



# **Special Committee To Prevent The Abuse And Exploitation Of Children Through the Sex Trade**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 17 — October 11, 2000**

**Prince Albert**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-fourth Legislature**

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PREVENT THE ABUSE AND EXPLOITATION  
OF CHILDREN THROUGH THE SEX TRADE  
2000**

Arlene Julé, Co-Chair  
Humboldt

Peter Prebble, Co-Chair  
Saskatoon Greystone

June Draude  
Kelvington-Wadena

Ron Harper  
Regina Northeast

Carolyn Jones  
Saskatoon Meewasin

Don Toth  
Moosomin

Kevin Yates  
Regina Dewdney

The committee met at 9 a.m.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — What we'd like to do is just kind of dispense with the process we normally go through — we kind of introduce guests to the background of the committee — so that we can give you more time. I think it might be nice for you, though, if we introduced ourselves. So we'll do that and then let you formally introduce yourself. But let's go around the room and . . . but starting with members of the special committee and our staff, let's introduce each other.

We've met already, Helen, but just for the record my name is Peter Prebble, and I am the MLA for Saskatoon Greystone and one of the Co-Chairs of the committee. And I'll let my colleague, Arlene Julé introduce herself.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Good morning, Helen. Really happy to have you here with us today. I am Arlene Julé and I'm the MLA for Humboldt.

**Mr. Toth:** — Don Toth. I'm the MLA for Moosomin.

**Ms. Draude:** — June Draude. I'm your MLA.

**Mr. Harper:** — Ron Harper, MLA Regina Northeast.

**Ms. Jones:** — Carolyn Jones, MLA Saskatoon Meewasin.

**Mr. Yates:** — I'm Kevin Yates, the MLA for Regina Dewdney.

**Mr. Pritchard:** — I'm Randy Pritchard . . .

**Ms. Woods:** — And I'm Margaret Woods, the committee clerk.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Murray, why don't you introduce yourself too?

**Mr. Webb:** — Oh, sure. Murray Webb. I'm with the Department of Social Services, and just following with interest.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well there are some people with us and I think, Helen, if you want to just turn around, and we'd just love everybody to introduce themselves.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — That would be very nice.

**Ms. Wells:** — Kathy Wells from *Hansard*.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Gary Doetzel, Prince Albert Police Service.

**Ms. Klein:** — Donelda Klein with *Hansard*.

**Mr. Sywanyk:** — Ihor Sywanyk, with Broadcast Services.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Good, thank you. And Helen, if we could just have a little bit about your background before you start your presentation, it would be appreciated.

**Ms. Johnson:** — My name's Helen Johnson. I'm the area director for eastern region 2 of the Metis Nation. I'm also the Minister of Social Services and Justice for the Metis Nation,

and the Associate Minister of Health.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — You can proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Johnson:** — Okay.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Yes, we're very much looking forward to it, Helen, so thanks a lot for coming. We know you had a long drive this morning.

**Ms. Johnson:** — Okay. See, when I got a call from Randy a couple of weeks ago asking if I'd be interested in making a presentation, I thought about it, and thought it was a good idea. I went through . . . I think I stated when I met a few of you this morning, that I went through the verbatim reports, the verbatim reports that were on the Internet.

And one of the requests that Mr. Prebble had, when Ingrid MacColl and Wayne Ross made their presentation in Saskatoon on behalf of Metis Family and Community Justice Services, was that Nation . . . his request was that Nation appear before the committee, give their . . . to advise the committee on the issues of unemployment, poverty, and inadequate housing for Metis families in urban centres especially because there are such high numbers of children being pulled in the sex trade in the urban centres.

And that's the direction that I think my report is going to be. And not so much that everybody knows there's high unemployment within the Aboriginal communities — that's just not the Metis communities, also of the First Nations communities — and because of that there's a lot of poverty, inadequate housing. And I guess the simplest solution is give them jobs that would alleviate the poverty, the inadequate housing, but it isn't as easy as that.

I can't speak on behalf of the First Nations because that isn't my community. Within the Metis Nation though, the challenges or the problems go a lot deeper than that, than just giving them jobs, giving them the education. They have . . . There's been a lot of years where there's been racism that has . . . people get to the point where they've got no self-esteem, no self-worth.

The Metis have gone through the boarding school system, which is I guess residential schools. There is a number of them; I'm one of them. And that is the one place where everything was taken from you — your culture, your language, your family — there is no parenting skills. When I was in university I told one of the professors they took everything from us. The only thing that we were left with was the colour of our skin and if it was possible they probably would have taken that also.

And it goes . . . with that you get dysfunctional families. They don't have the parenting skills. You get intergenerational effects from the boarding school systems.

And that is where I think we have to start. I've got this speech all nicely written, and I'm not even following it.

But we need to start dealing with families as a whole. We can't

go into a family where you've got a child that's on the street and deal with just that child because that whole family is affected. And it doesn't really matter what label you put on it — whether it's the wraparound process, the integrated approach, the holistic approach — you have to deal with the whole family.

If you help the child that's on the street, get them on their way to healing and they go back to their families, their families aren't healed because they've been affected or else . . . not just with the child that's been on the street, but they've got the issues that have gone back quite a few years. You've got to deal with the intergenerational effects or the direct effects of boarding schools. You've got to deal with the racism, the lack of parenting skills, and you can't do that in isolation. Yes. And we've got to be given the ability to deliver these programs and services to help our own people because what's been happening up to this point hasn't been working.

And I always talk . . . when we get people, especially non-Metis that come into our office and want to save us, I always think about the white saviour. They want to be the white saviour. And they get very insulted when we tell them, no, we've got the experience, we've got the education, we can help our own people because we know where they've been, we know what their issues are because we've been there, and we know what it takes to go through the healing process.

It's been over 30 years since I was in the boarding school system, and I'm still going through the healing process because a lot of the things that had happened there I did not . . . I buried them. I didn't remember the things that have happened and things are still coming out, just out of left field sometimes, because I had buried it so deep.

The other thing too is — and Mr. MacInnes had mentioned this also — when you get someone, they start healing, they'll fall back to their old ways. And what I always thought was they'll sabotage their healing because they don't think that they are worth the progress that they're making. They don't have the self-worth. They start questioning; they're not worth the effort people are putting into them. And you can't give up on them. It isn't something that's going to work in 12 weeks, in two years, in three years — it's a lifelong process.

A lot of the people . . . It's amazing because a lot of the leaders within the Metis Nation, especially from the North and people that have moved into the urban centres, are products of the boarding school system. And those are the ones that decided while they were in boarding school that they were not going to be broken; they were going to remember what their parents taught them.

I was taken away when I was five years old. My mom passed away when I was in boarding school and I was 14 at the time and saying to myself I will not forget what I was taught at home, and that was five years. It's very difficult to learn everything in life in five years and when you're that young. But I made a very conscious effort not to forget it and I refused to believe everything I was told in boarding schools.

I really don't have much else to say. That's how far back you have to go to start the healing process. Right now we're

working at a crisis level, intervention level. We have to start some preventative programs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think so, because once we start the healing . . . Like I said, there's a lot of us that have been healing for a number of years.

We've got the leaders, we've got the education behind us, we can do this. But once we start that healing process, then you're going to start seeing our people getting educated, getting those jobs, and they're no longer living in poverty, the inadequate housing.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — So with the healing process is a constant restoration of self-worth, and that entails education and so on to move you into . . . You're just saying that the healing process is a process.

**Ms. Johnson:** — Yes, it has to start. With Metis it's very unique because when we were conceived, for lack of a better word, and that's well over 100 years ago, 150 years ago, one society said we weren't white, we weren't wanted; the other society said we weren't Indian and we weren't wanted. So we've lived on the fringe of society for a number of years.

And a lot of leaders have tried, like well over 100 years, trying to get us out of that level I guess and we've never been allowed. We've come close but we've never been allowed.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Helen, some of the committee members would be, I'm sure, most happy to be able to ask you some questions, or do you feel at this time that you're ready to respond and enter discussion or do you have more that you would like to present?

**Ms. Johnson:** — No, you can ask questions. If I don't know the answer, I'll tell you I don't know the answer.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well, okay. Thank you. We'll open it up to committee members at this time to ask Helen any questions or make any comments or . . . And, Helen, the same applies to you, if you feel that you want to question us, you're certainly welcome. We're taking our information from you though. We're gaining knowledge and so on. Okay, June did you have a question?

**Ms. Draude:** — Yes I do. Thank you very much, Helen. I think that yesterday we had a day of witnesses talking to us about family, and again this morning that was the first issue you brought forward and I think that's the theme that we all are hearing that this isn't . . . when we're talking about children on the streets, we're not just talking about the child, we're talking about their whole family. And I think if we have one clear message right now, we all know that that's the word that it's got to revolve . . . our report has to revolve around.

But I also hear the word we've and I think by we, for you it means the Metis Nation and I believe yesterday when we talked to a number of First Nations people they talked about we and they talked about giving them . . . them be given their own responsibility for that.

Is there any way that we as a committee can put forward ideas,

recommendations, or whatever to the government that's going to be suitable for everyone whether you're Metis, First Nation, or white children?

**Ms. Johnson:** — One approach . . . and I'll talk from a racial perspective because I'm more familiar with that than the province. I've got a very difficult time actually switching to the province, so a lot of times when I became Minister of Social Services that was my biggest challenge to think as a province as a whole instead of just the regional boundaries that I represent.

But we have a lot of partnership agreements in our region, the Metis Nation, like eastern region to . . . with all the health districts that are within our boundaries. We've got a partnership agreement with all of them. We've got a partnership agreement with two school divisions in that region, and I couldn't tell you all of them because I can't remember them all. We've got a lot of them.

And the approach that we use is the integrated approach. We've got to be able to work together. The guidelines would have to . . . and recommendations would have to be flexible enough so if a non-Aboriginal organization wants to utilize something that's going to fit their mandate, and the First Nations want it, it's got to fit theirs and Metis Nation, and if they all want to work together then it's got to fit because we're not going to get anywhere by stovepiping ourselves.

I've been isolated enough as Metis. I don't want that again. And I think the First Nations have been isolated enough, and to start putting strict boundaries around Metis issues and have them just dealing with Metis isn't going to work.

Within our office, our mandate is to help our Metis members. But we have First Nations, non-Aboriginals that walk through our doors and we help them all, and we've never turned anybody away.

**Ms. Draude:** — I'm so pleased to hear you say that because, I mean, it is right. Like our children are working together and playing together, and even we recognize that we're different, at the same time we're the same. So it's going to be a lot easier to work if we're saying we can't just come forward and say this is the way it's going to be, but at least we can come forward as a committee and say this is what we're suggesting.

Yesterday there was a question about why we didn't have representation. And because it is a legislative committee and we just can't say well, I'd like you to come as a Metis representative, but we do need the input.

I'm also wondering, yesterday there was concerns about how we deal directly with the children.

The word johns came up quite often. And we discussed it last night, thinking maybe we should be a lot meaner and just say something that hurts more. Or use the word pedophile all the time when we're dealing with children and rather than just a john because maybe it would bring the level of not just importance but the intensity of it up.

Do you have any direct suggestions about how we could be

dealing with children on the street from your perspective as someone who cares about families?

**Ms. Johnson:** — With the reports, I agreed with some of the presentations that were done where . . . See, I think front-line people that are out there, trying to help the children making that initial contact, making them aware that there are options in life, that if they want to leave the streets, if they need someone to talk to, they need someone to call, there's somebody there.

