions, and one of the questions that was posed -- the question that was posed by Commissioner Stanton, picking up on a conversation we'd had this morning, really focused on the conditions for success of efforts to transform police philosophies into a more community engaged model.

And Professor Denise Martin had the opportunity to share some fantastic insights from the perspective of a great deal of work and a long-term project that Police Scotland have been engaged in along with the whole of Scottish government in response to this report that I mentioned at the beginning of this afternoon's session, the Christie Commission report.

But unfortunately, we ran out of time before we had an opportunity to hear from other members of the morning panel on that question, and so I had a note that both Cal and Sulaimon wanted to speak to this question and I anticipate, in fact, that others who are on the roundtable may well also wish to do so, including Participant representatives, of course.

And so if I may invite Cal to speak to this, I'll turn to Sulaimon next, and if you would like to join the speakers list on this question, please put a note in the Zoom chat and I'll keep a speaker's list.

MR. CAL CORLEY: Thank you, Emma.

So just picking up on Denise's remarks this morning on this issue of bringing it about, it's obviously a complex issue, very complicated. And the future as we've been describing this morning is one that does in fact require a whole system approach.

There's two elements that I'd like to focus for a moment on. One is the concept of punctuating the equilibrium.

So organizations can go along and the external environment, as well as status, and there can be modest changes, et cetera, and then you'll see a spike in the external environment. Think of the magnitude of 9/11 back in September 2001.

And what we see in those cases is governments can respond very quickly with incredible changes. And we saw that both in the United States, obviously, with the creation of Homeland Security and other changes within the FBI and other security apparatus there, but we also saw some significant changes took place in Canada as it pertained to it.

In the absence, many would have thought that perhaps after Mayerthorpe or perhaps after Moncton, there might have been, you know, more significant changes, those being one of these punctuated moments along that spectrum.

And we can debate whether, you know, whether fulsome changes arose from those. Many of the leading academics would suggest probably not.

I'm reminded of pre-9/11. There's a fellow that I knew in the FBI, John O'Neill, and he had an idea his area was not organized for success, and he got the number two person in the FBI behind his idea how they need to restructure and recognize. And it was not unlike some of the issues we've talked about this morning in terms of continuity of development of talent, et cetera, et cetera, to deal with this unique issue.

They developed a business case, took it to the executive FBI, and the long story short is that looking at it through the criminal investigative lens, which is the dominant culture in the FBI, they didn't see why there'd need to be any changes.

And it was only a matter of months later after 9/11 that those changes in fact came about because of the change in the environment.

There's not a lot of political currency in police reform. It, you know, typically isn't at the top of the parade in terms of those issues.

When we augment that with a four-year political cycle, there's the times in the political cycle when one would think, you know, if police reform is going to come about, it has to happen in that sort of window.

At a local level, I think back on the CBC Ideas program after the 2005 In Search of Security Conference held in Montreal. And CBC Ideas did a 10-part series on that and one part of it is called Power of the Police. And it's the Power of the Police vis-a-vie those in governance. And basically, we can listen to, on that, to Susan Eng, a former city councillor in Toronto, or John Sewell, a former mayor, and a variety of others, who would say that, you know, you can challenge or suggest changes to Parks and Recreation, or social services, or education, but you make suggestions about police reform at your peril.

Now, that's not me speaking. I'm bringing the voices of those people to this.

So it's a complicated -- it's a complicated issue. You've got to hit it right on the political cycle. And I think the challenge for governments, for those involved with police governance, and certainly for those transformational leaders within policing is to be prepared -- properly prepared for when one of those instances happen so you can move quickly to put in place basically change the paradigm.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing your reflections, Cal, and in particular, those insights from the example of 9/11.

If I could turn now to Sulaimon? I believe that you wanted to weigh in on this one too?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: I did. Thanks so much, Emma.

And also thank you, Commissioner Stanton, for your question before we went to lunch.

Commissioner Stanton, you had mentioned political will and de-tasking in your question. And to that, I would also add consultation fatigue. Other panelists, including myself, spoke this morning about the importance of communication in effective community policing. And this goal, however, is undermined by the sense of consultation fatigue that affected communities experience as a result of repeatedly participating in communication exercises or exchanges with police, in which solutions are offered to the police, but frequently do not manifest in reality.

This ends up as exhaustion and disillusionment, which is fueled by a lack of political will on the part of police leadership. It's also a significant impediment to the success of community policing.

Secondly, both Chris and Cal noted in their report for the Commission that police had been engaged in reform for many years, albeit not always successfully, due in part to their resistance to reform.

However, the language of reform continues to emerge as a concept in our discussion of how we do police differently.

And as another response to your question, I would suggest that the words we use define and also influence the actions we choose to take or not take, given that social movement groups advocate for transformation rather than reform, the question of whether police practitioners are satisfied with the status quo arises when reform is prioritized over transformation.

So the concept of reform, borrowing from David Correia and also Tyler Wall, implies the idea of perfectibility that police can actually be made perfect through process of accountability, police oversight, and professionalization.

What is frequently overlooked though is that reform also prioritizes other and public perceptions of police legitimacy. So this is the idea that police should improve community members' knowledge bases so they can better understand their

function, and that once the public has this information, crime and disorder will be easily addressed and discord between the police and the community will be reduced, if not eliminated.

This reform concept, for me anyway, is problematic in its engagement of community members from a deficit perspective. There's an assumption that the troubled relationship that exists as a result of this community's -- is a result of this community's lack of understanding of how the police actually work.

Transformation, on the other hand, is a whole system approach, as we just heard Cal allude to, to understanding how police work, what types of work that they do, as Jamie, Hugh, and others have also alluded to this morning, and also how can we better empower communities in the actualization of community-centred approaches to achieve community safety and well-being.

And I would like to emphasize as the last point that one aspect of transformation is not simply decentering or removing police from critical roles or functions that they perform, but also recognizing the strength that they and the community bring to the issue of crime, disorder, safety, and well-being. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Sulaimon, thank you very much for sharing those reflections. And in particular, I think on the topic of consultation fatigue, one of the dynamics again that we've heard, and it resonates with something that Amy shared this morning, is that, of course, much of the time, community members who were consulted in these ways are not being paid or compensated for their time and expertise, while those doing the consultation of course are. And that's an important dynamic, I think, in the mix here.

Hugh, I believe that you were hoping to speak to the question of political will?

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, thank you.

And thank you, Sulaimon, for bringing up the transformation/reform distinction.

Cal, I appreciate you're raising that too. You and Chris in your paper identified three forces for transformation from outside the police service, namely finances, of course, public outcry, and the question of the Commissioner at lunch time, political will.

Those are -- I wanted to note for this discussion that those are pressures from outside the agency and they are much more effective in changing the way the agency operates than any will for reform from within the agency. And we have data that supports that.

Secondly, then I'd like to give one practical example of how to influence political will. And in doing that, I'd like to emphasize the critical role of police in getting the political will that's necessary to support them and others in community to do the right thing.

The example came from a rural municipality which turned to the local detachment and said, "We have a severe problem with theft in our large box stores. Please fix it." And we had a wise police detachment commander who said, "We can't, without your help. Would you please, Mr. Mayor, convene those business owners in municipal hall to talk about the problem with us?" And the mayor -- in other words, using the Mayor's power, the political power of the municipality to bring the business people together, who were much too busy competing with each other to talk about a common problem, which generated tremendous insight and collaboration among all of them, and a municipality.

One of the interesting side effects of this was the emergence over less than a year of a monthly community safety and wellbeing committee chaired by that municipal council, at which they then convene agency partners to talk about whatever the hot issue is about safety and wellbeing. And, of course, those issues are brought by police in all their occurrence data, and other frontline responders, like mental health. And in that way, the agencies are guiding the political will to focus on problems which are priorities for that broad community, and that same political will then is turned to all of

the agencies to collaborate in finding a planned solution. That's about the shortest summary I can do of a complex process which has now been mandated by the Province of Ontario for all municipalities.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Many thanks indeed, Hugh.

I believe that El is next on my speaker's list.

DR. EL JONES: Yes, thank you. And before I make my comments, I do want to acknowledge that I'm here on unceded and unsurrendered Mi'kmaw territory, and I also want to acknowledge in particular and honour the families. We know that these processes retraumatize everybody and to have this ongoing is incredibly difficult for those who have lost loved ones, and I just want to acknowledge that as we speak.

I did want to add a couple of points. The first thing I wanted to add was that -- and this is where we have to be very careful around recommendations, we tend to make public policy as reactive policy. So there's a crisis, and then we make a number of policies around that, and then they become normalized, and it becomes incredibly difficult to dislodge them. And so when we think about what we're doing, we also have to be aware that, you know, today's harsh punishment becomes a normal punishment, and then becomes too weak of a punishment, and we always pile punishment on. So punishment, or policing, or carceral policies always become normalized and then we always feel the need to expand them, so we have an ever-extended growth towards more punishment. And it is incredibly impossible to pull those things back, because then we phrase them as this is normal and reasonable. In fact, it doesn't go far enough. And your critique of them is actually unreasonable or, you know, you don't understand the realities on the ground.

So this goes directly to the process of making recommendations in a crisis, which is what is happening here, that it is incredibly important not to respond by saying, okay, what policy can we make to respond to this one moment, and rather, to be also thinking about what are we doing 10 years from now and 20 years from now.

Michael Jackson, of course, not the musician, the prison lawyer talks a lot about how crisis is a natural part of the life of the institution. In fact, crisis becomes an opportunity to reform and then extend the lifestyle of that institution rather than transform it.

The final thing I wanted to say is that as we speak about community and policy, I think it's also incredibly important. We've had some discussion on the way that safety means something; right? And safety is, of course, increasingly being tied to security, whether that's in police, whether that's in schools, and all kinds of institutions. We've increasingly come to associate the notion of safety not with things like housing, food, wellbeing, but with security measures. And that's another example of normalizing a certain policy that was unusual only decades ago and has now become very normal to think about so-called safety measures.

But I also want us to problematize community, because we tend to talk about community as a kind of monolith, whether that's the black community, or the community of Halifax. And, of course, communities have many different power relations within them as well. Who is considered to be inside and outside of community? Who has a voice? Who matters? Who speaks? Who gets to the so-called table are all matters of power, often class, race, marginalization, et cetera. And I just put a pin in that because we tend to make policy from the top, those who are academics, those who are policy experts, those who are politicians, and that policy does not usually encompass the voices of those at the so-called bottom, who are going to be most affected by these policies themselves. So part of the problem in terms of political will or in terms of implementation is we end up with an elite class of people who make recommendations without the voices of those who are often not included in our communities and are not being thought of when we speak about things like safety, punishment, policy creation and so forth. So I just wanted to also put a pin in that and thank you very much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, El.

Ray, if I can turn to you next, please?

