



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

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 20 — October 12, 2000

Lloydminster



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 7 p.m.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Very nice to have you here this evening. We're pleased to open this public hearing process. Some of you may be pretty familiar with the work of the committee already, but in case there are some who would like a little more background on the committee, we're just going to run very briefly through a power point presentation which will introduce you to the members of the committee and our mandate and some of the work that's been done to date.

I'll just introduce the members of the . . . well, actually, I'll invite the members of the committee to introduce themselves but I'm starting with Arlene.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Hello everyone. Welcome. I'm Arlene Julé, I'm the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Humboldt, Saskatchewan.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And, I'm the member of the legislature for Saskatoon Greystone.

Ms. Draude: — Good evening, I'm June Draude and I'm the MLA from Kelvington-Wadena

Mr. Harper: — Ron Harper, the MLA for Regina Northeast.

Ms. Jones: — Carolyn Jones, the MLA for Saskatoon Meewasin.

Mr. Toth: — Don Toth, the MLA for Moosomin.

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

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — We also have with us the staff to the committee. Just to my right is Margaret Woods and Margaret is the committee clerk. And we also have with us Randy Pritchard, our technical advisor.

We have other staff that are here with us from *Hansard*, from the recording part of it for the legislature.

And the committee has identified some key principles that we're basing the reason that we're here on. And one of those principles that has been established is that every child in this province is everyone's responsibility.

And we've also established that the involvement of children in the sex trade is child abuse. The sex trade in regards to children should not be considered prostitution. Children are victims. It's a criminal activity — child abuse — and that zero tolerance is our goal.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I'll just run over some of the tasks that the committee's mandated. You can see them up on the screen.

Basically we're asked to make recommendations with respect to stopping the abuse and exploitation of children involved in the sex trade within the province. We're also asked to look at what

other jurisdictions have done — do you want to just move that forward, Randy? — and we particularly examined what Alberta and Manitoba have done in terms of tackling this problem, and we're beginning to examine what other jurisdictions are doing.

The thing that we're particularly anxious to do is consult with stakeholders here in the province, and of course, that is primarily what this public hearing tonight is about. So we're very anxious to seek your input on how you believe we should tackle this problem.

Finally, we're examining why children end up on the street and in the sex trade in the first place. And that's a very important part of our mandate and we've discussed that quite extensively at many of the public hearings to date.

Arlene, I'll turn it back to you.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So the process that we're going through is to listen to the views and the concerns of all residents of Saskatchewan, including our youth. Actually, that's of primary importance and that was our intent in having the public hearing process.

We also determined that we would have consultations in the three main urban centres of Saskatoon, Regina and Prince Albert, where the sex trade is the most visible.

As well, we wanted to ensure that we had consultations with people in the community . . . the rural communities of Saskatchewan, the smaller cities, and some of the towns, because we felt that it was . . . there's always input that can come from people that may be of vital importance to us in determining what needs to be done in order to address this issue.

The other thing that we had heard from some people was that there was a relation . . . correlation to . . . with children that are on the street and they're possibly coming from areas that were in the rural part of Saskatchewan. And we've heard from different presenters outside of the big cities that have in fact confirmed this is happening.

In the public hearing process we're sort of breaking this into two phases. The first phase was basically a time when we had the first hearings, and that was this spring and we heard from people, stakeholders, in Regina and Saskatoon. And we completed those hearings in April of this year.

This is the second phase and we started it by being in Prince Albert this week; in La Ronge, Meadow Lake, and Lloydminster. And after, just incidentally, after the first phase was completed, we did table a report to the legislature. And that report is for public scrutiny certainly, and you may have a copy of that if you should so wish.

There have been a total of 35 witness presentations and we have heard from people from Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba; different officials, government officials as well as the police there, as well as agencies that have done something about it. We've heard from outreach staff in Saskatchewan as well in

those other jurisdictions. We've heard from youth community groups and parents thus far.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Just very briefly, because we want to move forward to hear your views, but there is — as Arlene was saying — there's an interim report that has been published. We have a few copies of it tonight. Some of you may have already had a chance to review it. And basically there are six themes that are established in the report based on advice that we've received so far.

One is several proposals with respect to legislative changes that we could examine. One of the examples, for instance, that seems to have quite a bit of public support at these hearings is the notion that we should seize the vehicles of johns in the same way that the province of Manitoba has done. And that's just one example of a legislative approach. There are many others discussed in the report.

We heard a regular theme in both rounds of hearings that we've done so far around various strategies for deterring johns. Many of the presenters who have appeared before us are anxious to see deterrence of johns as a major strategy that's adopted by the legislature. And that again is discussed in more detail in the interim report.

I think there's been a widespread recognition that the healing process is a long-term process for many of the children who have been victimized and has many dimensions. And it includes everything from returning to school and dealing with drug and alcohol addictions to the longer term issues surrounding dealing with the actual abuse that's occurred itself.

We've heard a lot of suggestions with respect to preventive strategies that might be employed. And of course a lot of groups in our community are already doing very good preventive work, but we've had many proposals for additional preventive work that could be done.

The importance of the outreach work that's done, particularly in the larger urban centres but also in some smaller communities, has been emphasized to us. And we've heard a regular theme wherever we've been in the province around the need for children to have safe refuge.

In La Ronge we heard it in the context of needing a safe place in your neighbourhood to go if you're a child who's witnessing abuse in your home or experiencing it to in the larger urban centres the notion of having safe houses or places, more institutionalized places of safe refuge for children who have been pulled into the sex trade to go as a starting point for getting out of the sex trade.

And we continue to have emphasized at almost all the hearings as well the importance of educating the public about the serious extent of sexual abuse in our society, and the serious . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . consequences for children. Thank you, Arlene. We've had a lot of very powerful testimony that's underlined how horrific this kind of abuse is for the children involved, and how it scars their life for a long time into the future, and how difficult the recovery process is.

So those are some of the themes that we've heard from so far. I hope that will provide you with a bit of context for where the work stands today. And we're really looking forward to your presentations and the discussion that will follow. I'm going to turn it over to Arlene now, and we'll call forward the first witnesses.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Sure. Just a reminder too, it's up on the screen, that our web site address. And if you have in the future any concerns or ideas that you'd like to express to us, you can certainly use the web site. Okay.

And we'll get started with hearing from our first witness here tonight with us, and it's with us Cpl. Tom McNulty of the Lloydminster RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police). And we welcome you, Tom and thank you very much for your willingness to present to the committee tonight your perspective on these things. Just feel free to start with your presentation when you're ready.

Mr. McNulty: — It's my pleasure to be here. Welcome to Lloydminster and thank you for coming. We do appreciate being heard.

I've prepared a text I guess I'll read from. I don't really care to do that, but I'll . . . if I vary from the text, I have thought about this to some . . . a little bit more since I've written this and I'll have a few things to add, I'm sure.

But again, welcome. As mentioned, my name is Cpl. Tom McNulty. I'm a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police currently stationed here in Lloydminster. I've been in the RCMP for 18 years with all of my service in Saskatchewan, including Regina, and predominantly rural, two stops in northern Saskatchewan. I've been asked to appear before you on behalf of Staff Sgt. Chilibecki, our detachment commander here in Lloyd.

I am currently the NCO (non-commissioned officer) in charge of the general investigative section here in Lloyd. My section is responsible for all of the serious crime investigation, drug investigations, and the collection and dissemination of intelligence in our community. I guess, reading through, that is I'm supposed to know what's going on in town so . . .

Currently, we have 27 members stationed in our community with three of us on the GI (general investigative) section. As I'm sure you're all well aware that Lloyd is a growing community with a current population that I've been told is 21,000 officially, but I think it's closer to about 23. It is booming. The oil patch and the related activity . . . because of the oil patch and the related activity, we have numerous young men and young people in Lloyd on temporary basis, which causes our community to be very different dynamically than any other community I've been to.

We have a much younger nucleus in Lloydminster with lots of cash flow, lots of available money. The hotels and motels are very busy. The men are predominantly single and away from their families, have a good income, and do spend their money, which just allows the topic that we're here for to blossom — fortunately, it hasn't yet.

We share all the usual problems of a city this size. Between January 1999 and September 2000 inclusive, our detachment investigated 34 incidents where children were identified as victims. Of these, six were non-sexual, which would include assault by another child or family member; four of the files investigated were shown to be unfounded; and the rest of the 21 were of a sexual nature committed by family members, nine by friends of the family.

I think you may hear from my friends from the sexual assault centre that their numbers are significantly higher. It's a substantially different reporting system. Their numbers probably show a better state of affairs in the community.

In all of the investigations referred to, our detachment used a team approach where necessary involving Social Services and other interested parties. We feel that the current legislation in place gives us the required tools to investigate these matters adequately. Penalties are suffice as set out in the Criminal Code.

In Lloydminster we have had no reports of children being used in the sex trade, no reports of children involved in prostitution. As the community grows, I believe, we can expect to see complaints where children are involved in illegal sexual activity just due to the nature of our transient population. I believe this is an inevitable fact.

Since writing that paragraph, I've spoken to people who are involved in youth centres in Lloyd. We have two. We have The Gate Youth Centre and the Native Friendship Centre has a youth program. Both people there — I spoke to them on Friday and neither of them were aware you were coming — they have knowledge of young girls availing themselves to better themselves to certain people, which these workers certainly call prostitution. However, it's not on the street, it's not . . . you know, they will basically obtain room and board for their services. These two ladies also agree that there's not an identified problem in Lloydminster.

When the day comes, and it certainly will, when we need to have the legislation in place to assist, we will work hand in hand with the Social Services groups to give the most help to the child. As we are on the provincial border we deal with Social Services from both Alberta and Saskatchewan. We deal with all provincial statutes from both provinces. A child on one side of the border needs to be treated the same as the child on the other side of the border.

As you know, we have Highway 17 running right through the middle of our town, and in some instances under some laws, it's legal on one side of the street and not on the other.

There is on occasion major differences between the two provinces, their statutes, and the one example I point to is an uninsured vehicle. To operate an uninsured vehicle in Saskatchewan, you get caught and end up in Saskatchewan provincial court, you'll face a fine of \$25. The voluntary payment as set out by the provincial government, I believe, is 65, but our judge goes to \$25.

If you are across the street and appeared in Alberta provincial

court under the same charge, your fine would be \$2,875. That is quite a difference. But there are issues between the two provinces that we run into quite often, and the one thing that we beg you is don't allow a child on one side of the street to walk across and be safe on the other.

However, whatever you folks recommend to the government and however things shake out in Alberta, we have to be close. You know, somehow we have to be close. We are the only ones that are directly involved in that, however, we don't want to encourage someone to leave Saskatoon to go to Edmonton either, you know, at the same token.

That I believe is the loudest message I'd like to pass on to you tonight is just the equality between the provincial legislations is huge.

As we have not experience . . . we have not had experience in dealing with the enforcement of prostitution issue, or the child sex trade issue, I will leave that topic to be dealt with by my colleagues in Saskatoon and Regina which I have read some of their stuff from your initial report, and I think they've covered it quite nicely.

It's interesting that some interested group, which originally opposed Alberta's Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act, are now highly supportive of the legislation over there. I realize that that's run into some trouble in court and I'm not really sure where that stands right now, but it looked pretty good when I saw it come out.

We're familiar with that legislation, however, we haven't had the opportunity, which is a good thing, to use it. But we did support it and we thought it had some pretty good benefits.

Again, just in closing, for myself, we do lack the experience in enforcing and dealing with these problems because they're just not here right at the moment. Again, my main concern is the similarity in legislation.

And that's about all for my presentation.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Well thank you very much Tom. That was a very good presentation, and we thank you for putting it together and taking the time to consider and inform us about the situation and what you look at here and how it may differ from other jurisdictions, from other areas of this province as well as other provinces.

We have a committee who is usually very inquisitive here and we are going to open up the opportunity for them to ask you any questions, or maybe just to discuss with you any of the issues that you brought forward as well as the issues that might be on their mind regarding that issue?

Who would like to start here, committee members? Do you have questions, Kevin?

Mr. Yates: — I'd like to start by asking, do you have any evidence that children may be involved in any way in the sex trade through escort agencies or any ads in newspapers or things that you attract in the local area?