And I think that's very, very important to have those people out there. If they weren't out there the children aren't going to realize that there are options. And I think that's a lot of the challenges that we're having is people don't realize that they've got options in life. And it starts very, very young in life. If you're never given any options, how are you going to know you've got them. You think that's normal behaviour.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you.

**Mr. Harper:** — The committee has heard, I suppose, different policies and different legislation that's been enacted in other provinces. For example, in Alberta where they've enacted the legislation that empowers the authorities to remove children from the streets for a period of 72 hours, is that policy that you would agree with personally?

**Ms. Johnson:** — Personally, no. I think it's because . . . just with my background being in the boarding school system, and being picked up and . . . Mind you, 72 hours probably would have been better than 10 years.

**Mr. Harper:** — I'm sure. But just the principle of that legislation as it is in Alberta where the authorities can retain a girl off the street for 72 hours, is that something that you think that's a direction that this committee should be looking at establishing possible policy around that, or is that something that is totally not acceptable?

**Ms. Johnson:** — I think . . . well Manitoba's got a different policy. Alberta's got one. I think just looking at all the different, I don't know, options and making something that's going to work for the province. I can't say yes, take the children off the street and hold them for 72 hours, and that's something positive. To look at what's going to be positive and what's going to work for Saskatchewan instead of, well it's working for Alberta, it'll work here. Saskatchewan is unique.

**Mr. Harper:** — All right. Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Are there any other committee members that have questions?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Helen, I wanted to . . . Just going back to the issue that you originally . . . the question that I originally asked with respect to tackling issues of unemployment, poverty, and inadequate housing. To what degree do you see that being done on behalf of your people at a provincial level, and to what degree do you see the Metis Nation of Saskatchewan playing a role in terms of tackling those issues?

**Ms. Johnson:** — With unemployment, if you don't have the skills, if you don't have the education, you're not going to work. Right now we've got programs within the province that's funded through the federal government, and we are training our people. There are getting to be more and more out there that have the education, the training, and are finding more and more jobs. We need to — and a lot of them have the parenting skills; some don't — we need to start doing the training, but we need to do it ourselves.

There was a program, and I think it was for foster children in Metis homes in one of the communities and there was a lot of Metis that wanted to become foster parents. Social Services: great, we'll go in there, we'll train your members, and we'll get the foster parents. The first week after it started about two Metis members came back because, just the way, I don't know, the training was presented by a non-Aboriginal, and that was dropped.

About a year later, the same Metis members that had wanted to take this training, wanted to be . . . still wanted to be foster parents. So the coordinator went around asking — this was awkward — why didn't she do it; what do you need there? And this time when they went to Social Services, they had an option, said, we've got to do the training. We'll stick to the guidelines but this is the way we want to do delivery.

Most of those Metis parents that wanted to be foster parents completed the course. It was just the way it was delivered. We tend to overwhelm people. And if we put on, I think . . . when we deliver something as very inflexible at times and you scare the hell out of them and they'll leave, instead of going through all that process and having the fear of failure.

We need to be able to do our own delivery. I really, really believe that because of what we've been able to do in our region and a few of the regions in the province.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Helen, I was hearing you say that . . . or you were giving us a little bit of background of residential schools and really the impact, the historical impact, on the Metis people and the loss of your identify as being something that grieves you a great deal and that has caused a great deal of distress, because now as you're recognizing what that does to you, you're having to retrieve and you're in a process of trying to retrieve identity.

And I just want to assure you that there are many people out in Saskatchewan right now that are . . . that basically we want to have a wholesome, peaceful, and healthy society. And there is a concerted effort being made by a lot of people to gain understanding so that we can come to respect, so we can come to the ground where we have common ground, common interests, look at our common values, and as June has mentioned, work together. And you've mentioned that too and how important that is.

Because I think what all of our hearts seek mostly is harmony. We all want to be well and we know that harmony is the way.

I just want to tell you that I've been reading the book called *Stolen from Our Embrace* and also taking a class at the Indian

Federated College on Metis history. And I think Kevin had mentioned to you earlier, when he was discussing or having a little discussion with you before the committee sat, that there's a lot of things that we didn't realize that we're coming to realize. And I just think it's important to talk about what we . . . where we're at now, what we do realize, sort of from your perspective as Metis people and certainly from our perspective too.

And I need to say, you know, to you today that as I grew up as a white Canadian, I guess, with Polish ancestry and English ancestry; a lot of the same kind of things can happen to people. Even though it's not documented historically, even though it's not the same thing exactly, but sometimes oppression is experienced in other people also. And the Ukrainian people, I know, experienced a lot of oppression.

And so yes, we do equate and really we're all on the road back home. We're all travelling back home and we want the same things and the same wholesome society, the same happy families, and the same restoration of dignity. And I just leave that with you as an affirmation; as yes, we do care. We all care about each other and that we are working together and that it's important that we keep on talking and that we keep on walking together. So I thank you for that.

And the other thing I wanted to ask you about is the wraparound process that you mentioned I have become familiar with because we had a presenter that was giving us an idea of what the wraparound program or process is about. Do you think, as a committee, that we could start from a basis of that being one of the community initiatives that could be taken?

I mean there's so many components of healing and of being productive or leading towards a productive life that need to be looked at. And I mean there's education, there's the counselling, there's health, there's so many things. And in all of that there's a healing process going on at the same time.

And it seems to me from what I've heard about the wraparound process, that all of those things are valued and looked at as sort of in our walk forward.

So could you just comment on whether you think that that might be a holistic process rather than looking at . . . and it might be beneficial rather than just looking at sort of segregated areas that we would work at. We know education is important. We know that rehabilitation and counselling are important and so on. So do you believe that the wraparound process is something that would be valuable for your people at this time?

**Ms. Johnson:** — I think so because with . . . I know when we get clients coming into our office, they're awfully . . . they're shocked. Because if they need counselling in addictions, we've got an addictions worker under that roof. If they need any, if they want to take any training, have any education, we've got that under our roof. We don't have to tell them okay, I'm done counselling; you want to go get some training — go to the next town or go three or four blocks from here and apply for the training. They're all under one roof.

And I know it gets a little overwhelming when you talk about it

provincially, but it works. You need to have those programs where our addictions counsellor knows enough of what our employment counsellor does that she can go to the office, introduce them, and everybody knows what everybody's doing in that office.

We've got justice programs. If somebody's having challenges within the justice system, we've got a justice worker, a court worker. If you want mediation, we've got probably half a dozen people in our office that are trained mediators. And we've got parent aides. Everything works together within that office and there's a certain amount of overlapping within those programs.

Our justice worker doesn't do strictly justice things. She needs to know what everybody else is doing so if she's the only one in the office and somebody comes in, she can start the process.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — And could I ask if you have elders present at . . .

**Ms. Johnson:** — We did. The major challenge that we're having with elders: the federal government, provincial government keeps saying elders are very important and not only the Aboriginal communities, Metis and First Nations, but they are very important to non-Aboriginal communities also. We have to start accessing their knowledge, their wisdom, their life experiences to help with the youth or with anybody.

We had an elder on staff for about three months. We had to let her go because there was no resources whatsoever. We're were draining our accounts to pay for her and nobody would fund the elder mentor program. And we've applied and applied on other . . . especially federal and provincial where they've said that you're eligible. If you can apply for funding, get an elder mentor in here. Every single time we have applied, we've been turned down.

What they say and what they do are entirely two different things. Because they don't see it as a priority. They'll say it's a priority; it isn't to them because we don't get anything.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — What resources are you getting from the province and the federal government right now, Helen, with respect to housing — social housing development or new housing development of any kind?

**Ms. Johnson:** — Very little.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Do you know what it amounts to in actual dollar terms?

**Ms. Johnson:** — No, I don't. I believe they got a small percentage this year for housing. We've had provincial Metis housing for a number of years but all they were was delivery agents for CMHC (Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation) for the RRAP (Residential Rehabilitation Assistance) program — the residential rehab program. I don't think they had any money specific for Metis housing. They did a number of years ago. They don't any more.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — And when the province reinstituted funding for social housing this year and put six and a half million into it, did you get any? Do you see any of that?

**Ms. Johnson:** — I think it was very minute. I'm just thinking back to the reports we had at one of our provincial meetings, and the director of provincial Metis housing mentioned something. Very minute amount. It wasn't very much.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — But you are receiving dollars for skills training province-wide. And those are federal dollars I understand?

**Ms. Johnson:** — Federal. The truth be known, we probably get 95 per cent of our funding from the federal government and about five from the province. And I don't . . . and that's regionally. I don't think it's too much different on a provincial level because the majority of our dollars comes for training and employment through the old pathways program.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Helen, we want to . . . I think we'd like to invite you to stay because we're going to have a kind of more open discussion with everybody after we hear from our next witness from Prince Albert Police Service. But we want to thank you very, very much for your presentation.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you, Helen, very much.

We've just noticed that John Quinn has just come and joined us here. And John, we'd welcome you to come and sit beside your colleague there, if you'd like, when he does the presentation.

Okay. Well, welcome gentlemen. For the benefit of the committee and the rest of the people with us here today, we're going to introduce you and have the committee introduce themselves to you. I'm not too sure that you were here, Gary, when the committee introduced themselves a little bit earlier.

So committee members, and people that are with us today, we have John Quinn, the Chief of Police of Prince Albert. And along with John doing the presentation is Staff Sgt. Gary Doetzel, also from Prince Albert Police Services. And we welcome you and thank you very much for taking the time for preparing and for coming before us to brief us on the knowledge that you have.

And we'll just have the committee members introduce themselves so you have somewhat of an idea who is here. You can start.

**Mr. Harper:** — Ron Harper, MLA Regina Northeast.

**Ms. Jones:** — Carolyn Jones, MLA Saskatoon Meewasin.

**Mr. Yates:** — Kevin Yates, MLA for Regina Dewdney.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Peter Prebble, MLA for Saskatoon Greystone.

**Ms. Julé:** — Arlene Julé, Humboldt.

**Ms. Draude:** — June Draude, MLA for Kelvington-Wadena.

**Mr. Toth:** — I'm Don Toth, MLA Moosomin.

**Ms. Julé:** — Okay. Maybe, Gary, we'll just let you get right in and if you'd like to give us any kind of preamble introduction, whatever, you're certainly welcome to do so.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Okay. Thank you very much. Again, I'd like to thank the committee for allowing us, the Prince Albert Police Service as well as myself, to have some input in regards to your commission and I thank you.

Twenty-six years of service with the Prince Albert Police Service. Presently, I'm in charge of the criminal investigation unit which is a unit of eight members, four assigned to the major crime side, two of which are assigned to monitor the sex trade consumers and such. We have two people in the actual sex crimes and two in our joint forces. So we're relatively a small group which allows us to have a lot of input with one another, back and forth, which makes it a flexible and allowable type thing.

Approximately 10 years ago Prince Albert along with most other western Canadian cities noted a change in our sex trade industry. No longer was the sex trade restricted to the back alleys of rundown liquor establishments or apartment blocks. The sex trade was more present, more aggressive, and often operated during the daylight hours. The sex trade took its office to the main downtown shopping area as well as the nearby residential area.

The female participants of the trade also changed from a more mature female to that of a younger female youth. The youths were dressed in tight jeans, open tops, and often leather fringed jackets.

The cause of the sex trade was still found to be the same, with alcohol abuse being replaced by drugs, family dysfunction, and people with general low self-esteem.

The Prince Albert Police Service response to this whole problem, now with a new twist, was slow, almost apprehensive, much like the general population's attitude — an attitude of we really don't want to get involved. And whatever efforts were made were targeted as an enforcement towards the female youths who were involved in the sex trade.