INSP. RAY MOOS: Right, thanks. I just wanted to add to the comments that Hugh made and El as well and to the conversation this morning that was had, and then maybe reflect on how we got here. And so I was thinking about that, and I saw that, you know, police have been a very convenient way for city communities to address societal issues. And we can tangibly measure those successes through arrests and crime stats, so it's a tangible and it's convenient. And one of the speakers this morning, and I think again it was alluded to, talked about community safety and wellbeing and the plans that can be set out by the community, by the city, and that visual shift from addressing on how problems are addressed, from moving it away from police focussed to community focussed. And, you know, police services and detachments do their best to host town halls, engage the community through various forums, but it's more focussed. And while it's done to the best of their ability, a more coordinated approach is needed, and that's where I believe city-led, city administrators would provide that broader breath of the problem through a more robust engagement process, which would lead to a broader strategy to address those broader societal problems and issues.

I know that's being used in some communities. They call it situation tables, action tables, and this speaks to the previous comments that were made on obtaining the voice of those that we have not heard from in the past. And that's where I find that community safety wellbeing really has its merits and it's community led. And so while police are doing their best with -- and with competing priorities and the finite resources that it has, I really support and echo the need for that shared leadership.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed, Ray.

Hubert, if I can turn to you as a representative of the National Police Federation. What's your sense of what your organization and your membership feels is their part to play with respect to the kinds of changes towards a more community engaged mode of policing that we've heard about in today's conversation?

MR. HUBERT MARTIN: It's safe to say that the Federation agrees with all the comments that are being made here today as far as the more holistic approach to solving these community problems. Obviously, we're -- our role is to look after our members and how our members can best perform the task being asked of them. That, of course, you know, has significant -- a significant part of that is resourcing and making sure that we have people on the ground that are able to achieve what the communities are asking us to do. The Federation wants to ensure that these recommendations that our members are made aware of them, and our members know exactly what's expected of them when these things do come to fruition down the road.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much. Is the Federation working with community partners with respect to your approaches and your thinking about what the next pathways might look like?

MR. HUBERT MARTIN: We're fairly new in the policing world, as you know, just a little bit over two years. I think we're involved in a sense where our members are -- we're constantly in contact with our members who are part of these community approaches and community meetings and boards, and that's where we support our membership in that way. Not directly involved in communities per se, as far as I know.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's very helpful indeed. Thank you very much.

Kurtis, if I can turn to you and ask in a sense some similar questions. I'm conscious, of course, that you've played a number of roles in the RCMP, as is often true of those who attained your rank in the RCMP, including an important role with respect to the national inquiry into murdered and missing indigenous women and girls. What's your sense of how the RCMP and within your district policing model, for example, is thinking about the question now of community partnerships and of partnering with respect to the implementation of recommendations from commissions?

INSP. KURTIS KAMOTZKI: Is -- so I can tell you in general sense how I've approached matters in the past in planning priorities and addressing the will of the community. I have always made it a personal goal to gain as much perspective as I can from the community at large, not just going to government representatives, but to different interest groups. I feel that in doing that I bring a more balanced perspective to the planning that I'm putting into place and the -- I guess the representation from the community itself. That in itself is my personal approach to planning, and I guess what I would say is that the RCMP doesn't necessarily have consistency in those approaches, but we have -- consistency is in the way we plan the execution of the objectives and the initiatives that we have in place, but not necessarily the engagement. And I think largely, from my experience, we're not necessarily trained on engagement. There's a few training courses that are offered by the RCMP, but in order for us to really have meaningful engagement, it's a trial by fire process where we are trained as police officers in operational response, but really, dealing with community members and trying to nuance responses from them with respect to their perceptions and what they feel are important for the police to move forward with tends to be something that we learn on the job, more or less, and not necessarily something that's fostered by the organization itself.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's very helpful. Thank you very much, Kurtis.

Hayley, if I can turn to you, and I know that you're actively involved at the moment in a process to generate policing standards for Nova Scotia and I think we'll hear more about that tomorrow. But in the context of today's discussion of community policing and community mobilization engagement in the policing process and in the generation of community safety, what has been your officer's approach to engage in community with respect to setting priorities for policing and thinking through the policing standards process?

MS. HAYLEY CRICHTON: Thank you very much, and I'm happy to speak at this point in time to the subject with respect to policing standards in particular. So for those on this call who are not aware, a public safety and security division is currently in the process of developing and establishing provincial policing standards, to be applied across Nova Scotia, and that is to both the RCMP and independent municipal police agencies in the province.

One area that we will be developing standards for is community safety and wellbeing. So this sets a base minimum standard to which all police agencies in Nova Scotia must meet in order to be an active police agency in Nova Scotia. And what I think that this will do with respect to our conversation about political will is actually ensure consistency over time, so setting a base minimum standard for police agencies to interact with their community, what they are responsible for, what they are not responsible for as well, will be part of that developmental process, and then that will remain consistent over time, and the Department of Justice will also audit compliance with the provincial policing standards as well. So they'll be set, then we'll audit compliance of them, and then we'll work with police agencies across Nova Scotia if there are any gaps in service provision or areas that need some assistance such as, you know, providing or facilitating training opportunities for police in areas that we've established to be important. So that is one area, and that developmental process does include civilian representation as well. So we're working with police but also members of the community too.

And then there are a number of other initiatives that are ongoing from the Department of Justice that specifically engage members of the public in discourse, whether that is municipal policing reviews that are currently ongoing that the Department of Justice participates in, that are led by municipalities and discuss policing service provision, or initiatives that are being led by other divisions of the Department of Justice such as the response to the Wortley report and the work of the Wortley Research Committee as well. So I don't want to speak for my colleagues, but I do know

that there are some wonderful and productive initiatives ongoing within the Department of Justice that take into consideration communication with community members first.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you, Hayley, and I appreciate your exercising your discretion with respect to not speaking on behalf of your colleagues, of course. I wonder if I could take you back to the civilian participation in the police standards process because I know that's more squarely in your portfolio. Would you mind just sharing a little bit more about what that looks like, who the representatives are and how they've been engaged in the process?

MS. HAYLEY CRICHTON: Certainly. So we have two layers to the standards development process, so the first is a working group, and that's really the group that starts to do kind of the crunchy work of the standard development. And so we have representation from police leadership across the province, but we also have representation from police oversight -- civilian police oversight bodies, so municipal police force and police advisory boards as well. So right now, we have four representatives that sit on that working group. We meet once every four weeks that group does to draft and develop the standards. That then goes to subject matter experts and that depends on the subject matter area, so they can be fanned out quite considerably to different groups to ensure that we're taking different perspectives into consideration. And then it moves to the steering committee. And the steering committee is a group, again, made up of police senior leadership. So for municipal police that would be the police chiefs, and for the RCMP that's senior police management, and then again, we also have civilian representation from different municipal police force and different police advisory boards on that steering committee as well, to ensure that we take a consultative approach to developing the provincial policing standards.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing that process.

Dawn, if I can turn to you now, I imagine that as the executive director of Autumn House you know quite a lot about political will and the challenges associated with it in the particular context of gender based and intimate partner violence. What would be your reflections on the challenges of reform and political will to make reform?

MS. DAWN FERRIS: Thank you very much. I feel like on one hand we talk in terms of what sounds like the trickle-down effects. If we could just change the leadership, therefore, there would be an uptake in response of different on the ground level, and I'm not sure that it works any better this way than it does with finances and tax reforms when we're talking trickle down. You have to have buy-in. That institutional culture that was mentioned this morning by Cal I think really is important and we need to talk about that more.

We have good working relationships with lots of our police forces. Lots of the transition houses have board members that are police and/or police representatives on our boards. And yet the clients we see and the women we serve have stories on the ground that don't always mirror those great relationships that we have. And so our clients' voices are of concern are constantly dismissed and it's -- we need a two-pronged approach. I've said this before in other context, but we need to educate and change the culture of the membership itself, plus have that leadership directional change to reform, transform the way that we model with dealing with the clients. And I -- it -- I think it takes more than just political will, but it takes a real commitment level to say we're going to do this on all levels. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing that, Dawn, and I wonder if I can ask you a follow-up question and also actually give you an opportunity to address anything else you'd hope to say by adding yourself to the speaker's list. My follow-up question in particular is how do you work with your clients to make sure that you're serving them well? What model are you using to make sure that

you know what they need and to the extent that you can within your resources and at capacity you're meeting their needs?

MS. DAWN FERRIS: I call it the amplifying their voices model, that we -- when we hear what they have -- their -- the police responses to their concerns, we'll set up mini case conferences, and something changes when members show up in the transition houses to hear in front of the women support counsellors what the women are saying, then it seems to make a difference. So we hear, we believe women, and then we amplify their voices, and don't take over their voices or their stories. It's their stories to tell. So that's -- yeah, and I didn't have anything else to add. I kind of wanted -- I touched on a couple of the points, so thank you very much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's wonderful, Dawn. Thank you so much for sharing your approach and perspective.

Kristina, if I can turn to you. As a trauma therapist, I imagine you too are quite familiar with the dynamic that Dawn describes. I wonder what you'd like to contribute to this conversation.

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: Yeah, I just -- I want to, like, really focus on both the voices of individuals that we're serving, but also the voices of the expertise in our province around individuals dealing with intimate partner violence, gender-based violence and sexual violence, right, and that the work that is happening and the expertise, and especially for individuals that carry that expertise with being able to work with trauma, right, and there's a lot of trauma. We have to talk about the institutional culture of the RCMP employees, right, and also within other institutions as well, right. And we need to understand that that is really, really important for individuals that are impacted by violence. And we need to be -- the individuals providing services in our province that carries that expertise need to be involved in these processes. It needs to be brought back to community. It needs to be brought back to the individuals that carry an expertise.

I'm going to speak like -- I'm not a police officer; right? My expertise and experience in working in this field, right, gives me a different skillset than other individuals, right, and we need to -- it's about collaboration and understanding where people's skills are, and all of this cannot lie with police.

Trust is built in communities, and we need to realise that even in communities response to individuals being impacted needs to look different, and we need to be listening to survivors. We also need to be listening, like we talked about last week, to the voices of individuals that perpetrate violence, right, and also making sure that it's brought back to community and that we're collaboratively working together to create safer communities, and really, really important that that is not missed.

A top-down approach to this with individuals that are forming policies or for talking about political will. We need individuals that are on the ground in communities, present in communities, understanding what those needs are from community. And that is the way forward and why this conversation is really important and why community organisations and organisations and services outside of the police need to be properly funded, to be able to build that trust. They have that trust within individuals that would not normally engage with RCMP or police services.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much. And Kristina, if I can just ask you why is it important to take trauma expertise seriously if you're, for example, a police officer or another person who's working frontline with those who may have experienced trauma?

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: I think that if we understand the violence that has been perpetrated by individuals, including state violence, when individuals are seeing a person in a uniform, right, there is a trauma, it can be triggered, right, and that trigger can create trauma responses for individuals because of how police are responding, or other people in positions of power. And understanding what those trauma reactions look like, and understanding when a person is maybe outside of their

window of tolerance, when they're going into that fight or flight mode, right, and that is really important.

