



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

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 29 — November 28, 2000**

**Regina**



**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

**November 28, 2000**

The committee met at 10 a.m.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — I'll call the meeting to order and we'd like to welcome Ed and Linda Smith from Regina. And Ed and Linda, for the information of the committee, Ed and Linda are parents of a child who lost her life to the streets. And we're very, very pleased and honoured that you would come and be with us today and tell us your story because we all need to know what happens out there and why things like this happen and what we can do to change it. And there's no one in the world that could better inform us than people who are as closely involved as you are and Linda . . . So we thank you for coming.

And before we get started Ed, I imagine that by now you might have had an opportunity to visit with and to get to know some of the committee members, but I'm not sure of that so I'm just going to allow them to give them your name one more time and then we'll get started with your presentation.

**Mr. Harper:** — Ron Harper, MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), Regina Northeast.

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

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

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay and I'm Arlene Julé. I'm the MLA for Humboldt and I'm Co-Chairing the special committee with Mr. Peter Prebble. He's the MLA for Saskatoon Greystone. We also have missing today, Don Toth. He's the MLA for Moosomin, and Kevin Yates, MLA for Regina Dewdney.

And so we'll just ask you to maybe just give a little bit of an introduction of yourself, a little bit of your background and just some of the work that maybe you've been doing a bit. But I'd like you to start and present your story in just about anyway that you feel most comfortable.

**Mr. Smith:** — I'll start then, and first of all I want to thank the committee for inviting us to come and speak to you. We really appreciate the opportunity.

I'll start with a few remarks about our family and our history and then Linda will talk about some of the things we've learned as a result of Cheri's involvement, that's our daughter, her involvement on the street and her death.

So I'm Ed Smith and Linda and we are parents of a juvenile prostitute. And I've brought a picture of Cheri. This is one of the last pictures we have of Cheri, taken just the summer before her death.

Cheri was born in 1972 and was an extremely happy, compliant child. I have a job with the federal government. I work for Environment Canada. I'm the senior systems analyst for the office here in Regina. Linda is a stay-at-home mom. We live in northwest Regina. We've lived there for 28 years in that particular area in the home that we live in.

Our home was a happy home. We enjoyed our children. We

have a son as well who is five years younger than Cheri — his name is Steve —and we just really had a very contented happy home until approximately grade 9, when things started getting to be more of a turmoil for Cheri. We assumed that it was adolescent rebellion in some respects, I guess, and just that adolescence had come. We thought as good parents we would love her and we would get her through this. And we would all come out in the end okay.

But in the summer of 1989, Cheri took her younger brother to Regina Buffalo Days Exhibition and at the exhibition she met a young man only a year older than herself who she thought was very special. And three days later came home and told us that she loved him, she loved him so much she was going to leave home to be with him. And we tried to convince Cheri that you could not possibly know someone well enough after three days to make a decision like that.

But the day came when a car pulled up in front of our house. Cheri had some things in a couple of plastic bags, stood at the door and said to us, "Mom and Dad, I know what I'm doing is wrong but I'm going to do it anyway." And she went down the driveway, she got into that car and she left.

And for two weeks we did not hear from Cheri until early on a Monday morning, actually Labour Day Monday. A police officer from Calgary called us to say that he had picked Cheri up on the streets of downtown Calgary selling sex on the juvenile stroll in Calgary, and we literally could not believe it.

We flew to Calgary and brought Cheri home. And this was the start of our involvement with trying to get our daughter off the streets. Cheri worked on the streets of Edmonton. She worked in Calgary, Winnipeg, Regina and Victoria, all these cities.

Cheri was arrested in Regina by the Regina City Police but never did go to court because her pimp, who had recruited her, moved her to Victoria where in June, 1990 Cheri was murdered on the streets of Victoria. Cheri was six months pregnant at the time of her death and her unborn child died with her. Her body was dumped outside the city of Victoria and was not found until three months later, and Cheri's murder is as yet unsolved. No one has ever been charged with her murder. And so in that respect, this is something that really has not come to closure for us in that crime.

But as a result of Cheri's death and the media's coverage of her death and the events surrounding it, we became quite involved in working in the community and with other parents. And at this time, Linda is going to talk about what we've learned as a result of this.

**Ms. Smith:** — This happened in the fall of 1990, when we found out that Cheri was gone, and we, up to that point, had been very private people but that's when our notoriety began. We, with eagerness I guess, gave to the media Cheri's story. We did TV spots. We did newspaper things. We believed that in the telling of Cheri's story, other people would be helped and that this was something good that we could bring out of this tragedy.

And so September 1990 we began telling her story. We have told it over 500 times all over Canada — Ontario, Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, the Prairie provinces, wherever we've been invited. There are some schools who invite us back every three or four years to speak to their students. And so we have built a name I guess, an infamous name. We would rather not have this challenge, but a name of telling Cheri's story.

It's a lonely place to be because there are, to our knowledge, of the 10 years that we've been doing this, we have not found anyone else who is doing this. There is no one else going into the schools telling the kids that they can be victimized, that there are other people out there who want to use them and an innocent date can turn into turning a trick. You can be put out on the street when you take your first date. So we're trying to get that word out. This is what happened to Cheri. This can happen to you.

So we talk to the kids about the predisposing factors. What were the things in Cheri's life that led her into this life of prostitution? And there were actually two things. One is substance use. Cheri, once she was on the street, told us that she had been using drugs and alcohol since grade 9. All the way through grade 9, 10, and 11, we did not know she was using. We asked her straight upfront.

We had many confrontations with her. Her behaviour was violent and abusive in our home and we believed that it was alcohol and substance use but could not nail her down, had no hard evidence that that was happening, and therefore just let it slide. We just tried to love her through it.

And then two years after she was dead, and we found out that back in grade 9 she had been date raped. Not that she was dating, but that a close friend of hers had raped her, and that began the promiscuity that also carried through 9, grade 10, and grade 11. And so when she was procured at the exhibition, the young man who procured her, who became her pimp or who was her pimp, saw those two factors in her life.

And so when we speak to students, we tell them that those are two factors that are choices of theirs which they can avoid becoming involved in, or can change their current pattern if they're already involved in that, and can have a little bit more safety through their growing up years. And so we carry a very strong message in that light to the students.

We also work closely with the school administration and staff members. We are a resource for them. And so oftentimes a teacher will call us — particularly a guidance counsellor — will call us when they see a student getting involved in things that they seem . . . they feel are dangerous. So it may be somebody who is much older than them; it may be someone whom they know is gang related; it may be just a change in their behaviour. And those teachers will phone us and we'll go and talk to that student and tell that student personally what we saw in Cheri's life and how we would want them to take a different route than she.

Then because of the notoriety we often have parents calling us; particularly after presentations, parents will phone. Many of the parents who call us — and this I guess is the main point of our

presentation to you today — many of the parents who phone us are people like ourselves. They are people who care about their kids, who do not want to see their children destroyed by the choices that the kids make.

And oftentimes those choices are made very innocently. They do not believe that they're going to be destroying themselves by making the choices to become promiscuous or become involved in criminal behaviour or substance use or any of those kinds of things.

And so we sit with parents and we often feel impotent to change the situation with the parent. All we can do is sympathize. We can tell them where we've come from. We can hold their hands; we can weep with them. But we can't change the situation because you see in Saskatchewan the laws will not allow us to change those situations.

If a parent had a 14- or a 15- or a 16-year-old kid whom they felt was going down the wrong road, hanging out with the wrong people, what kind of situation . . . what kind of action can that parent take to keep their kids safe? There's very few things. We do not have a drug treatment facility that is available for parents to put their kids into.

When Cheri was on the streets we were able, as parents, to access Whitespruce, a drug treatment facility out at Yorkton. We went there and spent a day there with Cheri. She was introduced to the other kids, some of whom she knew. She liked the counsellor who was assigned to her; she liked the facility — she liked it all. But being 17 years old and having a boyfriend out on the end . . . out on the outside who had control of her, when she said I will not stay here, we could not make her stay there.

But that would have been a rescue net for her. That would have been a place, had we had the legal authority to keep her there that could have saved her life. But we could not make her stay there.

We went also to a counsellor here in the city, through Mobile Crisis. And that counsellor told her, put all your money that you make in prostitution in a bank and just . . . even a joint account with your pimp. If you can do that, you'll find out that he doesn't want you.

Legally we could not make her listen to him. We could not make her take to heart what he was saying because she was 17 years old. And so again, it seems to be, it seems to be a place where a parent has a kid . . . And again, I go back to the 15 year old. We've sat in a home, I've sat in a home, with parents whose daughter was dating Cheri's pimp — you see, he's still out there and this was a few years back; he was still pimping at that point — and she was dating Cheri's pimp and I knew that he was a pimp. He had pimped my daughter.

And these parents found out this, that their daughter was dating him. She was young enough that they thought that they would be able to change her mind. I went there and sat with them and all she had to do was call 911, which she did, and the police came and escorted her out of the house, and she went out and got in the car with the pimp and went off with him. Because she

was not . . . she was at the age where she was able to make those kinds of choices for herself but the parents couldn't . . . didn't have the authority to stop her from doing that.

Now thankfully, that has a happy ending. He roughed her up and she got tired of it and she came back home, and so she was smart enough to get out of the situation and I'm hopeful — I believe that it was because we were able to tell her who this person was.

Her guidance counsellor at school had told her that this crowd that she was hanging out was not good. The police officers whom we had spoken with had told her that this guy was no good. In fact, the very officers who came to the house to escort her safely out of her own home and out of the control of her parents told her that this fellow was no good. But she still went with him anyways.

So as parents who sit before you this morning who really care about kids — really care about our kids — we would encourage you to change the law in Saskatchewan that says that a kid who is 16 years old is free to make their own choices. Give the parents the ability to make the choices for their child until they come to an age when they are old enough to make those kind of choices. Give us the ability to be able to intervene for our kids and . . . and help them.

That's going to cost money. The bottom line is money. And I can remember — excuse me — I can remember in the anger that I was experiencing shortly after Cheri's death phoning around, phoning everybody I knew, going through the telephone book, phoning the policy people of Saskatchewan, all of the people whom I wanted to talk to in government, and say why is this? Why can a 16-year-old kid make their own choices when they don't have the savvy to be able to make safe choices?

And after many months of shouting at people and talking on the phone to people, it finally came down to one, one person just flatly telling me, it's a money issue in Saskatchewan. We do not have the money in Saskatchewan to build the kinds of facilities that would keep these kids safe, to provide the kinds of resources that the parents need, to put into law the kinds of safety factors that are needed to keep these kids safe. Because we have such a problem with children between the ages of 16 to 18.

Well that was not very consoling to me, having lost my daughter. So I would just . . . we would like to recommend to you as parents that this would be our first and foremost recommendation to this committee: that you give the parents the power over their child until they're 18. So that if my kid at 16 years of age or 17 years of age is leaving the house to hang out with people who are going to destroy them, that I can legally intervene to stop that process.

I guess that's it. Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you very much, Linda. Whenever we have people with courage and goodness such as yours to come before us and talk with us about your experience, you can be sure that all of us here have a great amount of

gratitude in our hearts for you coming. We can't learn unless we hear from people who have actually first-handedly experienced some of this sort of thing.

So I thank you for walking through your story with us. And I thank you for that recommendation because it's a recommendation that has been put forward to the committee previous to yours, and so it certainly is standing out as something that the committee will have to consider very seriously. That's something that would have to be taken to the Legislative Assembly as you well know. And we're not exactly sure what all the recommendations will be yet, but that one is one we thank you for.

I'm going to just open up the questioning to the committee and I'll talk with you a little bit later, okay. Committee members do you have questions?

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you very much for sharing your story with us. I'm a parent and certainly have gone through that rebellious period, and indeed actually lost my son at 22.

When you say it's a money issue as well as the legal issue of children being able to make their own choices at 16, is it . . . are you saying that because you need secure facilities to put them in? Having been through this, as I said, as a mother, very difficult to hold a 16-year-old boy in the home if he doesn't want to be there.

I mean the only choice to absolutely make them stay then seems to me some sort of a secure facility, and under what circumstances would you place them in a secure facility if you couldn't keep them under control in your own home?

Perhaps you could expound on the "it's a money" issue a little bit further so . . . I mean certainly I understand your proposal or your recommendation on a treatment centre, a drug treatment centre, and of course that costs money.

But in your daughter's case, she wouldn't stay in the one that you took her to so then you would have to have some commitment process. Is this what you're . . . Perhaps rather than just asking you one issue at a time, you could just expand a little bit on what you see to be the money issue.

**Ms. Smith:** — Parents in our situation — did you want me to answer that one, Ed — parents in that situation are very desperate for anything that will give them authority over their kids, give them the power to make choices for their kids when they believe that their kids do not have the rational ability to make those decisions.

In fact, another family that I was involved with — in fact, still am involved with, because the daughter is now 22 — but when she was 16, they tried even to have her committed into psychiatric care because their daughter was on the streets and they didn't know how else to get her off the streets. And that was one loophole that they pursued and tried to get her . . .

Now the . . . And she was in the hospital in the psychiatric unit in a kind of a lock-up, a safe place for a while. But these kids are really manipulative too, and she was able to con her way out

of there and was back on the streets. Now thankfully she's 22 and she's straight and she's actually in university right now. So that's a good ending to that story.

But what I'm saying is that there's such a desperateness among caring parents that when your kid turns that age, you have no way of stopping them. Yes, lock-up is an answer, is one of the answers. And that would cost a lot of money because we're going to have to go back and recapture some ground that is lost.

And it's really surprising to me. When I speak in schools — I start with grade 5, grade 5 through on up — and these 10-year-old kids understand that when I get to be 16 I don't have to do anything. I don't have to go to school, I don't have to listen to my parents, I don't have to do anything. But mom and dad are still responsible for them until they turn 18.

So yes, we're going to have to, if we start building facilities to house some of these kids who are out of control, who have broken the law, or who parents need to put someplace until they get safe, until they're safe, it's going to cost us money. But at least then the kids who aren't in lock-up would say, well I'm 16 but the law has changed now so I'd better listen to my mom and dad. And some of the kids will be saved.

We could not save our daughter because she was 17. We could not save her. We could not intervene. And I don't know all the ins and outs of it, but I just believe it would make a very large difference not only in the kids' lives, but in the families because we see the fallout in the families, we see other siblings tormented.

Our son is 23 now and he's got . . . he's still got issues to deal with from the trauma that he endured because of what Cheri was doing in our home, and we had no place to go and we had nobody to help us with that.

If we had of been able to go to Social Services and say our kid is involved with a pimp, she's being beaten regularly, she's taking drugs that are messing up her mind, please put her someplace where she will be safe, out of his grasp, then she would have been able to get some schooling, she would have been able to learn things about herself, got some . . . maybe got some self-esteem back — all those things might have happened to her. And when she was 18, she wouldn't have had to . . . she might have gone back to him, I'm not saying that she necessarily wouldn't have, but I just . . . I hope that answers your question. I'm sorry, I'm rambling, but . . .

**Mr. Smith:** — I could maybe add one additional thing here. There is a small segment of our population that do have other resources at their disposal. Very wealthy families that we have dealt with have the means to take a child and send them to private facilities out of the country for large sums of money; but there are not many people who have the means to do that.

We have dealt with parents who have themselves, feeling that the laws of the province were not protecting them, take matters into their own hands and actually kidnap their own children and take them out of the country themselves to North Dakota or a facility that was outside of this jurisdiction.

And in this particular case it worked for the family, but a father and his brother, physically grabbed the girl off the street, made arrangements with the US (United States) authorities at the border to get their child into the United States to a facility in North Dakota. Now it would be nice to be able to work within the laws that we have available to us rather than to take measures like that.