Mr. McNulty: — No. We're familiar with one ad in the paper that ran for a short period of time — and I'm not sure if it's still there; it wasn't in last week's paper — where there was massage therapy being offered, among other things. But it totally dealt with adult women. We don't have any evidence of any children being involved in just about anything.

Mr. Yates: — Okay. You had made reference to the youth organizations or Native Friendship Centre, talking about young women getting room and board in exchange for services. Are these young children, or in what context are we . . . could you give me a little more information, little more background to what we're referring to here?

Mr. McNulty: — Lloydminster is the destination of choice for some leaving their families from the rural area or from the Onion Lake Reserve. They come into town. There is numerous conditions that are set out which the children aren't happy at home, aren't comfortable there. The ladies that were talking to me were talking of girls 14, 15, 16 years old who have left their home and moved to town to a relative or friend or what have you and they haven't been comfortable there. They've met people through different ways.

One of the larger problems that we have here is the Lloydminster Motor Inn, or commonly known as the Capri hotel here. In the basement of the Lloydminster Motor Inn is a pool hall, licensed pool hall where, you know, they're not supposed to serve liquor to anyone.

We're in there quite a bit. We know it's abused badly. We know that the young people have access to liquor there. However, every time we go in, it's fairly well hidden and it's a difficult one to enforce.

Lots of these young people meet men there and these men may be 18, 19 or slightly older, but young men. And the young girls of 15, 16 will take up with them and just stay with them for a short time, relatively short time — two weeks, couple of months. And then the men will move on and the girls are back to where they started. And that context is what I was referring to.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So basically is it correct to say then that they in fact are exchanging sexual favours for someone to pay for their room and board?

Mr. Yates: — A monetary advantage whether it's direct or indirect.

Mr. McNulty: — I believe it's safe to say that, yes. They certainly don't see it as an issue. They just see a roof over their head and they enjoy it. They're enjoying themselves. But yes, they are exchanging themselves for comforts, necessities of life.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Are there other committee members that have questions? No?

Okay, I'd like to just make a couple of comments and possibly ask you a few more questions in regards to this.

I'd just like to continue with the line of thought that we had

here a minute ago regarding the exchange of sexual favours for room and board.

In a lot of other centres that we have heard from, people we've heard from in other centres have indicated that that's what they consider the sex trade: you are trading something for something else. Men or women are offering something. They're exploiting the fact that there is need on the child's part — some sort of need. Things they can't acquire on their own because of financial difficulty they may have.

And so that exploitation takes its form . . . it's a form of exploitation simply because the perpetrators are identifying that there is a need that is not met by those young people and that they are offering them something. They're offering to fill that need, whether it be food, clothing, or cigarettes, or a case of beer or whatever it may be, or money for drugs, whatever, in exchange for sexual favours. So that is considered, by and large, to be the sex trade, a part of the sex trade.

I just mention that to sort of . . . because sometimes in our population, our general populous, people do not sort of identify the sex trade like that. Just as you've mentioned, it's sort of something that the girls are exchanging and it's agreed upon and so on.

The difference is these are underage girls. The girls are 15 or 16, so they're seen as children. They're under 18 and so they're seen as children. And so this is where the criminal behaviour comes into play. Whether or not the johns or perpetrators are 21 or 45 or 30 or 60, it doesn't matter. The girls are underage. And so that exchange for sexual favours is considered to be criminal activity, I guess, is the way many people see it and certainly the law sees it.

It just takes a form that sometimes is so subtle that it doesn't seem like too much is happening. And we've sort of, over the years, have seen . . . as I've watched this, I've seen though that it's activity like that that leads on to more violent activity. And that's where the problem comes in because that's when it becomes very visible. And that's when the young people really find themselves in danger, and in fact their lives are ebbing away.

And this is often how it starts. It's out of just very basic need that it starts but for those girls the activity usually goes on. It escalates. And many times they will end in cities where they are exploited by pimps that are very dangerous and so on.

I just thought I'd add that comment to it, but I'm really very happy to hear that you don't have to deal with the sex trade on the streets as such; that it hasn't been a major cause of concern for you yet.

We've heard from people, as Mr. Prebble has mentioned, from La Ronge and from other centres actually. But I'm mentioning La Ronge and Meadow Lake because the incidence of child sexual abuse is heavy there. And even though you don't see, as some people have mentioned, girls on the streets with fishnet stockings and short skirts and you don't see young boys out there selling themselves, the sexual abuse that is going on is leading to a situation so intolerable for them that they end up

trying to escape. They run. And they run to the cities and then they end up in the hands of pimps and in a much more dangerous . . . or equally as dangerous situation.

And so it's a progressive sort of thing that can be out of hand and does destroy lives. It's the part of the process that I'm just sort of bringing to your attention here.

Mr. McNulty: — Well I certainly agree. I've witnessed that myself being . . . my last posting being at Pinehouse Lake, a smaller community where the issues that you saw in La Ronge are certainly there and probably more so in it's a much tighter family community and the abuse there is huge. And I know of two or three girls that ended up in Saskatoon and some in Prince Albert. And I certainly agree with your comments regarding the girls that I referred to earlier.

There's no doubt that issues are here. We haven't observed them and haven't had complaints about them, but we're certainly aware that they're there.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Could I ask you just one other, one other question. Have you noticed in Lloydminster or have you ever been notified of pimping rings within our country, of course, that may be transporting girls across the border and, you know, through Lloydminster possibly into Saskatoon, say, for the exhibition or any major conventions or so on. Have you ever recognized any activity in that regard?

Or vice versa, girls being transported or taken out of the province to other jurisdictions?

Mr. McNulty: — We know we have stopped vehicles here where girls are either going to or coming from dance strip joints. We know of one instance where they were on their way to Showgirls in Saskatoon. They were adult females in that vehicle. We have a strip bar in town where, you know, the girls travel in and out. I'm not aware of any involving children.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And I just have more reference to make to your presentation.

You had spoken in this presentation of your support for the legislation, the PCHIP (Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act) legislation, from Alberta. Can you maybe just expound a little bit on that for the committee as to why you support that legislation and how you think it might be helpful for us in Saskatchewan?

Mr. McNulty: — Well I guess just dealing with the removal of the children from the street and the 72-hour clause; it sounds like a very drastic measure to just remove someone from the street and, you know, the civil liberties that are involved there.

However, I think to remove anyone from a certain situation and to get them the required help that they need cannot be done overnight with a safe house that they can get into. If they're in a certain place for 48 up to 72 hours, they have a lot more time to think about it. People have a lot more time to get in to help them, and I believe that part is good for it.

I also like what Manitoba did with the johns, and, you know,

fine them \$400 before you can get your fine . . . your car back. It's not a fine, I'm sorry, it's a program fee — is it or something? It's a fine. But works for me.

You know, the publishing of names, you know, especially a community such as ours. If we had an issue there, I'm sure that being allowed to publish names in the local newspaper would be a huge deterrent.

In a place like Regina and Saskatoon, where anonymity is . . . it wouldn't have such a large impact but it'd have a huge impact here. Just the identification and the publication of their names, I believe, is a deterrent in the smaller centres.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Thank you. June, did you have a question?

Ms. Draude: — Yes. I wasn't going to ask but I changed my mind. Tom, this is the first time we've been to a centre where people are bragging about the bustling economy and that things are going great. And that's good to hear.

Mr. McNulty: — We're on the Alberta side, sorry.

Ms. Draude: — That's good to hear. But then you also said you were in Pinehouse a while ago. So when I think of Pinehouse and Lloydminster, there's two obvious differences — one of them is the economy and the other is the number of Aboriginal people.

And this afternoon, or earlier during our presentations we heard, somebody told us that they believed that sexual abuse of children was not just low income, it wasn't just cultural, it was right across the whole page. It's just that if there was more money, or if the families were more affluent, they had an opportunity to either hide it better or get whatever it may take to help them heal by going, you know, to private help.

Do you think that's happening in Lloydminster and you just aren't hearing it through the police force? Or do you believe it's just not happening?

Mr. McNulty: — When I gave my numbers, that was . . . I think that there was 21 files where children were victims of sexual assault or sexual abuse by family members. When I say nothing is happening in Lloydminster, I say it where they're being sold or the children are profiting by the sex trade or somebody else is. There are victims in Lloydminster of sexual abuse and general abuse.

And I do agree that there may be more instances in low-income families in certain cultures; I've witnessed that as well.

But it's across the board; there's no question about that. I don't know if it's because they're less likely to report it. I would dare say that, and I don't have this total, but well over 50 per cent of our files — this is a guess on my part but I'm pretty confident of it — are middle-income, white families that certainly don't have that other baggage to come along with them. They've just got . . . They've got other issues but they don't have the other, you know, lower income and that stuff. But there is definitely sexual abuse in everywhere — everywhere.

Ms. Draude: — It's a little more difficult to help when it's not the obvious cases that are out on the street or the files that come across your desk, when it's something that's happening outside of the public eye, than to bring forward legislation or help zero tolerance. We don't know if we've achieved that goal if the stats aren't there.

Mr. McNulty: — The stats aren't there and the mood isn't there either. And I'll just refer to a program that I'm taking this Saturday, actually. It's the Speak Out! program through Canadian Hockey Association, where as a result of the Graham James incident the Canadian Hockey Association has stated that all coaches, managers, anyone involved with the kids on the ice will take this course — this Speak Out! course.

I was at a course two weeks ago where we touched on this. There was 74 of us in the room. Out of the 74, I think there's 72 males and 2 women. We were all concerned parents that are out there willing to help coach our kids and be part of Lloydminster minor hockey on a volunteer base.

The last hour of that we spent regarding this Speak Out! and the abuse of children by coaches and by people in authority over them. We spoke on it for about an hour. We broke, and we broke for the day, and I've spoken to quite a number of guys that . . . right after that and since then, and the majority of them say, ah, that's not important, doesn't happen, you know, it's not an issue.

We've had instances here in Lloydminster — they're dated but they were certainly here — of coach abuse in hockey. I think you don't have to look very far in any reasonable-sized centre where it's been reported. There's another huge problem. But again, the people that are involved in it here . . . sorry, the people involved in hockey here, it's not an issue.

So zero tolerance won't come until everybody believes there's an issue and we're a long ways from that — a long ways. The program that the CHA (Canadian Hockey Association) has going is certainly bringing it to the forefront, and there are more people now talking about it and willing to step in and say let's not go there. It's coming, but we're a long ways away from it.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — I think just a comment and adjunct to that is if you think back probably even 10 years ago, we hadn't heard from hardly anyone even in the . . . from the female side of it, from the female gender, about this kind of abuse happening. There was a lot of it happening, possibly not necessarily on the streets but a lot of times it leads to the streets. That's why I keep bringing it up. But it was happening. But until the last 10 years we haven't heard a lot about it. No one was speaking out.

We now have places like Tamara House in Saskatoon who are dealing with the consequences — the fallout, the trauma — that women are starting to feel in their 30s, 40s, 50s. People are traumatized and eventually it does come out.

And so you know, the more that people dare to talk about this, the more it does come out. And it is for the better in the long run because healing can take place once there's people that are willing to speak up and speak out.

I want to ask you one more quick question. Of those numbers that you have, sexual assaults, was there a high incidence of boys also that were sexually assaulted or were they mainly girls?

Mr. McNulty: — Predominantly female.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Female. Okay.

Mr. McNulty: — There are some males, but predominantly female.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Don, did you have a question?

Mr. Toth: — Thank you. I think you mention a place in the city that people are gathering, like this pool hall, and you're not exactly sure but feel that there are activities going on there.

The question I have is and it's based on what . . . most of the presentations we've had to date have basically been highly Aboriginal or First Nations representation in a lot of the activity that's been happening. In fact just overwhelmingly carrying that race. And I'm just wondering: in this setting that we're talking of here, in looking at Lloydminster, would you say there's a balance or would you say you tend to notice more of the First Nations people involved at that level?