And I can say from working in transition houses for 11 years, before making a transition over to being a trauma therapist, I wish I knew now what I know as a trauma therapist. And I think it's vitally important that there is pieces of trauma work that is also included in work that's happening on the frontlines of crisis work in our province, and oftentimes, because of lack of resources and funding, that professional education is not there.

And when police are responding, or any individual is responding to an individual that has a history of trauma, where violence has been used against them, they need to understand what that looks like. And that look -- can look different for different individuals or individuals from different communities. And making sure that when police or RCMP are responding that they're not further escalating that situation and sending a person further outside of their window of tolerance, or for officers who are responding making sure that they're not outside of their window of tolerance when they're responding to individuals. And I think that's an important conversation that we often don't talk enough about in regards to understanding trauma.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's enormously helpful. Thank you very much, Kristina.

Mukisa, this feels like a good moment, actually, to turn to you. The E. Fry Society of Mainland Nova Scotia and E. Fry across Canada work directly with criminalised women, who, the research is abundantly clear, are disproportionately likely to have experienced victimisation and to be suffering from trauma. What would you add to what Kristina and Dawn have shared?

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Thank you. I would like to add ---

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: I'm so sorry, Mukisa. Your sound challenges are back again. Maybe let's press pause on turning to you. I have a request from El to speak, and then I'll loop back to you, Mukisa, if that's okay.

DR. EL JONES: Thank you. And I'm sorry, Mukisa, we want to hear from you.

I just also wanted to raise the intersections of traditional policing with other forms of policing as well, and I think that's incredibly important as we think about policy recommendations. So one example I'll raise is the work of David Moffatt, who has looked at how the police also collaborate with forces like CBSA, and that's Canadian Border Security Agencies. And you know, thousands of calls are made by the police to CBSA, which ends up with people detained often within the country for, like, 30 years and aren't involved in any illegal acts, they simply don't have status.

So the cops in Superstore is another example, right, where we have an intersection of, you know, a business calling in the police to act as security. And this has, obviously, recently gained a lot of critique in Halifax.

So I just think it's really important to say that we can't necessarily contain a policy recommendation to a police force because there's so many other ways in which policing and securitisation and punishment makes its way into other institutions without recognising that, and making policy that also addresses those pieces, in particular, the most vulnerable among us, end up not included in that policy. So those who are migrants and don't have status, no matter what we do to say the RCMP for strategy will still be under the -- you know, they still have to deal with CBSA, which is a whole other section of policing and punishment and crime -- criminalisation as well.

So we have to recognise within healthcare, within education, within the child welfare system, in particular at borders, in psychiatric institutions, as Dr. Livingston talked about this morning, that people are also facing criminalising, policing, and securitisation in those spaces, and if we don't recommend ways that recognise how these intersect we're not really getting to the full picture of how people actually end up experiencing policing, criminalisation and punishment.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much, indeed.

Mukisa, I'm going to check back in with you now.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Are you able to hear me?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Yes, we are. Thank you.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Okay. There was a lot that (inaudible) Kristina said and also from what El sound, and there is a few questions that I would love to raise ---

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mukisa, I'm so sorry to jump in again. We had good sound there for a few seconds and now it's not so great. I understand you're having some challenges with the Zoom chat as well, and I heard you say that there are some questions you'd like to raise. I wonder if you would mind conveying those to Selena Henderson, who can put them in the chat so that I see them, and I'll make sure that they -- that they get raised as the conversation proceeds. I'm so sorry for the challenges we're having.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Okay, thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much.

What I would like to do in the meanwhile, though, is to turn back to Amy Siciliano because I think, Amy, a lot of -- a lot of what we've heard resonates with information you shared this morning about the need for what you describe as a holistic approach to community safety that sees police as only one part of a broader kind of network of community and community safety providers.

I wonder if there's anything you'd like to add based on what's been shared in the last hour or so?

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Thank you very much. It's really great to listen to the discussion, and it's a privilege to contribute to it.

Yeah, I mean I think I would kind of reinforce some of the things that I have heard this afternoon around, you know, political will and massive social change I think is always really underpinned by the social movements that precede them. And I think more recently, especially in the work that we're doing right now with the renewal of the public safety strategy, we were, you know, asked by Council to reimagine

public safety and take seriously what we were hearing from the Black Lives Matter movement, from the Defunding the Police movement, and ask, you know, why are police tasked with doing the things, the multiple things that they are tasked with doing which, you know, fall outside of, really, crime and crime prevention, but are in social and health issues, and what can we do differently. So you know, I think that that has allowed me and the folks that work in my office to, you know, get to work to look at how we can do things differently, and that work is underway.

You know, even going back to how my office came to be, really, you know, it was political will, or sorry, community will that translated into political will for change, created an office to think differently about community safety outside of policing, establish a -- you know, Claremont -- Dr. Claremont's vision really was to establish a centre of responsibility high enough in the municipality that people would take it seriously, but outside of policing so that people would see something else besides that traditional kind of centre to for ways to do things to do things differently.

So I think change is happening in some ways, it's slow. And you know, I think also back to like the Horner Report, and I can't remember the exact title of the report, but it was commissioned by the national Department of Justice. And really, it was around, you know, crime prevention and doing things differently.

And at that time in 1993, Horner said if we're going to do things differently, we need to invest the same amount of resource in prevention that we do in enforcement. And I think we haven't gotten to the point where we're even having conversations about investing those same resources in the same way on those things that we know address root causes of harm in community, so. But I'm hopeful that -- especially given the conversation today and the folks invited to participate in this conversation, that we're moving toward a better future.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Amy.

Mark, if I can turn to you, please.

CHIEF MARK KANE: Hi there. Yeah, I heard it last week in one of the roundtables and it was -- it was very -- resonated, which is, you know, working together, we're stronger. And I think that is something that we have to sort of model everywhere.

And when I look at this approach, when we're looking at, you know, standards for police and everything else, just based on the conversation today, I wonder if that's a conversation that should be had across all levels of government in regards to setting the standards for everybody else because if you're going to set a standard for a police service, it might be that those services in the rural areas are not there to meet the same standard as a metrocentric approach. So I think when we're looking at that, I think we have to take in that holistic approach, which goes back to what I think Professor Martin and Professor Livingston were both saying, is we have to look at the systemic problem globally.

And I agree with El that we also have to make sure that we're bringing everyone to the table so that everyone can have that approach. And that really is -- when we talk about community safety and well-being, that is a fundamental part of what policing was. You come right back to parish wardens. The whole point of them was that they were part of the community. They knew the community and they knew how it worked.

And so I think that's a fundamental part of how I've always been led to believe that we should be asking everyone come to the table, how do we solve this. And it may be a bigger discussion then, as we set these standards, to maybe then sit there with your partners outside of that and then bring the public consultation piece in before we make the final decision how that looks so that we can establish a goal going forward that's going to be globally better for everyone and maybe take a model here in Nova Scotia where we have the opportunity and maybe take that right across every province. And it may be something that we can resonate, and that truly is transformational for every citizen.

So I truly believe whether you live in Halifax or whether you live in Yarmouth or in between that you should have the same level of service and the same standard no matter what that is, whether it be health care, social services, support groups, advocacy groups, any type of -- any type of information.

So that's just what I want to put across here, that I'm hearing that very loudly that we all agree, so what's the next step? And I think that answers the question. The condition for success is legislative changes that also have a major impact as well as getting government buy-in and having a -- instead of saying it's a four-year plan, it's a 10-year plan so that the next level of government, if it comes in, if it changes, we continue to move forward. And I think that's what we need.

So that's all I'll say on this matter and I'll join in something else later on. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thanks so much, Mark. It's good to hear from you.

Steve, I'm conscious we haven't heard from you yet, and I wonder if you'd like to weigh in on this discussion.

MR. STEVE MILLS: Yeah, sure.

So my perspective on this is what was, not what is. I retired in 2008, but I've still been connected with the RCMP for all those years since.

I'll go to the report that Cal Corley and Chris Murphy submitted. And I don't disagree with much in there, to be perfectly honest. And in fact, the Brown Commission report that came out prior to that in 2007, I had always said at that time if there were four of us in a bar, we could have made all of those recommendations because we'd been talking about them for all this time.

So when you talk about political will, that is one of the major barriers. These recommendations come out and no one wants to address them, although they make perfect sense and just about everyone agrees that they should be done, and they don't get done. And it's a shame because particularly the Brown

Commission report was very well done. There's maybe one thing in there that I don't personally agree with, but that's it. But -- and yet nothing has been done about it. And it's very discouraging.

And I'll speak about a barrier as well that I experienced, and I'm sure it's still ongoing, is the district policing model that took place here years ago.

It's removed the members from some communities and it's housed them in bigger detachments, but the -- anyone will want to stay near the mother house. That's really what the trend is. They'll stay near the mother house and they don't get out to the other parts -- or the outlying parts of the county because there are no calls there. And this has been shown time and time again.

So if you're looking at barriers, those are two of the major ones that I see. And I'll leave it at that for now and I'll chime in later.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thanks a lot, Steve. I appreciate it.

And actually, I've got a follow-up for you, if that's okay.

It was helpful to hear you reflect on the failure to take up the Brown Task Force recommendations. From your perspective as somebody who was inside the organization at the time that those conversations were happening, why didn't they get take-up?

MR. STEVE MILLS: So I participated in the interviews that led up to the Brown Commission report, and a lot of the things that are in the recommendations I voiced myself.

I retired in '08. Prior to that, we had meetings with the CrOps Officer at the time about the Brown Commission report and, you know, I was very encouraged at that time that something was going to happen, and it never did. There was a change management committee, as far as I know. That went on for a couple years and then it -- you know, probably a change of government, a chance of Commissioner, whatever it was. Cal Corley could probably answer that better than I. It just died.

And for no reason that I can understand, it just died right there, and it should never have because, as I said, those recommendations are valid. Even today, those recommendations are valid.

There's a couple of them that are -- that are maybe a little dated, but the vast majority -- if they were adopted today or prior to any of this happening, it would have solved a lot of the problems.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you.

And one more question for you, Steve. And certainly, as you know, it's something that we have heard from Cal on as well.

Was -- that phenomenon of good ideas perhaps being generated from outside the RCMP and seeming to get some take-up and then not going further, was that something that you observed in other contexts in the course of your career in the RCMP or was that an unusual outcome?

MR. STEVE MILLS: No, I think there's always been good ideas from outside. Some have been adopted, some have not.

You know, the notion of community policing in general, I experienced that when I joined in 1977. You know, folks will say that, "Oh, we've been doing it for 100 -- you know, 150 years coming up". Well, we have, I believe.

We were involved in the community. We were out there. We were visible. We talked to people and so on and so forth. But it's a different world today. It's much more difficult to be a police officer today than when I was in. I will give credit to the men and women that are out there right now, it's a tough sled. And they're torn in different directions and they just don't have the time to get into the community like we did and had the luxury of time to do.