And I have counselled fathers with baseball bats in their hands, ready to go after a guy, just, you know, don't do this. As much as it seems like the only rational thing to do at this time, the only thing that's going to get results, it really isn't the answer.

**Ms. Jones:** — So these facilities that the parents take their children to out of the country are secure facilities?

**Mr. Smith:** — Yes.

**Ms. Jones:** — And are they like a rehabilitation place?

**Mr. Smith:** — That's right. And particularly parents, because the child is not . . . The facilities I'm aware of are in the United States. So because the child is Canadian, they're in a foreign country. There are restrictions placed upon them. And they do go into facilities that do have very strict security, and they are not allowed outside of that facility. So they are private and because they are private, you know, they don't have to . . . or I guess they can stipulate exactly what measures will be, will be used to try and rehabilitate that child. And sometimes they're successful and sometimes they're not.

**Ms. Smith:** — Yes, that one . . . the one that I'm thinking of I think that it was \$2,000 a month that the parents paid to have her there, have their daughter there. And while she was there she was there for about six months or a little bit longer — this is a wealthy family — she was involved in a home setting. She had responsibilities; she had chores to do. She got one-on-one counselling; she got group counselling. She got schooling . . . like she was taught some of her school stuff. Her days were very full and her evenings as well. They had speakers come in. They had a whole program that helped them. But it was very expensive, and it was in Texas, I believe that one was. It was in Texas.

**Ms. Jones:** — Do you know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry, just one further. Do you know if the financial arrangements are the same, and the secure arrangements are the same, for children of American families? Like was the treatment any more secure because this was a Canadian citizen in an American facility? Or would the . . . I mean perhaps you'd have no idea but . . .

**Ms. Smith:** — I think it was the same. I mean we've got brochures . . .

**Ms. Jones:** — It was a secure facility no matter who you were.

**Ms. Smith:** — Yes. We have brochures of the facility so all you can see is the pictures, and it was like, it was like a jail except it was more like a ranch in . . . but it was secure. And the kids had to live in dormitories, and they had responsibilities, and they had, you know, they had to do chores and they had to do

cooking and all those kinds of things.

**Ms. Jones:** — Wealthy families have often sent their children abroad . . .

**Ms. Smith:** — Right.

**Ms. Jones:** — . . . whenever they felt, although not necessarily to a secure facility, certainly the . . .

**Ms. Smith:** — But this one was geared to substance . . .

**Ms. Jones:** — . . . the movies would indicate that they'd send them to Europe if they were getting out of hand or seeing somebody their parents didn't like.

**Ms. Smith:** — Yes.

**Ms. Jones:** — All right. Thank you. I'll pass for now, and I'm sure the other members have questions.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay. June, did you have any questions?

**Ms. Draude:** — Yes. Thank you so much for your presentation. You talked about going to the school and doing presentations to classes as low as grade 5. Was this something that when you were invited to the school, did the teachers ask you or how did you decide that grade 5 was the right age? And do you believe that going as low as grade 5 is a benefit?

**Ms. Smith:** — Yes, it's always initiated by the school administration. It started with Cheri's grade 12 class. She didn't go to grade 12; she was on the streets then. But after her death, the kids that would have been coming up into grade 12 were the kids that . . . the class asked me to come. And so I just sat there and answered their questions about what had happened to her. And then the word went out and it started through the school systems that we would do this.

The school started . . . they started deciding what ages. There are some schools where, up in our neighbourhood up in the northwest corner of the city, when I spoke there recently it was grade 6 and up. But the majority of class . . . of schools start with grade 5.

And that's the administration that decides that because they see the fallout of older siblings on the younger kids; and so if I can go in and speak to a 10-year-old about this, that perhaps will prevent them from making similar choices and give them information that will help them cope with what's going on.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you. And I know that you're aware of the Alberta law and the controversy around locking up the young people. Tell me what you feel about it.

**Ms. Smith:** — About locking up young people?

**Ms. Draude:** — About the new law that was passed in Alberta and then later appealed because 17-year-olds couldn't be held against their wishes; and what is termed as a lock-up when really it's a safe situation, they have 72 hours where they can be

apprehended and held, supposedly to give them a chance to think about what's happening.

We've had a lot of witnesses having different opinions on it; and of course then the courts get involved in it too, so that adds another opinion to it. So just tell me what you feel about it.

**Mr. Smith:** — I think there may be times when a child is in a crisis situation, is apprehended and put into a safe situation for that length of time, it may make a difference. I think where it would make the biggest difference is if there are caring parents that would be involved. So the child is apprehended off the street and then the parents were to get involved right away.

I would like to see that kind of authority given to parents as well as in addition to peace officers who would, you know, be able to exercise that authority. But I'm also aware that there are juveniles who this would probably cause a reaction, an adverse reaction, to authority and probably create even more defiance and rebellion for this to happen.

When we were attempting to intervene for Cheri, we had kids that had been forcibly detained by parents or authorities or whatever say to us, don't do that to her, it will just make it worse. Because when a child is in a state, a condition of rebellion, that type of authoritative action can make it worse.

And I don't know . . . I don't have the expertise to be able to tell whether that's going to happen or not. So I really . . . I personally don't feel strongly one way or the other as to whether this would be a good thing or not.

**Ms. Draude:** — So what's the difference in what Alberta was doing on a . . . it was only three days they were considering safe refuge, and yet you're asking, basically recommending the same type of thing but on a longer time frame where the parents can make judgements.

**Mr. Smith:** — I guess what I understand about the Alberta situation, it would not be initiated by the parents; it's usually initiated by the authorities — whether it be police officers or social workers. Where I think what we're referring to is, we would like to see parents have the ability to do this on a longer term.

**Ms. Draude:** — If they had . . . if a parent didn't know where the child was and the officers had the opportunity to detain this child for 72 hours and maybe could contact you, I mean that would be part of it as well wouldn't it?

**Mr. Smith:** — Yes.

**Ms. Draude:** — So that would be . . . give a . . .

**Mr. Smith:** — That's what I'm saying. There's certainly, I think, are times when it would be beneficial, you know, to have that.

**Ms. Smith:** — I just want to speak to that in regards to the brainwashing that goes on. Our daughter was brainwashed and it took a very short time. It took three days. She was willing, after meeting this man, she was willing within three days to

leave everything that she knew, everything that she loved and go with him.

Now granted at that point she did not believe she was going to be a prostitute, that didn't even cross her mind, she had no concept of this. It was just that this man had convinced her that he was all that she needed. And for kids like Cheri that's what they are in it for. This is a person, this man who is pimping them, is all that they need.

He, through the psychological manipulation — and we won't go into all of that unless you'd care for me to — but they can control that kid's ego. That kid becomes so tied up with the pimp that she is what he tells her she is at any particular time. If she's really good . . . if he tells her she's really good, she believes that. If he tells her she's really nothing, she believes that.

And so there needs to be a time, when you're taking a kid away from a pimp, there needs to be a time of debriefing and downloading and deprogramming. I hate that word, but a time frame in a safe environment where there is an environment of trust where this kid can take a step back and take a look at what's happening. And for some kids that can happen really quickly because they're looking for an escape hatch, they want to get out of it. But for other kids, like our daughter, it would have taken a longer period of time because she was psychologically addicted to this man, to this young fellow.

And so we were looking for a place where she could go and she could be kept safe and she could have this downloading take place in her head so she could get back her self-esteem and find out who she was again. Does that help? Does that answer your question?

**Ms. Draude:** — I just have one other short question. You talked about the secure facilities in the States and I can tell from listening to you, you have a lot more knowledge on this than I do.

Have you looked into what their rate of success is, and by success I mean how many children there are actually stay away from alcohol and drug abuse or go off the streets? Is that kind of information available?

**Ms. Smith:** — The brochure purports a high success rate because it's a long-term facility. It's not an overnight fix. It's not a short-term thing. It's six months or longer. And so they say that they have really good success because they're able to instill again into the youth the values that they've learned since childhood, and they get them out of the destructive behaviour. For the one family that we know when she came back — she was, like I said, only there for six months or so — when she came back she did get right back into the bad crowd again.

And she was . . . but when she did get back into the bad crowd again she had enough information that had been put into her during those sane hours when she wasn't using drugs. So that her involvement with the bad crowd again I think was shorter and was safer, and she is now a healthy adult.

So we believe and her parents believe that that was a rescue net

that having the money to be able to do that really saved their daughter because who knows where she would have been if they hadn't done that.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thanks. Ron, did you have any questions.

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you very much for your presentation this morning. You've indicated that you've visited many schools and made presentations at the schools. Is it in your opinion that this is something that should be adopted into our education system and should be made part of education system as a regular part of the curriculum — pointing out to children what some of the pitfalls or dangers of society are?

**Ms. Smith:** — I think that already our curriculum, and maybe — I've given Randy some names of school counsellors who might come and speak to this very issue for you — but I think right now from an outsider's perspective the curriculum is already so full and the teacher is so stretched that to add . . . this would be one more thing.

What I would like to see, rather than that, is I would like to see some support networks in place so that parents who are going through this or have gone through this have an avenue into the educational institutions to talk about their stories.

So I don't think that the teachers need to do it. I think that people who've been there need to talk. And we know prostitutes who are willing to talk and we know parents who are willing to talk, but to actually get the venue for them to do that is difficult.

And maybe, as a committee, something can be struck in that manner. You can do something about opening up avenues so that it can happen more.

**Mr. Harper:** — Then in your opinion, based on what you just said, do you think that — and I agree with you that teachers are taxed to the limit — do you think then that say a social worker being available to the schools on a regular basis to facilitate both the education and what the pitfalls of society hold, but also provide, perhaps through the social worker, an avenue, not so much for the parents but for the children who are maybe seeking advice, seeking direction, maybe reluctant to talk to their parents about it but would maybe talk to a social worker if that avenue was there, available to them in the school?

**Ms. Smith:** — Every little bit would help, and that would certainly help. I think that a lot of the schools, especially the core schools, now already have social workers in the school systems.

The thing that . . . the reason why I believe that the kids listen to me when I go in is because I'm a stranger to them. I'm a mom and I tell them a story that is my story. It's not somebody else's. So they can't repudiate what I'm saying. They have to believe it or they have to, you know, not listen. And they usually listen.

And so I think that the strongest education a kid can get is from somebody who's been there. And the social workers have to deal with the violence on the playground and they have to deal with the fighting in the homes and they have to deal with all the



other things. But when I go in to speak, I deal strictly with the self-esteem of the students and how it can be stolen from them by being involved in substances and promiscuity and how that can be a doorway to be pulled into destructive behaviour.

**Mr. Harper:** — Yes, my particular area of interest on this committee is exploring the opportunities for prevention. And I'm wondering if . . . because I believe in a lot of cases someone who is not quite so close to the scene as a parent or such as a teacher or a social worker could probably recognize problems with a student quicker than maybe even the parents would.

And then if there was some mechanism within the school system — I'm suggesting a social worker — that it could be brought to the attention of the social worker that this particular student seems to have . . . demonstrates some difficulties, then maybe the social worker could explore that.

It would be the mechanism within the school that would include . . . eventually include the parents too, but there would be some mechanism of identifying the problem before it got out of hand.

**Ms. Smith:** — And what I was saying is that I'm a shortcut to that. We do a question/answers thing in the schools; and the kids, because it's anonymous and nobody is going to see those pieces of paper that they write on except myself — and I ensure them that I'm taking them home with me afterwards and so on — they tell me the situations that are in their home. And then I e-mail back to the school and tell them these are the issues that I saw raised and these are the things that I think that your school should be addressing.

And the teachers are really anxious to have somebody outside of the administration, somebody outside who can come in and who has the time and the heart to take on these kinds of things when they are already burdened with all kinds of other things.

But if the government could say that this would be part of the curriculum and we're going to establish a speaker's bureau and the Smiths are going to from now until they get too old to do it, I don't know, go around and speak in all the schools, we would be willing to do that. That's what I'm saying. It's just that there's not enough of us doing it right now.

**Mr. Smith:** — And we do, in the speech to the students, what we almost always attempt to do is, in addition to meeting with the students, in the evening we have a parents' meeting. And what we always tell the parents is that one of your best resources for your child are the teachers in the school. So talk to your teachers because you're absolutely right. The teacher may see something and know that hey, something is going on with this kid and the parent may not recognize it.

So we tell the parents, be sure you talk to your student's teachers and tell them, like they're not an adversary. Teachers love the kids. They want to help them and so the parents need to let the teachers know I'm here, we're both working for the same thing, for the welfare of this child, and if you see something I'm not going to jump on you if you come to me and say it. I'm there, and by working together, we can be effective in heading off any problems that may be arising.

And if a parent sees something, they can go to the teacher and say, you know I've noticed this change here with my child, what have you noticed, and compare notes. It's something that we didn't do and we wish we had; because after Cheri's death we talked to some of her teachers and they said, well you know we did notice some things. And so if we had had that information it would have been a tremendous resource for us.

And you know you were talking about prevention as well. I think one area that we didn't really include in our presentation here, but the sad fact is, is that prostitution would not be a big issue if there weren't men willing to pay money to buy sex, and it's a perversion. And there is this huge myth that it's a victimless crime — nobody gets hurt. I pay my money and everybody's happy. And it's just sickening to think that that could be the mindset of men in our society.

And having William sitting over here . . . William and I work together on johns' schools. And I go to johns' schools and I tell the men that have been picked up, arrested for picking up prostitutes, I tell them that I'm here as a father and I want to tell you the story of my daughter. And by the time I'm finished, I believe that they don't think of prostitution as a victimless crime any more.

And so that's another side where we really need to make some changes, and particularly with juveniles. You know, we treat child abuse and sexual assaults on children as very, very serious; except, all of a sudden when it's the prostitution area, it seems to be completely different. And this just shouldn't be.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — June had one follow-up question.

**Ms. Draude:** — If they have time, I'll ask mine.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Just go ahead.

**Ms. Draude:** — Okay. Well I appreciate the opportunity, Arlene. Thank you. I know that we had a chance to talk before and I know that . . . you know how I feel about it. But I'm going to be a devil's advocate here for a minute.

Because I'm a parent. I have five children. I was engaged and married when I was 17 and had five kids right away. And I think if I . . . if good parents, which my parents were, would have said, at 17, June you can't do that, I could have . . . might have rebelled. And I don't know that . . . if they felt very strongly about it, then they could have affected my life because of that. Is that necessarily good?

Now I'm not saying that . . . And how, if they would have gone to the law, how does the law decide or the courts decide that my parents don't know what should be done for me but they know what should be done for this child? How do they decide which are the good parents and which aren't the good parents? Whose voice is going to be heard?

And that's why I'm concerned whenever I say that . . . whenever I hear somebody say, well we should make the government or the laws give me this right.

So where do we go to with this? You're asking for quite a

radical change, and I know why. I see the look in your eyes, and the hurt, and I understand why you're doing it. But it's hard to make a blanket decision that's going to affect everybody in the province.

So how do you respond to that, to the other side of the story?

**Mr. Smith:** — I guess what it really boils down to is trusting parents to be loving parents. And for example if the law said 18, the parents did have control over the child up to the age of 18, in your particular situation that you talked about, your parents would have had the right to say no, you can't get married or whatever. But I guess we have to come back to say we . . . your parents loved you, they cared about you, and they would make the very best decision that they could have for your welfare at that point. And theoretically, or hopefully, it would have been the right decision but we can't guarantee that either.

I just think there is much more . . . I think there is less chance for harm and error with it being 18 than it is at being 16. Because I believe that by far the majority of parents are loving, caring parents that really do want the best for their children and will make . . . and will not make selfish decisions when it comes to their children's welfare.