Mr. McNulty: — More of the First Nations. I mean the incidences I talked to that were shared from the ladies from the Gate and the friendship centre, I believe, they only spoke of three instances that they could recall over the last five or six years, and I'm pretty sure all three were First Nations young people. At the place where I referred to, downtown, there's a larger First Nations population of young people there than white. In the files that I talked to, I don't think there's any . . . I think, it's the opposite, I believe. But in the more obvious . . . downtown in this one spot, it is higher First Nations.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Are there any other questions?

Ms. Jones: — Tom, lest you think that we're an impoverished province, I'll want you to know that we're doing quite well in many centres, including Saskatoon, Regina, Moose Jaw, and indeed our provincial economy is sizzling along quite nicely. Just in case you think you're the only centre.

I do want to ask you a little bit about the . . . I'm not too sure if this is 21 plus 9, when it says of the total investigations 21 were committed by family members, 9 by a friend. So does that total 30, or is that kind of 21 still?

Mr. McNulty: — Thirty.

Ms. Jones: — Thirty.

Mr. McNulty: — Yes, I'm pretty sure.

Ms. Jones: — Okay, and so we're talking about sexual assault on minors I assume. Is this under 18 or under 14, or any idea of the age group involved?

Mr. McNulty: — This would 18 . . . this would be . . .

Ms. Jones: — Under 18. Okay.

And later on in your brief you say that you feel that the legislation gives you the required tools, and the penalties suffice as set out in the Criminal Code. Do you have any idea . . . Well first of all, of the 30 charges, were there 30 convictions?

Mr. McNulty: — I'm sorry, I don't know that. I don't know that.

Ms. Jones: — You don't know that. So in general, could you give any idea of . . . I mean obviously some were investigated and found to be unfounded. Do you have any idea of charges laid, kind of in terms of percentages, how many result in convictions?

Mr. McNulty: — I have . . . no, I can't. I'm not sure, but I believe — and I could direct it here — I think we're doing pretty well in that regard though.

Ms. Ralston: — I think across Canada less than 10 per cent ever reach the conviction stage.

Ms. Jones: — So that could be due to being dropped or . . .

Ms. Ralston: — . . . insufficient evidence or dropped or . . .

Ms. Jones: — So about less than 10 per cent. Okay, and of the ones that do result in conviction, do you have any idea of a length of penalty . . . a length of sentence or what type of a sentence is imposed for a conviction of sexual assault? On a minor. I'll try to, you know, make it as easy as I can.

Mr. McNulty: — I don't have any for instances. In Lloydminster, I can't . . . I can think of two fellows that have very recently been in court, but I can't recall their sentence. I'm . . .

Ms. Jones: — Okay. I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I'm just trying to get a sense of what type of . . .

Mr. McNulty: — Fortunately at work I take the attitude that it's my job to get them to court and then I leave it because I get too frustrated by that. And I just don't follow it through the court because so many times I get really frustrated from sentences and the interpretation of the law. So I try not to go there.

When I say the ground rules are there with the Criminal Code, they're there. There's . . . you know, the Criminal Code is pretty broad. Certain jurists tend to narrow it somewhat, which is rather frustrating. But the Criminal Code tools are there and I think there's plenty of latitude in there.

It's a case of . . . you know, I go back to the \$25 fine compared to the \$28 fine, you know, or compare the drug trade. Growing marijuana in Lloydminster, you might get three years in jail for a hundred marijuana plants, where in, you know, southern British Columbia, the Lower Mainland, you might get a hundred dollar fine.

For sexual abuse on children in Lloydminster, you might get three years; in Calgary, you might get a year. If it was all equal and they used the tools that were there, everything would be fine. The tools are there inside the legislation. It's just a matter of them being used.

Ms. Jones: — Okay. I did have another one. Oh it's a little bit of a . . . Well it is a question. The statement that you made earlier is that . . . or that your colleagues made — I suppose it was a collaborative thing — that as the community grows, I believe we can expect to see complaints where children are involved due to the nature. I believe this is an inevitable fact.

And given that our goal is zero tolerance, that's a troublesome statement to me. And I'm wondering from your perspective, are there steps that could be taken to try to make sure that in a community such as yours, where you appear to have very little abuse through the sex trade, what ways do you think you could utilize to make sure that it remains that way? I mean it's easier lots of times to prevent something from happening than it is to go in after and try and fix it.

So do you have any notions, any links with the community? Are you doing something that you think is working, that is making your community seem freer from this problem than other communities? Certainly we're interested in prevention and cure, but you may be in the very fortunate position of being able to exercise the prevention without having to go to the, you know, clean it up afterwards.

So is there some secret? Do you have a secret? Are you doing something great that you're not telling us about?

Mr. McNulty: — I wish I could say that we were and I could give you something that we could hang our hat on and maybe be chastised for not sharing, but I don't.

When I say it's inevitable, that's assuming status quo. If nothing else is done, the community grows, thus grow the problems with it. That's where that statement is coming from.

We've done nothing that I'm aware of that's magical in Lloydminster. We're lucky here. Or it's well-hidden.

To prevent it, it starts right at the ground zero. And we have to do an awful lot of other things that give the kids something else to do rather than go there. And starting back with your opening statements where you've heard from others that, you know, the low income, the abuse in the home, you know, generations of abuse has probably happened before these children are out — those things have to be dealt with too.

The one thing that we can do in this town — and again it's not a preventative thing, it's a reactive thing — is to identify it early and deal with it early. If it does surface, we have to be there. Although we've got 27 policemen in town, those 27 guys are awfully busy. We won't be the first ones to know it's happening.

I spoke with Muriel and Shauna shortly before and we talked about a committee to . . . In other places committees are set up — and I'll let Muriel expound on that if she chooses to — but

where, a sexual abuse committee, where we would . . . everybody would be talking to each other. Unfortunately we don't have that in this community, where the sexual assault centre and Social Services and the police and other interested parties are sitting down at one table and comparing notes.

Again we've got two Social Services, we've got two of this and two of that. It's a little bit more difficult to get them all together. I don't know if anyone's tried, but it's something that we'll have to identify early and deal with early.

But no, we don't have anything magical in place that's helped us this way.

Ms. Jones: — Well keep that zero tolerance in mind and don't let it happen. Thank you.

Mr. Harper: — Yes, thank you very much for coming in and making a presentation. I just have a couple of questions.

You indicated in your report here that there were 21 children reported to you as having been sexually assaulted. Right?

Mr. McNulty: — Yes, sir.

Mr. Harper: — Okay. In your opinion, would these . . . I assume these are 21 different families?

Mr. McNulty: — I didn't pull each file. It would be safe to say that, yes, pretty close to that.

Mr. Harper: — Okay.

Mr. McNulty: — Yes.

Mr. Harper: — From your knowledge, would you consider these families to be impoverished?

Mr. McNulty: — Not the majority.

Mr. Harper: — How would you describe the majority of the families?

Mr. McNulty: — As I spoke with June, I believe them all to be . . . No, not all. The ones that I looked at were, a lot of them, were middle income. Heaven forbid, quote, normal, white. There was lots of just middle income, white people.

Mr. Harper: — You sort of answered my next question. To the best of your knowledge, were all 21 families white? They were not First Nations or Aboriginal or Asian?

Mr. McNulty: — Our community is mainly made up of white and First Nations. We don't have very many other cultures here per se, and I would say 100 per cent of these are between Caucasian and white, or sorry, Caucasian and First Nations. And I would say, I believe, I believe that the majority were Caucasian.

Mr. Harper: — Okay, thank you very much.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — We will thank you, Tom, ever so

much for sitting with us today and talking about this issue and for bringing forth your presentation. You certainly do bring a little bit of a different perspective than some of the other communities, but all communities are different and what's important to us is that we address the issue in the context that it is.

And for each community we want to pay attention to which you think would be the best kind of measures that can be employed in your community to deal with your specific situation. And thank you very much for taking our questions and being here with us today.

Mr. McNulty: — Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thank you, Tom.

Just before we move on to our next presenters, I just want to give a special welcome to Milt Wakefield, the local member of the legislature who is sitting in on these sessions this evening and joined us earlier for the press conference. It's really nice to have you here, Milt. Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you for being here, Milt. We enjoyed having supper with you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We're now going to hear from our next presenters who I believe are from the sexual assault centre. Yes, Muriel Ralston and Shauna, is it Godin? Am I pronouncing that correctly? We're very, very pleased to have you here and we're looking forward to your presentation.

Ms. Ralston: — Peter, thank you for coming to Lloydminster, and a special thank you for inviting us.

I didn't give you a big written proposal but our agency began . . . we're in our 19th year, and we began 19 years ago in this community — and I was not here at the time so this is history — as a result of the many women that were coming forward disclosing childhood sexual assault. So a small agency began 19 . . . like I said we're in our 19th year.

It grew over the years. Basically for probably 10 years it stayed with the women who were disclosing sexual assault from childhood. But about 10 years ago we saw the dynamics start to change, and we were getting more immediate reports, more . . . They weren't waiting until they were into their older years to talk about and disclose. Over the past seven years we've seen more men coming in disclosing sexual assault. So our sexual assault centre sees men as well as women, and little boys, young boys, as well as girls.

So four and a half years ago myself and Shauna came on board, and we realized that what we felt would work for our agency was to develop a broad bank of programming. There was public awareness but it was still kept very quiet. I knew there was a sexual assault centre because I volunteered at the Thorpe when I moved here, and they said there was a centre, so I volunteered there. But that's the only way I knew that it was here.

We have become much more public with who we are and where we are, and we have a broad bank of programs — and I believe

I faxed this to Randy. We run three stages of children's programs now. We have an Adult Beyond Survival, which is co-ed. We have a Teen Beyond Survival, which is co-ed.

The Teen Beyond Survival has not seen young men take part in it yet. But the Adult Beyond Survival has seen men and women interact together. The difficult thing I think for society right now to deal with is the fact that we are discovering women offenders as well as men. And that's a tough pill to swallow. It really became public about 10 years ago to my knowledge. The numbers are not as high as male offenders, but they are there.

So why do we have co-ed programs? I think it's really important for men to learn to re-interact with women, as well as women to interact with men in those groups. So that's gone actually quite well.

We have a sexual harassment, date violence — if I put my glasses on, I could probably tell you what we have — peer support education, public awareness programs that we are constantly battering the schools with. And I say that because some schools invite us readily, others sort of need the little nudge.

And for sure in the question and answer period, that's something I'd really like to see implemented in conjunction with sexual assault centres as part of an education program. Because when you talk about children on the streets, if they're learning in kindergarten and in grade 1 about what's a good touch and what's a bad touch and who's safe and who isn't . . . They do have a program in the schools and it is called the Care Kit. We are no more graphic than the Care Kit. We certainly aren't graphic about our information.

But I really believe that sexual assault centres that are available should interact with the schools and keep that knowledge there. Because as Tom says, we too do not have any statistics of the child sex trade in our community. We're not going to say it doesn't happen and we're not going to say it isn't going to happen . . . but if they're learning at a very early age. So that's the reason that we developed the broad bank of programs.

We also have one-on-one support for victims, and that is Shauna's task to deal with the victims as they come through; and then we give support to family members as well. We will accompany them to the RCMP, to the hospital, and we will go to court with them certainly and help them with court prep. And that's a very important . . . a very important component from a sexual assault centre's agency given the number that get to court and go no further.

We've really seen a broad base of dynamics there where we will get a victim who really absorbs the court prep. You know we try and get them strong and their self-esteem up and they don't knuckle on the stand.

We don't send them in saying they're going to win. We send them in saying we don't know that. Win or lose, we just want you to be strong in your self-esteem there so that you don't crack when you leave. We've seen cases where they've come in once, taken an hour and said I can handle this, and they've knuckled. And we felt certain that that one could make it.

So we really . . . we don't push our programs but we encourage them strongly to do the court prep and to do some long-term education about how to cope with sexual abuse. We definitely do a lot of referrals because some of them are so severe that they're out of our mandate.

Fortunately Lloydminster now can boast two psychiatrists as well as a mental health clinic. So we have one psychiatrist that works very closely with us and supports the agency very well, whether it be a child or an adult.

So from 19 years ago to today we still run a 24-hour crisis line which brings a lot of stats over that crisis line, a lot of victims phoning in. Sometimes we never see them, sometimes we do.

And beyond that, I'm going to have Shauna give you the statistical evidence from, I believe, 1999 and 2000 to date.