I'm proud to say that I feel, as a police service, we have come a long ways from 10 years ago in dealing with the exploitation of youths.

Solutions — we no longer concentrate our enforcement on female officers but have taken a much more aggressive role at the johns.

In the year 1998, the police service had 44 offences relating to soliciting of which 27 of the participants were female and 17 were male. In the year 1999, the police service had 37 offences relating to soliciting of which 30 of the participants were male and 7 were female. So we almost turned those right around.

In the year 2000, unfortunately you've seen a setback where the johns, because of past experiences of decoy female officers, are

becoming wise to our tactics and often recognize our decoys. We've attempted to bring other female officers from other communities but with their strange appearance makes the johns hesitant to pick them up. To this date, we have had 34 incidents of which 31 were female and only 3 males.

New and innovative ideas will have to be found to offset these numbers again. In the past three years our records show that of 65 female offenders, 9 were under the age of 18, with four being 17 years of age, three 16, one 15, and one child was 14.

The Prince Albert Police Service, along with police in Regina and Saskatoon, are joining a Western Canadian police computer network called DISC — deter identify sex trade consumers. This computer network ties in all major police forces in Western Canada, and from a policing role we feel that DISC is a winner on many fronts. It's a grassroot solution which was created by officers in the field from Vancouver. It's an innovated approach to a common community problem, that's communities across Western Canada and major cities across the world face.

It involves day-to-day co-operation of front-line officers. Our front-line patrol officers are participating and trying to help solve our problems. And it encourages co-operation among interagencies and policing. And that's always a problem that we've had — what's happened in Saskatoon or Calgary or Vancouver doesn't get passed on to one another. But by this new computer system and network that we're presently in the process of hooking up to is a problem that we hope will help solve in sharing that information.

It's a proactive approach by allowing the police to identify the consumer and establish a database on the consumer. Example: description of vehicle; suspect's information, date of birth, age, his identity; specifics of sexual act, etc. — you know, was there tape and bonding in the vehicle and that type of stuff, or magazines.

The DISC computer is available to other police officers who have access to the DISC program. So what happens in Calgary now by one of our people from Prince Albert, when he comes back to Prince Albert and I see him in our downtown stroll, upon checking him it will show his activity while he was in Calgary. And that's a problem that we've often experienced is by . . . We know that some of our people travel lots, go out of our community, go to other centres and their activities while there, unfortunately, stayed there. We find a lot of people come to Prince Albert, and while they're here we find that we have dealings with this, with them. And that's a mechanism or mechanics that we hope to solve by this interaction and trading. And I think we're on the right road.

We are continuing our program of the sending out of the dear john letters to males who are observed communicating with our known sex trade workers.

We maintain a zero tolerance policy with males who attempt to solicit sex from juveniles under the age of 14. We are treating these incidents as major crimes and we are assigning them to our sex crimes or our major crimes unit.



Prince Albert by virtue of its small size presents challenges as well as practical solutions. The small size of our city allows police to keep a closer surveillance on what is happening. We are watching with great interest the Manitoba legislation. We feel that the smaller size of our city allows us to keep a running tab of vehicles that are cruising our city strip. By identifying these vehicles being operated by offenders from soliciting women and children, we feel that the seizing of these vehicles would greatly reduce the traffic in our areas.

We also feel that johns schools, which have sprung up as an alternative to other more traditional punishment, can be used as an effective tool in combatting this problem. Education of the johns and enforcing the fact that they are in fact taking part in actual child abuse must be stressed.

The Alberta legislation, although probably created with good intentions, could be interpreted as focusing our efforts towards the female offender again. Presently police can use the child service Act in our province if they locate youths under the age of 16 in high-risk situations. The Alberta legislation recently was issued a setback when it failed to make the first test in court and was found unconstitutional and violating the rights of the youth.

We also agree to continue lobbying of parliament to create the soliciting of juveniles as a hybrid offence. This would allow the police a better way of tracking repeated offenders and asking for more severe sentence of repeat offenders.

In closing, we, the police, realize that we are an important role in this problem, but we also feel that enforcement alone will not stop or solve the sexual soliciting of our women and children. We feel that combined efforts between the police, family, federal and provincial and local agencies as well as the medical and educational communities will have to be formed to tackle this problem. By this continued combined effort we will then see positive results in this field.

Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you very much, Gary. Gary we're going to just open up questioning to the committee members. And I'll guess I'll just . . .

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you very much. I've got a couple of questions here but number one, do you have the number of First Nations or Metis individuals involved on the force and individuals that you could even call upon to work with you when you're dealing especially with the large Aboriginal community on the streets?

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Yes, we have Aboriginal officers and we've been increasing that role as time has went on here. Off the top of my head, I think we're probably sitting — Chief, help me out here — about 12 officers of Aboriginal . . .

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think our total is about 20 per cent of our force which would be roughly 12, 13 officers. Some people don't declare their ancestry so . . .

**Mr. Toth:** — The reason I asked that question is because

yesterday some of the presenters brought out quite emphatically the fact that they felt it's important when dealing with issues of this nature and dealing with certain groups, such as the Aboriginal community, it's good to have people of that ancestry involved versus just say the white community. And especially with the conflict between the white and the First Nations people that tends to be there.

And while we heard yesterday the talk of trying to build bridges rather than continuing to build walls, we still have that difference. And there's that feeling of oneness and identity if you can deal with somebody of your own background. And so that was one of the reasons in asking the question.

Because I think as you've talked, talk to you right now Gary, we talk about enforcement but I think we have to go beyond the enforcement. You brought out three points; some of the problems and reasons why some of the people are on the streets, such as the alcohol and drugs and low self-esteem, but the dysfunctional family is an issue that keeps coming up. And how do we deal with that.

I think the unfortunate part as police officers, you're put in the role of enforcement. And maybe I could ask the question as the Prince Albert detachment here, have you looked at the situation in regards to prostitution on the streets, a little broader than just enforcement, and looked at ways of how you can maybe work with and take advantage of some of the First Nations community on your force of starting to deal with these children rather than just enforcement, but trying to identify some of the problems so that they are leaving the streets not just because the johns aren't there anymore but giving them reasons to leave the streets and not be on the streets?

That's quite a broad question, and I know it's . . .

**Mr. Quinn:** — I don't know where to start. I think, first of all, I think it's important that you've raised the issue of the makeup of our police service and how we deal with the number of people in our community that are involved in the sex trade. And unfortunately, a large number of the players in the sex trade in Prince Albert are of Aboriginal descent but we try to incorporate as many of our members as we can, I suppose from the enforcement end of it.

But also I've been trying to have them interact with the people down there. I think it helps because I think there's . . . they're able to relate better to a lot of these people and certainly, I think maybe breaks down some barriers that may exist there.

We try to work as closely within the city of Prince Albert with the different agencies as we can. There is an outreach program that we work fairly closely with. That particular program has a van and people employed where they go out throughout the community and try to identify the young people that are out on the street, and also the young people that are on the street that are involved in the prostitution. And there is an exchange of information between the members of the police service and the people that are . . . that they're having contact with.

I think some of the problem we have with trying to channel some of these people back, or young people back into a

healthier lifestyle is of course we've got to deal with some of the reasons why they're out there. And a lot of it is socio-economics. Well all know that. A lot of it is drug. I would say a lot of . . . I would say 90 per cent of the people that are working the streets in Prince Albert are involved in drugs.

And the drugs of choice up here are prescription drugs . . . (inaudible) . . . Ritalin. Very high level of intravenous drug use with our street people. So there's a health issue there with the needles.

So for the police to try to address some of those issues is we've . . . almost to get them channelled back into a healthier lifestyle, we've got to try to address their drug problem plus a number of other issues. Those are difficult, and we have some co-operation, good co-operation between some of the groups in Prince Albert but I think we can always improve on those.

There is a number of initiatives that are being started right now. There is a pilot project in Prince Albert that is set up to identify alternative justice issues with young people and trying to develop, I guess — what do you want to call it? — pre-charged aversion courses that people can, young people can be moved into without having to incarcerate them or move them into the justice system. And that program has just started up.

But I guess fortunately — for those who don't know me, I came originally from Saskatoon where there was a higher number of young people involved in the sex trade. That's not to say that Prince Albert doesn't have their problems but I don't think we have the numbers in Prince Albert that we were experiencing in Saskatoon. But I've said it before, if we have one person, young person on the street involved in the sex trade that's one too many.

Our job is to try to feel . . . develop a way that we can either eliminate it totally or at least eliminate the individuals that are, I guess, exploiting those young people that are out there.

I suppose some of our people argue it's the chicken-and-the-egg theory. You know, what came first? If the customers there or the johns weren't there, would the girls be there. And if the girls weren't there, would the johns be there? And I don't think we can keep battling, arguing that. I think we have young people that are at risk and I think we have to try and deal with that problem.

I don't think we make any apologies from time to time having to charge some of these young people. Because like I said, a lot of them have some problems that we can't deal with as a police agency directly. There's drug issues, as I said before. There's other issues.

Some cases the only way we can get a handle on them is to get them into court and hopefully have the courts put some restrictions on them or some means of probation where they can keep them out of an area. And it doesn't solve their problems that they're dealing with drugs but at least it maybe removes them from the area that they're . . . where these customers are.

So I don't know if I've answered your question or not. I think my answer was as long as your question.

**Mr. Toth:** — Well I know my comments and question was fairly broad. In fact it was going beyond the side of enforcement where basically that's the role that you're involved in. So it's sometimes difficult when you have the enforcement role and to try and provide a mediation or a protective role as well.

The other question I have and then other members . . . Since the outreach program has begun, have you noticed, has it had some positive influences in trying to deal with the problems on the street?

**Mr. Quinn:** — Well I think Prince Albert we have a young lady up here that was involved in the sex trade in Saskatoon. I knew her prior to coming to Prince Albert. She's been very active in the community of trying to address this problem. And I know from comments that people have made to me that we've got somebody here that is able to relate to these young people. And she's doing her utmost to try to get these people off the street, but of course it's not totally successful. And they were working, or she is working pretty close with the outreach program.

So I think we have some resource people that were connected with that that I think have made a difference. If not from the fact of being able to get them off the street, I think they've been able to I guess add or given them some assurances of protection because they do have a network of identifying individuals that are, to use the parochial expression from the girls, a bad trick. So I think they've been able to afford some form of protection for these people that . . . And so I get them off the street.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — . . . questioners. Just before we turn to that, I want to welcome Don Cody, the mayor of Prince Albert. Don, it's really nice to have you here. Thank you very much for coming.

**Mr. Yates:** — My question is centred around enforcement and enforcement authority. Keeping in mind we don't have jurisdiction in the Criminal Code of Canada and that's a federal issue, but are there other things that you as police officers in Prince Albert or throughout the province would see that we could do through any provincial pieces of legislation to give you greater ability to investigate potential abuse of children or detain or stop people?

As an example, we have control of The Highway Traffic Act which gives you the authority to stop a vehicle to check and to ask for driver's licence and so on and so forth. Are there things that are within our jurisdiction of authority that you can think of that would help you to do your jobs and make it more unpleasant for johns on the street, make it easier for you to investigate and perhaps prosecute through those investigations, more johns?

We've asked this of both the Saskatoon and Regina, you know, police services. And, you know, we had presentations from them talking about the difficulty they have in pulling a vehicle over and seeing a young girl in that vehicle that they know is going to go be abused, but they currently don't have the ability to do anything with that, and how frustrating it was for them.

So within the context of what jurisdictional authority we do have, are there things that we could do to help you in dealing with johns?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think Staff Sgt. Doetzel alluded to the seizure of vehicles in his presentation. Certainly I think that would deter these people from cruising, cruising the street, if there was a mechanism in place where we could remove their vehicle from them. It's only an inconvenience for them but I think if you seize their vehicle enough times, maybe they get a little tired of it.