And that's unfortunate, but that's -- that boils down to adequate resources, which we don't have, and the will of government to address those resourcing issues, and it all boils down to money. There's only so many dollars to go around.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: And I just want to make sure that I understand you correctly, Steve.

In terms of what makes it different for those young constables who are starting frontline policing careers today in the RCMP relative to when you began in the mid-1970s, is the major difference the amount of resources available to dedicate to frontline policing or are there other differences that you consider relevant?

MR. STEVE MILLS: Well, resourcing is a biggie, but I'll tell you, technology has complicated things terribly. Disclosure, the amount of steps that it takes to get an offence successfully through the court system, it's just been exponential from my time when you could write it out on a piece of paper and submit it to the Crown and it went in and it went to trial and it was over within a couple of months, at the very most. Now it's years. There's just -- you know, every sentence or every period that's ever put down on a piece of paper has to be disclosed, and it's overcomplicated everything and, you know, I don't have a solution for that, but -- well, I actually probably do, but no one would want to hear it from me, I don't imagine.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Steve, thanks for sharing your perspective.

So I've got a fairly lengthy and growing speakers list. Just to reassure everybody that I do in fact have a list and so I will get to you.

But first off, I actually want to give Mukisa another opportunity. I understand, Mukisa, that you've restarted your computer, so let's see if that's helped things out.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: I have. So hopefully my mic is coming through clear?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: It's great. Yeah, absolutely.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Okay. Great. And I did submit some questions to you, but it was mainly in the context of when we're thinking about community policing, they're not necessarily questions that we should answer or have to

answer in this session right now, but it's more so about the impact on community and how we have a structure of policing that is very hierarchal. And I work in a community organization where we really encourage community conversations to be circular, where we're all sort of on a level playing field. So how can we have sort of community policing, where police are sort of up here and community members are sort of down here?

And then further to that, how does community policing address the history of policing and racialize specifically black and Indigenous communities? How is community policing addressing the systemic racism, the systemic sexism, and the bias that research has established exists within the institution of policing? And we've also talked about the culture of policing.

So when these things are sort of part of that, then how do we turn to community policing as a solution?

My last question is, is community policing appropriate for addressing the tension and distress that has been established in minority communities?

So these are just some things to consider when we're talking about community policing.

But in preparation for this panel, I was reading the Municipal Public Safety Strategy and I thought it was very interesting. They identified four strategic priorities for public safety, including building resident resilience, ensuring safe places, strengthening communities, and preventing and reducing crime.

And within these sorts of topics, they identified 76 actions for reaching those priority objectives, and within those 76 actions that were identified, non-profit sector was identified as a key stakeholder in 45 of them. So not-for-profits are very key to public safety, in conclusion, and in actions like providing crisis supports for people experiencing mental health crises, providing affordable and emergency housing, for monitoring homelessness, for providing programing, and other important actions that keep people safe, and yet every year, non-profits are at risk of losing the funding to

provide important societal functions. Non-profits are identified as key strategic partners under every single strategic priority. And so we need to be provided with stable and long-term funding.

One example is Holly House, that is provided by the Elizabeth Fry Society of Nova Scotia. We were provided with funding, I think it was $340,000 for two years of funding, and we help people reintegrate back into society after having been institutionalized. They come out, they're facing a lot of trauma, they're facing a lot of mental health issues, and our house has 24/7 support staff who are able to help people navigate the system and help navigate re-entering back into the community. And by March, we are no longer going to have funding for that really, really important function that we provide.

So we know that non-profits are a cost-effective way to prevent crime, and provide safe environments, and to provide opportunities for people to become productive members of society and realize their potential, but we're severely underfunded, especially when we compare the amount of funding that goes to Corrections and prisons.

So provincially, we spend $2.7 billion a year to keep people in prison. So on average, that's about $120,000 per year per person, compared to the funding that we receive for our non-profit organizations.

So just all that to say that non-profits serve the most vulnerable people on such a miniscule budget, and if the government dedicated the same amount of resources and stable reliable funding on crime prevention, integration, and support to those vulnerable populations, then we wouldn't need to spend as much on sending people to jail.

So thank you for your patience and providing me with this space to speak today.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mukisa, thank you so much for coming so well prepared with those statistics and that analysis of the public safety strategy. It's really tremendously helpful to hear on all counts.

So I'm conscious of the time, and I do, as I say, have a speakers list. And just so that everybody is reassured, I hope I've got everybody that's signaled. I've got Hayley, then Ray, then Hubert. But what I'm going to suggest, in fact, is that we take a 10-minute break and return at 3:00 o'clock Atlantic for the last hour of our discussion. And if there's anybody else who wishes to be added to the speaker's list, or any questions that you want to make sure that we surface in the last hour, I'll invite you to drop them into the Zoom chat so that we can make sure we get to them. Thank you all.

--- Upon breaking at 2:49 p.m.

--- Upon resuming at 3:02 p.m.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Welcome back, everybody.

So as I alluded to before the break, I do have a speaker's list, which I will turn back to, but before I do so, I do have one follow-up question for Cal arising from Steve's comments just before the break, Cal. Having heard Steve's reflections on the challenges with implementation of the Brown Report, I wonder if you would add anything to his insights and recollections of how that played out?

MR. CAL CORLEY: Yeah, I thought Steve gave a very good response or thoughtful response to that. I'd add that I think there's a -- and I think this is an unconscious action that sometimes occurs. I've seen it time and time again in my years with the RCMP. And it's when there's an audit or a review or a commission, there can be a tendency -- and again, I think this is a subconscious thing that happens, and I think it's done with the best of intent on the part of the organization. First, they take them to Depot, and they see, you know, this wonderful place with all the history and everything. The next trip is to somewhere like Surrey, B.C., where they see really tough, large urban policing taking place. And then to close the circle, it's typically a trip

to a northern isolated detachment. And time and time again, I've seen these civilians coming in from the outside that complete those tours in love with the place, and I don't think there's an intent to coopt anyone, but the net effects sometimes can be that they fall in love with the place, and want to do everything that they can to be supportive, and they sometimes lose sight of their objective. And as I say, I don't think it's intentional.

I think Steve's comment on the, you know, when we think about community engaged policing, and he made a -- I think a very appropriate comment, I think we address it in our report around the idea of, you know, district policing models, or hubbing, and those can take members away, so that they end up being -- responding to calls for service but not embedded in those small communities which they serve. But, no, I think other than that, I would agree with him, that there's nothing in Brown or most of these that if we picked any of these and implemented some of them it would be marked improvements.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed.

So how we're going to proceed from here is I have Hayley, Ray, Hubert and Kristina are on the list, and then having heard from each of them, I'm going to do a sort of snap around where I give each of you an opportunity to speak to anything that you might have come hoping to say today that you haven't yet had an opportunity to address. And so I'll finish up my speaker list and then I'll ask a couple of questions, plant a couple of seeds about things that we might like to hear from you about, but this really will be your free time to speak to what you think is most important.

So, Hayley, if I can turn to you briefly?

MS. HAYLEY CRICHTON: Thank you. And I apologize if I look down. I was feverishly taking notes when others were speaking, so I'm going to be referring to some notes that I made off camera here.

So I find it really interesting to kind of look at the work of this Commission in its totality, and what I'm finding is that -- and I'm going to pull this back to policing just because that's the subject matter area with which I'm the most comfortable.

So when discussing, you know, policing reform, I find that over the course of this work, there is a tendency to speak about needs, core policing that often are quite difficult to reconcile. So, for example, in some discussions, we really highlighted the need for intelligence like policing while we're also discussing a need and want for investment in policing to be community based as well, and those two things are difficult to reconcile. In some discussions, we talk about the need for adequate policing equipment for a critical incident response, and that equipment is quite expensive, but then we also talk about the need to identify areas where there's efficiencies in cost of policing as well.

And so finally, in conversations, we have about de-tasking, defunding and re-tasking, those are extremely important discussions to have; however, in other discussions, we're also still referring to police as an integral part or taking a central role in tackling social issues in crime prevention rhetoric as well. So there are some kind of different conversations that I find are often difficult to reconcile.

And so from a perspective that is one that works with police but is not operational policing, so I always put the caveat that I've never been a police officer a day in my life, I can imagine that there might be some level of role confusion for police, where these conversations are so difficult to reconcile. And so what we're asking of police is causing some kind of role confusion where what exactly is our expectation for police, and I think there are finite resources in policing as well as other areas of service provision as well. Certainly, we've been hearing that today and I think, you know, the question that I still wonder is truly what is our expectation of police as one component of community safety and wellbeing, and how do we facilitate collective conversations to ensure community voices remain central, and then how do we also ensure that other areas, so other service provision areas are also functionally transitioning as well to establish the holistic approach that we're looking for that takes into consideration these areas that are difficult to reconcile.

So I think there is work being done to engage with different areas of service provision collectively. I think ensuring that our conversations are actually

meeting each other, I think different pockets are having different conversations and so how do we come together more holistically, and it's that how to that I put out as really kind of perhaps an unanswerable question at this Commission meeting, but really, the how to ensure we are having holistic conversations, ensuring that we are hearing the voices of the various actors that will be needed to ensure a holistic transition.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Hayley, many thanks indeed.

And, Ray, if I can now, please, turn to you.

INSP. RAY MOOS: Hi, thank you. And I just wanted to -- before the break, Mukisa had raised a good points on funding with community groups and completely support that. And I can tell you that the RCMP participates on justice-led working groups to look at enhancements to things like restorative justice, and how we can use that potentially as a primary tool, rather than the criminal justice system, essentially flip it on its head. But there are challenges with this. As some may know, you know, criminal justice is uniform across the land; whereas, restorative justice is more community focussed and geared, which brings about some challenges, but -- and funding related to that. But discussions are underway and so it's a good start.

What I did want to comment on was also in the perceptions of policing, and just to balance it out a bit, you know, recognizing that police is a dynamic profession. You know, the RCMP and police services in Canada have some of the best training in the world, and we take it seriously. That said, a lot of incidents are dynamic, split-second decisions, and officers are responding to the best of their ability and training at the time. Sometimes, we're disappointed with how those interactions occur but often, we're extremely supportive and often there's an overwhelmingly good work our police officers are doing every day. And so our processes, practices, training are evergreen continuously based on, you know, past experience. But this speaks to that bigger, broader issue on what is driving some of these societal issues, substance abuse, mental health and how police are being called to address those issues.

So, you know, there was that comment on, you know, the RCMP is slow to react. There was the Brown Report and these -- there are several levels of government processes, governance of review, analysis, recommendations, implementations, and that all takes time. And then there is, you know a procurement process, a utilization of shared services model from the federal government, required of official languages, all that must occur. And so these are all competing priorities. And while our, you know, 22,000 men and women strong organization across 13 provinces and territories try to do their best, you know, we're following those federal and provincial government requirements, and that's guiding a lot of the work and how we need to work within that frame.

So I think cyclical government funding is also an issue, you know, the impacts of recruiting, training, equipment, technology.