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

**Ms. Smith:** — So later they would have said, yes, go ahead and get married.

**Mr. Smith:** — Well that's . . . I probably think they probably would have.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you, June; and thank you committee members.

Ed and Linda, I've spoken to you a bit on the phone in the last few years since this issue has been raised and there's been more awareness of it throughout Saskatchewan. And also more awareness that there has to be something done about the rising incidence of children on the streets and we cannot, as a society, leave this go on and simply keeping it under covers, not talking about it, and so on. So I'm very pleased that you've come forward, as well as everyone else has come forward, to present to this committee to give us their understanding and views of it.

There's always intricate details that we have to, we have to dig into and understand in order to make final recommendations to the legislature later on; so I just have a couple questions surrounding that area.

One of the questions I had was to determine what kind of laws that you would like to see changed surrounding the issue of how to treat johns and pimps that would continually abuse our children on the streets, that harm them, and in fact be part of the people that perpetrate this ugly activity and end up causing children to die eventually.

We have got — and obviously you know — there are laws in place. There is a large fine if people are convicted of activities relating to picking up children under age and so on. There's also jail terms and so on.

Many people that have presented to us have indicated that if there's no demand — as you have today, Ed — if there's no demand, this kind of activity won't go on again or it won't continue. But in fact it does continue, and so the demand is a great part of it. And I think there should be a responsibility for people that continue that demand to have to look very, very seriously at what they're doing and what the repercussions of their activity is going to be.

So could you, in simple terms, tell me what you think the law should do about johns and pimps?

**Mr. Smith:** — I think there needs to be a change in public perception about prostitution, because what you hear is statements like: well, it's the oldest profession, you know; it's always been there, it'll always be there. This idea that it's somehow, although it's not a pretty part of our society, let's just face it, it's going to always be there. And I don't know how we change that in society.

But I think what we can change is that when people determine that they are going to buy sexual services, particularly from juveniles, that the penalties are very, very severe, because we value children. We value our children. And prostitution among juveniles is extremely destructive to the juvenile that's involved in prostitution. It destroys them. And do we value the life of a child? And if we really do, then I think we need to put some muscle behind the law to say yes and, by our laws, we will say that we do.

And so jail sentences with mandatory treatment — because I think people that buy prostitutes have usually a very perverted sense of their sexual identity — and so there needs to be treatment there and needs to be severe penalties.

**Ms. Julé:** — You had talked about your daughter's pimp and that you knew that this person was still out there and obviously has never been caught because there hasn't been any closure to this whole situation in that regard.

So what do you think could assist in, in as far as legislation goes, to be able to identify that pimp and to, you know, mete out the measures that you've just mentioned — possibly some incarceration along with counselling? Do you see anything from just looking at our laws and looking at society and speaking to all the people you have and from your experience? Do you have a sense of what you would do if you could make the law and you could carry it out?

**Mr. Smith:** — I guess as far as pimping is concerned of course there are the two charges — there's the living off the avails, and the procurement charges, that can be laid against pimps. In order for either of those charges to be laid, you pretty well need to have evidence given by a prostitute that worked for that pimp.

And we've been involved in a lot of cases where girls have been picked up and have said that they would testify, have given signed statements. But when the time came, they were nowhere to be found. Whether that was through intimidation from the pimp and his network that he has — because he's usually not working by himself, he usually has quite a network

that involves drugs and all other kinds of things like that — or whether it was just the pimp again has manipulated this person into again being an ally of his. So all of a sudden now the pimp is a good guy. And so it's very frustrating.

And I agree with our legal system that requires first-hand evidence. I wouldn't suggest that we go to . . . allow hearsay evidence to convict someone. I'm not saying that. So this is extremely difficult and I really don't have any answers as to how we can get around this.

**Ms. Smith:** — But I do think in regards to that . . . I just want to make two comments. In regards to the pimps, I really do believe that the judges do not understand how that all that works. If somehow we could get up there and show them . . . get all the way through the judicial system and show them how . . . what this is all about, what the pimps are like, and so on, especially when there was very young children involved.

When we first lost Cheri we started an organization, a charitable organization, called RIC (Regina Intersectoral Committee). And it was to help parents identify the situations that their kids were involved in, as well as to get mutual information regarding the pimps.

And we felt like we were butting our heads against the walls because the pimps were heroes in this society. They were heroes on the streets. They were the good guys and we were the bad guys. They were the ones who were taking the kids and putting them out on the streets — how do you fight against that? The parents were powerless.

And so we had parents who would go up to the house and barge in and take their kids forcefully and take whatever shots the pimps were going to hang out . . . hand out. We had parents who'd run the pimps' cars off the street. We had cops who would sit up nights, when they weren't working, to help the parents because they knew that their kid was with this pimp but the police officer couldn't do anything because there's no evidence. I mean there's got to be some way of gathering evidence to get these guys off.

I also just want to go back to the johns' thing — the question about the johns. We also tried to get *The Leader-Post* to print the names, to publish the names of those who have been identified, pleaded guilty to the charge of solicitation as johns. And for many years we fought with the printed media to print those names and they won't — they won't. They are afraid that if they should happen to misspell someone's name, they would cause that person a great deal of grief and they would be up on, you know, have litigation against them.

Maybe there's another route we can go because I know that one of the things that the johns do not want is they do not want to be known as a john. They do not want their name out.

And Ed has sat in court when 16 guys came up, all charged on prostitution, and just took down their names. That's all he did, is he just took down their names. And they, some of them, were just terrified afterwards, asking him, are you with the newspaper? Are you with a newspaper? And he just said, well what if I am? And they were so afraid that their names were

going to be published.

And so we know that if there's some way that we can break the silence around what is happening because these men are taking back into their homes — and many of them have a wife and family at home — they're taking back into their homes the things that they are picking up on the streets. And so we're, again, we're looking at families who are being affected by this.

So we need to do something to get the word out that this person is a john. And I'm not sure how to do that because I also want to act in mercy towards them and towards the pimps as well.

And I believe that the johns school, at least the johns school that Regina runs, is very effective. But we need more. We need more clout with the courts to make sure that this continues to happen and more people go to it.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — And I just have one question and I'm going to . . . hopefully we can make this quick because our time is expiring here.

But Ed and Linda, when you refer to pimps here and the pimp that your daughter had dealt with, what kind of people are pimps in Regina, or are there different characters that would pimp? Are these pimps local, or are they people that are in a pimping ring that come from outside of Saskatchewan and end up in Saskatchewan just because they know the vulnerability, and they know what's happening and who's an easier mark?

**Ms. Smith:** — Cheri's pimp was a young man who was born and raised in Regina. He came through social services. He was in foster care for many, many years. He was 18 when he procured Cheri, and Cheri was the first of several. But the guy that started him in the pimping thing in Edmonton, with Cheri, was a man from Montreal; and he was connected, very well connected. And so Cheri was under this . . . under her pimp's hand was able to travel extensively across Canada as . . . or across western Canada, as Ed has said.

The whole money was raised for drugs. The young man who recruited Cheri had a terrible drug habit. And so I'm not sure how much of the money that the girls brought in went back to the guy in Montreal. And that guy in Montreal was connected in western Canada, too.

So at that time, and again this is back 10 years ago, Cheri's pimp was white but the head guy was a Jamaican, and there was a whole series . . . circle of them. We have met pimps of all the races. There's an Asian . . . there was an Asian factor that we fought with parents against, and there was also a First Nations group. So it's not one race or another, but they . . . certainly there is a lot of free flow. And right into the jails. The one girl that we dealt with, her pimp was in Stony Mountain jail in Manitoba, and was pimping her from that location. So, however that worked, I . . . but she was under his authority for quite some time.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Are there a great number of parents that you've talked to that are . . . Obviously from your comments earlier you had mentioned that you go to the schools and you talk to the children there, but you also talk to parents

because of your group, your support group. In your estimation, how serious is the problem in Regina?

**Ms. Smith:** — Just to clarify, the support group only lasted for about six months because we burned ourselves out and there was nobody else to come and pick up the thing. So we don't . . . Regina does not have a support group; in fact, Saskatchewan doesn't have any support groups for people who have kids in prostitution. And that's another thing that this community desperately needs.

I'm sorry, what was your question?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — That's okay; I just wondered how serious is the problem?

**Ms. Smith:** — If one child is lost, it's serious. I'm sorry.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — That's fine. Thank you. Well, we'd like to thank you wholeheartedly for coming today and sharing with us, and the information and evidence that you've given us is going to be most valuable.

We do hope that we, as legislators, can do our part and that the community can do their part, and we can continue to attack this, this situation in our province that is so detrimental to our children.

Thank you very much.

**Ms. Smith:** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — The committee will take about a five-minute break and then we will be back in no longer than five minutes so that we can continue.

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

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — If we can gather the committee together again. We will resume our hearings. And we have at this time, William Davison. William is the director of the Indian Metis Christian Fellowship. And accompanying William today is his wife, Charleene.

William, we're going to go through a quick introduction of committee members so you feel comfortable at least knowing our names here. And we'll start over on this side.

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

**Ms. Jones:** — And I'm Carolyn Jones, the MLA for Saskatoon Meewasin.

**Ms. Draude:** — And I'm June Draude. And I'm the MLA from Kelvington-Wadena — north.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — And my name is Arlene Julé. I am the MLA for Humboldt; and I'm co-chairing the committee with Mr. Peter Prebble, who is the MLA for Saskatoon Greystone.

And we have also Don Toth, a committee member from

Moosomin. He's not with us today due to the weather, as well as Kevin Yates from Saskatoon and he's obviously having difficulty getting in too. But I'm going to . . . Kevin is not from Saskatoon, I'm sorry. Sorry about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . in Saskatoon and having a bit of time getting here.

But we want to welcome you today and thank you very much for being willing to come and present to our committee your knowledge and understanding of the situation, as well as hopefully giving us some suggestions and ideas and what you think might help the situation at hand in Saskatchewan.

So William, we'll just ask you to begin.

**Mr. Davison:** — Well thank you; and to start with, I'd like to thank you. It's not often I get the opportunity to sit and meet people that have sat and listened to the unpleasant stories that I'm sure you've endured. And though you may sit here professionally, I know you do go home at nights and some of those play out in your minds, you may not have opportunity to debrief. So I'm sure some of things you've heard haven't been pleasant and I know it's not over yet.

I am William Davison. Originally my name was Richard Commanda. And as a result of going through foster homes, group homes, residential school, my name was changed a multitude of times. So today I'm left with William Davison. The government won't return my real name, you know, and charge me \$180.

I'm a First Nations person from Ontario. I'm a tricky; I'm white, because my mother was a prostitute. My sister is Asian, and I have a brother that's Jamaican, African. And that's reality of growing up in that lifestyle.

I ran away when I was 14 and I travelled the country and the United States of America. I did not want to be caught. I did not want to go back. Obviously you've heard stories of sexual abuse, emotional abuse, spiritual abuse, imposition of Christianity onto Aboriginal people, fuelled racism, and of course confused identity, and disrupted it.

As time went by I tried to assimilate as best I could because of my colour, but due to the damage of abuse growing up, of course, in my early 20s I was experiencing my first divorce. And so I sought out counselling. I spent four years in counselling. And I might say, two days a week and hours at a time, not just an hour with a gentle counsellor, somebody that knew the depths of the abuse that I'd endured and worked with me through that.

After that I was quite pleased with myself though I did not have a lot of memory of my past, and that was just . . . I was comfortable with that, I didn't need to know everything. And I went on with my life. It seemed like after every five to ten years things would surface and I would have to deal with them.

I tried to stay away from Aboriginal people. I tried to stay away from victims of abuse, but it seems so prevalent in our society, not just in the Aboriginal world, in the non-Aboriginal world too. I knew the behaviours in the things I was seeing, the acting

out. And so I had a lot of difficulty with it, and more times then I just sat back with my mouth shut.

As time went by, I remarried and divorced again and lost some children. Then I moved here to Regina and got involved with some of the Aboriginal people from SIFC (Saskatchewan Indian Federated College). Some of the students there they were having difficulties. I was in a position of management and so I would give them part-time jobs.

And I would help them with Indian history, with the culture. That's one of the things I teach, in the position of Christianity onto Aboriginal people, what that did. You know, we have to seek approval from — and I don't mean this in a terrible way — from the white man, not just to find God but to be approved for things like this, you know; it's not evil you know, our drums, our culture, our traditions, our language.

And so I worked with a lot of young people that went to SIFC on a spontaneous basis. And then with time I started volunteering in north central. And at first I tried to stay on the peripheral, from the administrative point of view, and it was difficult because I seen and understood what was happening. And then so I with time I just got deeply entrenched and involved and by no means was it something that I chose to do, is it something that I wanted to do. People ask me to come and work for them and I would say no, and so I would do a lot of volunteer work. And finally it became that I just started working; first, half days and then finally full time. And then now full time is 9 in the morning until 10 at night.

One of the things that I did identify was the demand side of the sex trade. I already know all the ins and outs of the supply side. I already know who all the pimps are and the players are. I already know all their stories; I've been through that.

So I looked at the demand side because the demand side seemed to be non-Aboriginal, and the majority of them were. And so I started researching johns schools throughout the country, which at that time, in 1997, in January, there was not a whole lot of them going on in Canada and so I went to the States.

Edmonton had one. I travelled to Edmonton and visited with the officers there and went through their program. They put a lot of people through there; and I don't want to just speak about their program but they put about 20 to 40 johns through in a building in a lecture sort of way, and then they have police officers, women that dress up as prostitutes and shame them. I wasn't comfortable with that though. If that's working in Edmonton, geographical locations, that's fine.

I came back to Saskatchewan and got in touch with Los Angeles and had them send up their program to me. And I rewrote a lot of what I'd already seen out there because we are dealing with shame, and that shame comes from poor self-image or just lack of it, it doesn't exist. And we're dealing with abusive situations.

So I put the school together to deal with the shame that the individuals have, their inability to face their own shame, their own guilt, and how they . . . you know, you have shame and it does this and then to balance it in your life you have to blame.

So they blame their wives, their children, the government, Social Services, the police. They haven't done anything wrong — prostitution being a victimless crime.

And in saying that, that means that you have two consenting adults. So what can be wrong with that? The law is nuts. Prostitution is legal in Canada and yet soliciting is not. Isn't that so confusing? And I would recommend that prostitution either be legal and all of it be legal or pieces of it is and pieces of it aren't, that's, you know . . . and this is our government.

The age of consent is — what? — 16. The age for sexual consent, I believe, is 14. At what point is it illegal for a child to become a prostitute. As long as they're under the age of 14 and then it's okay between 14 and 16, but it's still kind of, oh you shouldn't do that; it's not socially acceptable. And then after 16, well we're done — nothing's done.

So prostitution, in my point of view, either go all the way or get out of it — get into it or get out of it. I don't agree with prostitution being legal in Canada. I'd like to see that law struck down. In 1867, 1870, John A. Macdonald tried to stop, and I think he brought forth legislation trying to stop the non-Aboriginal people from taking women off the reserves and putting them into prostitution.

So it's nothing new for the Aboriginal people. It's always been down through time. I hear all the stories from the old people and my own mother. I'm sorry to say that a lot of the people that were responsible for Aboriginal people sold them into prostitution. And it's pathetic.

I do run the johns school. I guess that's why I'm here today. I dropped you off a client school synopsis.

Just the john being caught and charged with soliciting in and of itself, and having to go to court, is enough to prevent that individual from once again going out onto the street. The more chronic individuals that have a . . . deep into sexual addiction, compulsive-obsessive behaviour, no, they're going to continue. The pedophiles are going to continue. But for the average person on the street, going through the court system once and being charged with soliciting is sufficient to stop them.