The other, from a . . . relating to the legislation that was put in place in Alberta, I don't feel that in a lot of cases, unless they're going to appeal that decision of the court, that following the suit and allowing the police to have the powers to remove these young people off the street is going to be a workable solution. If a higher court would uphold that legislation, then maybe that's an avenue that we could look at in Saskatchewan.

One of the things we don't have in place, and Mr. Prebble knows what we battled long and hard for in Saskatoon was some special training or treatment, counselling centres for a lot of these young people. It's one thing to pick them up, or have the authority to pick them up. A lot of these young people need a different type of counselling than you would give to some young person that was having, you know, the usual teenage conflicts with their parents or school, this type of thing. I mean these people are in a different lifestyle altogether, and tied with it are a lot of other issues.

And most of these young people on the street, I would say 95 per cent of them, have been sexually abused themselves. So you've got the initial sexual abuse you have to deal with, plus you've got the abuse that they're suffering at the hands of the people out on the street, plus they've got a drug problem they're dealing with, plus a number of other issues.

So normal counselling or normal facilities for these people I don't think is what we need, or they need. I think we need special units or special centres that we can take these young people to.

I don't . . . You've asked a good question, and I think the police have . . . you know, it's a difficult crime to investigate when you've got a 13-year-old or a 12-year-old. I've been in policing for almost 37 years. Sgt. Doetzel's been in for a long time. We all know what's happening, but to be able to take that and relate that in a court of law and to be able to prove to a judge or maybe a judge and jury of what's happening is difficult.

A lot of times these young people don't really want to co-operate with you for a number of reasons. The individual, unless you really, I guess, catch him in the commission of an act are not going to co-operate with you. Basically the police are left to their own wits to develop different strategies for how they're going to charge these individuals that are really exploiting these young people out there.

And I'm not too sure if we can pass legislation or you can get legislation passed that would really change that for us.

**Mr. Yates:** — Just to give you an example, and I'm not saying that this has even been looked at, but right now under The Highway Traffic Act police officers can suspend a licence for 24 hours for somebody that they believe has been drinking. What if that power was allowed to be extended to where you believe there's a criminal wrongdoing being done and that person's licence is suspended immediately for 24 hours. Then that vehicle sits there. He can't go anywhere with that child.

You know it creates an environment that may be enough to prevent people from being involved in those types . . . I'm just saying, think creatively outside the box that we put ourselves in as a society in how to deal with problems. There may be tools that could be given to police to help deal with potential problems.

I'd like you to put some thought into it, and if, you know, you can think of anything that would be useful to you, to get back to the committee through our web site.

Because we often limit how we look at problems based on some of the . . . Until Manitoba came up with the idea of seizing vehicles, it was an unheard of thing. And there may be things that you can add upon. Not saying that's not a good idea, but that's always after — we're reacting to it. Are there things that we can do that can be preventative within the authorities of what we have provincial jurisdiction in?

**Mr. Quinn:** — This is just kind of an add-on and it's not directed totally as criticism to anyone in particular, any particular event in particular, but the police are only a small segment of the justice system.

And I think if we're going to buy in to this whole concept of the fact that we've got young people being victimized by adults out there, that when the police do subsequently lay the charges, that there has to be a follow through throughout the entire system to get the message through that this is not going to be tolerated by our society and there is some penalty that is administered at the end of the whole process. There has to be some consequences for your actions.

And like I say, I don't want to get into specifics but I don't feel that, in some cases, the consequences have been borne out to people that have been charged. And it's not only when dealing with young people that work in the street, it's young people that are victimized in the making of pornography. I mean does it really make an awful lot of difference whether it's actual sexual . . . (inaudible) . . . or of children . . . (inaudible) . . . or anything else. I think it's still a detriment to them as young people. But I think the whole system has to be in step, and sometimes I don't feel that that's happening.

I think the police are trying. I don't think we're succeeding as much as we would like to succeed, but I think when we do have some successes, I would like to see that kind of proceed through the entire system.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Ron, you had a question.

**Mr. Harper:** — Yes, Staff Sergeant, in your presentation you indicated that you have instigated a program — the dear johns

letter?

**Mr. Doetzel:** — John letter.

**Mr. Harper:** — Can you explain that to us please, how that program works and . . .

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Well it's an older program that's been around for a little while as well. It comes through the administration, the support from them, where we find a sex trade solicitor that's down in the area and communicating with known sex trade providers. We stop, we talk to the person involved. We tell them they're in a high risk area as such. We take down the particulars. We then send it back to our office, document it. It gets reviewed by a group or committee and a dear john letter is then sent out.

And all it says or indicates is that in fact that this vehicle and yourself were checked in a high area of activity in regards to sex trade industry. And it's sent to his home, addressed to himself to that location as such, and it's for his information. And it's kept on our files for our information that a letter was sent.

And it's just showing the seriousness from the policing side of it — the point that you were in a high risk area, you were seen, you were detected and noted, type thing. So we're trying to put some responsibility back into the people, that please don't go to that area. But it's quite a common practice that's followed by different police forces in a way of trying to deter people from going to that area.

Again it's back to the vehicle situation that Kevin alluded to that, you know, I feel if we . . . it's a solution that helps for quite a rural area, as a good part of Saskatchewan is. A vehicle's very important to people. I don't care who you are, if you don't come home tonight with your vehicle you may have to do some explaining. I may have another vehicle on the lot but there's still one missing.

I think it's something that we . . . It's just putting responsibility back on the johns, type thing, and I feel that's a good part of it. And again like the chief alluded, the chick and the egg, which one's . . . you know, type thing.

But responsibility and accountability, I think we have to throw that back onto the laps. And I know from a policing side we are much more proactive. Like I said in '98 and that type stuff, we were strictly — and prior to that — just enforcement, very narrow focussed.

I know now we want to become more proactive. I know we work with different agencies like the outreach and as well as the FSIN. I was just over there a couple of weeks ago talking to some younger ladies that were in fact involved on a proactive thing, sitting around in a circle discussing everything from trying to get back as to what drove them onto the street, to try to get them to looking from the police side, why we're doing what we're doing and that type stuff.

So you know we've got a long ways to go but I feel proactiveness . . . Like the speaker before me spoke about the

family situation, we'd like to be in that situation much more than in an enforcement role.

**Mr. Harper:** — In that program, how many letters — just approximately if you don't have the exact number — how many letters would you have sent out last year and how effective . . . in your opinion, how effective was that program?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I wasn't expecting that question, but we're very careful when we send the letters out that we're not basically accusing somebody of something that we don't know they're doing. I would say last year we likely sent out oh, close to maybe three dozen letters or more. It varies.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Did you say 3,000?

**Mr. Quinn:** — No, about three dozen.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Oh, three dozen.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I've got writer's cramp but I sign them all.

We rely on the officers that are out patrolling this to identify in the cards they send in what this individual was up to at the time he was stopped. Did he have a person in the car with him, that is, a known person that's been in the sex trade, or somebody that was charged before? You know, what were his actions? Was he cruising . . . was he cruising our stroll area and stopping and talking to the women on the corner? So before we send the letter out, we've got a pretty good idea that the individual was up to getting himself involved.

There's two letters we send. One is where the person actually had somebody in the car with him that we know is involved; the other one is basically related and he was stopped by the officer and spoken to. And the letter goes to say that you were stopped and spoken to by an officer regarding your activities in that area and we identify the area — as Staff Sgt. Doetzel said — as a high-profile area. The other letter basically says you were observed.

Neither letter identifies or points a finger at what we were . . . we don't accuse them of anything. We just identify that area and ask them if they would co-operate with us in trying to assist us in maintaining or trying to maintain a quality of life in that community or help us with our problems.

You can . . . they can read into it what they want, but we aren't accusing them of anything. But I think we're getting the message . . . we get the message across that . . . because the letter does come with the police service crest on the outside and it's addressed to the registered owner of the vehicle. So we never know whether the individual's driving his wife's car, or whose car he's driving or whether he's driving his own. So I think it certainly has some effect, but I mean it's not a cure-all either.

Interesting thing is, I don't think I've sent a letter back to the same individual twice since I've been here. That's almost two years. So maybe that speaks some success for the program.

**Ms. Jones:** — I am just wondering if there's . . . if it does

currently, or if there's any possibility that the letter could contain information on john schools, or resources for pedophiles. If there could be a little bit . . . you know, if you need help, please call, or something like that.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think we'd have to very carefully have that researched. We've tried this . . . we've tried to stay away from identifying anything in the letter that would . . . that we can be actually taken to task for. But I think if we put in something that identifies something like you say, with pedophiles, I think you're really going to . . . someone is going to say you're accusing me of being that. And we couldn't back that up in some cases.

So we would be putting ourselves in maybe a little bit at risk. I'm not saying it can't be done. I think we'd have to really take a look at . . .

**Ms. Jones:** — Could you throw a little pamphlet in?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think it could be done. I think we'd have to be using our wits on how we could word it or how we can get that message across without accusing somebody of something. Because that's a lot of it. We know, like you've said before, we know what's happening out there. But to be able to go and convince a court of law, we likely couldn't convince them. So if I send a letter to somebody and somebody challenges me — because that's who they're going to challenge because my signature is on the bottom of the letter — I'm going to have to be able to be in a position where I can say, you don't have to convince me, I can prove what you're doing out there.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — I guess, Carolyn, that's the kind of — if I can just add to this — that's why we kind of take a safe ground or the middle-of-the-road type thing where we can prove his vehicle was down there at the time. And that's all we're saying. And we're letting the person imply himself what he was doing, or whoever.

I know the chief and myself have had wives come to us and ask if we could elaborate on what this letter means, and we say all we can tell you is that this vehicle was in the downtown area, it was observed; or like the chief said that in this case here, that the vehicle was stopped and there was a young lady in it.

But again we get into when you start making accusations or theories of what you think is happening, you can get yourself into deep water pretty quick without being able to swim very well. So we take kind of that safe ground, and that way everybody is somewhat protected and the person will have to be responsible for his own actions because he can't deny that part — that he was downtown — because we have proof or verification that he was.

**Ms. Jones:** — I'm just trying to think in terms of the entire healing picture because, I mean, they have to have an illness as well to be preying on 12- and 13- and 14-year-old children.

I'm interested though in Chief Quinn's comments about the police department feeling that they do their part in trying to apprehend and charge, and that I think I heard you say that from there the system somewhat seems to fail you. I'm wondering —

again I'm putting you a bit on the spot — but are you saying that the prosecution and the, I guess, the judgment, the judicial system, is not looking at this through the same eyes as you and I? Are the charges . . . I mean the charges are laid. Does the penalty not reflect the seriousness?

**Mr. Quinn:** — It's not up to the police services to really criticize other parts of the justice system for whatever action they take. What I think, if what I'm hearing over the last number of years is correct, is that we've taken the approach that the exploitation of young people in the sex trade by adults is a serious, is a serious matter that has to be dealt with.

The police services have tried their hardest to deal with that issue and have charged a number of people. And these people have appeared in court and they've walked out. There was absolute discharges.

Maybe that's what they felt was warranted but I don't think it sends the appropriate message. And I'm not the judge and I'm not hearing the case, I'm not hearing the evidence. But it seems to me that there has to be . . . the entire system has to take it as a serious matter. And sometimes the deterrent effect of some of the rulings has an effect on how people react in the society also.