So, you know, I'm not trying to provide excuses; rather, some perspective from a policing lens on the challenges that police organizations face and that they're working with, and the best resources and skills at their disposal.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Ray, thank you very much for sharing that perspective.

And so if I may ask, as a follow-up to your remarks, are you suggesting, then, that fundamentally, the model of policing that we have is working well, and that some changes are required, but that change is complicated; is that a fair summary?

INSP. RAY MOOS: Well, we can always do better, and the public expects us to do better, and we can certainly look at how we can improve those processes. And going back to my original comments, you know, we always learn from our past, and so we are learning. And certainly we're trying to get there. Definitely some roadblocks, definitely some challenges; governance process, national governance processes, competing priorities, but certainly we could always do better, and we're certainly always striving to do better.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: That's very helpful. I'd be very interested to have a bit of a sense of the lessons that you and your organization is learning as a result of the kind of current process and some of the things you're seeing as areas for focus in the future.

If you feel able to speak to that question.

INSP. RAY MOOS: Oh, sure. I mean, I don't want to get into any specifics to it, but various issues such as, you know, there was a need for body-worn video, and so now we're looking at implementing that across the country. So that would be a very topical example of how we take feedback seriously and we implement it. And we're doing our best to do that, recognizing all the challenges related to privacy and the other impacts that it has, but we're certainly learning and that would be a very topical and current example.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed.

Hubert, if I may turn to you?

MR. HUBERT MARTIN: Thank you.

It was just more in regards to what Steve Mills said regarding police officers.

I'm still, as of today, a police officer that's working out in the community. I've had the opportunity to work in bigger centres, like Moncton, and smaller northern communities up in Prince Rupert in British Columbia, and now in Yarmouth, Nova Scotia. And as a police officer, I can tell you that everything that I'm hearing here, like, as a police officer, I want that as well.

I want to be more involved in the community; I want to have the opportunity to go out there, and if it's just to have an hour to park down at the local wharf to talk to the local fishers, to know what's going on. And, you know, that's what we like to do as police officers. Dealing with people that are breaking the law obviously is part of the job and we have to do it, but, you know, I remember some shifts where you go on and you realize that there's an extra person on shift, so that gives you the

opportunity to drive to that far part of the county, just to go speak to people that typically you would not speak to, right?

But most days, the truth of it being, probably across Canada but in Nova Scotia I can speak to, is that we're simply trying to fill seats in police cars, and those members that are working are being pulled from every direction. So you don't have the time to go to the rink or to go to a local coffee shop, or just to park down and go for a foot patrol in downtown Yarmouth to meet with people to discuss what's going on, right?

Somebody had mentioned earlier, I think, that, you know, there were -- it was hard to reconcile community-led policing with intelligence-led policing, you know? Again, as a serving member, the two kind of go hand in hand, right? Now, if I'm not dealing with a Federal drug investigation, I'm dealing with, you know, problems that are local to Yarmouth, I'm going to gain that intelligence just by simply speaking with people that are out there on the day-to-day basis. And I've been in the community for a fair number of years now, and a lot of the stuff that we find out is that we find out through means that we -- aren't conventionally reported to the police.

People don't want a crime -- call Crime Stoppers; people don't want to call the police for various reasons, they don't want their neighbour to come cut down their tree the next day or something. A lot of times they'll tell you, "Hey, just so you know, you know, this person is doing this. I don't want to get involved but..." And that, you know, as a police officer, that gives me the opportunity to at least start looking into what the problem is.

It's unfortunate that we're so short on resources because I think that's what most police officers want to do, and directly when Mukisa had mentioned about funding non-profits, if I deal with a person who's in a mental health crisis, the first thing I'm looking to is to those non-profit partners.

In Moncton, we had a -- from 1:00 until 8:00 we had a mobile crisis team, and the first call we did once we arrived at the crisis was to call those people to come and help us.

I'm in a position right now and -- in a plainclothes position in Yarmouth where I deal with a lot of victims of sexual violence. I work hand in hand with the shelter, the Tri-County Women's Centre, and rely heavily on them.

So, again, as a police officer, fully, fully support constant and ever-evolving funding for non-profits because it makes our job so much easier to work with these partners.

Just -- and one last thing I wanted to touch on in regards to I think you'd mentioned how to implement these constant reports that we seem to go through every five or 10 years with the RCMP.

I was there for Brown; I was also there for Moncton -- the Moncton shootings. I was one of the officers on site there, so for the Phonse MacNeil Report, and we're currently going through the Bastarache Report.

The MacNeil Report, the recommendations were enacted very quickly because they were very tangible: We need more carbines; we need more hard body armour; we need better training for outdoor active shooters. Those were easy to measure for the RCMP and they were implemented very quickly.

Things like Brown and Bastarache, they're a lot more difficult to measure; how are we going to make these things happen in the RCMP, and I think that's why some of these reports take a long time to actually come to fruition or, you know, as Steve said, some of the recommendations never actually happen.

That's just what I wanted to touch on.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Hubert. It's very helpful to hear your -- both your experience of working with non-profits as you say, and your sense of the contributions that they bring to the work that you do. But also your

reflections on the implementation of various reports; and thank you for sharing your experience from MacNeil in particular.

Kristina, I believe that you had a contribution that you'd like to make.

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: Yeah. I'm just seeing in the chat that it's probably a wee way into, but I want to pick up on something that was said this morning about competing, and something Mukisa said around funding ending, and how non-profit organizations are always in this constant competing against one another, and how that is actually problematic. And it's also creating a situation when these pilot projects are funded in community organizations, and especially when those pilot projects are focused on working with marginalized and vulnerable communities. When those pilot projects are in place, and they're in place for a period of time, and those workers that are attached to that funding are in communities and working on finding new pathways, finding new ways to work and create safety and that funding ends, for individuals who, you know, have not been able to trust, for all kinds of reasons, they're then seeing those services being taken away; those key people that they have built trust with, who they have been able to maybe establish and get connected with other resources.

And I spoke last week about this at the roundtable, about the importance right now of navigators and outreach workers in our non-profit organizations, and I'm going to speak from Avalon's funding here right now around a navigator's position within our African Nova Scotian communities and the work that that individual was doing, and how it has created new pathways for individuals to come in to Avalon services that would not normally engage with our services, and these are vitally important in the works that happen in transition houses and other services across our province, and they're key in providing pathways for individuals who have not been able to trust, and that creates safety.

But that safety is taken away if the funding ends, and what message are we giving marginalized and vulnerable individuals when those pilot projects are just cut off and those key connections are lost?

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Kristina, thank you so much for sharing that perspective, and for reminding us of the conversation last week.

So I'd now like to turn, in light of the time, to a closing round in which I'll give each of you the opportunity to respond to the question; is there anything that you came today hoping to share that you haven't yet had an opportunity to share, or anything that you'd like to respond to that you haven't yet had an opportunity to respond to?

I have included in the chat for everybody a few ideas about some of the things that we've been hearing percolating in the conversation so far, including a question of how we might cultivate a culture of collective leadership and collective responsibility within policing, but also across agencies, funding and the challenges of different funding models for policing versus other areas of service provision. Christina has just touched upon that again, Mukisa's questions about how community policing addresses the history of policing and racialized specifically black and Indigenous communities, how it addresses systemic racism, sexism, and bias that research has established exists in the institution of policing, and is it appropriate for addressing the tensions and distrust established in minority communities.

You may also wish to pick up on Hayley's observation about competing needs, objectives, and funding priorities and the challenge of addressing those.

But equally, this is an open round, and so I am inviting you explicitly to weigh in on any topic that you feel you haven't yet had an opportunity to weigh in, or anything you'd like to add.

And so, Denise, I'd really like to start this round with you. we haven't heard very much from you this afternoon, but I'm sure that from your Scottish

perspective, it's been an interesting conversation of the Canadian scene. I'm very interested to hear any reflections you'd like to share at this stage?

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Thanks, Emma. And yeah, thank you to everyone for allowing me to be part of this.

I have to leave shortly, unfortunately, so I won't hear everybody else's reflections, so I'm really sorry about that.

Yeah, I mean it's been a really interesting conversation. I wish I had time to actually go through all the questions, but I'm conscious that times kind of short.

But I think, you know, the issues that you're grappling with are not unique to Canada. I mean similar situations in Scotland, particularly around kind of, you know, the resourcing issues that have just been brought up and that idea of what our, you know, demands, you know, that we have to sort of deal with and what police focus should be.

I think for me it's gone back to probably a point that I made earlier, and I think that I'd also like to reflect a little bit on the questions about institutional racism, just again based on experience I had last week. I think that, you know, it's about shared responsibility. And I think it's about changing the narrative and changing sort -- trying to change the narrative around community safety and well-being and that being a priority, not just for policing, but for all agencies working together. So I think that would be a point I'd like to leave with.

But I think it's also continuing and I think what's been good today is about continuing to have those challenging conversations.

And I think I referred to a sort of event that I was part of last week with policing, and we talked about institutional racism and, you know, a member of the community challenged the police and said, "Why are we still having these issues? Why are still experiencing, you know, those kinds of cultural barriers? And, you know, I think

that even using the term “institutional racism” for the police officers in the room is still difficult.

They felt actually it was -- you know, people were saying that they were, you know, they were individually, you know, racist or biased. And actually, it’s not about that. It’s understanding that, you know, this is embedded in organizational processes, institutional processes, and actually, we can’t resolve this as individual organizations. Actually collectively we have to work towards changing our analysis and our thinking and embedding that within an organizational sort of structure so we have change. And that takes, you know, the continuation of challenging conversations, which I think some people have. And listening to different voices.

And I think it’s through that. You know, things are sometimes uncomfortable, but we have to have those uncomfortable conversations to kind of move and change the narrative. So I think that’s probably the thing I’d like to leave with.

And actually, about -- “recommendations” is a term that I think that’s been used quite a lot today. I feel that “recommendations” is not something that -- you know, I try to avoid using “recommendations” as a term because I think it should be either provocations for continuing to kind of challenge ourselves about moving forward, or kind of suggestions, because recommendations is a very sort of top-down hierarchal way. And actually, if you want to change the narrative, we should change the terminology and the narrative that we use ourselves.

So I suppose that would be my concluding comment.

But again, I’d just like to say thank you very much for inviting me to be part of this, because, you know, as I said to you, you only learn as much as being part of this process as you give. So thank you very much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Denise, as I think I said to you in response the other day, it’s very generous of you to take that attitude. We’ve learned a tremendous amount from your participation today. We’re very grateful for it. And of

course, please step off if you need to. I know it's late in Scotland. So thank you again for joining us.

PROF. DENISE MARTIN: Thank you. Good evening, everyone.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mark, I think this is probably a really good moment to turn back to you if I can?

CHIEF MARK KANE: Yeah, it's funny, two Scottish people straight after one another; huh?