What it did not do was allow the individual to look at himself in shame. It was not a healing process; it was a legal process. And so the individual could still deny. It was entrapment, and entrapment is legal in Canada. She approached me; she waved me down. And they tell their wives that, you know, I just stopped because she waved, and I wanted to see what was wrong, and she asked me about sex. And these are all the excuses I hear. And so court allows for that. The individual can still be in denial, and I haven't done anything wrong.

At the end of the day at johns school, they're in tears and they've looked at themselves and are looking further to counselling: how are we going to approach my family; how am I going to make changes? And so what we've done is approach them spiritually and emotionally.

And when I say spiritually, I'm not talking about the Bible, God, Christ. I'm talking about senses: a sense of belonging; a

sense of capability; a sense of knowing who I am; a sense of being heard, that I know I'm being heard. Basic things. What is love? How do you have relationship? Good feelings restored within the individual in looking at their identities and seeing where they come from and what happened to them.

The youngest I've had in johns school is 18; the oldest I've had is 74; the average is between 35 and 45. I've only had five or six that are not married. The bulk of them are married, they are professionals from all walks of life. I've had professors from the U of R (University of Regina), I've had city councillors and their lawyers; teachers, I've had them all. And I am, quite frankly, amazed. I have seen and talked to human resource people that have sat there and cried and told me that their job is to help people not abuse them, and they have to come to terms with that. And we've had counsellors too.

And I am quite amazed at the amount of people that are out there demanding sex. And at the same time, do not want to take ownership or responsibility for their behaviour. When they do come to me, they deny. And they deny what happened. And it isn't about that one arrest. I don't care about it. I don't want to hear about it, whether you were arrested properly or not. That's between you, the courts, the judge, and a lawyer. I tell them that you've been all your life getting here. If you're 50 years old, it's taken you 50 years to get here and learn what we're going to teach you.

And so it's progression. From birth. That's how we're born — a blank sheet of paper. And what's the information that goes in onto that growing up?

Most of the men at the end of the day, we break off into a debriefing session; I do have a counsellor there all day with me — I am not a counsellor and at the same time, I am. The things I have heard from the men are just as disturbing as the things I've heard from the girls and the children on the street. The men have had sex with animals. The men have been sexually abused. The men have been forced to give blow jobs in schools as boys. They have sat in the neighbour's house, groups of them, and watched pornography when they were 12 and 13. Dad has abused them. Mom has abused them. A lot of them come from divorced homes. And so I see it as a societal problem. It isn't just the men.

Yes, I would like to see something done. The demand side is greater than the supply side. And so when I initially started the johns school . . . I have a lot of anger for them. You know, I ask them are you my dad? Like a 74-year-old, he could be my father. And they don't like that. They don't think of that. How many children out there are children of tricks, of johns? Quite a few of them. I meet them every day. I work with them. I do the prevention side too with children, starting at age seven. They don't know who their fathers are, you know.

Mom was able to buy a six-pack and the kid was born. And a six-pack is when you buy six sets of Ts and Rs (Talwin and Ritalin). That's a \$120; one set is 35. You get four slams or three slams out of one set. A mother may do 10 sets a day, which reverts to 40 slams. A stone lasts twenty minutes. If she's pregnant, she's limiting herself to about 4 slams a day because she'll go into labour. That's where most of the money goes, is

into drugs.

As for your pimps, most of them are the person living with them in the home. Most times it's mom, dad.

I've gone into homes, we've done counselling in the house where the 13-year-old can't get out of bed — and that story is in the book — and her brother was her pimp. And of course he got caught and went to jail. So her sister and her two friends held her down while a 54-year-old man raped her and they got paid for it. And then when she wouldn't do it again, they beat her so bad that she couldn't get out of bed and thus the police called us and then we went and we did what we could.

I recommended that the girl be moved to another city and the mother did that, although the mother was using too and cleaning up at that time.

With the men, I've had two Aboriginals come through. It's been very difficult on them because they are First Nations people and it is a First Nations program.

Most of my presenters are former prostitutes, parents of prostitutes. Ed, I bring in — he's non-Aboriginal. I bring in a mother of a prostitute — she's non-Aboriginal because it doesn't just affect the Aboriginal world although 90 per cent of it from what I see is.

I bring in health care workers to talk about STDs (sexually transmitted disease) in the morning. I bring that from four directions — health . . . Although in the past I have trained Aboriginal people to do that.

I have found that for the women and the men that come in and share their story . . . I bring in one pimp too, that had three girls working for him. And they're all former and they're all clean. If they relapse, I don't use them and I help them work through their relapse.

But they provide for the men the side of it that they've never seen before. They didn't know that this was the behaviour they were supporting. They didn't know that all the drugs, and violence, and pimping, and girls, and the sexual assaults, and the women putting, and the mothers and fathers putting their children out there at 11 and 12 — they didn't know that's where their money was going. They didn't know that's what they were supporting.

And they break down and they cry. Some of them shake involuntarily by the end of the day. They had no idea that they were hurting anyone.

And then when we talk to them about how — I'm sorry, but your wife does know at some level and your children do know too, things aren't right. And we talk about that and then they start talking about that also. How their wives haven't had sex with them in the last three to six months. How their children avoid them. They're never home. When they are, they're not loving, they're not caring, they're not hugging and interested in the family. They don't spend a lot of time with the family. And how they blame.

And so we get down to the denial and the anger and the fights and things like that. And how they have the fights and then that gives them an excuse to just storm out of the house and go cruise a stroll.

We present to them the cycle of compulsive-obsessive behaviour as it relates to sexual addictions — addictions being illegitimate ways or behaviour to fulfil a legitimate need, and so we talk to them about needs.

I have had men in there that don't see anything wrong with prostitution. They want it, they like it, why is it going on, it's legal. Like what's the problem here? How come I'm sitting here? I've talked to younger men, 18 to about 23, that stay in denial. It's really, really tough to get through to them. And they have been involved in date rapes. They don't see it as date rapes. I identify that for them.

A girl goes out with him and they're drinking, and she says no after some heavy petting and necking and kissing. And they don't stop; they force it from that point on. They don't see anything wrong with it. They think no is not no, and so we go through all of that. Those ones I do report to the police. Anything that is really extreme I report it. By no means do I intend to break the law.

A lot of these men need healing, they need restoration, they need to look at themselves. It's difficult. The courts, from my point of view, deal with it just as that. From a legal point of view, soliciting. How serious is that between two consenting adults? I agree when it's under 13 and under, 16 and under, it should be child abuse. That's what it is, by all means. These are just people using other people to gratify themselves. They don't care about them, it's objects.

These people can't relate emotionally, the johns, but they can relate sexually; and sexually is the only way they can give of themselves. Without giving of themselves emotionally that's as close as they can get. There's no intimacy. Intimacy — they don't even understand what that word is. Honesty — they don't know what that word is. They live lives of illusion. Their wives don't know who they are. They don't even know who they are.

Our program is a one-day intervention, in other words we hammer them. We try to break through the denial system. We know we've done that when they break down and start sobbing and start getting honest. And then after that we offer them counselling. I mean a lot of men come back and see me and see the counsellors the following week. Some have brought their wives and then we start dealing with the family.

In saying that, over the years since 1997, many men have come to me now in the last year prior to being arrested. A lot of the wives call me. They phone me Mondays after they know their men have been out with prostitutes. And I ask them has he been caught and charged? Is that why you're calling? No, they know and they need someone to talk to about it. No one knows about it, so they call me. And then Fridays they call me too because he's getting ready for the weekend. They know all the signs and the behaviours. They know what's happening.

They bring their children with them into my office and cry and

they don't know what to do. They're afraid of losing their husband and afraid of losing their father, the children's father.

Some confront them. I tell them what to do and how to do it, you know, because they are going to have to confront because the relationship is falling apart and they're going to have to say why. Some have, I recommend, if they're Christians, a pastor, a counsellor, but never alone or with just someone like myself. I wouldn't even go in alone. I would require two or three other people to go with me — the people he knows, friends he knows. And so even that is a process. And so that's happening today.

As for prevention side — you guys can stop me any time you want — as for the prevention side, I work with the children, Aboriginal kids, from seven and up. I build blocks, blocks of information.

They know what's going on. They just can't name it. They know they're being abused, but it's normal because it's happening at my friend's house and everywhere I go, it's happening. So I bring in speakers, social workers, child care workers, police to talk about violence, and then they're able to say, yes, that's happening to me. In foster homes, so I bring in child protection.

We talk about sexual abuse. We talk about STDs. They already know about that. They know what sex is. They can't name it, the different things but once we name it for them — oh yeah, yeah, no, that's been done to me. And social service workers have covered their ears because they can't take these children here out now into . . . you know, I don't want them to take them out. That's not why they're there.

And so I bring in Saskatchewan mediation to do conflict resolution. Now think of this — I'm teaching seven and eight year-olds conflict resolution. We're talking about acting out, why they set fires, shoplifting.

I can't get enough speakers in a year to come through those doors. And alls we're doing is building blocks. We're preparing them for when they're 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. You're going to see this. You're going to go through it.

What we're trying to prevent is them being a victim and, when I say that, it means they won't freeze. They'll know what it is they're seeing. They'll know to get away. We talk about after you said no, what do you have to do. Well you have to leave. No is not enough, now get out. Remember, Clinton? She said no but she didn't leave, you know. And so we talk about that.

We talk about values. Where do we get them from? We get them from home, church, school, work, family. Well we had a generation of children or three generations of them that don't have families, don't stay in school and don't go to church, don't even practice their own traditions, though they cry that, you know, we need to restore the culture and the traditions.

What are morals? And we teach them that.

So we're trying to provide for them as much information as we can that the schools do not. We talk about the things that the schools do not. We talk about the terrible, terrible stories.

Every Monday night I give them the opportunity to vent. In other words, what happened last week — Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday — since we talked last? Let's talk about that. Let's get it out. Because they'll be angry in a month from now at something that happened two months ago and you'll see that behaviour being acted out. They'll break a window, set a fire. And so we get them to talk about it in a non-judgmental or condemning way.

It's kept very confidential. In other words, unless it's something that I feel the child is unsafe right now at this moment and when they go home tonight or in the following week, other than that, I don't report it. And I report everything to my director. I am not the director of Indian and Metis Christian Fellowship; I am the community program coordinator.

It is very disturbing because I have sat with 15-year-old girls and boys who do not remember the first 12 years of their lives, do not know who their father or mother is. And they live in little dream worlds and they believe they're going to go home to their mother. They believe their father is going to come and get them.

We sat with a girl, two counsellors and myself — she was 11 years old — and we had just about got through her denial gently over time and bringing her back to reality because she has all these illusions, and she's looking at the world through rose-coloured glasses. Mom has a room for her with a wonderful bed and she has all these dreams.

And we were just about to break through that and then we stopped and said no, that's how she's protecting herself. If we take that away from her, she might become suicidal. And so we stopped there and let her go and refused to counsel her any more because she's too young. Other than that, all we can do is build the blocks and work on their prevention.

We talk about suicide. We talk about self-mutilation. We talk about the abuse, who our abusers are. We talk about how we love and hate our mothers and our fathers. We don't talk about how the government abused us through residential schools; we're not trying to teach anybody to become whiners and blame. We're trying to get them to let go of the things that they're not responsible for, so they don't have to carry that burden with them the rest of their lives.

One of the things that happens with the johns, with the abusers — and not just them; I'm talking about mothers and fathers and other people — is, because they refuse to take ownership and responsibility for their behaviour, for their own actions, you have to, I have to, community, the children. It gets spread out.

I was dealing with a prof from U of R who's been going through a sexual harassment that I witnessed and was a part of, with the practicum students. I tried to avoid that and I tried to meet with him on numerous occasions and get him to take ownership and responsibility for that and deal with it in-house. But he wouldn't and I couldn't get through the denial, and so I had no other recourse but to go through policy and procedure.

And then he admits it after he's been caught, and it's too late for him, and I don't know what to do. And I'm sorry about that

you know because we're talking a man's life. But when he started looking at the erratic behaviour and how it affected everybody over a period of eight months, he broke down and cried. The damage he had done and he didn't realize, the trauma that he had induced into other people — the fear, the poisoned environment, the threats — and we still deal with that afterwards, a year later.

For the johns, they just go home; for the abusers, just go home. They carry no burden, no weight, no guilt, no shame, until they get caught. And then, in that time, they only admit to those things they've been caught with. How do we get them to come out with more?

With that, the girls that I've worked with over the years, some have gotten off the street and stayed off. Sadly, so many of them relapse, and that seems to happen 10 to 20 times. They contact me; because I ask them to, just tell me when you relapse and let's talk about it, let's start working on it. Because a lot of times something new has come up from the past. New memories, new feelings, and they run and escape and avoid them. And the only way they know how to do that is numb themselves with drugs. The only way they know how to pay for the drugs is sell their body.

And so I see them relapse, relapse, a lot of them — well, I shouldn't say all of them — I've seen them, some of them, now come out of that and stayed away for 9, 10, 12 years, but they still don't sleep nights. They still have moments of terror, horror, bad feelings, crying, anger, rage. Many of them don't enter into relationships. Many of them have to deal with the amount of children they've lost through abortion, that they've given up for adoption, that they've hurt as a result of doing the drugs and the alcohol, FAE (fetal alcohol effects), FAS (fetal alcohol syndrome), and other damages to the nervous system.

When the johns hear about all the damage that they're a part of . . . You see, because prostitution doesn't happen in a vacuum, you know there's the prostitute, the pimp, the sexual abuse, the john, the police, social services; it's just a part of so many things, and they're just a part of it.

And so it's difficult to work with all of that, and to try and say that we're going to solve this overnight — not going to happen. For some of them, it's a lifetime of feeling. For others — I'm talking the 40-year-olds — I just tell them, why quit now, you know, because it's so hard for them. I've seen 60-year-olds still drinking and I don't condemn them for their drinking. I know what they're going through. I know the horrors that they've lived with growing up.

So I don't know. Good, right, wrong, in, out. But I do know this: that as a whole society is responsible. And for the people I've seen come through the johns school, it'll be a long time before I run off to any counsellor. I trust a lot of people in this world that I call them pillars of the community. The amount of people that I've . . . and then the MLAs, the PC (Progressive Conservatives) government. I tell you, I've seen the good, the bad, and the ugly from both sides.

I can't condemn anyone. I don't know which generation to condemn. I don't know which individual. And I think we're in a



situation where we all need help. To condemn the johns as being the root cause, well yes, they are the demand side. If you took that away, that wouldn't stop the sexual abuse in the homes, or the physical or the spiritual or the emotional. It wouldn't restore anyone's self-image.

But they need to be punished. I mean that's not a very good word — disciplined, taught when they get caught. I don't know that public embarrassment would do it. Shame — they're already living in shame. That's what they're acting out so we need to teach them how to have relationships, how to love, how to care. They've forgotten what a man's role is in society. When I ask them very few can answer that question. To provide and protect — and what does that mean and what does it look like?

And they're very competitive. You know, I met with Randy here and Randy and I were talking and I asked him, how you'd get this position, Randy? Was there 20 people that applied, three, four? The best one got it so what are those other two doing? Well they're out there competing.

What's value number one — my education. Value number two for a man — career. Because if I can make all that money I can buy myself nice clothes, a nice car, a nice home, a hobby, boat, prostitutes.

What else can I get? I can get a wife and support her. She might come into the top 10 on the value list but she won't be number one. Children are consumers not providers. So we call them children and they take money out of our pockets. So they would even be less than the wife.

And why is that? Well if he hangs on to the five or six things that attracted her, because he's a good provider — a lousy protector — he can replace her. He can replace those children. And so we need to go back to a time where family was very important, relationship was very important. And those values need to be restored.