Ms. Godin: — I sort of wish I would have broke them down more but I'll just sort of define each one.

In 1999, ones that were seen that have come through the centre — and this number includes child sexual abuse, incest, adult sexual assault . . . yes those three — which was 128. Of the 128, some people came in support for a victim and some were victims. So of 128, 97 were victims, which is 76 per cent of that number were actual victims that came in.

In addition to that there were 14 children that came in that were sexually intrusive. Four of that 14 were victims of sexual abuse from children.

Through the crisis line itself — which is 24 hours, runs every day of the year — all the calls, the total calls in '99, were 575; 293 of those were about sexual abuse, were victims of sexual abuse.

In the year 2000 up to today, those that have come through the centre, come to the centre, 101 that were child sexual abuse, incest, adult sexual assault, 77 of those are victims, 76 per cent of that number are victims. To date, 12 children that are sexually . . . regarding sexual intrusiveness, two were victims of abuse by another child, sexual abuse by another child. To date with the crisis line, total calls are 283; 168 of those are about sexual abuse, victims of sexual abuse.

And if I can just sort of take a guess as far as with males. Males through the crisis line and as well who have come in through the centre in '99, probably 15 to 20 per cent of that number. Which was a huge increase from '97 and '98 where I might have seen one person, one male.

And there's been a little bit of a rise in that from '99 to 2000. Maybe plus 5 per cent . . . 5 to 10 per cent. So probably a good quarter of those numbers are males at this point, which is a big jump from . . . in '97, which is when I think I started there.

Oh, just with children, like child sexual abuse and incest, we're . . . under the age of 18, to date, 88 children. In '99, for the whole year of '99, it was . . .

Ms. Ralston: — One hundred and forty-six. You don't even

have to add it up because I know that — 146 last year.

Ms. Godin: — Yes, yes.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Eighty-eight children under 18?

Ms. Ralston: — That's this year to date this year; 146 for last year.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay, 146 for last year.

Ms. Ralston: — And we're just into our third year of actually running children's programs. Because when they're referred to us, we interview the family and the child and put them into an appropriate program, which can be My Body Belongs to Me, Safe and Happy, It's Okay to Say No.

And this year we had to develop a preteen survivor because you'll . . . we will often get 10-, 11- and 12-year-olds that just don't fit the mould, and their intelligence level and their comprehension level is away above the other programs. So the preteen survivor course has . . . actually it ran in June and it was very successful.

Ms. Godin: — And to keep in mind just to refer to the statistics with the RCMP, these statistics are brought in and typically, and something that we really struggle with, is the parent or somebody has come in with the child where the child has disclosed to that person. What we find extremely common is once the child discloses, that's it. They're done.

So it goes to Social Services and/or an RCMP member to interview them, and they've got nothing to say. Or they just let us know, or the parent know, or the person that they've already told that they won't tell again. You know, they're just . . . they're done with it.

So that could be part of the reason, you know, as well, why our numbers are a lot higher. So that's something that we really struggle with.

Ms. Ralston: — However, typically every one of these kids are sent to Social Services, whether it be the Alberta side or the Saskatchewan side. And the other thing to keep in mind is that we keep Alberta-Saskatchewan stats and, unfortunately, that's about money.

I mean if we, you know, we need to keep those numbers split, whether they're the crisis line or whether they're in-house. They're usually about half at the end of the year — half Alberta, half Saskatchewan — but when someone lets us know that they believe a child has been sexually assaulted, it's . . . they must take that child immediately to Social Services.

If they're sitting in the office, we hand them the phone or we make the call for them. But that must be reported and go in the circle. Then they will refer that child back to our agency if in fact there is a need.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Comments you wanted to make before we open up questions?

Ms. Godin: — There is just a couple of notes that I made in reading over the interim report. As far as what the committee principles, the first one where responsibility needs to be balanced between government and with people. And I don't believe that there's a balance or I don't see that there's a balance there at all.

I know a lot of people, mainly parents, people who have been affected by sexual abuse, directly or indirectly, in many different ways have tried to do things and continue to. I see that, you know, if somehow the government end of it, you know, can sort of pull up their socks, I guess maybe to say.

The victim is very much discouraged as far as going a legal route. In doing an accompaniment to court when it has actually gone to a trial, I have seen on a couple of occasions where it was just completely unjustifiable what happened with that victim on the stand, who was under 18, as well as what has come up earlier.

They don't get charged with a lot of time. Very commonly, I've seen three months, where it's a suspended sentence, you know, so probation for a year, two years. If you're good, you don't have to serve your three months, you know, or serve your year. Big deal. And that's what, a lot of times, the victims will say, what's the point, you know, what he's going to get, you know.

In the meantime, you know, they're getting it from all ends. Family has disowned them, troublemaker. The community, if it's an adult who has disclosed what happened when they were a child and their family, you know, has been in the community for a long time. I mean, there's . . . in all directions, you know, they suffer all kinds of consequences.

Ms. Ralston: — It's revictimization over and over again in various levels.

Ms. Godin: — And I guess that's the strongest message that I would like to send is if, you know, there was some way that the government could be directed somehow, you know, with the people, being in a direction of looking after that victim. Somebody that does want to come forward and has the guts and wants to put their life on hold for a minimum of two years, who's going to support that person?

There needs to be as far as what the court process, some blocks as far as, you know, how far can somebody go with that person up there, I think and how many times do they have to tell their story to how many people. And I don't really have an answer to that, but that's sort of an area I think that needs a lot of work.

And just for agencies and organizations within our community and other communities to work cooperatively together. Like was mentioned earlier, you know, it's multidimensional effect that victims of sexual abuse have, you know. So everyone to sort of work as a team.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you very much. We're going to open up some questions from the committee members for you if they have any.

Mr. Harper: — I'd like to thank you very, very much for

coming in and your fine presentation.

Just to get this straight in my head and my notes here, you're saying that to date in the year 2000, they've had 88 children come to you or referred to you as having been sexually abused?

Ms. Godin: — Yes.

Mr. Harper: — And in 1999, you had 146?

Would have any of the 88 who came to you in 2000 also have come to you in 1999? What I'm saying by that is are there any repeaters?

Ms. Godin: — No, not with this.

Mr. Harper: — Okay. Fine. Of the 88 that have come to you, is it your belief that the perpetrator is a family member? All 88?

Ms. Godin: — Probably. Well the statistic for incest is 93 per cent — Or no, I have to correct that: 93 per cent of child sexual abuse the child knows the offender. And most of that is family, like a relative, blood relative.

Mr. Harper: — And in your opinion what would the class status, if there is such a thing as that, of these families be? Would they be impoverished, would they be middle-income, upper income?

Ms. Godin: — I'd say middle.

Ms. Ralston: — I would say the average client at our centre is middle-income.

Mr. Harper: — Okay, when you say average, of the 88, would you say it was 44, was it 66, or was it 80? Or on a percentage basis, we can do it on a percentage basis if that works better for you.

Ms. Ralston: — I would say you could do three-quarters middle-income.

Mr. Harper: — Three-quarters middle-income. And what would these families be? Would they be Aboriginal, white, or Oriental?

Ms. Ralston: — Probably the larger number would be white. However, our centre definitely deals with the Aboriginal culture. I mean we certainly have the door open for them to come for services.

We had in '99, I believe the number that was given to me, and maybe Milt can help me with this, I think the population of urban Aboriginal in Lloyd was about 3,000 in '99. Does that sound correct?

Mr. Wakefield: — From my recollection.

Ms. Ralston: — However, remember that our centre will assist anyone within 100 kilometre radius. But again probably, I mean there's definitely a mix, but I would say that two-thirds were white and a third were the Aboriginal culture.

Mr. Harper: — Okay. Fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, just a couple of comments. You'd mentioned that you have had . . . well you've given us stats of people who have come to you and then you find when you call Social Services in, they basically clam up. Is that fairly often?

Ms. Godin: — Well I don't know if . . . Some children, yes, they clam up and it's like well, you know, I don't know this person.

But a lot of the times, too, it's just done. You know, it's like why are we talking about that again? And they won't focus on it. I mean they seem comfortable. You know, they're not withdrawn. But they just have nothing to say about it, you know, and I think their line of thinking is more, well, I've told somebody, like, ask him.

Ms. Ralston: — And we're talking age groups from about four to about 11 are very much that way, okay. And that's correct. Like I've been there, done that, and I don't have to talk about this again.

Ms. Godin: — Yes, ask my mom or, you know, that kind of thing.

Mr. Toth: — You know, I think maybe as well possibly you're perceived in a more kinder note.

I think just from having been a legislator for a number of years and the things that have come across my desk, to be very honest with you, many times Social Services can be very impersonal. And we get into, this is more the letter of the law versus how are we going to help this person. And sometimes I become very frustrated with it and I think that's what happens.

I've also dealt with situations where accusations of assault have been brought forward, and by the time the child was through, they felt that they were assaulted by the workers.

And I think we need to really re-address that, because unfortunately sometimes we're dealing . . . I think we see with individuals who feel that they're forced to gather information that could be used at a later date if you end up going to a court case, rather than looking at that individual as someone who needs some care and allow them to . . .

Ms. Ralston: — And the other thing that's flipping through my mind is that there's that thin line with children — and very often it can happen with adults as well — where I think that a good opener is: do you have anything that you'd like to share with me? Beyond that, if they are pressured and they're bounced from one place to the other, they get into the mindset of telling you what you want to hear. Okay, so they want more, what more can . . . Do you know what I mean?

So then you're contaminating and misconstruing a process. So there's that really thin line of knowing how much to ask a child. I believe my philosophy is ask them nothing other than if they have something they'd like to share with you. So that they're not . . . You know, the story can get bigger and bigger as it goes if it's pushed. And you know, when all is said and done, the

child was assaulted but it was not this way, it was this way, and it makes the picture look pretty murky.

Mr. Toth: — And I appreciate that. The other thing you mentioned about the good touch/bad touch, and I think that comes back to what we just talked about. Because I think that's very important. I've talked to a lot of educators who really feel frustrated as a result of the whole area of sexual . . . and just any assault because of the fact that, I think, there are a lot of educators out there who are people and look at children and have a compassion for them. They can see when someone's hurting, but they dare not, they dare not reach out their arms and wrap them around that child because it might be perceived in some manner that is not one of love and it could turn against them which is very unfortunate.

And I guess the question I have, when you talk about good touch/bad touch, and through your programming and — I don't know how to phrase it other than in the programming — do you really put a real emphasis as trying to distinguish between what is good and bad so that there are areas, mannerisms of showing love and affection and appreciation are not conceived, because of some education, as being the opposite? I think that's very important.

Ms. Ralston: — One of the things that's done in our programming — and I'll just share this briefly with you — is when a child is referred to our program, the younger children do body profiles so we get paper from the *Booster* that's not printed, and they lay down and they do a body profile. And then they get to hang their profile up. And then they go into the concept of . . . you know, where do you think a good touch is and where do you think a bad touch is?

That can be fairly scary but, you know, it's of one way of distinguishing, those kids distinguishing that where they have been touched may in fact, it may have made them feel good but it's not a good touch.

So that's proven to be an extremely beneficial method of assisting those kids to leave that program, being able to say I do know where a bad touch is.

Ms. Godin: — Like the good touch, we describe it as that it makes you feel good inside — loved, happy. The bad touch might be something that hurts like a punch, pulling hair, something that makes you feel bad. And then that's what we call, what would be a sexual touch we call the confused touch. And it's confusing because it might feel good at first but then your feelings — you might feel angry, scared. You know, and try to get them to sort of brainstorm. It's something that you can't control comparable to like goose bumps, you can't make goose bumps go away. And they seem to pick up on that. We've done that even from playschool age.

Mr. Toth: — There's the one point in the physical touch and you mentioned bad touch. If you will, I come from a little bit of the old school and if you set some guidelines and disciplines and you say these are the results. If it happens to be a spanking that can be — based on what you're saying here — that could be a bad touch. That could mean someone coming to the door. And to be honest with you, that infuriates me because we're

lacking some of the discipline and it's showing up in our schools and on our streets.

So that's why I'm trying to point out the fact of, trying to be very clear so that we're not, we're not creating a situation that people are using that and using it against family.