Yeah, you know, when I look at how do we cultivate, you know, this collective leadership and I think it is a top down -- I mean, it's from a top and at the bottom. We have to start at both ends. So from recruit training right from the very top, and we kind of have to meet in the middle with those people that are sitting in those sorts of mid-level supervision positions, because then that way we challenge it from it from within; right? Transformation from inside.

Secondly, funding challenges. I don't think we'll ever get that model right until we understand what the role of policing is going to be in the future, and then we can start talking about how that funding is going to look, because if we're going to start looking at funding from other social agencies, how we're going to look at not-for-profits, we have to look at the big global picture before we start saying, "Here's the funding for you. Here's the funding for you," so we get that correctly.

And sorry, I'm just going down the list as I go here.

I think how do we change and how do we look at this, how we police different sized communities in the past. I think we have to learn from the past, but I think we have to engage those communities and ask them, "How do you want us to police you in the future?" That is the biggest question. And, "What can we do different?" That's something we have to look at. And, "What have we done wrong?" But also more important, "What have we done right?" Because I think a lot of times we're always looking at the negative narrative than some of the positives, and I think we

have to look at both. There is some things positive in amongst it. And even a negative can still be a positive because we can learn from it.

And lastly, you know, Hayley's part about the competing needs, objectives, and funding priorities, the needs are going to always change. And I think I heard it earlier on where it's the knee jerk reaction to things sometimes. I think we have to really sit down and say, "What have we learnt?" You know, when I look at, you know, recent history, there's been so many events that have happened recently, and every time we're trying to evolve and change, there's change fatigue. And that's one of the things we have to be careful with, that we don't constantly try to keep changing the wheel, because people get -- people get tired of it very quickly.

I think we have to take this opportunity here, and I would agree that we try and find the best way possible to make changes that are going to be beneficial and are going to be sustainable, but more importantly, are going to be achievable and that we get the buy-in from everyone.

And I think everybody here today when I've been listening is really passionate about community well-being. And I think if we keep our focus on that, we'll succeed.

And policing, fundamentally, for me, as a police officer, that's always been my fundamental role, is I want to be part of the community and I want to try and help solve some of the problems. Not all of them I can do myself. I have to go to someone who is a professional. You know, if you need heart surgery, you go and see a heart surgeon. They're the professional at it. And I think that's what we have to remember. The police has morphed into this dumping ground of all these areas that we certainly have to deal with all these different calls that historically we never did and we never got training for. We just suddenly evolved to those.

So I think it is the time to sort of peel back the layers and say, "What do you need us to do in the future? Who is going to pick that up?" Because if

you're not wanting us to do it, who is going to step up to there, because it will eventually come back to us again if no one else steps up to the plate.

So I'm just going to leave it at those comments there.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, Mark.

Sulaimon, if I could please turn back to you?

DR. SULAIMON GIWA: One second, please. Can you hear me? Okay. Perfect. Yeah, you can hear me? Okay. Perfect. Thanks so much.

Thank you so much, Emma and colleagues, for the opportunity to be in your presence today and to be learning from you all today as well.

As a final point, I guess what I want to advance is that a lot of what we know about community policing comes from how it has been used in the past to deal with primary social disorder. And because of this, most of the strategies that have been developed and also utilized dealt with these problems based on the idea of primary, secondary, and also tertiary crime prevention.

And clearly, as we've heard today, I believe that our approach to community policing must be wholistic.

What has not been mentioned, which I believe is important, is the need to bring our understanding of community policing beyond crime and social disorder.

So the issues that lead to these situations are inextricably linked to structural, political, economic, cultural factors that make certain bodies and communities vulnerable and which brings them to the attention of the police and the criminal justice systems. And when we define criminal policing only or mostly in terms of crime and disorder, we also limit the possibility of what community policing can actually do. And I think it also makes it hard for police practitioners and police operators to also see communities as anything but full of problems.

So I think when we work in the opposite direction, we begin to actually involve our communities, especially those where police are called most often, in

ways that can begin to address some of the issues that we've been talking about here today.

Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much for sharing those reflections, Sulaimon.

And if I can turn now to your co-author, Hugh.

DR. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much, all of you, for your contributions today. I've learned a great deal and I appreciate your good thoughts.

I want to spring off the previous two comments to the effect that I worry when this discussion today focuses, on the one hand, on the issue of police reform and then, on the other hand, on goals of safety and well-being for everybody in the community.

I don't want the latter to be held hostage by the former, and recognizing that there is tremendous need for police reform, there's no denying that. Everybody knows it. Everybody sees it. And it's a big challenge.

But I think we have to keep in mind that our broadest goal is safety and well-being for everybody, and if we could achieve that, of course, there wouldn't be so much demand for police time, among other emergency responders.

That is a challenge for community in policing itself, in dealing with these issues and inequities that Sulaimon just mentioned, and there's a great deal we can do about that before we deal with police reform.

It goes back to that very simple question at lunchtime about political will. Who are the elected people who have the power to not only govern police, but to guide the goals of community in achieving some of the balance that Sulaimon has acknowledged already is unfair? Who has the political will, the power, the resources to allocate to achieving well-being for everybody in community?

And of course, in all of that, there's got to be a role for police and other responders, but we're dealing with conditions which are pre-conditions to crime

and social disorder, the latter only being symptoms that we have not dealt with those more profound questions more effectively.

So let's keep our priorities straight here. It's safety and well-being, especially the well-being side, the social determinants of health, and balance and equity and all of that, and trickle down to, and how do we fix those things where we haven't done that well enough, which can lead us to some of these other questions like police reform.

I would only reinforce that with the oft-repeated observation that police are spending 80 percent of their time not dealing with crime, but with dealing with these other symptoms that we have not fixed, the safety and well-being, the social determinants of health in a balanced way. And that's a powerful indicator for us.

We must thank police for the data that drives us in that direction, and let's use that data to drive politicians and other powers that be, funders to support our not-for-profits and other services that can do so much more for us in achieving well-being.

Thank you very much for my participation today. I appreciate that opportunity.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Hugh, thank you so much for joining us today and for sharing those reflections on the conversation.

Amy, if I can now please turn to you.

DR. AMY SICILIANO: Sure. Thank you. And thanks so much. It's been a really rich discussion and, as I said before, it's a privilege to be a part of it.

You know, I kind of want to just start with something that Hugh said. It was an example where, you know, he talked about going out for a call for service and relying on those not-for-profits, calling them in to support, you know, an incident in the community.

And one of the things that I'm lucky enough to be involved in right now is kind of flipping that around and saying, okay, so let's imagine that the not-for-

profit is the one that's the first responder and then, you know, if they need to, they can call police for back-up.

And one of the challenges we're facing in thinking about flipping that around is that, you know, at a municipal level -- and Mukisa raised this as well when -- with her comments on the public safety strategy and the funding, is that, you know, although we've kind of tasked the criminal justice system at the municipal level -- I'm talking about policing -- with filling in the gaps for the disinvestments that we've seen systemically in social services, housing, you know, there's a long list, education, but at -- you know, where I sit, we don't have the funding structure. We rely primarily on property tax and user fees and government transfers, which ebb and flow, to solve those kind of root problems.

And so I think when we're thinking practically about what alternatives look like and we're talking about community-based responses, we need to really think carefully about that -- about the resourcing question and if we want to do things differently, we need to have hard conversations on those, like those "how" questions. Like how are we going to do this? How are we going to fund things in a sustainable way that allows for those non-profits not to be working on pilots or projects, but core funded first response to crises in our community, to prevention strategies in our community?

And I think that, you know, if we start to do that hard work of thinking about the methodology in which we're going to do this, then we actually are going to see some significant changes.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Amy, thank you so much for sharing those reflections and for your participation today. It's been really helpful to have you at the table.

I'm going to turn now to some of the Participant representatives. And just for the record, I'll give Chris and Cal the last word as our Commissioned Report writers, but for now I'll turn to the representative Participants.

And Dawn, if I can turn to you, I think it's a good moment to turn to you given the comments that Amy's just made. What reflections would you like to share today?

MS. DAWN FERRIS: Oh, gosh. Thank you so much.

We've had a great day. We've had a lot of conversations, a lot of rich conversations. I think lots of us have learned lots of things.

I also feel like we've had a typically Canadian conversation, very polite, right, not too critical. We do live in a society that models under the critique the police at your own peril, but we have a lot of work ahead of us.

Some of the things that today -- I know that we have great training for the police, but it's the same training that gives us the reports that show that there is racialized -- there's bias, there's racism, there's -- in that culture, so we need to move forward with looking at the potential for training differently, screening differently upon hiring, and making those kinds of bottom down -- bring up the changes from the bottom up by those types of things.

And I understand and I get the fact that there's so much expected from police because they're supposed to be all things to all people to keep us safe, and yet so much of our system is set up that doesn't value the not-for-profit work funding-wise from the government, and yet it is the safety net for society.

We're moved into a direction where I think things are going to get a little worse with inflation being as high as they are and the cost of living for incomes has not matched that and, in fact, anybody living on less than, you know, minimum wage is struggling, and that struggle's going to get worse. And when people can't meet their basic needs, crime goes up. But that's just a reality that we're dealing with.

And so if we don't get it right, we're going to be looking at more of these Commissions in the future because there are real life implications to the decisions that we're going to be making. And I know that amongst all the people around this table and through this will have the say and the knowledge of how to make it different. We

just all have to be open to listening and hearing things in a new lens without -- I'm saying a little tongue in cheek, but it feels sometimes that we're talking about a fragile ego of the police force, and we shouldn't look -- there's no other industry -- like we should be able to hear plainly what needs to be said to make things better in the lens of I want to help.

And so my thoughts are I want to be helpful in making the change and not to beat down any one person or organization, but change is needed, real change. And those things will come along with -- you know, I wrote myself a whole bunch of notes this morning and in hearing that 50 percent of the women, the diversity of police has increased, but the training has amounted to removing the diversity of opinions and thoughts and acting differently out of the culture, so I'm hopeful that we'll have some great recommendations that can move us forward. And I've been thankful, very thankful, to have my voice here representing my colleagues and the women that we serve. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Dawn, thank you very much. And we're very thankful in turn. I know that as the executive director of a not-for-profit, you're pulled in a million directions and so thank you for giving up your precious time to join us today. it's much appreciated.

El, if I could please turn to you next?

DR. EL JONES: Yes. I fear I'm about to do the academic thing where I start quibbling terms, but here we are.

The first thing I wanted to say is that I do want us to make a distinction between community policing and a term that was quite popular a few years ago, which was community-controlled policing.

So community policing in Canada, I mean, we can trace it back to 1822 with Robert Peel if we want, but in Canada, you know, community policing, as it's currently kind of envisioned is really an implementation in the 1990's.

And as people have been talking about today, that's actually occurring at the same time as we're experiencing massive cuts in social safety nets. So beginning in the '70s, but particularly through the 1990s, when we start really getting not only austerity-based politics, but this is when Clinton in the States is putting in three strikes, this is when we're getting welfare. So we're having this growing neoliberalism globally that's also making its way into Canada that's really cutting the social safety net. And this is the time when we implement something we call community policing.