And when we talk about that . . . and what's the morally right thing to do — support value number one? What if value number one . . . suddenly you take value 1,000 and put it up as number one and that's sex with a prostitute. It becomes number one for the next hour. Even . . . (inaudible) . . . the morally right thing to do is support it. And so many people don't understand morals, values, and ethics — where they come from, or where we can get them, and how we can alter them. That's how we're able to live with ourselves. So it's phenomenal.

I'll end it there and then . . . I could talk for hours.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well actually what you have . . . what you've presented us with is very interesting, and we could listen to you for a long time because there's a great deal to learn. William, June Draude has another appointment . . .

**Mr. Davison:** — Yes.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — . . . and it's about 5 to 12, so we're going to have to let her go, I guess.

**Mr. Davison:** — Oh my, did I ever talk.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes, but that's fine. The information you provide us is what we need. But we do have a few minutes here, and I'm going to ask the committee members if they would like to ask you any questions in regards to what you have said today.

**Mr. Harper:** — In your schools what has been sort of the consistent reaction from the johns? I mean is there any one common theme or one common thread that you'd identify as reaction from the johns? When you're working with them — whether they be from high-income earners or whether they be low-income earners or whatever the case is — what seems to be the common theme, whether they're 18 or 74? Have you been able to identify a common theme?

**Mr. Davison:** — Sexual dysfunction; sex is love. They can give physically but not emotionally. So they can actually go through the motions without the emotion. You would think they cared, but it's all designed for one thing — to satisfy themselves or self gratification. And more times than not, it's about sex.

**Mr. Harper:** — Have you been able to determine whether these individuals were sexually abused as children?

**Mr. Davison:** — No. Some admit to it; others don't voluntarily give it up. Over time they do. The ones that have come back to us for counselling have. I can't speak for the ones that have gone elsewhere. We do recommend that they go to different places for counselling.

**Mr. Harper:** — In your experience would you believe that the vast majority of those have been sexually abused at some point in time in their life?

**Mr. Davison:** — I believe they've been abused. I can't say all of them sexually — emotionally, physically, spiritually, and/or sexually — one of those.

**Mr. Harper:** — But abused in some manner?

**Mr. Davison:** — Oh, yes. The one common thing they do all share of is how dad was growing up. Sadly their sexual, compulsive, obsessive behaviour is very similar to the father's in the home, and/or lack of father. So mother brings home different boyfriends and things like that.

**Mr. Harper:** — Yes, okay. Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you. Carolyn, did you have any questions?

**Ms. Jones:** — Well it's a very interesting presentation full of almost more information than I can absorb.

**Mr. Davison:** — I'm sure it is.

**Ms. Jones:** — Because much of what we've heard has been about the root causes and the prostitution-for-sex-trade side of it, so this is kind of a new game. Not game, that was a bad word; a new side of the issue.

If you consider that we're trying to look at this as legislators

and considering that kind of in your closing comments we . . . you talked about we need a whole new value system almost.

**Mr. Davison:** — They need to be taught the values. There's a lot of things lacking in homes today.

**Ms. Jones:** — But as legislators that's a very difficult issue.

**Mr. Davison:** — Yes, it is.

**Ms. Jones:** — So my question is, do you have any legislative ideas, any ways . . . I mean certainly there's value things can be taught through various institutions that are already in place and symptoms can be dealt with through institutions already in place. But in terms of legislative ideas, do you have anything in particular that you think would help both the supply and the demand side of the problem?

**Mr. Davison:** — I think we would have to make prostitution illegal in Canada, period. At any age.

**Ms. Jones:** — On that particular issue would we not then be faced with charging victims which we tend to think of — hopefully, we think of it — as a victim crime that the . . . particularly with what we're dealing with, with children involved in the sex trade. I mean they are certainly victims of sexual abuse. I mean you can call it sexual abuse as opposed to prostitution and therefore have the crime element.

But the older consenting adults, if you will, are still in my opinion victims in most instances. And so you're now charging victims with a crime. And you don't . . . You think that that's an acceptable way to deal with it?

**Mr. Davison:** — The reality of it is, is it's how it's being dealt with now. The reality of it is, is the Regina Police Service makes 140 prostitution-related arrests in a year — and this is going back a couple of years — and most of those were the girls themselves or the men themselves on the street.

In 1997 I had 14 johns. In 1998 I had four schools with 10, 20, 30 men come through. So that year there was 140 charges, 30 of them were johns. The rest were soliciting from the prostitute side. It is far easier to catch the girl standing on the corner than it is the john, and less amounts of money spent there.

**Mr. Harper:** — I have to leave right now. Thank you very much for coming.

**Mr. Davison:** — You're welcome. It's a pleasure talking to you.

**Ms. Jones:** — Besides that then any further ideas about legislative approaches? And I guess keeping in mind that we're a provincial jurisdiction and unable to influence . . . well hopefully we're able to influence or to attempt to influence, but we certainly aren't free to just bring in laws that are in the federal jurisdiction.

**Mr. Davison:** — No, I understand that. It's quite a bit of a process. I think on the provincial legislation, is it possible because the charge is only soliciting. The courts have been

gentle on first-time offenders, first time people have been caught. One of the things that the men have admitted to is it's the first they were caught; it's not the first time they've used prostitutes.

An increase in fines. Presently the average person pays about \$200 in a court fine and are . . . we determine our price for john school at \$400 based on they're going to spend 150 to 200 on a lawyer. The judge is going to fine them a couple of hundred dollars.

And of course the threat of a criminal record, but then again it's their first offence and then not a serious one at that, you know, from a court's point of view. It doesn't deal with the past behaviour that led to where they are today. I think . . . Oh, it's tough.

**Ms. Jones:** — It is tough, and I don't want to put you on the spot, but if you have any further ideas on it.

**Mr. Davison:** — I don't like to see the public shame — I don't like to see the public shame, but at the same time I like to see the individuals look at their own shame, at their own lives. It is a difficult thing.

**Ms. Jones:** — Something mandatory counselling or mandatory . . .

**Mr. Davison:** — That more preferable. I agree with alternate measures programs. I was a part of that when that first started at RAMP (Regina Alternative Measures Program). And I notice a lot of white people coming through that as opposed to Aboriginal people. But I'd like to see them come through. I was wrong then thinking that it was racist today. Perhaps that's the part of society we need to educate — on the demand side.

I've looked at doing preventative stuff but who would come on a volunteer basis? Perhaps instead of a fine, instead of forcing them into alternative measures program, anyway, not necessarily john school per se but into counselling, into other areas that gives them the opportunity to address themselves as individuals. That's something that can break through the denial.

Just to say it's illegal is not enough in this country. I think we need to start looking at ourselves. And finding some way through the judicial system to do that is difficult, but it's something that can happen after their day in court. You see, prior to coming to the john school . . . it's a post-charge program, so they do have to be charged prior and then it's voluntary on their part.

I heard one story where the judge . . . a gentleman refused and wanted to go through the court system and the judge fined him \$1,500 and then forced him to go to the john school anyways. So that wasn't pretty and I was glad to hear that. And I don't know if it's true or not. I heard it from the RAMP workers.

I think if it's possible for the judicial system to do that . . . RAMP does that, not just with johns, they send them to the john school. With the children that set fires and B and Es (breaking and entering) and things like that, we have the victim offender mediation. And then of course some of them get sent to us for

counselling to deal with the issues that led to the behaviour. If that could be possible instead of incarcerations, which, you know, let's lock up all the evil guys together in one place — doesn't make sense to me, you know?

**Ms. Jones:** — You see some value in some sort of sensitivity training in schools, like, sensitivity about relationships.

**Mr. Davison:** — Certainly.

**Ms. Jones:** — Respect for women, racial sensitivity.

**Mr. Davison:** — Other than Aboriginal people, women have been just as oppressed. And women struggle against that and fight that and they get angry about it.

And in that, too, we lose a human side. I'm a woman. I'm different. No, you're a human. You're no different than me. I need to recognize that in you, that you're just as capable. And that's getting into spirituality, that sense of you're no different, no better, no less than . . .

And then how do we get above that? And then that takes time. We have to change perceptions. You're a man. You're a woman. You have the specific roles. You're a human being.

And for me to be whole, I need you. I need relationship. It's a man and woman that come together that create another human being. We can't do it in isolation or in a vacuum. So we need to accept one another and we need to find that. It's difficult.

We talk about that in the john school too. How do we do that? I can't be whole ~~\*\*\*~~ without you.<sup>2</sup> You can't heal without me, and I can't heal without you and I can't find myself without you. I need to have relationship to see who I am because I need to reflect it. I need you to point out my faults and hold me accountable. I don't like that at all.

One of the things I did do on the education side — and, Randy, I don't know if you circulated that — . . . probably that book, *Stories From The Street* — ~~I\*~~ I try to cover everything in here and I wonder, ~~A~~ am I going too long here? ~~Do—Y~~ you ~~gothave~~ more questions?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — I've got a couple but you go on with describing your booklet—.

**Mr. Davison:**<sup>\*</sup> — And so I've had an Aboriginal pimp and also a male prostitute, ~~whi~~le male prostitute, Aboriginal male prostitute, a white female prostitute, Indian female prostitute, Indian mother, grandmother, white parent of a prostitute. — I didn't put Ed's story in here.

Interviewed the children — what they thought of prostitution and foster homes. Assessment of the youth known to be involved in prostitution, so we're talking 11-year-olds and up to about 13. Interviewed local residents. Cruising the stroll. What a john goes through. And that's the one thing that they identify with is that cycle.

I spoke to a wife of a john, a john himself, the police, life growing up for someone that gets into prostitution, what they go

through and some of the effects and the damage of it. So Randy has that. And I've been using that to make more people aware. This is what it takes to create a prostitute. This is what it creates to create a john.

They're already hurt and damaged people now, and the word is exploitation. That's what we're doing. They're vulnerable and we're taking advantage of that as a society. We're training them for that. It's phenomenal.

But anyways, I'll shut up.

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

I just have a couple of questions. I opened your booklet to page 56 and I'm just reading some excerpts and it says: "Well, I'm sorry but those are your issues to deal with, not ours." And that's pertaining to the sob stories that people make up and use those . . . the excuses they use for abusing children or people on the streets. "I'm lonely" or "I pay prostitutes so I won't be tempted to abuse my family."

So again back to the response, "Face it guys, most of you have a sexual addiction and this can only be treated by professionals not prostitutes." Now that's a pretty profound line there. And it is because as far as I can see and what I've heard from people throughout the province, and I've been listening closely, and one of the things that tends to happen is that people are telling us about the external events that are happening and they're not really speaking about the real, real, real root causes.

And so sexual addiction is obviously prevalent and problematic. And I think a lot of your presentation is saying, you know, we have to help people understand why that addiction is in place and we need to get down to the bottom of that so that there is a reason for a person to want to break that and to get into healthy living. And until they understand it, they won't.

One of the things that has been mentioned in the past that has just really made . . . really struck my heart, and made me think deeply, was a comment that came from a man working in a centre in rural Saskatchewan. And he said, until the day comes when cultural attitudes towards women change we will continue to have this problem. And I had identified too, along with a presenter at a conference in Edmonton, and I mention this over and over at each of these presentations, because it's something that we're not dealing with, and something we have to bring to the light more.

But what was mentioned at that conference was that the devaluing, and the demeaning, and the degradation of women in our society is one of the root causes. And that as long as people have the attitude that women are sort of less than, and . . . or can be used as commodities, that we will forever, forever deal with this problem and many more. But we won't have a balanced society; we won't have a wholesome society until we regain a consciousness that gives everyone equal value.

And I just really appreciate so much you bringing those things forward, because I think there's something here that has to be studied more. And as legislators, as Carolyn said, we can't — nor can you or anyone — legislate or force an attitude. But I

think by talking about this a little bit more, and by addressing that issue and bringing it into the light a little bit more, that that may be what's needed in order to change things around, and that's going to take a long time.

But in the meantime, we as legislators, I feel, we have a responsibility to enact legislation, or change legislation that we can . . . so that we can do our part to relieve this horrible plight on our society. So sometimes I think well, until people who are gravely offending other people, get the message about how terribly detrimental this is to our children, that maybe we do have to invoke and impart laws that will shock them, if nothing else can. Shock them into understanding just how grievous this activity is.

So I'm just going to close with that, and I'd like to give you a chance to respond, but I know other members, and other people here, have got other commitments that they have to look into so . . . oh, Carolyn . . . Carolyn has got to say something here.

**Ms. Jones:** — . . . ask a question and you can put it in with your response, because it's hard to interrupt you, once you get going.

I'm looking at your breakdown of client schools and the attendance. And I realize that you just began in 1997, but obviously 2000 is quite up from the other years of '98 and '99, and '97 of course when you just started, that's understandable.

Do you have any explanation? Is the incidence greater in 2000 or has there been some changes in the charges that have facilitated this?

**Mr. Davison:** — It's just a question of resources. The police are limited into how many stings they can do in a year. It takes four to five officers to go out and do that and make those arrests. It takes 15 to 20 minutes to make one arrest. And it's quite time-consuming. And the officers have . . . so street crimes that's a part of their area. And so they can only do so many stings in one year.

In the past the average seemed to be four a year. So at Agribition, different things that brought different people to the city of Regina, they would go out and do stings when the traffic was high.

But when there's lots of car thefts, street crimes has to go after that. A lot of B and Es, they have to go after that, so prostitution or soliciting or johns gets put on the back burner.

This year we had six schools. And I don't know if that has to do with Cal Johnston, the new police chief. But it surprised me because normally I was used to four a year and quite comfortable with that. In terms of . . .

**Ms. Jones:** — So you think there's a greater emphasis being placed by the police. Could you translate it into that?

**Mr. Davison:** — That's how I see it. The numbers have changed dramatically in one year. I don't know how the soliciting charges are in terms of the girls on the street, you know. They're still doing 140, 150, 200 arrests, you know. I know every john that's been charged has come through the

johns school as far as I'm aware. I haven't heard of anything going through the court system. So the rest would be the women on the street or the men.

And that's another thing to keep in mind — the boys. I once tracked how many homes that had young boys being sold out and there was nine in North Central, and then we started counselling them and dealing with them. And their aunties and cousins, you know, are getting the boys involved in that. And then those stories are in here too. So there's a lot of boys.

In the last john school I had one homosexual that was arrested on the male track, and that was just Saturday. And so the police are doing stings there now too, so I imagine in the future I will get more homosexuals coming through. And when I say he was homosexual, he's admitted to it. He told me that. And he's married and two children, and so going and relieving his sexual appetite out there on the male stroll. That's what we're dealing with.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well thank you very much, William. We must talk again someday. You've provided us with so much information and it's absolutely valuable. Thank you very much. Thanks Charlene for coming.

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

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Ladies and gentlemen, and we're going to get started with the hearings. We have with us today, and we're very fortunate to have with us today, Albert Kienle, and he's a concerned citizen that would like to give us his testimony. And accompanying him is Pastor Merv Switzer; and Pastor Switzer will be assisting communications here today.

So before we get started we're just going to take the opportunity to have the members of our committee introduce themselves to both of you.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Don Toth, out of Moosomin.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I'm Peter Prebble, and I'm the MLA for Saskatoon Greystone.

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

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — And Arlene Julé, and I'm the MLA for Humboldt and co-chairing the committee with Mr. Prebble.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — There's a couple of other members who are not here. I'm expecting at least one of them will join us. Carolyn Jones, I know is in the building. And is Kevin here right now? Do you know?

**A Member:** — No, he's not here.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — No, okay. And the other member is one of our Regina MLAs, Kevin Yates, and he's absent today. But Carolyn should be joining us shortly.