Ms. Godin: — It's interesting you bring that up because I've never thought of this before. We'll put it across to them, what's a bad touch? Okay, so it's something that makes you feel bad and if no one starts saying anything like punching, kicking, we'll introduce one. And no child has ever, has ever said spanking, which is interesting. Actually that surprises me.

Ms. Ralston: — Pinching and pulling hair.

Ms. Godin: — Pinching, pulling hair — usually things between other children, like their peers. So that's interesting.

Mr. Toth: — Well maybe that's because it's been probably handled in the right way, in love shown and so that's . . . Just so we don't confuse those areas. I think that's important.

Ms. Godin: — And we have had . . . you know, I've had parents say to me, oh, I know we can tell you went to the school today because as my child's running up the stairs and I give them a little pat on the bum good night and they turn around — that's my private part. You can't touch my private part.

And it passes but as much parent involvement that we can get and awareness before we see the children is what we prefer. To let them know — they may have learned some new words as far as the appropriate words for their private body parts which they may choose to exercise — and just don't reinforce it that it's funny. So we try to cover those bases as much as we can.

Mr. Toth: — I want to thank you for your work and efforts and being available. That's important.

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

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I've got a few questions and I thank you for a really interesting presentation.

I want to sort of pursue questions along three lines. The first is with respect to the nature of the abuse cases. As you know one of the things that we're charged with is seeing where the sex trade in one dimension or another is at work in the province.

And I'm wondering if — you know, we heard the presentation from Tom and what has been formally identified through the RCMP process — through your reporting process is there any evidence that children are being sexually abused either through the exchange of sexual favours for money, drugs, or other things that children may be seeking or any indication of pimping occurring in the community or children being out on the street in any kind of way? Is there any dimension to the sex trade that you've identified in the reporting that's coming to your agency?

Ms. Ralston: — When you, Peter, when you say in exchange

for money or I would believe — and I basically am aware of all of the client files that come through the agency, that some of the children, especially if it's an older adult such as a step-parent or a grandfather or a grandmother or an uncle — then certainly I believe those children are being exploited in that home if they're promised, I'll take you here, there, and everywhere with me, or I will buy you this. I would say that there's definitely a slim percentage of them.

I think what this particular committee has done for me is to realize that we need to put that in our statistical evidence forms so that we are logging whether that child disclosed that this evolved because grandpa, or mom's boyfriend, had promised me. And yes, in my four and a half years there, I have heard that.

It has come as a result . . . we log it under incest or interfamilial. But I realize since reading this that we need to change our statistical logging. So I know that that has happened.

As far as pimping is concerned, no. Like we're not aware of it. Now the one thing that we have dreamed of and hope some day to have money for is an outreach program as a part of our agency. Then I believe such as the Gate and the friendship centre's youth centre, we would hear those things.

But much of our thrust and many of the issues that come to us are direct sexual assault — deal with the issue and try and get that person to a level of coping. But it's been a wake-up call that we need to really look at how we collect our statistical evidence.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Well thank you, Muriel. I think that helps to clarify it even further.

I wanted to ask your advice on whether there's anything that the province can be doing to give more support to child victims in the court. Are there more things that the provincial government can be doing to assist cases of child abuse to come before the courts, to assist children in the testimony process before the court? And basically to give support to the child and their family — at least the family members that are not involved in the abuse.

Ms. Ralston: — They're secondary victims actually, and we log them as secondary.

Ms. Godin: — I think the use of a screen, which has been a battle and I don't know if . . . I've never seen where that's been allowed. I've seen it get close once but it wasn't allowed, which really appalls me. Because to me that's a very obvious thing, you know, to set a child up in a courtroom that's formal and there's so many authority figures and you're facing this audience and then you have the person who's been sexually abusing them and traumatizing them sitting there looking at them.

Ms. Ralston: — We don't know if that's customary in Saskatchewan courts. But many years ago I was a part of an issue where three young children had been abused by this offender and definitely we lobbied and we did get a screen. Now that was in an Alberta courtroom and is that something

that can be accessed, Tom, in Alberta courts? Because I did . . . I think it was as recent as about six months ago the screen was requested in a case, and I'm not sure if it was Alberta or Saskatchewan, and it was denied.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Tom, just come and join us at the microphone so we can . . .

Mr. McNulty: — Screens are available in both our courts here. I know that there's a process either this week or next week where we're going to make one available and have the opportunity to do that.

Again there are certain jurists out there that take the ideal of having to be tried in public to a bit of an extent unnecessarily, in my view. The protection of the child in many, many, many times certainly outweighs the public interest of the media or what have you to close down the court. And then to screen that person from the abuser is a huge step forward.

And then again the defence lawyer and the tactics used there. Now those have to stay in place to a certain extent. I understand that those have to stay in place. But the use of a screen to protect a child from the visual, from seeing the abuser while he speaks or she speaks I think is hugely important and not used nearly enough. And that's a decision totally up to the court.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thank you for clarifying that. I think that's very, very helpful.

Mr. Yates: — One clarification. Is that determined by the Criminal Code of Canada or through a piece of provincial legislation, whether or not a screen is used?

Mr. McNulty: — That's under federal jurisdiction. It's under the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act and something else. It's predominantly the Criminal Code.

Mr. Yates: — So is there any piece of provincial legislation that could be enacted to make that mandatory, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. McNulty: — No. I say that without having a total understanding of the ins and outs of the meshing of legislation. The direction given by government to the Minister of Justice to the judges to open that door, the legislation is there and we can use the legislation that is in place. It's a case of interpretation. It's all there but it's the weight put on the fair trial issue, the weight that's put on . . .

Ms. Ralston: — The rights of the offender.

Mr. McNulty: — Yes, the offender being able to face the accuser. And that's a really important right. I don't want to get away from that right. But it has to be tempered with . . . case by case. But the tools are there. If the Provincial Court judge allows it, it's there. It's totally within his discretion.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Could I just have a follow-up question. The rights of the offender to face the accuser, do you believe that . . . I mean we all have our opinions and we recognize that it . . . you know, my opinion is my opinion. It's

just the way I see things at the time.

But when you mention that it seems to me that might rightfully be so. But in the case of a child that has been abused, that's a different story to me. Like it's the fear, the trauma, the retraumatizing, the impact on the child each time that child has to see that person that has hurt them so badly. That impact just keeps pounding into that child, and it just seems to me that that's cruel.

So I don't know, in the case of children who have been, you know, offended in a sexual abuse situation, I have a problem with that, that's all.

Mr. McNulty: — I'm not arguing against you by any means.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — No, I know you're not. I'm just . . .

Mr. McNulty: — But in many cases — as I'm sure the ladies will support me on this — as Muriel mentioned before, the child will tell you what you want to hear if the interviewer takes that way. It's vital that the proper story come out and that it's not made up and that's it not . . .

Ms. Ralston: — Enhanced, because children I think historically have always wanted to please adults.

Mr. McNulty: — And you can't take away all of the barriers to allow that. We have to ensure that justice and the truth come out. It's a fine line; it's a fine barrier. And I certainly believe in our system, and I believe that there's ways that we can do better. But at the same time, you know, to protect the child solely at the expense of perhaps an innocent abuser, it's a tough, it's a tough weight to carry.

I think my previous comments kind of almost condemned the judges and their use of the screens and stuff; at the same time, they've got a very tough call to make taking in the both sides of the issue.

Ms. Godin: — See, and like I think on one hand we have to be just as concerned with somebody that is being sexually abused as somebody making a false allegation, and there's definitely a fine line there.

And I mean maybe I don't know enough about this area, but I don't understand whether the person is falsely accused or he or she has done something, sexually abused this child, what harm it does to an adult to have a screen up in front of a child. I don't understand that, how that harms the adult, you know.

Ms. Ralston: — Or the case.

Ms. Godin: — Yes, is what I don't understand.

Mr. Harper: — I just have a couple of short questions . . . (inaudible) . . . asking my questions earlier. Of the 88 cases that were brought to your attention to date, what method were they brought to your attention? How was this instance brought to your attention? Was it a parent that brought the children in or . . .

Ms. Godin: — Sometimes a parent. The child has said something that seems odd or doesn't make sense so they may phone through the crisis line or to the office and say, this is what my child said, what do you think that means? Or through Social Services it comes through . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The schools, yes, that's right. Schools, friends of the family. Sometimes with older ones 10- to 15-years old, teenagers, through friends. That age group is a lot of times through friends coming in and saying, you know, my friend told me this last night, you know, what should I do type of thing.

Mr. Harper: — Okay. So when that contact is made, what do you do? Then you'd sit down and interview the child . . .

Ms. Godin: — No.

Mr. Harper: — And work with the child and talk to him?

Ms. Godin: — No, we don't interview. What we would do is, you know, very first question: have they been to Social Services and/or RCMP? If they haven't, that's where we direct them.

In the case that something has happened, they should definitely be the first responders for that. We don't want to contaminate, you know, anything that could go further; you know, where somebody could be charged and it be known that somebody . . . a child molester, an offender. After that point we'll do one-on-one support services, put them in a program.

Once then, you know, we'll, with the RCMP and/or Social Services, get the okay from them that we can continue on doing support services with that child. So they've gotten all the information they need or they can get at that point. So there's . . .

Mr. Harper: — So for the most part your preliminary contact with that child is after they've gone through . . . gone to Social Services and/or the RCMP?

Ms. Godin: — Right. Or in previous years they've done that . . . (inaudible) . . . children.

Mr. Harper: — Okay. How do you find the children to work with at that point, after they've gone and talked to Social Services' workers and then have come to you? How do you find the children to work with at that time? Are they open and receptive or . . .

Ms. Godin: — Some are very open. It's a type of closure for them I think, for some, that they've told somebody, especially an RCMP, and I got to go in the cop car and you know it's . . . And they feel good; like I told somebody and somebody believed me. Others are just . . . they're very withdrawn. Here's another person that knows or . . . And they naturally think that you can tell by looking at them anyway.

But we don't talk specifically with them about the abuse. We do body safety education with them, with ones that have disclosed and it's known that they've been sexually abused, putting those kids through a group together so that they don't feel isolated and like they're strange and they're the only one that this has happened to. So they get some kind of sense of a connection

with other children that, you know . . . that seems to be really . . .

Ms. Ralston: — And in addition to that, with the kids, we try and involve the parents as much as we can. The parents — we invite them, in fact, we insist that they come. If they've registered their child or their child has been put into a program, we want them there the week in advance for an evening to know what this program is about, and when the kids bring home something to fill out, work with them on it. You know work with them so that the whole household is aware of the education that's going on. And we call it that — an education and an awareness program. So that's an imperative part.

I don't believe you can take a child to a program and have them go back home and expect them to understand and process and use that information if you haven't tried to encourage the family to work with it.

Mr. Harper: — So then after they've been interviewed by Social Services and they come to you, you find the children quite willing to . . . for the most part, quite open, quite receptive, quite willing to work with the program or get involved in the program in conjunction with their parents. By that I mean you don't find them damaged as a result of having to be interviewed by the cold-hearted bureaucrats at Social Services?

Ms. Godin: — I think at first probably a majority of them don't want to be there. They don't want to be in this kids' program. What if somebody I know is here.

Ms. Ralston: — And they're terrified to go to Social Services, that's part of . . . I think that's one of the main components. When a family comes in and speaks to the issue that they believe that something has happened, is trying to pave the way to saying this is a necessity. No, they're not all, you know, they don't all have fangs and horns. You really need to do this for the betterment of your child. And bottom line for me is, if you don't, you know what, I have to do it anyway so I would like your participation in turning this case in.

But it's a tough one. That's probably the biggest hurdle right there is taking the time to get them to adjust to the fact that they need to do that, because our mandate says that we must turn it in.

Mr. Harper: — Now who are you suggesting has to make the adjustment, the child or the parent of the child?

Ms. Ralston: — Well I mean the child is sitting there, and if the parent is frozen in the chair and saying I'm not going there, what do you think the child's learning.

Mr. Harper: — Okay, that's what I want to clarify here. It's the parent that resists going to Social Services, not the child.