And initially there's quite positive reviews. People say, you know, "There's more cops on the street, people walking the beat." This is often what community members want to see.

But when we look at critiques, it's very clear that it's wealthy, middle-class, white communities that experience and enjoy community policing, and those communities who are heavily policed do not.

So we see white communities, for example, or middle-class communities, or gated communities, however you want to put them, privileged communities that, for example, are into neighbourhood watch and they're engaging in this kind of neighbourhood surveillance alongside the police, or things like Crime Stoppers. And these kind of community implementations become quite popular with privileged people, but of course also include things like now you've involved the neighbourhood in calling the police on a Black person who is walking on the street. So it actually starts to implement not just community policing as putting police into communities, but instrumentalizing communities against other people. So this is what Black people talk about with "walking while black". You know, that we can't even be on the street, and be perceived as out of place, without experiencing people calling the cops on us, or, you know, seeing us as some kind of disturbance.

So I did want to lodge that particular critique, make sure that we understand that there's now studies of community policing that quite clearly show that

it's not evenly received by all communities. And of course, all communities are not equal.

Community-controlled policing sometimes gets folded into that. That's quite different. And that was a term that was quite popular a few years ago, which was really about communities, particularly marginalized communities that experienced policing, having police forces be accountable to us.

So that might also include not using, like, the RCMP, or HRP, or whoever, what your police force is, but instead policing within communities.

So examples of this would be Indigenous communities like the Bear Clan Patrols or, you know, people that are actually using their own communities, that you then have a say over who is hired and fired, who is policing your community, what that looks like, what you want -- which of course we don't have a say over when it comes to state-sponsored police forces. So that's quite different. So I did want us to just recognize that, that when people are talking about community-controlled policing, we're not talking about, you know, police office on the corner, right, a camera on the corner, or like, you know, putting an RCMP office into the recreation centre in North Preston. That's not what we mean. We mean that police governance, oversight, and all those things belong to community and we get the say over what policing looks like.

I'm going really long. I'll just distinguish really quickly, the final thing I wanted to say is, you know, we've had this discussion of competing interests, and I agree with that, but I also want to challenge that term in terms of is it really a competition when one side has all the power and one side doesn't; right? So if I want to take the sports analogy, there's an assumption that a competition is a level playing field, it's fair, there's referees, and there's rules, but that is just simply not the case when it comes to policing. I don't carry a weapon. I don't have the right to implement state force; right? Like, this is just a basic.

And I'm sorry if that sounds harsh, but it's true; right?

And this was said perhaps most clearly in the critique of implementation of reports, where it's quite truly said that it's easier to say we need more body armour and we need a tank or, you know, what do you call it, they're not called tanks, you know, an armoured vehicle, we need that, and much harder to say, "We need stable profit to -- stable funding to non-profits." But why is that?

That is very true. I agree with that. But what does that say about us? That it's easy to call for more weapons, which is so dangerous and should be treated with so much care; right? Use of force should be treated with so much care. And then it's decades and decades of debate over whether we should give a couple of thousand more dollars to a shelter.

And I think that really says it all around our priorities and our discussions of funding and what that means.

So the final thing I'll say is we cannot have this discussion without a discussion of power. Obviously the power of police, but also power within communities, as I said, who has say in every community, which includes racialized communities as well; right? But some voices are stronger. Community itself is a construction and that isn't always a reality.

So we also have to keep in mind what is our power analysis? Who actually has the ability to implement these things and are we really ever on a playing field where we're able to speak back or to have the same say. And when we talk about policing in particular, we have to understand that fundamentally, policing is about who has the right by the state to use force against other people. And that is a very powerful thing and it is very difficult for anybody to combat that. And I'm saying that on a systematic level, not directed at any particular person, but on the very conception of policing, which is why, of course, many communities are now coming to critiques not of police, or form of different training, or body cameras, but of thinking differently completely about policing, including whether we need it in its current form or if we can

think differently about how to implement community safety that begins with community and doesn't involve use of force by the state at all.

Thank you very much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed, El.

Mukisa, if I can turn now to you, please?

Mukisa, I am so sorry, your microphone issues are back.

What I'm going to suggest is I'll carry on and I'll get you to do the reboot again since it seemed to work so well last time. I'm sorry to put you to the trouble, but we'd like to be sure that we hear you.

And so I'll carry on down my list and give you an opportunity to reboot and hopefully that fixes the problem. Thank you.

Kurtis, if I could turn, please, to you?

INSP. KURTIS KAMOTZKI: Yeah, I'm afraid I won't bring anything new to the table. What I will bring is just essentially my perspective, which is a reiteration of a lot of the same perspectives that were shared previously. I think when we talk in general about community policing, it's a terminology issue. I think we need to move it from the policing lens more to the security lens or the safety lens and say community safety engagement, community security engagement, something to that effect.

And I know earlier there was a discussion of an eco system. I think that landed well within my wheelhouse to frame it to say that it's a macrocosm of community services that are responsible for the safety of the community.

So any reform that needs to be done to policing needs to be complimentary in responsibility or accountability for service providers, government, public stakeholders, or any other interest parties within the community that would service the security of the public in general.

So that's what I would propose and that's what I would, I guess, more or less reiterate in my own words.

So thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed.

Steve, if I can please turn to you next?

MR. STEVE MILLS: Okay. Well I'll just kind of reiterate what Hugh Martin said about the struggles of the current environment that policing has seen.

You'll hear much on this tomorrow, I gather, from one of our representatives, about adequacy and enough resources to do the job.

The police have a very difficult job. The rest of the organizations here have a very difficult job. Healthcare have an extremely difficult job. And there is just simply not enough money to go around.

However, there has to be a time when the investment must be made and adequacy does not equal minimum. And that's what we -- this is my experience in the RCMP, have been living with for decades, is minimum funding, minimum resourcing, just to get the job done, looking for a Cadillac service on a beer budget. And I know every other agency is experiencing the same, but this is where we are and the discussion has to keep on going in that regard. And unless there is a will by government to change that, it will just continue.

So that's it for me. And I really appreciate being a party here.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Steve, thank you so much for your participation today. It was great to have you along to the conversation and thank you for your contributions to it.

Ray, if I may turn to you next, please?

INSP. RAY MOOS: Thanks. So it's been a privilege and an -- frankly a great opportunity to participate. Thank you for this.

I just want to say in closing that, you know, I really applaud Nova Scotia's direction in going towards these community safety wellbeing plans. I like the fact that it's taken as a shared responsibility, it recognizes the limitations of police and

puts the community more in that driver's seat to address those broader societal issues within the community.

Some of the issues that are still going to be long-term sustainable funding and a coordinated -- and coordinated funding is critical to its success. And I recall one of the earlier comments, whether it's in the morning or on this panel, but it was, you know, how do you measure what you don't see. And there is a way to do that. The challenge is that you have to take a longer view at it. And we are all in a world where we want that quick three to six-month return on investment, and these are large, broad societal issues that may require a three to six-year return on investment. And so we need to adapt our performance measures accordingly, so that we can see the type of change that we want to see in the future.

So thank you very much and I appreciate it. Thank you.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much.

Mukisa, I think that you're back. Let's give it another try.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: All right. Hopefully, my microphone is cooperating.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Sounds great.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Okay. Thank you.

I do first want to comment on we've had a lot of discussions about funding this afternoon, and a lot of questions about, you know, how we're going to fund, and that we have to assess how we're going to fund, and we have to think about -- think so thoughtfully about how we're going to allocate these resources. But again, when it comes to policing or when it comes to prison, there's never any question of how or where we're going to get the money. It is just provided. So I do want to just make that comment as non-profits are just so important and key to maintaining public safety and connecting with community on that grassroots level and making sure people are feeling heard and supported and safe. So there really shouldn't be a question of how. We also have -- there is so much research, there's so many recommendations.

Also, for non-profit organizations to even receive their funding, we have to write proposals. We have to justify every penny that we spend. We have to write reports quarterly to show what we're doing and show the effectiveness of our programs. So the information is always there, it's always been there, but we have to actually resort to it and use it, so that when we're looking at I guess what to fund, if we have to sort of divide the resources, then we can see what's already working and just continue funding those things rather than having to start over and start new pilot programs all the time when we already have these programs that are already working.

So I'll leave that at that, but I do want to unpack institutional racism a little bit because we -- there was some discussion on I guess how police and how people feel about the term institutional racism and whether it's individualized, or whether it's not. And although it is an institutional sort of systemic thing, we do need to take collective responsibility for eradicating that racism. So that's going to have to happen on an individual basis. People as individuals are going to have to assess their decision making and whether their decision making is anti-racist.

Ray also brought up the point about justice-led working groups and how to use restorative justice that is a more community focussed sort of route for justice, and we are supportive of restorative justice. But again, bringing it back to the conversation of institutional racism, we have seen in the Wortley Report that black people are less likely to even be referred to restorative justice, so we don't even get the opportunities to participate in these programs because that institutional racism is a barrier.

And I also have an example, which we haven't really talked about, the use of community policing in the educational system, which is one type of community policing, but where -- there was an example of in 2019, the police was called to respond to an incident in an elementary school. So what happened was there was a nine-year-old boy. He was being bullied, and he was upset, and sort of in response to that bullying kind of was acting out, and instead of the school being able to handle it

internally, they actually called the police. So after lunchtime, the school locked this nine-year-old black child outside, put the school in a hold and secure, and called the police. And then when the police responded, they were treating the young, black boy like a criminal and asking, "Oh, like, do you have weapons?" and such and such. And this is in contrast to a pretty famous case in Halifax from 1995 when the police were called to respond to 3 12-year-old girls who had been alleged to have stolen $10. The police were called to the school, and as a result, these 3 12-year-old girls who were black were strip searched. So when we do resort to sort of these community policing, we resort to calling the police as a response, then police tend to respond to these problems as if they're responding to a crime. So the behaviour that police are trained to do doesn't really change when they're addressing these community situations.

But bringing it back, the central issue there is institutional racism. So racism causes people to see adults, teachers to see these young, black children as adults and treat them as such. And then when the police are called, they're responding as if it is a crime. So while police are trained to address criminality, this ends up criminalizing these children, or even when charges are not laid, it still traumatizes them for the rest of their life.

So we need our institutions as well to be anti-racist in their policies and in their practices, and we need to resort to alternative solutions, and also use those solutions that are already there. Like, in these situations, we could have called trained professionals, social workers, ECEs, student support workers, or even parents and families to respond to these issues rather than trying to call police for I guess conflict between children.

Another point that I wanted to raise is gender-based violence and policing and the ---

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mukisa, I'll just ask you to keep this last point brief, if that's okay. I'm sorry to jump in but conscious of the time. Go ahead.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Yes, apologies. I have -- I've been talking for a while, so thank you for the space.