So I hope you'll just take your time, Albert. It's great to have you here. And I know we had a chance to talk on the phone when you called me. So we're looking forward to your testimony.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay, good.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — So just start any time you'd like to.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay. Well I'll turn it over to my pastor, and then you can ask me any questions that you want. Okay?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Sure.

**Pastor Switzer:** — Yes, when the questions start I'll just evaporate. I find it a real privilege today, committee, to speak for Albert. I've known Albert for a long time and he's a credible man, does a lot of reading and communicating with his computer, so I'm on his e-mail list.

I'll read some highlighted areas of his presentation, which I think you have in completion; and then we'll have you ask him any questions you wish to. Okay?

In the introduction . . . television is a staple in most homes in Canada. Canadian adults spend an average of 23 hours every week watching television. And teenagers spend 17.5 hours, while children averaging 17.8 hours. Television entertainment informs and educates us.

The TV (television) programs we watch shape us individually and as a society. That's why as a society we must work to ensure that the types of programs available to Canadians do not portray violence of any kind — physical, sexual, etc. — as socially acceptable. The Vanier Institute of the Family estimates that by the time children finish elementary school, they have witnessed at least 8,000 murders and more than a hundred thousand acts of violence on television.

So Albert's premise is: while the cause and solution to child prostitution are many and varied, I wish to focus on the destructive influence of our media channels. Ideas have consequences and TV is a great communicator of ideas to our youth.

Is the media giving the incorrect signal concerning sex by . . . and so by cleaning up the airwaves of sex smut, would we lessen the chances of innocent children being caught in the web of the sex trade?

I believe violence goes beyond the overt acts of outright violence to the suggestive and not so suggestive language and attitudes towards sex and human sexuality. So we may think of it as benign but the benign is often more dangerous and is more readily available and acceptable and therefore more difficult to contain. It is not the victims of the sex trade who are to be judged, it is the media who stand guilty as charged.

I am not promoting censorship, but accountability.

The portrayal of sex does not leave much to the imagination

today in today's media — whether it be music, TV, video games, computer games, or the Internet — the morality is encouraged by television and enabled by the Internet and so in focusing mainly upon television, I'm not limiting myself to that alone.

He makes the point that we have an open season on sex today. You can't switch on the television without being bombarded with loose sex talk, jokes, etc. Even commercials from cars to soap use sex to sell their products. It's marketable and its marketability creates an atmosphere for the real thing, which can lead to violence. In this light, the incorrect portrayal of sex is a form of violence against children. He suggests here that young minds and old are fertile ground for these deadly seeds to produce a harvest of destructive behaviour and violent acts. Sex has been glamorized and degraded to the point where children are shown by example that using sex for personal excitement, fulfilment, and gain doesn't hurt. And if you want to be cool and get ahead in life, sex is the way to go.

So technology is giving children the idea that they are the measure of all things, and the reality can be manipulated to their personal liking, that by pulling a few strings here and there their life will benefit them.

He applauds the efforts of CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission) to provide guiding principles to curb TV violence. However, children do watch beyond the 9 p.m. watershed hour. This does not cover the seemingly ordinary run-of-the-mill crude and unsavoury talk about sex portrayed or pre-watershed TV. This is my concern. If not directly then most certainly indirectly, this cheapens sex and creates an atmosphere for child prostitution.

So sex within sacred boundaries is healthy. He makes that point. And then he talks about the current industry sponsoring; sponsored rates are fragmented and sometimes not good foundation for us to make our judgments.

So we're to the next page. Not all television is bad but the data shows the negative effects of exposure to violence . . . inappropriate sexuality and offensive language are very convincing. Current literature suggests the following: Canadian children watch excessive amounts of television; there is a relationship between watching television and an increase in the violent behaviour of children; and television may have a deleterious effect on learning and academic performance; and irresponsible sex behaviour may be encouraged by television; and television is a very effective way of advertising products to children of various ages.

Over the next he talks about safeguarding our future and safeguarding our children. He talks about the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) *In Focus* when featuring the dilemma of sex trade earlier this year concluded that the spiritual component in life is a necessary one. And if we're to effect positive change, as a member of the Christian community, he states, I believe this is a missing link in our attempt and is within the context that I now speak.

He talks about religious faith does play a large important part on the Christian landscape. Polls indicate 84 per cent believe in

God; 69 per cent believe in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Offsetting this however, there's only 20 per cent attending church. His conclusion, there is a discrepancy between our being and our doing. Our actions do not reflect our believing. He is thankful however the church is involved in several ways to combat this plague of child prostitution or more accurately child abuse.

And I was recently made aware of a joint initiative of the Saskatoon Police Chief Owen Scott and Fire Chief Bill Hewitt. And they called a special meeting of church leaders recently and extolled upon them the virtues of their involvement in ridding the streets of crime, including child prostitution. Their perspective is that the root cause of the problem is spiritual, as spirituality is jurisdiction of the church . . . and they need to commit to helping resolve that problem.

He talks about life in a pluralistic society, allows equal opportunity for the voice of faith to be heard in the public square. He makes a very important point here. Admittedly, the Christian community has not done well in recent times. Its record for sex scandals to the treatment of Aboriginal families has been aired for all to see.

We are, and I include myself, as a community of sinners. We stand in need of redemption ourselves. So does that remove us from our responsibility as citizens in community? Far from it. The wounded are often the best healers. We do have something to offer and the forgiveness and healing which we have and are receiving through Jesus Christ we can share with the larger community and is a reflection of divine purpose.

It talks about why being involved. And he points out the points that he has now already made because child prostitution is a criminal act, and as such the results are there's wounded children, these wounds and children's dignity are matters to God and God's people. I'll just run over that quickly and give you his conclusion.

The problem of sexual . . . of child prostitution, pardon me, is real and darkening. The johns, inadequate and ineffective laws, and poverty are all part of the issue. To push against this evil tide the whole community living must involve itself. We must seek to save the youth of today, to give them alternatives that are more enriching and rewarding than that of selling their bodies for fear, grief, disease, and often death. We must stand up for them. Our youth, whether Aboriginal or non-, are not a piece of meat to be sold to the highest bidder. They are persons of value created for higher purpose than the low life they already exist in. They do matter to God; and it is time they matter to us.

We must empower them with hope and meaning and purpose, and a faith in God that will keep them through the good and the bad times. We must give them something to believe in. Ideas, whether positive or negative, do have consequences. And a proper belief system results in proper behaviour and actions. If we do not provide the foundations, they will indeed be the lost generation. And what will we have for the next generation?

We as a society do seek to teach and instil values, moral systems to our children. And yet, on the other hand, we devalue

the very system on which values and morals were built, that of religious and spiritual realities. Devaluing ultimately leads to dehumanizing. If foundations for a happy and health society are destroyed, either by will or neglect, what will the future hold for us and our children?

Therefore, to this committee and our society I would say, listen to us. Listen to the voice of faith. It is also the voice of reason. We can help. Take our hand. Let's work together redemptively to protect our children and society as a whole.

I also would challenge the Christian community — he's talking to me here — get off your laurels. Become an agent of the restorative wholesomeness we were designed to be. Ours is a message of hope and life and it is relevant to the problem at hand. Get on with it.

Thank you. Albert Kienle.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you very much for communicating to us ever so effectively Albert's message; and thank you, Albert, for taking the time and the thought and the commitment to children and our society. Thank you for putting the time into this. It's very, very wonderful of you to do that.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay, good.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — We're going to, Albert, have committee members that might have some comments or exchange that they might like to have with you right now and so I'll open up . . .

**Mr. Kienle:** — I might add that if you don't understand me, I don't mind if you ask me to repeat it, okay.

**Mr. Switzer:** — And I will help you too, if we need that.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay, good.

**Mr. Switzer:** — We'll work as a team.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you. Thank you, Albert. And if you don't understand us, you let me know too, okay.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay. But I'm an easygoing type of a person so I don't mind if you don't know.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Thanks, Albert. I know that Don Toth has a question, so we'll start with Mr. Toth.

**Mr. Toth:** — First of all, thank you, Albert, and thank you for taking the time to come and give us some of your thoughts. You've known me long enough that there's probably a camaraderie between us and our view on . . . and the spiritual matters.

But I would like to just mention as well that I'm not sure if you've talked to a lot of the First Nations community, but some of the testimony we've heard and that has been brought to our attention certainly reflects from the First Nations community

... reflects something of their spirituality as well. And they keep talking about getting back to some of the tradition so their young people begin to understand who they are. And a lot ... when they talk about tradition, a lot of it is getting back to some of the spiritual heritage and values they have which they feel that they have lost and their youth have lost.

I don't disagree with you on the fact that I believe basically, morally, in this country we have really lowered our standard, lowered our values, and I think television certainly has played a major role and impact in that regard.

The question I would have, Albert, just from your experience — and I know you read a lot, and research on the Net; you've got a very keen mind, just from having talked to you on a number of occasions — what would be some suggestions that you would make to this committee in regards to how we deal with the media and television. Because we could say ... like as a parent, I have a responsibility, and I can give some direction in my home, but that doesn't necessarily reflect what's going to happen in somebody else's home. And I think the media, they share what they feel the audience is calling for, and so have you got some thoughts around some of these questions and where we could maybe go, or some suggestions?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Well I do believe it begins at home, but again I do believe that the whole community has to work together. If we don't work together as a community, I mean every part of the community has to be involved, and if we don't then we are defeating our purpose. So what I would like to have done is the community, which includes the church and different, ordinary citizens, I think we need to work together.

But of course, like you said, you can teach your children at home and that's where it begins, but then what happens in your neighbour's home, you know.

So somehow, I think we need to make the community aware and we need to get the different organizations, the different churches and we ... like it might be ... When I talk about the faith communities, to me that means the church. But I do realize that not everybody goes to church and there's different groups of faith. But there are guiding principles that guide every faith and every good work to give as a community. I think it would help to combat some other problems.

**Mr. Toth:** — Yes. I've got another one. I'm just trying to look for a quote here. I should have underlined it.

Talking about the Christian community and about the faith community and I think ... right: "There is a discrepancy between our being and our doing. Our actions do not reflect our believing." I think that's a good point. Certainly, it's well thought out. And that is something that I think really speaks in a way probably somewhat negatively of the faith community, in the fact that, over the past while our actions have not exactly lived up to what we were speaking or believing. And I put myself in there because I believe that.

But I think, Albert, just from what we have found out so far and from the discussions that have been brought to us from many groups and organizations working with children on the street, is

there certainly is a lack of not only family values and principles, but the ability to really become parents. We found many of the young people on the streets have talked about the fact that they've grown up in very dysfunctional homes and, to be honest with you, I'm not exactly sure how we settle that.

We hear the problem, where we talk about maybe poverty is an issue and yes, some of these children come from very poor homes, but they come from every level of society. And when it comes to ... When we look at poverty, on one hand if you say it's a poor situation, you need to put more money into it, we were just told by one of the witnesses that pouring more money isn't necessarily the answer because some of the children are on the street because their parents are looking for the income to support a drug habit. So more money doesn't necessarily mean it's going to go towards the children.

I'm not sure, Albert, have you had the privilege of talking to some groups that have worked with children on the streets? Got any suggestions or ideas in regards to some of the views they've shared and what you've given some thought to? Would you have any recommendations to the committee?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay, excuse me, I couldn't talk because ... (inaudible) ... so can you repeat your question?

**Mr. Toth:** — Sometimes I have a hard time remembering two minutes ago.

Actually what I was wondering, Albert — you've given a lot of thought to this obviously — and from your research, I'm just wondering if either via the Net if you've talked with certain groups, organizations, who are currently working with children on the street to get some ideas. And, if you have, if there are any suggestions you might have to the committee as to recommendations that as a committee we would make to the legislature.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay. No, I have not talked to people. Most of my information comes from the Internet. But one thing I have found out is that TV does play a big part in how we ... (inaudible) ... people. And I'm not here to say that we have to do away with TV but I do believe that somehow we need to be more responsible about what goes on TV because young people want to model what they see on TV, and there is so much on TV that drags us down. I believe that people are the most important commodity that we have. And if we don't treat people more as a human being made in the image of God, then we treat them as a dog, you know. I have always believed that people are more important than anything else. And if we can start treating people as a human being, I think we would be further ahead.

Today's young people, they have a hard time. And I think it sometimes it's our fault more than their fault because we don't give them anything to really believe in. You know, it almost appears that we allowed the TV to bring up our children. And TV is not the educational item, the home is. And if we would give, if we as a community in our homes ... if we would, again, if we would return to some of the basic foundations our children would be better off.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Albert. Albert, I think that if people in this province would have to sit down and write the report that you just wrote, put that much thought into it, maybe we'd go a long way to solving the problem. Because a lot of people just aren't thinking about it. So I really commend you on the effort and the work you put into this.

And I also have to admit that I know you are a lot more educated on the Internet than I am — in fact, I'm probably an extreme in this room because I don't use it very much — so I know that the work that you do and the time that you spend on the Internet gives you a chance to go to the various chat rooms and see what . . . listen to what young people are writing.

So I want to believe that our young people . . . in fact, I do believe that, by far, the majority of our young people are good young people. I think you're right when you say they don't know maybe sometimes what to believe in because maybe they're not taught, maybe there's nothing to stand on.

But when you go to the various chat rooms, do you see a lot of young people who are searching for a spirituality or a . . . maybe not a faith issue and I . . . (inaudible) . . . because everybody is different.

But please tell me that you see that there's a lot of good people, good young people out there that have got an idea for a bright future.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Yes. Well, it is too bad that good news is not reported more. It is the bad news that we hear. I was talking to Mary and it is the bad news that we hear of. And we have the . . . like, there is a problem with a bad bug and we have to deal with the bad bug. But where do you . . . I think it would be so good if we would hear more good news about what our young people are doing, you know . . . (inaudible) . . . question June.

I think young people want to believe. They want something to believe in. They don't want to go through life without a purpose. We were made to be protective people and I believe that young people, old people, they want to believe but they don't know what to believe because society as a whole doesn't know what they believe either.

And I do believe that one of the problems is because the church has not been involved. We have not been asked to be involved or we don't want to be involved because we have so much going on of our own and who, okay, who wants to get involved with prostitution, you know.

I mean I don't know too many churches or too many faith groups, I don't care who they are, but I don't find too many people want to get their hands dirty. We don't want to get involved in the nitty-gritty problems of young people, be it drugs, be it prostitution. It's easier to complain than try to help.

**Mr. Harper:** — And thank you very much for your fine presentation, it was very informative.

Just a couple of questions on your take on television. I think it goes without saying that television certainly is influencing young children as they grow up. The concern I have is our

media, period, whether it be television, whether it be newspapers, whether it be books, is very much influenced, if not dominated, by our neighbour from the South — United States — and their take on society.

And I'm wondering if you have any ideas of how we, who in this country who have allowed our media to be so largely influenced by and dominated by a foreign power, how we would go about regulating the subject matter that is on our television? Because quite frankly, television, print media, even shows in the theatre, and I would think even the Internet is much dominated by the United States' ideas, their moralities; their influence is very large. And how would we as a nation limit what our young people are exposed to through an American-controlled media?

**Mr. Kienle:** — That is the problem. It's not the main problem but yes we are influenced by our neighbours. But have you got anything?

**Mr. Switzer:** — I guess we'll never come to the point where we have control of what comes at us. We have to control from within. You can't stop the birds from flying over your head but you can stop them from building nests in your hair.

**Mr. Harper:** — That's a good point, good point.

**Mr. Kienle:** — But yes, I guess the problem is how can we keep our TV programming clean? Because we do keep too much of all programs from . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes.