Ms. Ralston: — Sometimes the kids do. I mean if a kid is on Social Services and they have a social worker and they have to go to that social worker every month to find out where their cheque is, you bet they learn to despair over that as well as the family. But lots of time the parents are just ill over that fact.

Mr. Harper: — But in your opinion, would the resistance of the child be because the parent has already demonstrated a resistance to wanting to visit Social Services, just a reaction to what the parent has done?

Ms. Ralston: — Prior to this I worked as a contractor to Social Services. And I very often saw that families who had generationally been embroiled in Social Services, the kids grew up hating something they didn't even really understand except . . . and I don't think they even realized that it put food on the table. Do you know what I mean? So it's a learned behaviour.

But your average parent who believes that Social Services has to be involved is petrified.

Mr. Harper: — But you told me that two-thirds of the 88 victims were likely from middle-income earners.

Ms. Ralston: — And they're terrified.

Mr. Harper: — So they would not . . . the children then would not be terrified of Social Services, but the parents would be feeling awkward about having to go to Social Services. So this is what I am trying to clarify. It's the parent that offers the resistance to go to Social Services.

Ms. Ralston: — On the average.

Mr. Harper: — On the average. Of the two-thirds that you said were of middle-income earners, it would likely, for the majority it would be the parents that would be resistant to go to Social Services, not the child.

Ms. Ralston: — You wouldn't see a child that was resistant where the parent wasn't. You wouldn't. I've never seen that. So it's either both or it's the parent.

Mr. Harper: — Okay, that answers what I'm getting at. I'm talking about the child here now. So after the child has gone and done their interview with Social Services, would you say that the child is — I hate to use the word damaged; I won't use the word damaged — is the child harder to work with because they've had to go to Social Services?

Ms. Ralston: — What's your point? Like, I'm trying to figure out what your point is here.

Mr. Harper: — Well the point is I'm trying to determine whether the trauma of a child having to sit down with a Social Services worker and describe to them, or whatever they have to do to satisfy the requirements of Social Services, if that makes your job any more difficult? What I'm saying is, if you were able to do that job without the Social Services intervention at that point in time, do you think it would be easier for you to work with that child? Or do you think it makes no difference at all?

Ms. Ralston: — I don't think it makes a difference at all. Now if a child has been sexually abused, number one, they're already been traumatized, okay. It's traumatizing for them to come to our centre. They have no idea who we are and where we are. Then they have to go to Social Services and then maybe very

often they have to go down to the soft room at the hospital, correct, and be interviewed by an RCMP member and a social worker.

So what you're looking at is a mushroom effect of traumatization. Would the kid be any easier to work with if other agencies weren't involved? I don't even think I want to go there because in order to protect that child we need those two other agencies.

So even if the child is more difficult to work with when it comes back to us, we may have to assist them with mending fences and we very often tell them, you know, that the RCMP are okay. And maybe sometimes they wear their uniform and maybe they won't, but that's not to be afraid because they're parents too, and the same with Social Services. I don't think that there's any relevance there to the fact that it would be easier or harder.

Mr. Harper: — I personally happen to agree with you but there was a question earlier . . . I just want to make one more little short statement here please, Peter. There was a statement earlier that . . . at least left the implication, at least in my mind, that Social Services workers were cold-hearted and perhaps even bullyish. And if that is the case — which I don't think it is — I was wondering if that would have any effect on the child as a result of the interview, but obviously it doesn't because quite frankly . . .

Ms. Ralston: — Well if you get a bullyish, cold-hearted, social worker, you darn right it will affect the child. It would affect anyone. It would affect me.

Mr. Harper: — I don't think most of the social workers are bullyish though . . .

Ms. Ralston: — So you know, but they have a job to do, and they probably see 10 times the cases we do in a day and quite frankly . . .

Ms. Godin: — And they struggle more with the red tape, and the same with the RCMP. I mean at least we don't have to be in it, you know, like Tom was saying, when it gets to court it's like I can't watch it, you know. I can't imagine being in a position where you're trying to fight something and you know something is wrong here, but you've got this law here or you've got this written rule here that I just don't have enough, you know. But you know that something is going on. And I've heard that from social workers, you know, it's extremely frustrating. They can't get the kid out of the home. They just . . . they don't have enough . . . or they don't, maybe not even so much have enough but they don't have the right stuff, you know.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I'm afraid we're going to need to bring this portion of the hearing process to a halt, and I'm sorry because I know that both Arlene and I have many questions that we haven't had a chance to ask you, and other committee members have many other questions they'd like to ask you, but I'm realizing it's 9 o'clock and we have other witnesses still to come forward.

But I want to thank you both very much for what's been a wonderful discussion and Muriel, Shauna, thank you. At the end of the evening we may have a further opportunity for a general discussion and if you're able to stay we'd really enjoy that.

I think we'll take a five-minute break and then come forward with our third presenter who is from the Onion Lake Family Services. So we'll look forward to that very much.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And just as an adjunct to what Mr. Prebble has said, in the discussion, it's sort of an informal discussion, so some of the people that are here with us other than the presenters may want to get into discussion or ask questions too. So they'll be welcome to do so at the time.

Ms. Ralston: — I want to thank you all for coming to Lloydminster because, like Tom said, we're not aware yet. If nothing else, we can go away, I think, better educated as to what is happening around us. And I'm sure, in all honesty, there may be some there, but I think it's given us a wake-up call to get ourselves together.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Well you're doing all kinds of really good work right now so . . .

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes, and we thank you so very much for coming.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we are very fortunate tonight to have with us one of our presenters, Connie Matchatis. I hope I'm pronouncing your name correctly, Connie.

Ms. Matchatis: — Actually that's very correct.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Connie is the director of Onion Lake Family Services, and Connie, there might be a couple of . . . a couple of things that you want to present to the committee. We notice that you have down here that you'd like to speak on your involvement with British Columbia's public consultations on sexually-exploited youth, and we're really eager to hear about that. But we'd also like to hear about your perspective as far as your work with Onion Lake Family Services.

So we'll just certainly invite you to start in any which way that you would like to, and welcome, and thank you for coming.

Ms. Matchatis: — Thank you. Good evening, committee members. My name is Connie Matchatis and I'm originally from Cold Lake, Alberta. For the past four years I worked for the Carrier Sekani Family Services in Prince George, British Columbia, as the program director for family support services. In June 2000, I moved to Saskatchewan and assumed the position of director of child and family services.

I was hearing some comments made about the cold-hearted social worker so I'll be able to speak to that a bit.

My presentation is basically . . . involves my involvement as

part of a committee member that was a result of . . . The Ministry of Children & Families in British Columbia had initiated some discussion around looking around at locking children up — children and youth — when they felt that they were at risk of sexual exploitation in any centre in the province.

The responsibility would have relied on . . . would have fallen on the social workers, as the legislation would have been part of the Child Family and Community Service Act. So this is why they wanted to get some information and some feedback from various target groups within the province.

What they did was they visited different locations and had community consultations or open meetings similar to this, and talked about what some of the issues were, whether or not there was an issue in terms of children being lured into the sex trade.

When they began looking at the Aboriginal communities, what they did is they wanted to isolate them because they felt that there was specific issues that were geared or that affected the First Nations community that may have been a bit different than the non-Aboriginal communities.

As a result, there was representatives from throughout the province who gathered in Lower Mainland, and had . . . I attended three consultative meetings with them but we did have, we shared information via faxes and so on and so forth.

The consultative group consisted of First Nations agencies and tribes throughout the province. So there weren't only social service agencies but there were also just other interested individuals from various tribes.

The issue had apparently . . . had rose a year or two before, in terms of wanting to do something about the issue that children were being lured into the sex trade. And one of the initiatives that they were looking at was what they termed secure care, which was basically a lock-down.

The idea of locking up children for a 72-hour period was opposed by the group, primarily because it was seen by the social workers and by the communities as a band-aid solution to a much deeper problem.

There are many reasons that children and youth are being lured into the sex trade, as you've heard from the other presenters. It was kind of a nice segue that the sexual assault centre was speaking before me because I'm not really going to elaborate too much on sexual abuse, however look at some of the issues that the First Nations communities were dealing with.

There was a number of issues that arose from the effects of extreme poverty in a lot of the communities. Many of them, especially in the northern communities where I worked, were also dealing with isolation factors, which meant that there was minimal financial resources available to them. Many of the communities had no local supermarket so they had to travel quite extensive distances to get to, you know, buy groceries and get to the laundromats and things like that.

In extreme weather conditions some of the communities had to face other things like if power lines were down and phone.

Usually some of the more isolated communities had maybe one phone within the whole community. So if it was . . . if your phone line was out there was virtually no ability to access any services, because RCMP had to be accessed by a phone. Usually took, in some situations, you know, one to two hours to get up there. If the roads were closed, then there was another problem there too.

Furthermore the communities that their main means of employment were usually seasonal, in terms of forestry and fisheries, and so it created a bit of a feast or famine situation. When there was work, there was a lot of money. And when I talk about that, it was not uncommon to hear of people going to work for a couple of months and having made 6 to \$8,000 — and that's cash — and then maybe not work for another four to six months.

So there was high levels of alcohol and drug abuse because of that kind of financial availability, I guess you would say. And because of the isolation as well, it created an opportunity for a lot of abuse to occur, because there was just no opportunity for people to get any support, or even getting to courts and stuff like . . . and things like that were literally just not available to them.

The other part of it was that, even if there were people who did get abused and they went through the process of going through courts, that eventually those perpetrators would return back to the community and there was really no safety net for them.

One of the communities that I worked with, we attempted to work on putting in a safe home in the community. And when we looked at the physical structure, we were looking at pretty much a compound that would not have allowed people in. And it was really not going to work, you know, because people would use guns or axes or whatever, however means to get back in, get their families out of there, and stuff like that. So it just wasn't practical or feasible.

Another issue that they were faced with was that they were not in access to medical services. And when there were communicable diseases this really created a problem. Many times they would not have . . . they might have a nurse that came in, you know, if they were lucky, twice a week. If they were really lucky they had someone there for a longer period of time.

But the medical services was also a big problem for them. So that when children or adults or anyone was being abused and there was some perpetrators who had sexually transmitted diseases, they might not have had an opportunity to be checked or things like that. So there was that health issue along with the abuse.

The other part of it was that a lot of the communities were dealing with fetal alcohol syndrome. And it created a situation where the fetal alcohol affected individual was easily victimized. And sometimes what we found was some of these young, especially the young girls, were coerced to logging camps and would be made available for any of the loggers in the camps and stuff like that. These were sort of . . . I guess they were the initial stages into eventually going to larger urban

centres or being lured into larger centres and being sexually exploited in that sense.

In relation to having the isolation, there was a problem in relocating victims because the only way really was sometimes to get them out of the communities. The one community that I worked in, it was believed that every man, woman, and child had been sexually abused.

And so when we looked at how can we assist, because we were there to provide some services, removing children just wasn't an option because there was no place we could possibly have placed them. And the abusers had way too much control over the community that we wouldn't have been able to do it any . . . there would have been a lot of political backlash. And there was just no homes to put them in anyway even if we did remove them from the community. So it was a really sad situation.

The transportation was another issue. The road conditions in some of those areas were very treacherous in the wintertime. When you're driving up on logging roads it was quite difficult. The other part of the transportation issue was that some of the communities because of the poverty maybe only had one or two vehicles in the community that were working.

And so with their little bit of income they would also have to pay extremely high amounts of money to try to get to the stores or to their, you know, necessary places. So that also created a problem.

The local schools, which may have been a resource in the community, were often over-exhausted because of . . . maybe two or three grades for one teacher and that a lot of the kids were special needs or could have been easily classified as special-needs children. So they weren't able to meet that demand as well.

There was also, in terms of resources to the communities, a lack of trained human resources. And trying to deal with some of the personal issues and the tragedies that they had experienced without those — the human resource — was very difficult to do.

And we would come in, in teams, and do some community workshops and things like that to assist but when we left it was kind of leaving another gap. Sometimes, it seemed, like, you know, is it really beneficial? But what we came to see was that each time we came in then more people were more receptive. So it was just that they had to, you know, give us an opportunity to get to know us and stuff like that.