But I mean that's my own feeling and I'm being very candid on my comments on that because I think it's a serious problem. Like I said, it's no different than, whether you're exploiting the children on the street or you're exploiting them in some other media, whether it's pornography or something else, I think it's still a serious matter and I think it has to be dealt with — consider to be serious.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well I think it's an attitudinal thing that the shift from focusing on prostitutes as offenders, particularly young prostitutes, young people involved in the sex trade as offenders to victims, you know, is an attitudinal shift that's had to occur. And perhaps what you are saying is there needs to be an attitudinal shift in the . . . at the other end of the police service as the result of all the good work that you're doing.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think the disturbing thing I've noticed in my police service is — like I say, I've been in the policing business for almost 37 years — that the age of the people involved in this particular sex trade has got younger and younger and younger as I've got older and older and older.

And that's the disturbing part about it. Because when I started back in '63-64 you never saw anybody out in the street, and they were there, but you never saw anyone on the street that was working, I would say, under the age of 19, 20, 21. Never saw that. Maybe in some of the larger cities in Canada or the States certainly, but we never saw that here. But as we've progressed from the '60s into the . . . now into the new 2000, that age has dropped where it's not unusual to find young people as 10, 9 years old out there.

Years ago when I was in Saskatoon we dealt with a couple of sisters, and I think it really opened my eyes at that time, and we're going back in the early '80s. One was 10 and one was 12. And that's what they were . . . you know, that's what they were providing out on the street. So certainly if it's 10 and 12 in 1982

and '83, obviously it's not going to be unheard of to find young people out there that are 8 or 9.

That's kind of a scary thought but I mean it happens and it's part of reality. The biggest issue is how do we deal with those individuals that are taking advantage of those people. That's our task because that's what our mandate is, and in some cases it's difficult for the police to do it. And certainly if we can come up with some innovative ideas for some of the different legislation, we'll certainly put it forward.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — June, you had a question?

**Ms. Draude:** — Yes, I did, and good morning. I was interested in hearing you say that you've never had to send out two letters to pedophiles or potential pedophiles. From information that we've received in this hearing and one last year, we understand the numbers of the children that are being exploited, about 80 per cent of them are Aboriginal. And at the same time we're hearing that about 80 per cent of the johns or pedophiles are white people.

I'm wondering if the police have met with the tribal council, if you've set up meetings to discuss the problems, and maybe even had an open meeting in front of the media so that some of the discussions and the intensity of how people feel about it can be shown to the people and say they're even considering things like — whether you do it or not — things like putting it on the front page of the paper when I see your car go by.

You know, just to let people know that it's . . . they're not hiding, that it is an issue that is dealing . . . that is so important, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people are recognizing it as one area we have to be working on a common solution, and that we're willing to go to extremes that may just plain embarrass people into saying, I better not do this because heaven knows what those crazy people will do next with my name.

I mean, a lot of it is fear, and is there any . . . is there any work, is there any thoughts about thinking it might be important enough to try something like that?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I don't know, Gary, if . . . We've had meetings where the issue has come up with different First Nations organizations in Prince Albert, or Aboriginal or Metis organizations. I don't think we've ever done it on a large, formal basis. In Saskatoon I know that we had met with, at that time it was George Lafond from the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations), a member of the tribal council, because we were directing our resources, trying to establish a safe home for some of these young people.

You can correct me, Gary. I know we haven't had a formal one since I've been here, but it has come up in conversations and it is recognized as an issue to be dealt with. Maybe that's not a bad idea we can pursue.

**Mr. Toth:** — Now just one follow-up question — this is going to be a fairly serious one. We've had comments from people who have testified before the committee. I've dealt with and talked to people just on my own, trying to get some understanding. And the suggestion has come, as was even

indicated yesterday, that we could give you names.

Now as a committee we haven't asked for nor we intend to, like you were just explaining how you do the dear john letters. But the seriousness of the question is the fact that the suggestions of people in high offices, even wearing uniforms. And as a politician I know what it's like to have someone discredit the name.

And I guess whether it's here in the city or anywhere, I think it certainly makes the job of enforcement even more difficult if there are perpetrators who people see as having authority over them. And I'm wondering if that's something that you've had to deal with or have issues that have been brought to your attention or suggestions that you may face.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Well there is provisions in the Criminal Code for sexual exploitation of people when you are a person of authority type thing, and we have utilized those in the past when we have done investigations. I'm just thinking on the soliciting side. None personally comes to mind right now where that has been the case where we could actually say that person was in authority of another person, on the soliciting side.

But I know in sexual assaults that our agency has investigated, we have followed that and the penalty for that is more severe because of the position that person holds over, you know. So again that's legislation that's been changed and has worked favourably for us, and we've pursued that in approaching the law.

But from the soliciting side, personally I haven't had any experience on that. Maybe the chief has in his time, but I guess regardless who you are or what employment you have, it's a cross-section of our community as such. And we have different people with different problems throughout. No matter, you know, doctors, lawyers, policeman or whoever — those problems show up and they have to be dealt with.

And again it's making responsible decisions. I feel we have to make those johns be responsible. I think that's the name . . . you talked about an embarrassment and that. I'd like to say I'd like to see those guys make those responsible decisions so we don't have to embarrass them because the consequences are too great. Don't risk what you all have here by foolishness or whatever.

And we know that people that we charge that are maybe a little bit influential sometimes move their court cases out of the community, or whatever the case may be, to avoid the embarrassment. And there is a little bit of that in policing, to make you accountable. I think that that's important so . . . I'm starting to ramble here, I'll turn it over to the chief.

**Mr. Quinn:** — First of all I can say that I don't really think it makes any difference who you are. If you're involved in any of this type of activity and whether it's . . . I guess whether it's dealing with young people on the street or whether you're involved in that type of activity, I can tell you beware.

We're going to do our enforcement and we're pretty open about the fact that we do our sting operations up here and we have used undercover, we use undercover people. We try to utilize

some people from with outside of the city because being a small city and a relatively small police service it's not too difficult for our people to get very well known.

I don't think that in my experience that I have ever been deterred when I was actively enforcing the prostitution requirements under the Code because I was afraid of who I was going to come across. I think it's a fact of life.

I mean you can get philosophical about this business. Maybe sometimes you get too philosophical because you try to determine why is that individual out there. Obviously the customer is out there too. What is going on in his life that would force him out onto the street to obviously proposition a female person, whether she's young or old? You can give yourself some pretty decent reasons why maybe a person is there.

I think that you have got to draw yourself back and say, this society has said this is something that they don't want as acceptable behaviour in their community. His rationale may be good for being out there, or her rationale, might be good for being out there.

I think the fact that the legislatures in our country have identified certain aspects of prostitution as something that society says, this is where we draw our lines and it's up to the police agencies to enforce those regulations. And I don't think that I've ever experienced where I've ever been deterred from enforcing those regulations regardless of who was at the end of it, if the investigation leads that way.

And I mean we run across all kinds of people unfortunately, rich and poor and unknown and well-known. I guess that's how things play out on life's stage but I've never been deterred from it.

**Mr. Toth:** — The reason I asked the question is because it's been brought to our attention. But also, even as a committee, I feel very strongly that if we're going to make some suggestions and coming back to whether it's dealing more forcefully with the — and we've been discussing this, we're not exactly sure john is the word to use — maybe pedophile is where we get a little more firm with what we really mean.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I express a strong objection to my name being used that way.

**Mr. Toth:** — That's one of the reasons why it was brought up.

But the fact is I feel very strongly about the fact too, for members of the committee, if anyone — or elected officials, it doesn't really matter — you're making rules, you'd better be prepared to live by and to live at a standard higher than the rules you're establishing because what kind of message are we sending. And I think that's one of the things we're dealing with, even trying to deal with this issue, is the messages we're sending and how we're dealing with so that we're really getting to the root of the problem rather than trying to cover up something that we aren't really prepared to deal with.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I think another comment I'd like to make is that

... And I'm sure some of the comments that have been made — well, the police didn't charge this person because he was this or they didn't charge this person because of this — stop to realize, and I said it before, is that one of the things we have to be able to prove in a court of law, that we have the evidence to lay the charge.

Now I mean a crime is a crime I suppose, but if you were accused of stealing a car, that's one thing. If you were accused of some sexual impropriety, that has a certain, a totally different connotation to it as far as how you are perceived in the community — not only by your fellow workers, your neighbours — your family.

So I would say that in some cases, if charges aren't laid, we know that we've got to make a very, very calculated decision and we don't want to lay any charges unless we know we're going to get a conviction because there's a judgment in the community that isn't there, when you charge somebody with sexually related offences, than there is tied to different types of crime.

And I say that only because I think that some people, you know, they say, well we heard and we know; but I don't know, it's a big decision to make. And you don't want to walk into a court of law with a half-baked charge on some of these things just to kind of, I should say, prove a point or try to feel you're proving a point.

**Mr. Toth:** — Just one comment. I appreciate that because I feel very strongly about that; I feel that regardless of what the situation is. Because when a charge is actually made, there's an implication that there's guilt there. And even if, at the end of the day in the court of law, whether the charge is laid aside because you couldn't prove guilt or what have you; it still stays with the individual.

So I think the responsibility you have as officers is certainly really important and I think what you shared is recognized in that fact, because you can destroy a person's life by a charge if you can't follow it up. Even though innocence is proven at the end of the day, doesn't mean anything. So it's quite serious.

So I appreciate that — your approach and the views. Even with the dear john letters, I appreciate the fact that there's a scrutiny that you go through before you just start firing letters out because you don't want to start bringing, you know, reproach on individuals. So thank you for that.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — John, I've — did anybody else have a question? — I have a number of questions that I'd like to ask you and Gary.

And I want to just start by commending you on, I think, a number of very important initiatives that the, you know, Prince Albert Police Services embarked upon. I think the dear john letter is a very important innovation, you know. I think, probably, your ... the 1999 figures, Gary, that you cited with respect to the turnaround and the focus on men rather than girls on the street, in terms of soliciting charges, very ... I doubt any other police force among the major urban centres has got comparable statistics.

I think this is really impressive work and I just want to personally commend you on this.

I want to take a . . . I just want to pursue Kevin's line of questioning a little bit more, because I think he raised some important questions and I . . . you know I . . . I mean we're kind of cutting new ground here, so we have to tread carefully.

I gave you a copy of a page that I just wanted to cite from in our interim report. It's page 7. And I'm not sure if you've had a chance to look at this before so I'm just going to read it into the record, but it's testimony from detective constable Sherree Gay from the Regina Police Service. And I think she . . . this is a very experienced officer on the ground, who's been involved in morality work for many years and she says:

We see a 12-year-old girl on the corner of the street . . . She is waving at cars . . . and from our experience we know that she is . . . selling herself . . . a car will pick her up . . . So we stop that vehicle . . . when I pull that vehicle over and I approach the driver and I ask him for his driver's license and his registration and he complies, and I see no signs of impairment, and I ask him who the young girl is and he tells me that it's none of your business, basically as a police officer I have no grounds to arbitrarily detain him any longer. If he tells me that it is his niece . . . doesn't tell me why she was on the corner or refuses to answer those questions for me, I have no alternative but to let him proceed. Because as the law states at this particular time, I don't have enough reasonable grounds to believe, based on the fact that the child was standing on the corner, that that crime is going to be committed . . . So I can't . . . (tell) you how heart-wrenching it is for me as a police officer to let that john drive away.

That's the . . . well I guess my first question is: from your experience in the police force . . . Obviously different members of the force will perhaps have somewhat different perspectives on the law, although I hope not too divergent of perspectives. But when that testimony was provided to us, I think many of the members of our committee were quite surprised that a police officer, a very experienced detective, would feel as constrained as she did by the ability to investigate a potential situation of a pedophile about to abuse a child.