But again it goes back; again if we look at the big picture, we want to quit and give up because the problem is getting so big. But if we take one easy step at a time. If we build . . . (inaudible) . . . We can't avoid coverage over the TV but we can keep what comes in our own home.

And you know, if we look at all the problems as a big picture, and we do need to do that, but we need to start with each one of us again. There are things that I can do that you can't do. There are things that you can do that . . . I mean there are things that I can . . . you know what I mean. I mean each one of us can do something.

And if we don't start somewhere, then we don't do nothing. And somebody has put it that if good men don't do something, then evil will take over. And I think the committee; they have a responsibility. I believe that it just needs to really get involved. Every faith community needs to get involved. It has to begin with you and I, and if we don't do something then it's not going to get done.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you very much. Carolyn, do you have anything?

**Ms. Jones:** — At this time, I don't.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay, thank you. What I would like to ask both, you, Albert, and Pastor Switzer, is what are the specific ways that you think that the church could get involved? Now I think the whole role of a lot of organizations is being questioned and reassessed these days and you have challenged



the church to take a role in this in regards to this issue.

So in practical and pragmatic ways, Pastor Switzer, what kind of a different vision do you think the church might be able to have of themselves these days? Obviously the neglect and abuse of children and of people all the way around is happening and that does not lend to human dignity.

So what I'm thinking is possibly we should have our leadership of the churches that maybe speaks more about this issue. I think we need to maybe have some suggestions from the faith community, from the leaders in the faith communities, as to how they might change their overall mandate or their purpose of looking at . . . or looking at it right now in the light of the 21st century and what we are dealing with as church and what is our role and our responsibility as church in an environment of love.

**Mr. Switzer:** — What I find is — Albert and I have talked about this just before we came into the meeting — that my daily schedule is very full and in order for me to, and I think I speak on behalf of others, in order for me to do something pragmatically about this, I'd have to do some prioritizing and changing of schedule and that's maybe not a bad thing.

But I did think of something as I listened here in this discussion today. A couple of years ago there was a committee set up in the education department — I don't know if you as a committee were aware of that — under Larry Huber and it was to do with setting some standards in the education system in our province. And he had been commissioned to get information. And in that committee he had representation from First Nations, he had representation from the Moslem community, he had representation from the Jewish community, and representation from the many different churches. I was asked to serve on that and we met for, oh, months; we'd meet once every second week for a while. And you know what I discovered in that — to my amazement but when I sit back it makes sense. We really didn't have a lot of disagreements.

From the First Nations leadership through the Moslem leadership through the evangelical through the old-line church, whatever, we had common understandings about what was right and wrong. And another thing it did, where the polarities had formed as we discussed about problems that surface in schools, I became aware, and other leaders became aware, we weren't really poles apart. We misunderstood each other. And I found that a very helpful process and do you do that kind of thing. Quite involving.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — How would you be able to take that kind of education that you've received there and then transpose it to the faith community out there that you, in fact, maybe once a week or twice a week meet with? And in fact in having affirmative action to do simple things — like for instance, we recognize that there are people in society who are suffering and reach out towards them — has there been any sort of a strategy that . . .

**Mr. Switzer:** — Yes, we can go through our channels that we have there. The purpose of this committee that was pulled together was to prepare a report for the educational system so they had an understanding of what the community out there was

. . . community out there was asking for in standards of education and even governed the moral standards.

Now how do we convey that back out again — as I've served on that committee — back out to the faith community. I would say we had a, we had a glitch there. I did share in a ministerial. But maybe we're weak in that area.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Could I ask you just a personal question?

**Mr. Switzer:** — Sure.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — And you really can answer it or you can choose not to. If for instance someone brought to your attention that there was a young, a young person, maybe 18, 19 years old, that had to, in order to make ends meet, had to go to the streets to, you know, in order to make some money, and you were aware as a pastor of that person's location and their home or where they lived, what kind of things do you think that you would be able to do as part of the faith community to assist that person? Or what would you be prepared to do?

I understand that we are all part of the faith community. But as a leader in the faith community, how would you address that?

**Mr. Switzer:** — Well we've been a fair amount . . . We have a fair amount of involvement in getting people off the street. We give them support. It involves some financial support for a time. There is also the need of protection, physical protection, and sometimes they have to leave the city for their own protection.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Do you assist them in that effort?

**Mr. Switzer:** — We worked through that with some individuals. We don't have a big program in place.

Now there are some . . . There's the love lives here bus that drives our streets. I know the people in charge of that and I support them and we assist them some. That's not specifically out of our church, but we have become involved.

And what would I do, you say, when I would know that somebody was on the street and if I knew their pastor, what would I do? Is that what you asked me?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well, no. I guess more practically if we take it into a real, real scenario. If it was brought to your attention . . .

**Mr. Switzer:** — Okay.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — . . . that there was a young woman or a young man that had left the streets and had obtained their own residence, and it was brought to your attention that they needed support or . . .

**Mr. Switzer:** — We have paid; we have paid their mortgage payment.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay. But, okay, what about emotional support? Psychological support?

**Mr. Switzer:** — Yes, we have small support groups that they can attend.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — They can attend, okay. If this were in a rural or a northern area where it was a remote community?

**Mr. Switzer:** — A little more difficult for us, yes.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes. But the faith community as a whole, the churches, when the churches assemble sometimes for their . . . like there's the congress of world churches and so on that if this issue was brought forward, do you think that there would be a pragmatic strategy that could be employed to address this, irregardless of what area a person was in — a young person in need. Do you think that faith community would be willing to go that far to make this issue a major priority?

**Mr. Switzer:** — Well we sure should be. To me the big issue is, the big issue is people have to feel worth something. And we can put all the fences up and all the gates and all the protections and everything else. But if they feel like dirt, they're going to live like it. And my involvement personally, where the river meets the road is, every time I meet somebody then I look at him and I see that they think they're not worth anything, I want to say to them, come on, you're worth a lot.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — They need to experience that worth in some way?

**Mr. Switzer:** — Yes, and it's very difficult where some of them live to . . . But somehow we've got to get them believing that, help them work through the process. But when people feel they are worthwhile, they're going to walk like they're worthwhile.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well thank you very much.

**Mr. Switzer:** — And it's part of our responsibility and I know we're doing not a very good job.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Well I think every effort is worth the while too and to be commended. So sometimes we seem to be just taking baby steps, but those baby steps are very important. They lead us to bigger steps and so that's important.

**Mr. Switzer:** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Peter, do you have questions?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I do, yes. Thanks, Arlene. Albert, I want to thank you for what I think is an exceptionally well-written and thoughtful presentation. And we haven't had many presentations that look at the big context in which children's sexual abuse on the street is . . . into which that fits. You know, we haven't looked at the . . . we spent time sometimes during the discussion sessions looking at some of the bigger questions.

But this is an important submission because I think it looks at those big questions. And it's the first submission to specifically

address in detail the questions of the effect of television on children's attitudes toward violence and inappropriate sexual behaviour. So I think it's a very important contribution and I thank you for it.

I think we should — and I'm just flagging this for all committee members — I think we should make a point of looking at the *Report of the Ontario Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry*. And I've asked our staff person, Randy Pritchard, to pull that report. I think we should specifically look at the recommendations that were made in that report. I realize it's back in 1977 so that's 23 years ago.

And I take it, Albert, that you have identified more recent studies. Could you let us know the title of the U.S. 1995 study so that we might examine that because I'd like to see if we've got more recent material than 1977?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Okay. I've got on my computer about eight different . . . where I got some of my information. I could e-mail it to you . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — That would be excellent, Albert, if you could do that. Thank you. Thank you for . . .

**Mr. Switzer:** — Does he have your e-mail address?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Yes, yes.

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

I think one of the tough things, you know . . . as you know, communications . . . I mean there's two vantages that we can come at this. One is encouraging people to take individual responsibility for what they do with television and you were speaking to that earlier and I thought you were very articulate on it. The other is what we do on the regulatory side. And of course here the regulatory apparatus is at the federal level rather than the provincial level so we'd be, in effect, limited to making recommendations to the federal government in this regard.

But I'm wondering if you have any suggestions to the committee about the nature of the recommendations that you think we should make, if you think we should make them. If you think we should be making recommendations to the federal government with respect to the regulation of violence on television, I'd be interested in hearing what your suggestions are with respect to what recommendations you think we should make.

And you can think about that and e-mail us if you don't want to speak to it now. But if you've got any thoughts that you want to put in the transcript . . .

**Mr. Switzer:** — While he's thinking about that, can I add a . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — And Pastor, I hope you'll feel very free to comment on this as well.

**Mr. Switzer:** — There are programs available out there — computer programs, and they do affect television as well — where you can actually program what can be viewed in your

home. Should government levels look into that kind of . . . it's a tool made available to families where they maybe are weak in their structure, where they could decide on a structure and then have something to help them when they're not home and their kids come home, to protect the kids from what they view in the absence of the parent.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — We use this in our home with respect to our computer.

**Mr. Switzer:** — Yes. Okay.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — It's trickier. I don't know of such an apparatus with respect to television.

**Mr. Switzer:** — I was trying to think. I've seen something somewhere but I can't remember how it relates. It'd probably have to be that your signal goes through your computer to your television and I'm not familiar with that.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Albert, did you have any comments?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Well I don't know how because, you know, when it covers two different programs on TV . . . Whatever makes the most money.

**Mr. Switzer:** — Whatever makes . . . what was that again?

**Mr. Kienle:** — Whatever makes the most money.

**Mr. Switzer:** — Okay, whatever makes the most money.

**Mr. Kienle:** — So I mean there seems to be a market for dirty movies or dirty programs on TV.

**Mr. Switzer:** — And it's hard to control the individual minds.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Yes. But I think it goes back to what pastor said. And this is where I come from — people are important. If they don't feel important, they'll do whatever. But people need to feel important. That is one thing that I try to do.

I mean when I see a young child I try to take time to talk to them, to make them feel that they are important even if I'm in a wheelchair. They are people that I can touch, that I can make them feel that they are important. If they don't feel important, they'll go out and they'll become prostitutes. I mean that's not the only problem, but if people could feel that they do matter to somebody.

Then, you know, then children do matter to God. They do. And they need to matter to each one of us. And each one of us can do something. We might not be able to do everything, but we can do something. There might not be no easy answers but one answer, one child at a time; we can make a difference.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Well, Albert, thank you very, very much. Is there any other questions that the committee members have?

**Mr. Toth:** — I just want to make one comment in regards to

TV and I think it comes to . . . We don't have a satellite dish yet and one of the reasons I've haven't made that choice is not that there isn't some good programming available, but it's the fact that you have to buy it in blocks.

I think we should be free to choose whatever program we want. You wouldn't have to put black boxes up to eliminate the viewing that you didn't want available. And that's something I've felt strongly about. I believe there was a court challenge in BC (British Columbia) a number of years ago in that regard.

I think it's something that certainly should be looked at. And maybe if more of the public demanded it, CRTC would give some thought to it. Because I don't know why we should be forced to, in order to get a specific channel that we would really like to watch or was family viewing, have to have five channels in a package that in many cases are very offensive. So that's just a thought I throw out.

**Mr. Kienle:** — I will make one more comment and then I'll shut up.

But, you know, why don't we . . . Each one of us can do something, and so why don't . . . If there would be enough people complain to the TV network, if we would write to the newspapers, if we were to become the . . . (inaudible) . . . voice that we can be, we can really make some changes. It's not impossible. But sometimes we look at the big picture and we don't know what to do. But if each one of us around this table, if we would write to the newspapers, write to the TV, or now with the e-mail, man, we can do things that we could never do before. But we need to get off our butts and get going.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you, Albert, some very wise and good words there.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Carolyn, I know you had a question.

**Ms. Jones:** — Actually I didn't have a question. It was a comment to both the presenters and, indeed to our own committee.

And that is the problem that we've been speaking a lot about is the responsibility of what our children watch on television. And what we hear in our committee meetings, so much is about dysfunctional families that don't take the responsibility of ensuring that their children are raised in a healthy and wholesome environment.

And when we're in remote communities and we hear about children on reserves who are all in a house while the parents are in a different place partying and doing drugs and that. There is things to be done for responsible homes but, you know, then taking that individual responsibility doesn't translate into some of the most needy people.

However your last comments were very timely as I was formulating what I was going to say in that if we would each get off our individual butts and try to affect changes in the whole system.

Unfortunately, we all know that sex sells and this is an extremely commercially driven society that we are living in, so it's going to take enormous effort on everyone's part to try to affect change in that area because the commercials are full of it, violent shows are everywhere, and it's going to take an enormous effort to affect change.

But I appreciate your comments and I think you're entirely right that it's one voice alone is not much but one voice multiplied by several million is a lot.

Thank you very much for your presentation. And it was a pleasure to meet you.

Mr. Kienle: — Thank you, thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you very much, Albert and Pastor Switzer for being with us today, for sharing yourselves, and for sharing your knowledge and your understanding and your suggestions. We appreciate them more than you'll ever know. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Switzer:** — Thank you, and I respect the individual views of each one of you. But of late I've felt a greater responsibility as a leader in the community to give backing to you people in the Legislative Assembly here.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — We appreciate that very, very much.

**Mr. Switzer:** — In fact I've made a personal commitment that I'll pray for you every day, and if nothing else, to give you some moral support. I might show up in the coffee shop.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you. We'll be happy to see you. And thank you very much.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — We'll make sure you both get a copy of our final report. And we're very grateful to you for coming today.

**Mr. Kienle:** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — We're just going to take a couple of minutes break here, five minutes, and then we'll resume our hearings.

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

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Our next witness is Tanya Buhnai. Tanya is a board member with the Core Community Group in the city of Regina. Tanya, we want to welcome you to our hearings. We're really looking forward to your presentation.

I know you came in after members of the committee had introduced themselves, so just before you get started I'm just going to invite members of the committee to introduce themselves. And I'll start with my colleague and Co-Chair, Arlene. Arlene, go ahead.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Hi, Tanya. Happy to have you with us today. Arlene Julé, and I'm the MLA for Humboldt, and

co-chairing the committee.

**Ms. Draude:** — I'm June Draude. I'm the MLA from Kelvington-Wadena.

**Mr. Toth:** — Don Toth, MLA from Moosomin.

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

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

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — And, Tanya, I represent a Saskatoon constituency. It's called Saskatoon Greystone. It's the university area in Saskatoon.

Now we're missing one of our committee members, and that's Kevin Yates, and he represents Regina Dewdney. He's unfortunately not able to be with us today.

So welcome, and please proceed whenever you're ready.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Thank you. Well prostitution is a really big problem in my neighbourhood as well as north central in Regina. I feel that addressing the concerns of child prostitution is just the tip of the iceberg. If you're not going to address all the concerns concerning prostitution, involving poverty, no low-income housing available, I mean what are you going to do? As well as policing of it.

You know, poverty is a really big issue concerning children that are on the street. Now whether they're being put out there by a family member or a friend or a pimp or whatnot, I mean poverty plays a role in that.

The welfare issues, you know. A single mother with one child hasn't had an increase since 1983. Now you're given so much for your living allowance. Where are you going to live? You have to live in a poverty-stricken area because that's all you can afford.

And if you, I mean, even want to live . . . you know, I mean have plumbing in your house or whatnot, you're taking money out of your grocery money in order just to pay your rent. I mean a lot of these people, I mean they just . . . they can't afford to live anywhere else except for in a poor inner-city neighbourhood.

I don't see any long-term programs in place. Everything that's in place at the moment through outreach programs and whatnot, are short term. Short term doesn't work. Because you can take a child and put them in a safe house — or a young girl — put them in a safe house, and then what do you do? You turn them back out onto the street. They have no money. They have no education. They're back to living where they were living. They're back running with their old friends.