In terms of fatalities, there seemed to be a very high rate of fatal accidents on the roads and also drownings and deaths by violence. So in comparison to the community that I currently work in, I would probably say that the percentage of deaths by those means or abuse was much greater percentage-wise. And I think that because they were such small communities and it seemed to be very rampant.

It was definitely a very big learning lesson that I came to understand how, when you're an outsider and you're looking in, you might be able to think that some of your solutions might

work when in fact, if you don't have all of the information or you're not able to really have that kind of global or I guess community view, you may miss something or you may create a situation that really isn't as helpful as you would like it to be.

I think that one of the things that we also as a group discussed was that we didn't know exact numbers of children who were being lured into the sex trade and we were a bit thrown off, I guess, when we were looking at the issue. Like how many kids are we talking about? And nobody could give us a real number.

And we felt that there were other issues that needed to be looked at as opposed to one solution, and that being, you know, locking children up.

What we found was that because of poverty some of the kids were being sexually exploited, in terms of being offered money or gifts, far before they even hit the street. So by the time that they did hit the streets we'd already known that there was a process that had already occurred.

When we were looking at the idea of locking children, talking to some of the community members, it really raised a huge concern among the elders and the community members at large. There were many questions that were posed as a result of the lockdown approach to remove children from the johns and pimps that seduce the children into the sex trade.

Since the majority of initiatives were concentrated in the heavier locations like Lower Mainland, the representatives from the North and remote locations were concerned that they would not benefit from any additional resources because most of the time it ended up to be in the . . . the South would kind of get everything. So the North was always a bit bitter about that.

There was also questions about the type of facilities that would be built to house children that were picked up and there was also . . . and who would be responsible for them.

There was also the concern of the already overburdened child welfare services and the lack of social workers. The child and family service agencies were concerned that if the responsibility were to fall on them that they would not be able to keep up with the demand. There was also a point to be made that the exact number of children were, like I mentioned, were never really were researched and so the numbers were a bit arbitrary.

Because many of the community members were either first or second generation residential school students and foster children themselves, these experiences compounded the agreement or the . . . To even approach the issue of locking up children or removing children also became an issue for the elders and the community members because they felt that they'd already been through that. And so that it was just a repeat of something that didn't work and so they were not in favour of it.

Some of the people from Lower Mainland did feel that in certain situations that it was in the safety of the children, that they felt that it would be beneficial to them. The concern around it was that the length of time — what would be the purpose of it? Because it wasn't a long enough time for

anybody to detox or to . . . If the kids were already into drugs and stuff like that, they wouldn't be able to achieve anything, they'll end up back on the streets. And so that's what they feared would happen.

What they really were unanimous in agreement with was the concept of a continuum of care. And that approach would be looking at preventative services, current services, community needs, looking at ways to deal with the socio-economic development, the transportation issues, the parenting, those kind of things.

One of the approaches that they took in terms of looking at some of the problems within the community was an integrated case approach, so that when children were brought forward or identified as a possible high risk, then they would try to involve all the resources available to them. So sometimes we're called in because of that as well. And not only us, but in each of the territories the tribes were often utilized in that way.

There was a huge demand for victim services, family support, therapeutic counselling, alcohol and drug services, and RCMP services as well.

There was one, also, concern that had come up and that was that although the communities had requested and there had been a lot of work towards getting more Aboriginal people trained, they were concerned that the training centres — the universities and colleges, in particular — were creating programs that tended to be watered down. And so it sort of compounded that problem too, because you were getting people who were not . . . it was almost like second class or not quite meeting up the measures. And you're throwing them into a situation, just making that situation even more detrimental to those that could have been helped the most.

And so they were really questioning the quality of training that was . . . that workers had and were really concerned that their qualifications were not up to standard. And so each time there was some steps forward, there seemed to be some steps that it really heightened the problem more than it did the resolution.

So in the end they abandoned the approach. It was aborted. No further to date that I know of there has not been any further effort towards secure care.

This really sort of concludes my presentation.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thank you for a really thorough account of that process. It's very helpful for us, and that's the first time that we've really had in-depth testimony about the British Columbia situation, so we really appreciate it.

Are there questions that members of the committee have?

Ms. Draude: — I really do appreciate your testimony and I'm wondering, you're at Onion Lake now and I know you've listened to the ladies before you talked about some of the concerns they have and the work they're doing.

Can you compare the two, what you're doing at Onion Lake and the children that you're working with and the family

situations? Is there some comparisons in there?

Ms. Matchatis: — Well I guess the comparisons for me kind of relates . . . I think that there's some comparison in terms of how they're trying to address the problem and that is . . . I still feel that there has been training programs here in the province of Saskatchewan that have really not been the same standard or quality of programs in terms of the training programs for degrees and diplomas and that. I think that's one of the issues.

And I do . . . what I do find is that there is a . . . what we're finding anyway in the short period that I've been there is that there is a lot more children that are coming forth disclosing abuse. And I sort of . . . I can't say for sure but I feel that it may possibly be due to the fact that I think that they feel that they're being heard now.

There was a period of time where our agency had been shut down for almost a year so it really . . . it was just . . . there was a big gap there. So I think that, you know, that's part of it. I think that there's a lot of historical abuse that has gone on.

In terms of them being lured into the sex trade, I haven't really been confronted by that.

Ms. Draude: — From your experience, I know you haven't been there long enough to know the individuals, but have you been told that there are residents that were on the reserve that have gone into the cities?

Ms. Matchatis: — Actually I haven't really gotten that much information about anything like that. Like in BC (British Columbia) certainly we have had parents who came to us and said, my child is in Vancouver and she's on the street. And so we would connect up with the street workers and try to find out some statistics on them so that we could report back to families whether people were alive or not. We haven't been confronted with that here.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you for sharing your knowledge with me.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, just a question and it comes back to a couple of the presentations that were made most recently. The comments were made about communities really not willing to recognize or do anything about some of the concerns.

And I guess the question I have, in your involvement — and I realize as you've indicated you're just very recently beginning to work on the Onion Lake Band Council — I'm wondering is the . . . would you say that the Onion Lake Band is recognizing that this is an issue that they have to deal with?

Ms. Matchatis: — I believe so. I think that they have, especially with the health program; they have a wellness program that is looking at getting resources like therapists and counsellors who can address the issue.

My conversations with many of them have indicated that they are aware that it is a problem and that . . . but still you have to build your foundation of resources before you start to open it up otherwise you're not going to, you may create more damage

than you would any good.

So I think, I believe that that's the approach that they want to take. But I know that they are definitely interested in dealing with the issue.

Mr. Toth: — Well I appreciate that because I think just the recognition — at least that's what's been pointed out — recognizing that this is something to deal with and then, as you've indicated, just not rushing into it but trying to build up a system whereby you begin to address is probably very important versus just, well we're going to address this now because we realize it's an issue. But not knowing how to tackle it may just make it . . . complicate the whole process. So I guess the comment I would make is the fact that the recognition is needed to begin to deal with the circumstances.

As a committee, we're having a lot of presentations to us and we can go out and say this is a great big issue. But as we've heard in some areas it's not as large an issue or concern and some of the issues aren't specifically . . . Like our mandate is more street children and prostitution and young children on the street versus what has been brought to our attention of it goes beyond just what's on the street. Possibly the children who have become involved on the street — there's situations that are even a little deeper that have caused them to move there.

So I guess that recognition factor is important and that's why I just wanted to get a feeling of where you're coming from and if you're getting that support there.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, Arlene, go ahead.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — I just have one . . . I guess I have a need for some clarification and maybe just a little more explanation on your part regarding the determination that the 72 hours or children being apprehended and brought to a place was . . . how that was met with as far as the general public and communities and so on.

When that suggestion was brought forward as whether or not it would be a feasible strategy to employ, was there an intent to ensure that with the apprehension of children that were tagged as in danger as such, that there would be a continuum of services for caring or was it just sort of an isolated look at it? That this is a strategy — we will take the children out of danger and basically put them in secure care so that . . . because we don't know what else to do.

Was there a plan from that point on? Having services that were set up all ready so that, you know, so that there was some purpose to taking them out of danger.

Ms. Matchatis: — I believe so. I wasn't part of the initial discussions that happened, like a couple of years before me, but I believe that what they were hoping was that when they were able to get the children into a secure care, then from that point they would try to get them referred into, for example, a treatment centre or some sort of . . . get them some kind of help.

The problem of course is that children ran anyway. If you put them into a foster home, if they're runners, they're going to run.

And so they were concerned about how to deal with that.

And I think that a lot of it too, was not . . . they were hoping to get more discussion around whether or not it was a good idea and what kind of things would happen and looking at the consequences of it. But there was at no time did I ever hear that there was a commitment put towards the funding for programs to help, you know, to give more money to the safe homes, to the victims' services. There was never, ever any discussion about that.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So you know then, from the point of view of Aboriginal people who had experienced the taking away of their children and sort of the residential schools and so on, and they'd experienced that kind of a thing before, there would be a natural fear for sure that this is sort of the be-all and end-all. They're just going to be locked up and that's it. There's not any intent for real help and protection and care ongoing. So I can certainly understand why, you know, they would almost have flashbacks to the past and how that would present a fear.

But you know, had there been a planned strategy for continuum of care, do you think that . . . and there was the knowledge that that would be the case, do you think that would have been met with a little bit more of a acceptable stance?

Ms. Matchatis: — In the end that's what they wanted.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay.

Ms. Matchatis: — And because the government was not willing to put aside those extra funds, it just, you know, fell apart. But that's what they were requesting.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — When you say "they" who do you mean?

Ms. Matchatis: — The government.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Who was requesting what?

Ms. Matchatis: — Oh, pardon me. The communities that were requesting more funds.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So just for clarification, the communities would have been open, you think, to the 72-hour safe custody, closed custody in the event that there was more resources coming with it?

Ms. Matchatis: — Yes.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. So it was the failure to make the commitment to additional resources that in effect killed the process.

Ms. Matchatis: — That's fair to say.

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

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I have one other question. And that pertains to . . . I'll just roll these together. It's kind of two but I think one's pretty straightforward and that is that I

think our committee would really appreciate any written material that you have on this. I don't know if there is a report that was prepared or formal findings, but if there was that would be very useful for us. Was there something prepared in that regard?

Ms. Matchatis: — There was. Only I don't have it. I left actually all my material when I left because I wasn't sure, you know, the issue could surface again. But what I could probably do is find out whether or not there are . . . I know they printed so many books, because the government was the one that put it out, and then I know that they had stopped. And so I might be able to get a few from the people that I know. So I can try.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Sure, well that would be wonderful. If you could get us a copy of that, that would be very, very useful.

And the other thing I wanted to ask was with respect to models of success in BC, I'm wondering if you could point us to any British Columbia communities that have been really successful in terms of either the healing process within their community among children and adults who've been victimized, or really successful in terms of dealing with the issue of predators. And I don't know if there's any kind of cases that really stand out for you, but if there are that would be very helpful for us to look at.

Ms. Matchatis: — Okay. I guess just a comment around that is that Prince George was one of the communities that initiated what they called an integrated case management process. And what that is about is that people would . . . like the resources within the community would network that, and they would also meet together to determine how to deal with specific cases.

And what they were looking at is how to . . . There were certain issues like, for example, the mandates of different professions. Like the young offenders, they had — the probation — they had their own mandate. The social workers had their own mandate. And what they were able to accomplish was to be able to develop a system whereby they could share information without violating their own mandates.

And I think that . . . When I left, I was part of the team that went in and did the training with all of the various levels of communities in . . . I mean of the structures, meaning that we had the managers, we did training with the managers and then we were doing training with the front-line workers and some other groups. So we were able to . . . we had to also do with the . . . Along with the managers were, like, boards of directors and things like that because they had to buy into the idea. Without the full cooperation of everybody, it wouldn't have succeeded.

And I feel that that was probably the best approach to take because not one agency could provide everything to one family, and of course you want to respect the rights of individuals too.

And when we knew . . . We also networked with the outside communities too. Our agency was comprised of . . . had representatives from 10 member bands. So if a child went missing from a certain community, because we were located in Prince George, we could easily . . . they would contact us. We could contact the street workers and they would send out their

. . . you know, get information from their sources to help us to locate kids that way.