Is this your understanding of provincial and federal law? Are these the kind of constraints that you're feeling on the Prince Albert Police Service as well?

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Well from reading this, realistically, I can see this happening. You know, like that's the way the law presently is and our limitations of doing our job. This is a very conceivable situation, you know, type of thing, and those are the things that we have to work around which sometimes makes us become more innovative in trying to figure out different ways of dealing with it.

We have to operate on what, you know, the reasonable, probable grounds, whatever. If we feel she's a missing person or whatever, sometimes we can dwell a little bit more in trying to pursue that matter. But when push to comes shove, if they're

not breaking any federal or provincial statute or somewhat, people really don't have to identify themselves or co-operate with the police.

Now we encourage that people do, and being good citizens we ask that they do. But there's limitations placed upon us and when people wish to abuse them, we are somewhat roadblocked in what we can do.

I felt for her when I read this because I can see where that would break your heart, or would be very emotional at the time, you know.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Is this the practical situation that your officers face on the ground as well? Or are they able to push the envelope a little bit in terms of asking the potential predator more questions about his relationship with the girl in the car for instance? Is there anything that prevents a police officer from saying, can you clarify for us and establish clearly what your relationship is with the child in the car? Is the police officer entitled to ask that question?

**Mr. Quinn:** — You can ask that question. Now whether you're going to get a response from the operator . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Is the operator not obliged under law to answer that question right now? I just want to clarify that because I think it's key. I mean if the . . .

**Mr. Quinn:** — Not really. I mean there is a situation where an individual picks up his daughter and you pull the car over and you go through the same rigmarole with asking these questions, you get the same response. There's nothing untoward happening. And you ask the person, who is this in the car? And he might say, it's my daughter.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — The context is clearly different, John, in the sense that the daughter wouldn't be standing on the street corner looking like she was about to sell herself. You know what I'm saying.

**Mr. Quinn:** — No, but I think the . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — But I understand what you're saying too.

**Mr. Quinn:** — What I'm saying is that there's a point where you can ask questions and they don't have to answer. Then you've got to put your own . . . you've got to . . . like I say, this is where you'd be happy to become a little bit innovative in how you're going to approach this.

And if you really feel strong about this person, I mean it is how far you as a police officer, having a certain amount of latitude in your ability to investigate something, how far you feel you're willing to push that to the point where you feel that you maybe are going to create yourself a problem.

There's Charter, there's Charter arguments there. Everybody has the right to go about their business without having an unreasonable search and seizure. And those are going to get thrown up at you right off the bat. So there are issues there.



I think if I felt strong enough about that person, that that young person was out there, I think I'd push until I don't think I could push it any more. I'd want to get all the information I could. And it may still end up with that person driving away. But I think I'd put enough of a concern in the mind of that individual that he would hopefully drop her off at the next corner. Or he'd have somebody riding the bumper of his car for the next hour and a half.

But that goes into another realm of investigation follow-up I suppose. There's a fine line when you're out there from what you can do and what you can't do.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — I think, Peter, I think this is an age-old problem that we've had some time, be it even . . . Take it away from the sex trade.

You find someone driving around in high industrial area at 4 in the morning or something doesn't belong there. As a policeman, you stop him and ask him for his driver's licence and registration. If he provides that to you, he has met his obligations under the law as they currently stand and he doesn't have to answer you anything more, you know. Like if he clams up and says nothing, you know, you've got no signs of any criminal activity as such. All you have is some intelligence that this gentleman was around at 4 in the morning in a high industrial area where there's known to be high concentration of break and enters.

And in kind of Ron's . . . that's where the dear John letter comes in. We're on shaky ground or thin ice here. We know the activities aren't well. But on the sexual trade side, we then throw out this dear John letter, just saying that you're in the area, we can't prove what you were doing. But that's why we pursue that, just to let them know that we know, you know, type thing, that your activities weren't really appreciated.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I guess one of the things . . . one of the really important things I think that the committee has to grapple with, I think there was a belief that under The Child and Family Services Act — and I think we perhaps have believed this incorrectly — where there's an onus for less proof. But at least, under that legislation, albeit, you know, the charges that can be laid and the convictions are only up to two years, but under that legislation do you not feel that you have the ability to investigate more fully?

If you believe that a child is in need of protection or is in danger, can you not haul that prospective predator out of the car and conduct a full investigation without running the risk of, you know, violating the Charter?

**Mr. Quinn:** — You'd be really on touchy . . . really on thin ice. We got a scenario here and if we're trying to deal within the confines of the scenario — doesn't leave you much.

But if this young person has been working the streets, you've likely seen her before. And if I've seen her before, there's no way that I'm going to believe that that's his niece and I would likely to take some action as to getting some identification or questioning the person. I mean, I guess I'm trying to build on it.

But I think you have to get a wedge in there somewhere, if you're really that concerned about it and pry with it. And I think a lot of times the officers do. I think they prevent a lot of things from happening because they either make that individual that's driving that car feel so uncomfortable, he isn't going to go through with anything because he knows that the police are going to be right around the corner or they're going to be on his bumper, like I said, for the next hour and a half. Or they scare the young person out of that situation.

So I think there is . . . you know, it's good to say there's prevention this time around. But I mean, 15, 20 minutes later, it might not be there. The situation might save itself, but the interaction with the officers and these people, I think, do prevent some of the situations.

I know there's one of the departments that was utilizing an approach on how they were getting their charges where they were allowing the perpetrators to pick up the young victims, take them to a hotel, wherever it is, and, just about the time they figured something was going to happen, then they boot the door in. Well that's a pretty, pretty risky approach in trying to charge these individuals, because you only have to be 30 seconds late and now the person's committed an offence. And, you know, I don't know if I'd want to have that on my conscience.

So I mean, there's . . . it's how far you're willing to let that envelope or push that envelope or whatever it is. I mean, it . . . and it's a judgment call in a lot of cases on the part of the officers.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I think we're almost ready for a break here, but I just want to ask one more question in this line and then when we . . . after we have coffee we can kind of come back and explore this a bit more.

But I'm wondering if you could give some thought to what sort of a change at least in provincial statutes we could make to allow an officer to conduct a full investigation on a predator in the event that he's — a prospective predator — if a child is in the car who's known to be involved, to have had some involvement in the sex trade in the past.

I mean, I guess I'm feeling that unless we empower police in this province to conduct a full investigation of potential pedophiles when they're picking up kids . . . I mean, we've got 300 kids in the city of Prince Albert that Regina city police tell me in our committee that are out on the street. So presumably we've got at least 1,000 pedophiles out there because I think it's pretty safe to say that there's three or four men picking up each of these kids over the course of a year. And that's likely an underestimate. But let's just say it's 1,000.

Well there's got to be a way for police officers to conduct investigation of these 1,000 men. And you know Regina city police say very clearly that the statistics they have in terms of charging these pedophiles versus the number that are out there bear absolutely no relationship to one another. And clearly the problem is the inability of the police to conduct the investigation because they know who the prospective people are, just like you know who the 36 potential people are, likely. I mean, you don't know for sure but you know it's likely.

Clearly there's a problem in terms of you not being able to conduct a full investigation. And you're doing a lot more innovative things here than are being done in a lot of other urban centres. So I guess the question I feel this committee has got to pursue is how do we facilitate our police services, particularly in the urban centres, but right across the province, conducting . . . doing the kind of investigative work that would be needed to pin these people down and actually lay successful charges. What changes at least in provincial law can we make to facilitate you being able to do that work?

Maybe you could think about that and we could talk about that after the break. And I know that's a very tough question, but I kind of feel like you're on the forefront of a lot of creative work here, and I'll be grateful for any advice that you can . . .

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — The answers for it.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — The answer's a lot tougher than the question, John.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Actually when we come back we're sort of in a question and answer period here, but I think that pursuing this line of thought . . . and we need to discuss this. Like I would be really happy if we could sort of just sit around in a very informal way and get into discussion.

Because I think sometimes people can throw out some thoughts they may have of things that may need to be changed as far as the seriousness of this crime, and how we've dealt with it in the past, and how we may have to put pressure on the federal government to see this in a totally different light. Things like that. So I think it would be really probably more comfortable if we just sat in discussion after coffee. So take your moment to have your cigarette, coffee, or whatever.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Thank you, John and Gary, very much.

**The committee recessed for a period of time.**

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — We have a bit of a time constraint here. We are going to have to engage in discussion until about five minutes to 12 and at that time it's necessary for our *Hansard* people and so on to pack up their gear and be ready to move on to La Ronge, so just be aware that we have that sort of a time constraint and . . .

So we'll go on with this discussion. As I'm listening to all of this and I'm going to . . . certainly when Peter comes back, I think it's good for him to continue his line of thought here. But as I listen to all of this, there's a couple of things that I recognized as we talk about the constraints that police are under basically as far the Criminal Code, the Charter, and so on like that.

We have to, I think, understand where our authority comes as far as influencing policy and maybe a change to the Criminal Code. A change to the attitude because from what I understand this offence is a major criminal offence, and it is that simply because these are children. This is not the same as any other offence. These are children that are being violated and their

lives are being violated.

So in order to, I guess, announce loud and clear that this kind of a violation is met nowadays by the public with a zero tolerance attitude, I'm wondering if you can tell me, do you believe that the police association has enough influence to pressure changes in the attitudes so that the offence — as it is right now I believe it's treated as a summary offence — and could you put pressure on the federal government or any other authorities to change that attitude, to put forth that it needs to be treated as a much more serious offence?

It's a matter of . . . as I see it as there's cause and effect in life. There are, you know, actions and there are consequences. And to treat this so that the judicial system ends up seeing this as a major criminal offence, and treating it as such, under mandatory obligation by the judiciary in that the penalties must be . . . a much stronger penalty must be enforced.

**Mr. Quinn:** — How am I going to answer this? I'll answer it from . . . I'll give you two answers or two avenues. As a chief of police, we have our own provincial association of chiefs of police. I think knowing Chief Johnson and Chief Scott and obviously other chiefs in the province, I know how they feel about this particular issue.

They feel that we can put it on our own agenda. We meet on a regular basis and we can put forward a — if this is the wish of the association — put forward a resolution that we could put it on the agenda for the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police. That we may be able to move for some change going that route.

Now Gary should be speaking to this because I don't want to speak on behalf of the police association, but they also have their own provincial policing association which is a part of a national group of the Canadian police officers association. They also have a mechanism within their means to bring these issues forward on a provincial or on a national basis.

So I think we have some means to our disposal to move certainly these items up. Whether that has enough . . . would bring enough pressure to bear or would have enough influence, but I think it would make it . . . it's better if you come unified than it is if you come from all over the place . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Splintered. Not even splintered, but I think it's one thing to have everybody standing behind . . . this is what we would like to see happening than it is to have everybody kind of show up one at a time.

So that's one thing we can do from the chiefs of police point of view. And certainly the police officers association, I think, have the same mechanism but I wouldn't want to speak on their behalf. But I mean that is something that they could look at. I would have no problem putting, say, this issue forward for our agendas and discussing it amongst our own . . . my own peers.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — I think that would be really appreciated, John Quinn. I know it would by the general public in Saskatchewan as well as in other jurisdictions across Canada. Because the very fact that this issue has been raised time and time again, and more frequently; there's an immediate sort of urgency right now to make sure that the offence, that the

violation is treated more seriously. And if we all bear pressure where we must in order to have changes, I think we could be successful in that.