But I guess I would just recommend that police have more training and understanding of coercive control because what we've seen is that there is a lack of understanding from our -- and our clients are hesitant to call the police in these situations because they don't want to be criminalized themselves. So I'll keep that point brief and thank you so much for having me here today.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Mukisa, thank you for your very thoughtful contributions. If I may just ask one follow-up question about the 2019 example that you shared involving the young, black boy at the elementary school. Was that a Nova Scotia example? I'm afraid it's one I'm not familiar with.

MS. MUKISA KAKEMBO: Yes, that was Nova Scotia. That was in Dartmouth at Forsyth School.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much. And the 1995 example is one that I'm familiar with and, Commissioners, we can put some information about that before you if you wish.

Thank you very much indeed, Mukisa.

Hubert, I haven't given you an opportunity to speak to this last question yet.

MR. HUBERT MARTIN: No, I'll keep it brief. Again, thank you for the opportunity to be here. It's very insightful. I can guarantee that as a police officer, the last thing I would want to do is have to arrest a child in these types of situations. And I think we've evolved to a point now where, I'm hopeful, that if I received that call today, my first call would be to one of those non-profit organizations that we partner up with, right, because they're so helpful. It's not a police issue. I agree a thousand percent.

I'm here on behalf of the Police Federation, and ultimately, all we want to be able to do is to ensure that our members are, you know, are placed in these

rural communities that we're talking about today, and that they find ways to enhance the public's trust, so that, you know, crime is reported to us, whether it's firearms, whether it's gender-based violence or sexual violence. We just want our officers to be able to be around to -- and have the opportunity to gain trust and not be put in situations where we're having to deal with non-policing issues.

And again, thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you very much indeed for your thoughtful contributions today, Hubert. They're much appreciated.

Hayley, if I can turn, please, to you?

MS. HAYLEY CRICHTON: Thank you very much. I just wanted to begin by quickly clarifying one of the comments I made earlier with respect to intelligence-led policing, and I guess, quite frankly, the importance of language to ensure kind of a general understanding. So when I was referring to intelligence-led policing previously, I was really talking within the framework of police resource requirements. So it's the more formal understanding of intelligence-led policing, which is leveraging technology advancements and analytics to generate intelligence that can be used to organize limited police resources rather than resourcing FTE positions for police visibility, which have been a large discussion of this Commission as well. So the difficulty to reconcile an advancement towards replacing persons with technological advancements versus the kind of reliance on FTE visibility policing that is more resource heavy. So I just wanted to ensure that clarification was provided there.

For myself, I know that I'm extremely appreciative to be a participant in today's discussion, in part because I think it's important that we all come to the table as learners. And I certainly have come to this table today as a learner as well. And I know that I'm going to be taking a lot of the comments that have been made today back to the work that I'm completing within the Department of Justice to, quite frankly, inform my approach to work.

So I'm just very appreciative of the time all the participants have taken today and know that you have -- those in non-profit organizations are often pulled in many different directions and so their time is extremely valuable. And just we'll keep it brief there. I appreciate everybody's time.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Hayley, thank you so much for your contributions today and for coming, as you say, to this roundtable in exactly the spirit in which everybody is invited, which is the idea that we can all learn from one another. And we have appreciated learning from you, but we also appreciate hearing that it's been valuable for your work. Thank you.

Kristina, if I can please turn to you?

MS. KRISTINA FIFIELD: I'll keep it quick. I just want to say that I think that the cultural shift, the institutional shift, we need to be individually and collectively dealing with power and privilege. We need to be looking -- and that reform and change needs to start there; right? And we need to also look at accountability for individuals who use violence, right, racism, and discrimination within -- when people have -- are in positions of power, including police and RCMP, and all other institutions.

And I do believe that when we start to shift from power and hierarchy and we're creating spaces, safe spaces for all voices to come to the table like we're doing today, when we have survivors, individuals that perpetrate violence, their voices being heard, we need to get everyone together, because communities will not be safe until we can all create safe spaces together. And we need to have uncomfortable conversations and we need to be okay with being able to have enough capacity to have those uncomfortable conversations, because this is difficult work ahead, but it can be done, and we need to stop avoiding dealing with violence that is happening within our institutions, in society, coming from all sorts of different places. And that's, I think, how we create community safety moving forward, especially for marginalized and vulnerable persons.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Kristina, thank you so much for your contributions today and your many contributions to our process. They are sincerely appreciated.

Cal and Chris, I'd like to give the last word to you.

And Chris, let me begin with you. Thank you for coming out of retirement to prepare a commissioned report and to participate in today's proceedings. Both are very much appreciated.

Are there any last words that you'd like to share?

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Before I go back into retirement? Yeah.

Well, I just have a general observation about the conversation that we've had all day. And it's interesting, and it's expanded my sense of the issue because our focus of the report was how to bring about change and reform within policing. And we have ideas about how to diversify and complicate policing and expand its capacity to deal with issues in ways that they haven't done effectively or as effectively as they could or should. And that might mean going beyond simply the standard law enforcement constable as the deliverer of all police services. And we've thought about bringing in other kinds of police officers and bringing in resources like social workers, community navigators, various services that exist in the community, rather than have police try and do things that they're not necessarily well equipped to do, et cetera.

Now, that's one narrative, which is how to make the police better, how to expand and diversify what they do, how to make them more effective in the community, and how to go beyond where we are now.

What I wasn't as sensitive to as I am now is the degree to which this approach is not always necessarily always welcomed in the community, in the sense that the community, at least some of the community represented today, is saying, "We can do and should be doing those things, but we don't have the resources, we don't have the power, so we can't develop the capacity." And maybe those resources

that were thinking about might be brought within to policing, should remain in the community and police should actually limit their role to what they do and we can deal with these other issues more effectively.

I'll give you a concrete example. We're talking about police response to mental illness and the use of, I think this morning you were told about a program where, as an alternative to policing, social workers, et cetera, and agencies deal with those issues.

Well, there's another approach too, which is Halifax is doing now, where police and social workers work together. So in that sense, the social work capacity is brought within to the police service and not out in the community.

So I do wonder about these two, kind of, semi-independent narratives, where we're building up, and hopefully will build up capacity in the community to deal with a lot of the issues that sometimes police are, by default, asked to deal with.

But I think we've got some work ahead of us to figure out what the role of the police, versus community groups, and agencies, and civil society are going to play, and what relationship and how that relationship is going to function in this kind of new ecosystem or network of policing and security that we're envisaging in the future.

And I don't know that we have had that discussion yet, and whether where we want to put our resources, because they are limited and they're not going to be any less limited.

And so maybe both need to go on this ongoing attempt to improve and make policing more responsive and more accountable, but also more flexible and more sophisticated in dealing with some of the issues, and recognize that the community has an important and critical role in producing public safety and include systemic funding as part of the overall community security budget, rather than call it a police budget, and rather than call it a police board. Perhaps we should start talking

about community safety and security or community safety and wellness board, et cetera.

So I leave this discussion and go back to my book, which will never get finished, knowing that there are at least two, you know, movements going on here at the same time, and -- police reform and community development. And I'm hoping that they will work at establishing clarity and relationship that makes it truly work as kind of a rambler network of community safety, et cetera.

So ---

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Thank you so much, ---

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: --- thank you all.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: --- Chris. It's very much appreciated.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Right.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: And I'm sorry to jump in.

DR. CHRIS MURPHY: Yes.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: I'm conscious that we do have a hard stop today.

And so before we conclude, I do want to give Cal the opportunity to share any last thoughts.

Cal?

MR. CAL CORLEY: Yeah, thank you very much.

And, Emma, it's been an honour to participate here today. Very well moderated, learned session.

First I'd like to pick up quickly on a couple points Mukisa made. And without repeating what those were, the police today are still the gateway to the criminal justice system. The primary tools they use are those associated with that. Arrest, prosecution are among the primary tools.

I'm reminded, listening to Mukisa, that -- about a lead in a million-size city in Canada that's policed by the RCMP, and talking to the lead on resort of

justice in that community. I'm very proud of the model they had and everything else. And I said, "So what's your uptake?" And she said, "We get no referrals from the RCMP." And we got into that, and it's back to the few offramps that they envision, et cetera.

So progressives are really seeing that role shifting to police within a public health context with their education, social, and other partners there, which afford more offramps, and the culture goes with it.

I think in addition, I'll just close by saying I think, you know, we're beyond community policing. Chris touched on that. the future is really in a post-community policing world, as characterized by collaborative community safety and well-being. We touched on that in the report.

I know you're short on time. The heavy lifting is yet to come. There's lots of pilot projects and that sort of thing going now, but the heavy lifting will be on leadership, culture, governance, and, you know, funding and keeping that full spectrum of stakeholders engaged through this next several years. Thank you so much.

DR. EMMA CUNLIFFE: Cal, many thanks for sharing your reflections, and if I may convey my personal thanks to everybody who's participated today, for your contributions but especially for the spirit in which you've come to the table. It's very much appreciated.

Commissioners, if I can turn now to you, please.

COMMISSIONER FITCH: Thank you, Dr. Cunliffe. Just I'm going to wrap up with just a huge thank you to all of you. The topic of community safety and wellbeing is near and dear to all of our hearts, and you've given us a lot to think on as we go forward in our work. So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MacDONALD: Yes, and I would like to say thank you and I would also like to say please. Thank you so much for such a rich, absolutely wonderful, fascinating conversation and thank you, Emma, for, as already

observed, a wonderful job facilitating it. I've learned so much today and I'm greatly appreciative of that. So thank you so much. And the please part of it is, please be our voices and be our advocates and be our champions to make sure that our recommendations -- because there was quite a bit of symmetry here today, which I found to be very positive. So, please, for the memories of those whose lives were taken and for all the pain and suffering in this province and in this country and beyond, be our champions for change that we discussed today. So thank you all so much.

COMMISSIONER STANTON: And a thanks from me as well. It's just -- we're always struck by how generous people have been when we've asked for time and assistance from people who have huge demands on their time and the response to and the call to public service is answered and we are so grateful for that. We do really appreciate your perspectives and suggestions for recommendations, or as Professor Martin has invited us to think of them as provocations for thinking differently. And those suggestions for community policing and safety and wellbeing will certainly contribute to our thinking as we prepare our final report.

Thanks, of course, to Dr. Cunliffe and the research and policy team for your work today and all you do to make these round tables possible, and to our interpreters, who have worked very hard today, along with all of the tech team and everyone involved. We're always so grateful to all of you.

If something you heard today inspired an idea about community safety, please share your suggestion for recommendations or provocations with us through our website. Thank you so much, everyone, and for those of you joining is again tomorrow, we'll be here then. Thank you.

--- Upon adjourning at 4:14 p.m.

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sandrine Marineau-Lupien, a certified court reporter, hereby certify the foregoing pages to be an accurate transcription of my notes/records to the best of my skill and ability, and I so swear.

Je, Sandrine Marineau-Lupien, une sténographe officiel, certifie que les pages ci-hautes sont une transcription conforme de mes notes/enregistrements au meilleur de mes capacités, et je le jure.

Sandrine Marineau-Lupien