And so we developed that network and it worked. It was succeeding very well.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thanks for pointing us to that.

I think, unfortunately in part because of our time constraints, we'll need to move on to the next presenter. But we're very appreciative of you coming forward and sharing a really important piece that we haven't looked at so far. Thank you very, very much.

Ms. Matchatis: — Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. We have with us tonight — I'm not too sure if it's Lucelle — I think it's Lucelle . . .

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Louella, I think.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Louella Crichton. And Louella is just . . . certainly a person that is very interested in all of this and a member of the public here. And we welcome you and thank you for coming forward.

Ms. Crichton: — And it's Lucelle Crichton.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — It's Lucelle Crichton?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, sorry. Sorry, yes.

Ms. Crichton: — And I'm here to speak only on my behalf.

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

Ms. Crichton: — And this is an impulse. I'm not gifted at speaking in public.

But some of the issues that I've heard you speak of tonight, I've spent the last 20 years in La Ronge. I've just recently moved back here to Lloydminster which was my home community.

It would be really nice if we could identify it simply as being one nation's problem or a problem of poverty, but it's not and I know it. I come from a community just west of here where the sexual abuse is very often . . . every family is involved somehow. And it's a white community and it's an affluent community.

One of the reasons that you heard so much in La Ronge is because when I moved there 16 years ago there was no wife battery, there was no sexual abuse, there was no AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), there was no . . . None of these things were ever discussed. And as a result of five women working very, very strongly to raise awareness. And as the last presenter mentioned, there was absolutely nothing in place to keep people safe.

And I don't have permission to speak from the other people

what they did, but I can speak for myself. One of the things I told the children in the schools was right now there's no funding available and there is no help in our community. So if you disclose . . . if you chose to disclose, you're not going to be helped whatsoever, because the way the government works, the way society works, is we need to have numbers. We need to say there's a problem and we need to have large numbers so people can apply for dollars in order to have programs to help.

And very, very brave children spoke up, even though they knew that they were going to be turned out of their families, even though they knew that quite likely they'd be shipped out of their community, which very often happened.

It's an universal problem. It's as old as time. The Romans had sexual abuse and incest, so why should we think we're any different. The thing is it needs to be spoken to. And in this community once again I'm faced with the fact that there is no sexual abuse going on. There's no HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) problem in this community, and that's why none of us have any work.

You know, it's silly. It's silly to pretend. Just don't pretend. This is a human problem. Sexual abuse and exploitation. I understand the need to get these words clear because English being the language it is, that you need to have your English words exactly as they should be. However, English is the only language where you can have more than one meaning for the same word.

Sexual abuse is sexual abuse. It's a life sentence. Personally, I know this for a fact. It affects every aspect of your life. Now I hear saying, well, let's take the children off the street. Let's lock them up. These children aren't the ones who are breaking the law. It's adult males and females who are the ones who are breaking the law. Why can the law be interpreted in such a way that a rich person can throw off a \$500 fine and go out the next night and pick up another teenager? Why is this possible?

I also have the question of revictimizing the victim. Why does a victim have to repeat their statement over and over and over again? Why is it not videotaped and presented in court? If you have a law officer there, how can it be manufactured evidence?

If you have things in place that requires a child to talk to a compassionate person about what happened to them and allow them to use their language, in their way, and show the videotape, what's wrong with that? We say we love our children so let's show them that we do.

On the other hand, I've also been on the other side of wrongful accusation. So again, it was very clear once the videotape was shown in court that the child had been prompted, had been told words that, at her age, was not possible for her to use. Why it even got to court in the first place, I don't understand that.

Yes, there needs to be legislation. However, like punish the people who are doing the wrongdoing not the people who are being exploited. And whether it's for gain . . . When you're a child and you believe that if you tell the truth you'll kill your mother, you have something to gain. You are being exploited.

If you are a child and you don't have anything — you don't have Christmas, you don't have Thanksgiving — and someone's going to take you to P.A., you have something to gain. You are being exploited.

And after all, when TV shows, all it does, that a body is just a body and there's no respect for it. In soap operas everyone's jumping in and out of bed with each other, and that's okay. Children learn from the modelling they're receiving and one of the biggest teachers is television.

Why is there nothing regarding the programming that's going on in television? Why is there such a thing as pornography tapes even allowed — for freedom of speech, for other people's freedoms — when the people who are paying the price for that have a life sentence and are forever have difficulties with their body functions, forever have difficulties with their minds and their emotions and their spirits?

I believe in freedom. I need my freedom. Yes, this is true. But when some person . . . and it's a fact out there, that a pedophile will have at the very least, at least 70 victims. And when they're charged and the victims, the very few, very brave victims that come forward and tell their story 50 times and watch that person walk away, do you really have a problem understanding why there's so few disclosures? Like these things are stats. These stats have been around for a very long time.

What I find very, very sad is in Aboriginal communities that I have lived in, our community is our family and our families are sick. But we're talking about it. We're yelling and hollering and screaming and talking about it. What I find incredibly sad is I have friends whose fathers are mayors, government officials, and they can't talk about it because what would the neighbours say?

So in a sense, the culture that's called white is more hobbled and chained than the culture that I've lived in lately. And I have to say when I came back here, after living 20 years in native communities, it was a culture shock to come here and remember again how words are twisted and how appearances are everything.

And I'm really sorry, terribly sorry, that what is so-called society, we forget it's made up of human beings. And if we don't say this is so wrong . . . And what will the neighbours say? Why aren't they saying poor girl, poor boy?

That's all I have to say except to mention that Hollow Water, Ontario, has a way of dealing with perpetrators. They use community . . . It's a Metis, Aboriginal . . . or treaty, Metis, and non-status community. It has four legislative bodies to have to go through to deal with.

And somehow they found a way, but I can't be specific about it because I don't remember well enough. I just know that Hollow Water has been working on a system for about seven years now. That might be someplace you'd like to look, see what they're doing.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you very, very much. Would you mind if we asked you any questions?

Ms. Crichton: — Sure.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — If you don't mind. Are there any committee members that would like to comment or ask a question?

Ms. Jones: — I would like to comment that I'm very glad you came forward, and it's good to hear what you had to say.

The revictimization is something that we hear over and over again. The presentation that was before you on the 72-hour lock-up, there are a few groups who agree with it, but there are many who don't. And I think even though I believe that those who instituted it did so for the best of purposes or the best of intentions, in Saskatchewan it hasn't been met with a great deal of understanding. And indeed, in particular the Aboriginal communities think that it's revictimization of the victims.

And so it's a very difficult issue, and all of the information that we can gather from people like yourself and all of those who have presented tonight and all this week is most appreciated. And I just want to thank you all for coming forward.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Could I just ask you, from your personal perspective, you know there were a lot of suggestions coming to the committee about what communities can do — whether they're Aboriginal communities or non-Aboriginal communities — what we can do as far as healing processes go.

There's the other concern that perpetrators need to be dealt with, okay, offenders need to be dealt with, and that there may need to be legislative laws to deal with this. I just want to ask you what your suggestion would be as far as dealing with johns, pimps, or people that are sexual offenders towards underage children.

Ms. Crichton: — The idea of using shame, like printing their names and things like that, seems like a good idea.

In BC when a person wants to change their name, they are required to go through a criminal record check. And if they have been ... have a history of either being defined as pedophiles or whatever they define them as, that also goes with the name change. So that a person who has been convicted of a sexual offence in BC, even if they change their name and move to a different province, that record will follow them. However BC is — what I've been told anyway — BC is the only one.

So if a convicted pedophile in BC wants to go be somebody else somewhere else, it's not a problem in Canada. He just has to change provinces. If something like that could be instituted across Canada ... and I understand your Saskatchewan government ... But even if Saskatchewan would again follow and try to get something universal across Canada in a way that these criminal ... these sexual offences follow a person.

When a person uses young women or young boys and pays money for that, they know they're doing wrong. And I don't particularly care if they are a mayor or a president or whatever — wrong is wrong. We have the example in the United States of this president that everybody's behind 100 per cent who has done very, very wrong things to his family.

So why are these convictions, these ... When a so-called john, like he's pedophile, name for him for what he is — he's a pedophile — does this thing and he gets a fine, why shouldn't he lose his status in the community? That child has. That child has lost his life, her life. Because they don't know ... They're a victim. Like a victim is a victim and there's no getting around it.

And the idea of pimps ... Like why isn't absolutely everything they own confiscated? Why are they not out on the streets then, turning their bodies over to people to try and make money because that's what they're doing. They're taking advantage of people who want to eat, who have no skills or believe they have no skills. Why isn't everything that a pimp makes off his business confiscated?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you for that answer.

Like what you mentioned is that if someone is sexually abusing children, be it a man or a woman or whatever, that shame is one of the tactics that could be employed. So if, for instance, that did happen and there was a publication and a notification of that person with the police and in communities, wherever you might tack that poster of that person up, do you think that that would be sufficient after a person is, you know, has committed this crime twice, three times, ten times, and would that be sufficient as far as you're concerned? To shame them in that way?

Ms. Crichton: — Well from what I understand, true pedophiles have no remorse. They believe that they are loving children the way that they need to be loved.

What I've been told also is there is now a test that invades their human rights. That they can have sensors put on their body and a series of pictures flashed at them and by the rate of their heartbeat and their breathing and their body temperature, they can pretty much tell if this person is a child offender.

But right now they're not allowed to use it very arbitrarily. A person has to be willing — it's like the lie detector test — has to say it's okay for them to use it. How come that isn't mandatory when they're a known offender? So that if they are able to be even weeded out as far as, yes, this person is somebody who gets off on Pampers commercials, you know, and have them — I don't mean labelled in some way — but have it be known in the community that this person is in your community.

Like why is that not universal across Canada? Why when a pedophile gets out of jail because he's done his 18 months hard time, why isn't his picture plastered all over? Like CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) — why doesn't CBC have it all across Canada? This man's a pedophile and he's out now and he's planning on moving. This is his home territory, this is his MO (modus operandi), this is how he looks. Like why are the identities of these people protected when the victims aren't?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Right. So your comment just before that is, when he gets out of jail, so you're ... I'm assuming then that you're feeling then that there should be, if a person is convicted, there should be a mandatory jail sentence

or some penalty that meets the crime?

The committee adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Ms. Crichton: — What I've been told, and I don't know this for a fact, but what I've been told is there's no reforming pedophiles. And this is by the lady that . . . What's her name? Linda Halliday-Sumner from BC.

And she's done an amazing amount of work regarding pedophiles and sexual offenders and research, and she's taken it upon herself to create a directory of the names. Because one of the things that she has said is, some of this is such an ego . . . like it's not a sexual thing, it is a power thing that manifests itself sexually.

So if we stop being shy and pretending this is, oh under-the-bedcovers kind of thing. This is a power and control issue and they get off on the amount of notoriety they can have out of cheating the system on technicalities, out of playing with the police — we'll make it very, very, very difficult for them to do these things.

And when this lady said that reform, reformation of a pedophile is very, very hard to do because there is no remorse, then yes, if he's a true pedophile I believe that he has to be kept away from people to keep himself safe but also to keep at least 70 other people safe from him.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you. Thank you ever so much. That was truly very helpful for us and I just commend your courage and your willingness to be part of the solution. Thank you very much.

Applause

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Just the general public that are here, if there are any of you that would like to ask questions to any of the presenters that have come forward or to the committee, you have an opportunity to do that right now. If there's anyone that wants to speak, we welcome you to sit at the table and make your comments also or to ask any questions.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Are there any final comments that anyone wants to make?

Otherwise I think we've had a very worthwhile evening. And on behalf of all members of the committee, we want to thank you very, very sincerely for your presentations, for taking a lot of care in the answering of questions. We very much appreciate it and we'll make sure you all get copies of the final report.

If anybody hasn't left their address with Kathy who's sitting over in the corner there, please do before you leave. That just makes it easier for us to make sure that we get those final reports to you.

Have a good evening and please feel very free to be in touch with us. We probably won't be returning to the community for further hearings but we are very available by phone, through our web site. We're just a phone call away. So if you have additional information you want to share with us or topics you want to discuss with us, please feel very, very free to be in touch. Thank you.