I also think, and many times think, of the police and how their hands are tied because we have talked with police officers from different cities. And I think that when there are probable and reasonable grounds to believe that a child is in danger and that they need protection, that you should have the tools that you need in order to ensure that that child is taken from the dangerous place to a safe place. Not only the police but other people working on the ground — outreach workers or whatever.

Now I've had it repeated to me over and over again by people working to try to help the kids off the streets to protect them, I've had them tell me that they know who the perpetrators are because they repeat their sort of activity. They come time and time again to certain areas. They also say that they know the children or the young people that are in danger because they frequent time and time again. So it's not as though there isn't a knowledge and understanding of what's happening.

The missing link here is what kind of tools can we give those people that are trying to help the kids in order to effect a transition from that moment on the streets into a safe environment where, in the case of Aboriginal children, their own people can start working with them to assist them into alternative lifestyles.

So I think, you know, we look at where the gaps are and we have to look at how we're going to have to fill those gaps.

I'm just going to ask you a question that's sort of a little bit . . . well it's related to the topic but it's . . . Have you ever had parents call you, parents of children that are over 16, 16 or over, and tell you of their concerns that their children are in danger on the streets, knowing that they are and parents will know that they are, and asked you to apprehend those children? And how successful are you at just being able to do that?

Because from my understanding, once a young person is 16 years old they no longer have to acquiesce to parental guidance and so on. So have you had those kind of requests coming from parents or guardians to apprehend their children who they know are in danger on the streets?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I'm not sure if I've had them in the context of the fact that their children are . . . (inaudible) . . . involved in the sex trade. We have had people phone us, concerned because they've got a son or a daughter that's in a runaway mode and you know they want us to apprehend them and bring them back in the house, which we can do to a certain extent. But the fact of the matter is the child isn't going to remain there if they don't want to stay there.

So we're placed in a bit of a quandary. And if we do locate the person under the age of 16 and they're not doing anything, then there's a bit of a dilemma as to whether we can really seize hold of this young person and take them.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Are you speaking of young people under 16?

**Mr. Quinn:** — No.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Over 16?

**Mr. Quinn:** — Over 16. And I've had conversations with the people and . . . (inaudible) . . . They're trying to deal with what their children are into. And if they're of, you know, tender years or under the age of 16, it's a little easier to deal with because there's still some requirements on the part of the guardian to provide the necessities of life and so forth.

But I think we've learned from experience that once the young person gets their mind made up that they're not going to reside with their parents, they usually just continue to run away or to leave. And of course unfortunately in a lot of cases they end up making the wrong decisions.

And I don't know whether there's anything that can be enacted that would change that or make it so it would be . . . I mean if they're under the age of 16 or say under the age of 14 and they won't stay at home and they are continually running, then there is a mechanism where they can be apprehended and made a ward of the Social Services department.

But there still becomes a point in time, and I've had my experience, where even after they're made a ward of Social Services and placed in a foster home, they won't stay. And that goes on until, you know, for a long time. And I guess it's a fact of life and I wish I had an answer to it and I am sure Staff Sgt. Doetzel has the same thing. We've dealt with a lot of these issues.

But, yes, you're right. I've had calls and you . . . sometimes you push, like I say, you push the envelope to try to help the family cope with the situation. But I'm not sure that in some cases if you're really not stepping over that line when we're picking some of these people up and taking them back home.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — I think sometimes — Ken and I were kind of speaking — you deal a lot on individual cases and like the chief spoke about pushing the envelope sometimes.

And sometimes you'll see an opening where you can push that envelope because the child said something or you saw something in the house that you didn't like. And often the calls that I've received is: my daughter's out of control, she's hanging around with a bad group, they're doing drugs, or whatever the case may be. And you know the symptoms of that. Unfortunately sometimes then they end up on the street or whatever the case may be.

But sometimes when you go to investigate those, you'll see evidence of drug activity or whatever the case may be, so you say, hey look kid. You push the envelope and say, look, you can't live in an environment like this or whatever. You kind of bluff them type thing; here I'm going to have to take you home or foster care or whatever the case may be.

But that worked in that case because maybe you had a little bit of something to hang your hat on because there was something in that individual home that allowed you to do that, because otherwise you kind of blew smoke and said, look, they're going

to charge you under the Narcotic Control Act or whatever the case may be. This is a lot better. Go home, try to patch it up with your parents. We'll get a worker in here to help you. And you try it that way.

But you kind of have to analyze each one. What worked here doesn't necessarily work here, you know. And that's the thing. Like I said to Kevin, as a policeman, the more tools you have in your bag to work with . . . You may only use this tool once or whatever but it's nice to have it in your tool chest to use it.

You know, I appreciate committees like you have here and allowing us from the police side to speak to it. That's something we in the police always felt — not speaking for the chief here — but the working fellow on the street often felt we never have any input or whatever the case may be. They don't hear our voices or whatever. You've allowed that today and, you know, I can say from the working people from the street level, thank you very much. And we have a lot of faith in people like yourselves because we feel you have an ear that you can go to.

So five years ago, 10 years ago, like I said about . . . Kevin and I were again talking about 10 years ago when it came to sex and that, we really didn't want to talk about it. If I can turn my head and walk by it, we'd like to do it; but it's here and it's hitting us in the face everyday now and we have to. And it's programs like this that allow us the opportunity to talk about it in a mature-type manner, you know. And people like yourselves and everybody in this room, you know we all have an interest and a benefit in it.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — If I could just go back to the question that I posed, which I'll only very briefly restate. But we've got this huge discrepancy between the number of predators on the street who are picking up children and the number of charges that are able to be laid. And there appears to be a lot of difficulty around the ability of a police officer on the ground to feel like they can fully investigate a situation where a child may be about to be abused but there isn't sufficient proof.

And I'm wondering — and as Arlene was suggesting, I think this question is open for discussion among all of us here so I hope everyone in the room will feel free to comment on it — but we're really looking for some advice about changes that we can make, both to provincial and federal statutes, that would allow a more full investigation by a police officer if they believe there's reasonable and probable grounds that a child is about to be abused.

So if you've got any advice for us on how we might either change the provincial Child and Family Services Act, the federal Criminal Code, or create other provincial legislation that would allow you to more fully conduct these investigations, we'd be very grateful for that advice.

**Mr. Quinn:** — You're looking at a situation like is stated in this book here, Peter. I think the police officer — and maybe this is something we have to look at — the police officer always has to work on the fact that he's got reasonable and probable grounds that there is an offence about to be committed or there's an offence being committed.

Maybe the legislation or something could be enacted that would basically identify the fact that if a police officer has a reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an offence related to section 213 or one of the other sections in the Code is about to be committed, or however it should be worded, would have the right to detain the suspect or whatever for a period to enable him to further his investigation.

The problem as I see it is you got to be very, very careful because what is reasonable, probable grounds to me may not be quite reasonable, probable grounds to Gary or Mr. Badger here. I mean it's subjective to whoever is dealing with that situation. And so you have to be very, very, very careful what we're going to set up. Because I can envision the right motive of getting into a shemuzzle that you wouldn't believe.

Because like I said before, you've got an individual who's got . . . who's being a bit of an antagonist or doesn't really have a lot of respect or doesn't want to co-operate with the police decides to give the officer the wrong answers just out of the fact of jerking his chain, so to speak. And the officer said, well I'm going to detain you because I think there's something going on here, only to find out that there was nothing going on and now he's got himself in a lawsuit, or some such thing.

So you've got to be very careful. But I can see if there was some provision that was identified, as we always have to go on that presumption.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I mean I'm presuming that this law would essentially be in force in stroll areas, for instance, you know, and that it would be . . . it would be largely enforced with kids who were known to be . . .

**Mr. Quinn:** — There may be . . . there may be an approach and that if a city designated a certain area as a . . . oh what's the word I'm looking for . . .

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — High-risk area.

**Mr. Quinn:** — High-risk area. That certain provisions may prevail in that area if you're caught, if you're checked or you're observed cruising that area or observed approaching young people or approaching anybody, that you would be subject to . . . first of all, you're subject to a surveillance by the police and you're subject to a search and . . . search provisions.

I mean that would have to be something that obviously the city would have to be willing to identify an area. I think we looked at that, Peter, in Saskatoon, where we were looking at signing that one area. And I don't know if it ever . . . I think I left before that came through. But I think we were looking at making it a high-surveillance area or whatever the signage was going to say.

And I think the idea there was that it would be zero tolerance and you were subject to being stopped by the police. And I think that it wasn't set up to hassle the people that resided in that area, but I think most people supported that initiative because it was a big enough problem in the area that people were willing to say yes, I don't mind being stopped by the police, because I know that they're trying to address a larger

problem.

So that may be another approach that we could go to. I think the issue was seizing the vehicles. I think that's another area that we have looked at.

I just quickly scanned this and I see there is a reference to the johns school here. I would not want to see anybody that's been picked up for sexual exploitation of a minor going to a johns school. I don't think that's serving any purpose. If they want to send him to a . . . if he is sent to a johns school or whatever they want to call it, after he's had his day in court and as a part of the sentence from the court they suggest this person should go for counselling, I have no problem with that.

But I think there is a difference when you've got — I guess if you want to use it — two consenting adults and they're picked up . . . either one of them is picked up in a police operation, and there is an alternative of addressing the problem and an adult can use it as an alternative measures.

But I think when you're dealing with an adult sexually exploiting a young person, I don't really think that we should be . . . the alternative should be there. Because there is no record as such. There is no conviction registered, there's no tracking of this individual. And we would track it. But as far as a criminal conviction would be concerned, there would be nothing on record. So I have a problem with that.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Thank you very, very much for that advice.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Okay. I'm just going to add a little to the chief's. I made reference in my presentation to johns schools, and I look upon it kind of like the driving without impairment program that's presently operated throughout the province. And like the chief said here, once they go to court and then the process is . . . and that's where I fail; my presentation also.

But the john schools could be an alternative because I think it's important that we educate these people. And be it a little bit of an embarrassment or whatever the case may be that they have to sit there through this and know the consequences, I think we . . . my feelings are there is room to be gained from that type thing, and because this is something that society is not going to tolerate, and you're going to have to learn about it.

And I think it could be quite uncomfortable sitting across there for a day or two days having to listen to professionals come in and speak to the consequences of what you are doing, you know. And so I think hand in hand with the court system, I think there is . . . I think there's some room to look at that — something similar to the driving without impairment program is where I'm thinking of them so . . .

**Mr. Quinn:** — This comment I'm going to make is not really tied into new legislation. I think one thing we can't, we can't sell short in our communities is the education, an education program. I think we've got people at the front of this right now. I think that if there was some funding or there is some monies that are available to set up a program, that would really get to a lot of our young people.

I know we try to do it through our own resources. We've got somebody in the schools right now, but I don't think we particularly specifically talk about prostitution as such. I mean there's a number of other issues that we deal with. But I think there is a room . . . there is room for an education or some joint effort between . . . in the community of trying to get that information out — whether we do it through the schools or we do it through our own respective organizations. That's just a thought.

I mean I think we've talked about enforcement; we've talked about a lot of things. I think we still have to hammer away at getting the message out. And maybe it has to go to the . . . maybe the information also has to go to the parents. I mean it's our community. I mean we can try to do what we can, but I mean I think if we can get a real combined effort between the different people in the community and the police and different other organizations, we might be able to address some of the issues here. But I don't want to leave here without saying there's an educational component to all this too.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I know there are members of the committee have questions. Carolyn, you have a question. Ron, you've got a question.

**Ms. Jones:** — I just wanted to follow up a little bit on the possibility of designating certain areas of the city as an area where if you're found in you may be investigated or something. Would that cause problems with mobilizing the strolls, the different areas that the children and women frequent? And would it just make it a highly mobile problem?

And my other question which doesn't really have to do with that is: through your experience, how many children, or if any, are perhaps pimped through the, you know, the ads in the paper, the personal ads, the professional services columns? I mean are they pretty strictly adult-oriented operations or do they quite often undercover exploited children?

**Mr. Quinn:** — I'll answer your first question first, I guess.

There is that possibility if you designated an area. And, of course, it would mean that there was going to be stepped-up police activity and that. Of course, one way to get around it would be obviously to go to another area that's not signed.

A lot of these young people are not . . . they're obviously not stupid. They're there for a number of reasons too. I mean, some of it's money, some of it's to support their drug habit, some of it's a fact they are being put out on the street by an adult — so many reasons why they're there. So if you're interfering with what they see as them achieving their end, they're going to move. And of course when they move, customers are going to be moving. But I guess that's a risk we'd have to look at and take.

I think that's one . . . I threw it out because I think that's one way of at least increasing maybe the opportunity of stopping these vehicles and maybe enacting some kind of . . . where you are subject to a search. You are subject to a little bit more intense police examination than you would be outside of that area.

I've had the experience of being involved where there was increased police activity put on a certain area of a city. And, I don't know if we want to say fortunately or unfortunately — fortunately, we moved it; unfortunately, we likely moved it to the wrong area of the city which created a bigger problem, which Peter is well aware of. I mean, we moved it into an area where there was a whole raft of schools.

And I mean we've discussed the issue here. How much pressure do you put on our little stroll in Prince Albert to move them from that area? If we move it from that area, we're going to do the same thing here.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — I can kind of speak to that; that in fact, when we have put extra pressure on in our commercial area, then we pushed it into the surrounding residential area. And then, you know, the calls were coming from the residential people with kids and that type of stuff. This is what's happening in front of my house, or I'm finding syringes. And you kind of put up your hands and say, God, how do I . . . you know, did I do the right thing, you know.

So you know, it's a real . . . (inaudible) . . . A little bit what we've started doing here on the court side is asking our court system, after you've been — and, again, this is reactive instead of proactive, which is unfortunate — but we've asked the court to put restrictions on these people in certain hours as such. Like, not to be in the downtown area from 6 p.m. till 2 a.m. or something like that, where a high time is that we find or something.

We've had some co-operation, you know. You put a little rider, of course, for business purposes or whatever the case may be or whatever. But that's something that we've tried through the court systems to restrict their activities as such, be it on their probation or whatever the case may be. But it'd be nice to stop that before it happened instead of after closing the gate.

**Mr. Quinn:** — Now as to your second question . . .

**Ms. Julé:** — We have only about 10 minutes left and I'm cognizant of the fact we have committee members that have questions yet. But we've also invited everyone here to engage in the discussion, if they wish. So if we could maybe just be as brief as possible so that some of the other people may have an opportunity for some input.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I can answer the question quickly. I think in Prince Albert I would say we've never experienced, you don't experience the fact that these professional ads are actually funding for our real young ones. I had the same experience when I was in Saskatoon. That's not saying it doesn't happen, because I think you know it does. I think there's . . . depends who's running the business. If they're really thinking about the fact that the police could come crashing through their doors or wherever it is, then they're likely going to shy away from it. But I don't think that we have that problem here.

The other thing we don't have a lot of problems here is we don't have a lot of the people out on the street being pimped. I'm not saying it doesn't happen, but it's lower, less here than it would be say in Regina and Saskatoon. That's my own

experience. Somebody may have some different information and that's great, but it doesn't make it any less of a problem.

**Ms. Draude:** — . . . he had offered a suggestion to me before that I thought was quite interesting so I was just going to ask him if he wanted to relay it.

**Mr. Badger:** — Okay. Like a lot of these people that you pick up, these johns, people that say maybe this is my niece or my daughter, find her again on the street a couple of days later and you've got this guy's address, take him to his place — hopefully his wife is home — brought your daughter home, you know.

Now another thing too is that . . . I'm not attacking the force or anything but I have to take you back a little bit to, like in my younger days I used to get beaten up by the city police, RCMP, that sort of thing, and since the Knight case there's been a lot of people phoning in and reporting issues like this. And there's a lot of people in P.A. that I've talked to, young people and older people that have been abused by the city police and RCMP. And it's still going on and a lot of people on the street consider the police as the enemy, you know, that sort of thing.

So our faith in the present legal system and law enforcement has to be re-established so that we can believe it. Because as far as I'm concerned, there is institutionalized racism in all forms of government — the legal system, the education system, political system, the media, everything. But that's my own point of view. And it's reinforced by our overrepresentation of our people in the penal system. So there is something wrong there.

And a lot of times I'm not sure if there's any assessments done on the people that are hired to be policemen. Like is there a psychological test done to find out exactly where they're at because there's . . . or what they've done in their lifetime sort of thing. Because going back to the Nerland case, like there's been rumblings in the community about his involvement with the police, you know.

And these things like are all questions that we ask as individuals and people in our community. And so we have to try and get that trust established again so that we can work together. Because it's not good working apart and it's not good observing the law enforcement as enemies, you know. So we have to start working together to create, I guess, understanding and working relationships between people. Because if we don't, then there's be a lot of trouble down the road.

**Mr. Quinn:** — You and Donna have the same speech writers.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — We have a couple of women here that would like to have some comments.

**Ms. Green:** — My name is Norma. I just wanted to . . . it was just some comments and probably reinforcing the need for education. We continue, and I've made some observations this morning of going to the schools to work with individuals who could become, who may decide to go the avenue of prostitution, but I think we need to . . . It has to be stronger than that.

What about the perpetrators, the johns, the pedophiles, the

people who do come and use the services? I think that's where we have to start.

I am aware that within the last month and a half you guys did a scoop of women, potential or suspected prostitutes on the street. Now what did you hope to get out of that? What about . . . were there not Charter cases in that area as well?

And my observation is I have lived away from P.A. for the last 12 years. I have come back and I've noticed that racism here, discrimination is worse than when I left it 12 years ago. And again, the power of the police, the power of individuals who are higher up in society, there's that unequal power.

So I'm wondering whether you would have taken such a . . . maybe a stronger stand if the children on the streets were non-Aboriginal and they were being exploited as what is happening now. Because the fact is we do have racism, like somebody said, alive and well here. Aboriginal people do not have the equal place in society that they should have, and I think it's very important to everyone to rethink of their own values, our own morals to ensure that everyone is treated equally.

And I just . . . my question about the scoop with the prostitutes or the potential, I guess, suspected prostitutes, what was the purpose of that? Why can't you . . . and I know you've probably done this with the johns as well. How often is that done?

But I think that the education part is also very important. There should be articles written on, you know, these young children that are being exploited, because they are being exploited.

And we talked about the john school and maybe we should call it another . . . have a pedophile school and send those individuals who are exploiting our young Aboriginal children to go to those schools.

But as well, some more public awareness of the inequality of Aboriginal people compared to the general society.

That's my comments.

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Chief, if I can answer part of this.

We've had three operations this year, type thing, the most recent one being August, I believe it was. And, unfortunately, that's where some of our known — well, we're telling some of the techniques here — is like we try to run some undercover police male people to, how do I say this, lessen the competition on the street for us to bring in our female decoy, type thing. So we start out by running a day of having our male officers cruising the strip to see if they in fact get solicited. Our second venture then is to have the female decoy go out and try there as well.

And the reason we have to kind of do that is because the competition from within on the street is sometimes quite fierce. And for our own safety, of our decoy officer from the other girls, we try to lessen the competition. We ran into the problem on the last one.

And I got to say, the last two, really, on the male side, haven't been that well because of the fact of we brought . . . on the second last one, we brought a person from out of town, from Shellbrook, an RCMP officer trying to . . . type thing, as soon as she was new on the street . . . And appreciate those people that are making the loops, there's somebody new and as exciting as that is, they've been burned; some of them have been burnt before are cautious so we were finding they weren't picking her up, type thing, even though she was out there and appeared to be available, type thing.

It was just, you know, they're watching. People make contact, drive away, it's street smartness by everybody out there. And the males watch to see if other people are coming back; the ones that have picked her up, are they coming back? No they're not. They soon realize, hey something's not right here.

The last one we tried running one of our local decoy female officers again and we had limited success with that as well. So, like I said in my presentation, we're looking at new ideas.

No we did not target the females; unfortunately that's just the way it worked out. We have a greater pool of male undercover officers that we can utilize than we can do females, and that's unfortunately somewhat of the staggering differences this year in our reports between male and females.

I'm hoping if you have a committee next year and we're invited, I hope maybe we can come back and we can bring those '99 stats back that shows that we are also targeting the males, type thing.

Chief, do you want answer the other part of it?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — How many of those charges against the men in '99 were for sexual contact with children or for soliciting children under 18?

**Mr. Doetzel:** — Well like I said in my presentation, in the last three years we only had nine that were 17 years and under, you know, type thing. So generally not a large amount. We're finding most of ours are running anywhere from say 18 to 25ish, 26 in there seems to be our majority of participants.

**Mr. Quinn:** — I don't think that we've ever predisposed when we set up any of our operations of who is going to end up being charged. Certainly we set up different operations that is geared towards apprehending the johns or that is apprehending the females. But I think when we get down to try and break it down into the fact that the police are targeting their operation towards one racial group or another, I . . . that has never been the direction that we've ever set out.

As I said in one of my opening remarks, unfortunately a lot of the people who we have in the regular sex trade business in Prince Albert are of Aboriginal descent. And I guess we're mandated to do a certain amount of enforcement. And I've said publicly that we'll do our best to enforce it equally so that we're targeting the males and we're targeting the females.

We're talking a couple of different issues here. We're talking one issue is prostitution, the other one is child exploitation. And

I think that we got to make the separation. The thrust of what we try to do out there, of course, when we're doing these operations is to identify what do we have in the sex trade business in Prince Albert. Do we have a high percentage of young people on the streets in Prince Albert?

That's one of the other reasons we do some of these operations. I would say that we have a percentage out there; we have a number out there. I wouldn't want to give you a number because it could be way out, but I don't think we're as bad off as obviously some of the larger centres are on a percentage basis. But the fact that we have anybody out there, as I said before, is too many.

So that's one of the reasons we try to have an idea of what we're dealing with out there. And that's one of the reasons we run the operation. We've never directed it, like I said before, at any one particular specific group, certainly not from an ethnic origin. I think unfortunately there's a percentage of people involved in that. That's why the numbers are up.

Getting back to you were mentioning the johns school. Don't get me wrong, I'm not opposed to johns schools. I don't feel that when we're dealing with this particular issue, which is child exploitation, that these individuals should be given the opportunity of choosing what their penalty is going to be. I think they should be . . . I think they should go through court. And if the court finds them guilty, if they want to send them to a johns school, then the court can send them to a johns school as part of their sentence.

But I feel very strongly on this issue and I don't think that . . . We're giving these people an opportunity of deciding the easy way out. Because in some cases I think the johns school has a very good message, but it's easier . . . you can stay fairly anonymous and unknown.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you, John. It is most unfortunate but, you know, the hour has come that we are going to have to be on our way. And we thank you ever so much for coming and spending the time. And we thank everyone else who became part of the presentation and voiced your opinions and ideas.

We are going to be getting on a plane to be leaving for La Ronge shortly, so we thank you once again. And we know that in the days ahead we'll most likely be conversing with you again on this topic. And just good luck in all of your endeavours, and congratulations for the work that you are doing.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Our thanks to all of you.

The committee adjourned at 12:05 p.m.