And the cycle is just repeating itself over and over and over again. There is no long-term programming in effect, and we know that short-term programming doesn't have an impact at all.

The policing matters. You can't . . . I mean if there's a 12-year-old girl on the street, you can't take her out . . . you

can't take her off the street. I mean I don't know why we don't have some type of legislation. I mean Alberta's trying, they're starting. But you know, I'm sorry, taking a 13-year-old prostitute and taking her to Mobile Crisis, they can't hold her. She doesn't want to be there; she turns around and walks right out the door. So we're just . . . You know, we're just back to repeating.

I'd like to see mandatory jail time for men that are picking up. And what we call a child prostitute under 14, that age should be raised to at least 16 — at least. And I mean the . . . What? We're giving them 24 months as the maximum jail penalty — that's ridiculous. And most of these men don't even hit the system.

Four hundred dollars — I'll go to johns school for a day. Nobody needs to know. My family doesn't need to know; my wife doesn't need to know; my co-workers don't need to know. Slap me on the wrist and I'll be on my way because that's about the equivalent that that does. These men are pedophiles that are picking up these young girls. And, you know, I'm sorry, but you'd get a longer sentence for robbing the convenience store down the street. This is ridiculous.

I'd like to see mandatory jail time for the men that are picking up these girls, and I'd like to see that age raised to 16, not 14. And also the men that are picking up girls of that age, I don't think they should have the option to go to johns school. I think they should be going before a judge — with maybe going to johns school too — but I don't think that they should be able to pay their way out of that.

And let's see what else here. As far as policing goes, we have the vice squad which they've just cut from seven to five members. There is two women on the vice squad at the moment. So when they go out to do their stings and those women, you know, go out there as hookers, it's not hard to know who are the only two women in the city that pose as hookers. I mean these men are out there every single day.

I'd like to see more police presence as in let's get the foot patrols back in the areas that need it. Because, I mean, I live on a stroll. There's a girl standing across the street from my house every single, bloody day. And the police will drive by — they don't move. Why should they? They're not breaking any laws. There's no loitering laws. I mean nothing's being done. The police are not a deterrent as far as that goes.

I'd like to be . . . I'd like to see them doing more foot patrols though. And like the sting operations that they're doing are . . . I mean for the amount of men that went to johns school last year, I have more men driving down my street every single day than how many men went through johns school last year, so I mean I don't think that . . . I don't think it's adequate. I don't think what they're doing is substantial enough. I mean it's like getting rid of one hooker and saying wahoo, we did a great job. You know, I mean, it's not working.

In our community nobody feels safe. We have a lot of seniors in our community that are afraid to go outside after dark. I mean, I, as a young woman, I can't be out in my own yard doing yard work without men cruising the block four, five, six times. Like

this is ridiculous. Children being harassed by the street workers and the johns and the pimps to get off the streets. This is their neighbourhood; they should be allowed to play. And just the noise disturbance, the traffic. We should have a traffic study in all areas of the city where there are prostitution. Traffic studies . . . the noise is another factor.

The hazardous waste that goes along with it — the used needles; the used condoms. I've been fighting with the health district for a long time to get a condom pick-up program in place which they are stalling me. They say they have a program in place, but they're stalling me. I mean, I see five-year-old children walking down the street — hey, they just found a balloon, a red balloon. And where's that balloon going? In their mouth. They just picked up a used condom and put it in their mouth.

I mean, I don't know. In any other neighbourhood in this city, this would not be tolerated. It would not be tolerated. But because we're a low-income neighbourhood, nobody cares. Nobody cares.

Our property values have decreased. We have an elementary school in our neighbourhood. These children have to walk to and from school by . . . you know, walk by street workers, walk by the johns that are harassing them, walk by the pimps that are harassing them. And I'm sorry, but no child should think it normal to see a hooker standing on the corner. This is not normal. I mean, I didn't grow up in this area, and I don't think it's normal to see a hooker standing on the corner, but these kids do. And, I mean, that's a really strong message . . . a really strong message that's being sent to them that it's okay, it's normal that, you know, that they're there.

And I mean I've talked to the school board. I mean they don't want to have hazardous waste on their school property. Used condoms litter the school ground, needles, you know. And I mean the health district says that there's no health risk. Come on. I mean I just . . . I think it's completely unreasonable.

And I mean I just don't think that we can address the issues of child prostitution without dealing with prostitution as a whole. You know a lot of these . . . the parents are putting these kids out on the street. Well you think that child is going to testify against a parent? I don't think so.

I've read your action committee newsletter, whatever thingy. ~~Whatever~~. Everybody familiar with this?

Okay. And it says that the province will not introduce amendments following the forcible confinement of children and youth as victims of child abuse. Children and youth need our support, and forcible confinement is too much like punishment.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I'm sorry, I'm not sure what you're referring to but it's something I haven't seen.

**Mr. Pritchard:** — It's a government publication that was put out in 1998.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Okay? So we're not going to have forcible confinement. So what are we going to do? I mean it says it right

there, ~~w.~~ We're not having forcible confinement.

So you pick up a 12-year-old which you can't hold legally anyways, take them to Mobile Crisis, they're out the door, and it says that you will not introduce amendments ~~for~~ forcible confinement. ~~S.~~ so I'd like to know what this action committee is even here for if we're not going to force confinement of these kids?

-And it's all fine and dandy to put somebody in a ~~h~~ safe house but after they're there for two days, there's no long-term programs available for them. They're right back out on the street — uneducated, living in poverty — and what options do they have? Not a lot, not a lot of options.

I have read your . . . I don't know if this is accurate any ~~more~~, this thing here — the *Federal/Provincial Territorial Working Group on Prostitution*. It talks about a lot of points — publishing john plate numbers, ~~I~~ I have a real problem with the whole secrecy surrounding it. You rob a bank, your name is in the paper. You pick up a 12-year-old girl and it's hush, hush, secret, secret, which, I mean, I don't understand that. I don't understand that. And I don't like somebody deciding my health risks for me.

I mean for any woman out there, women should be appalled that this is going on. You know, I'm sorry but if your husband is picking up a prostitute, I'm sorry if it destroys your marriage, ~~I~~ I'm sorry if your kids are embarrassed at school, ~~I~~ I'm sorry if you're ridiculed at work. But you know, your family had a lot of problems before that. And if your marriage breaks down, well you should have thought about that before.

And I mean this should be considered rape of these children. These men are pedophiles that are going after these young girls and young boys. And I mean there's just . . . they're getting a slap on the wrist. There is no penalty involved because the majority of these men never see the courts, never see the courts.

And I mean I just  ~~. . .~~  I don't understand the big secrecy issue around this. Put their names in *The Leader-Post*. Advertise them on the news, ~~I~~ I mean this is ridiculous and I don't think that it should be secretive.

I mean I think the police should be mailing out letters to the registered vehicle owner. They do it in other places. They do it in P.A. (Prince Albert); they do it in Edmonton. I don't understand why that can't be . . . and I mean I have spoken with everybody from the mayor to the chief of police and they've told me if I don't like it maybe I should move. That's right — maybe I should move. Okay, well that could be an option for me, but for a lot of people it's not. I mean this is just . . . it's ridiculous that more isn't being done, and what is being done is so ludicrous that I don't even know why we're wasting time doing a lot of it.

Another thing is like prostitution, we all know, it's not illegal. Prostitution is legal in Canada; only the act of soliciting in a public place is illegal. A car is not considered a public place. So we don't have a lot of enforcement; we don't give the police a lot to work with there.

You know, and I'm sorry but even a red-light district would be

better. It would get it out of our residential neighbourhoods, which nobody wants to hear that either. But I mean we don't think we're naive and we don't think prostitution is going to go away any time soon. We all know it's been around for a long time.

But I shouldn't have to see it on my doorstep everyday and these kids shouldn't have to see it walking to and from school in their own neighbourhoods where they play. Nor should they have the health risks that are associated with it — the used condoms all over the place, used needles. I mean, nobody wants to do anything about it.

And unless you're going to be dealing with prostitution as a whole, you're not even going to be able to touch child prostitution. Because you're not willing to take them out of their homes. The child that is put out there by a parent is not going to testify against a parent. Chances are they're not going to testify against an uncle.

I don't see anything that's being done that's working. Short-term programs don't work. I mean we have SWAP (Street Worker's Advocacy Project), we have ACCAR (Action Committee for Children at Risk). You know, I mean, they hand out needles and condoms. They can get needles and condoms anywhere. It's not helping them. I mean it might be helping them in a health sense for short term, but it's not helping them.

We don't have any programs in place in this city so that a girl can go into a safe house and then go into a long-term rehabilitation, you know, to get some education, to get rehab if she needs it, to get away from the people that put her out on to the street, and to start to turn her life around. I mean, a safe house doesn't work if you're back living where you were with no money in your pocket and no education. It doesn't work.

Well, I think that's most of it but . . .

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Thank you, Tanya. You've spoken very frankly here today and I commend you for that and I applaud you for that. You've certainly hit the nail on the head with a number of the issues surrounding this greater issue that we're talking about.

Why the committee is here, I just wanted to, you know, respond to your comment about that. Much of what you have said in the past has been brought forward, and there are some people that would concur with every one of those things.

We felt that basically it was important to hear from people throughout the province as to how they're affected by this, whether or not in fact there are youth from the rural areas that are being forced into this kind of a thing, and how to look at it from the provincial level as a whole.

So whether you believe it or not, our intent is very good. And I agree with you that there hasn't been enough done in the past. We need comprehensive treatment programs that look at every aspect of a need. And we also need to look at legislative changes, and that's being discussed. But we want to make sure that we engage a number of people throughout the province in conversation about this, in dialogue about this, so that we can

determine the best avenues to take, you could say, to address this as immediately as possible.

I'm going to just invite the committee members to ask you any further questions and possibly engage in conversation with you if they would like to at this time.

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you. I sense the frustration, and I think as a committee we know we have an enormous problem to deal with. And part of it is out of our control in that much of it is controlled by the Criminal Code which is federal jurisdiction. And that's not a cop-out because I think we have a responsibility to try to recommend changes that will make things better. But just so that you do have some understanding that we're not the beginning and the end of solutions to this problem.

I'm interested in asking you a little bit more about — although you say it's not a popular concept and I'm sure it's not — but when you referred to a red-light district, were you referring to an area of town where a blind eye is turned, or are you referring to a controlled prostitution in a . . . well a controlled, a legalized environment?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Either/or. Get it out of the residential neighbourhoods; it doesn't belong there.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well I mean I think there are differences. Where a blind eye is turned leaves it open to all the criminal elements of prostitution.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — It's already open to that right now. So how would setting up a red-light district be any different? It wouldn't be.

**Ms. Jones:** — I'm not saying it would be. I'm exploring the two ideas — of one being legalized and controlled under safe and healthy . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well the government could make millions. It could be regulated. I mean these people could be going for health tests and AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) and STDs, and be paying taxes on the money they're making.

**Ms. Jones:** — I think a large part of the problems of prostitution is the under elements that go along with it — the drug trade, etc. So I was interested in your preference for one idea over the other.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well I don't really have a preference for one idea or the other. But I would like to see, if nothing else, a red-light district set up to get it out of the residential communities where it has no place to belong there.

**Ms. Jones:** — Do you believe that a red-light district would do anything towards protecting our children — which is the focus of this committee — to preventing the abuse and exploitation of children in the sex trade?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — No. But I don't understand how you think you're going to be protecting children when there are no laws in place that . . . I mean, it says right there in your brochure that

you're not willing to make amendments to confine children.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well first of all, it isn't our brochure. It's from 1998 and this committee has been struck subsequent to that brochure, and I think you should give us an opportunity to see what we can do about this problem.

And that is why I'm questioning you in the area of how you believe a red-light district would go any distance whatsoever towards protecting children involved in the sex trade, which is the focus of this committee.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well I don't think a red-light district is going to protect children. It will protect the children that are in the neighbourhoods so that they are not at risk of seeing this everyday, of dealing with the after fall of it.

It's not normal to see a hooker standing on your corner. And I'm sorry, but it would protect some children that live in the neighbourhood, that see this on a day-to-day basis, that walk to school and get propositioned by johns driving by or harassed by pimps.

So yes, it would protect some children. It would protect a lot of children that are at risk. It's not going to protect every child, but it would protect some.

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Ron, did you have any questions?

**Mr. Harper:** — Yes. Just a couple of questions. You say you live in the core area?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right.

**Mr. Harper:** — And you indicated that you see, on a regular basis, a street worker across the street from where you live and so on. Of those street workers you see out there, on any given day, how many would you estimate are under the age of 16?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I would probably say at least half, if not more.

**Mr. Harper:** — And half would be how many approximately?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Any given day . . . I mean I don't . . . I'm not at home all day. I mean I'm at work and, hey, they're out there at 8 o'clock in the morning sometimes too, but . . .

**Mr. Harper:** — During the period of time that you are at home that you have the opportunity to see them working.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. I would say, on any given day, there could be at least five to . . . who knows? If it's a busy time of the year, there could be 20 of them out there.

**Mr. Harper:** — And half of them would be under the age of 16.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — You bet. The majority of them are under the age of 16.

**Mr. Harper:** — And do you recognize these as repeaters? I mean are they basically the same people or are they new people . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — No, there's new people all the time.

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Don or June, do you have questions at this time?

**Ms. Draude:** — I do. I appreciate you being really forthright with us. I think it's great. And we've been given lots of numbers in the last couple of months about how many children are out on the street, and also the number of johns. So do you see the same vehicles around there all the time? Like is there a . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I'm sure if I went through my list of john plate numbers, I could pull quite a few. There's regular people. I know certain licence plate numbers that cruise my stroll every single day. One guy, noon hits — it's a nooner. He comes every single day, every single day.

And I mean I have limos, I have Porsches, I have Lexuses, I have . . . You name it, it cruises. But there are lots of men that repeat every single, bloody day; they're out there.

**Ms. Draude:** — The children that are going to school and see these people on the stroll starting to consider this normal, I don't know if you have children, but do the kids talk about it?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I don't have any children. I'm sure that they do.

**Ms. Draude:** — In the school we've had witnesses tell us that there is talks that they give at schools where people have first-hand information on what happens when you get involved in prostitution and they come to the school. I guess if you don't have children you don't know, but I mean this type of thing is . . . we're searching ideas of what might solve some problems.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I don't think that that would even be adequate. Because I know that in the schools they give talks about the condoms and the needles that kids find in the neighbourhood, but I still see kids walking down the street, picking up condoms, and putting them in their mouths. So I don't know how that is translating into something good at the end.

**Ms. Draude:** — Do you make the health district give you a written reply on, no, this isn't a problem. Have you asked for something in writing from them?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I was just actually there today. But no, I haven't gotten anything from them confirming this program that's been in the works for just about a year.

**Ms. Draude:** — So you've asked for something in writing so you can say that . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I've been bugging them.

**Ms. Draude:** — Okay. Thank you very much.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Tanya, I've got a fair number of questions for you, and they mostly relate to wanting to be clear about the recommendations that you're making to the committee. Because we're in our final stages of grappling with this issue and we've probably heard from at least 120 witnesses, and in the coming three months we'll be pulling together a report with a set of recommendations for the legislature.

So I think your recommendation . . . I want to be clear on your recommendations to us. I just want to start with the last point that we've been discussing, which is, I take it you want this committee to find a vehicle for getting the problem that we're discussing out of residential neighbourhoods. You want it to stop, period, but you particularly are anxious to see the stroll out of a residential neighbourhood. Is that what I'm hearing you say?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — You bet. You bet. I mean . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — You want us to find a vehicle for doing that. And you talked about the idea of a red-light district. I took it from your comments you are not wedded to that; it's just that you want to see some vehicle for having this happen. Is that accurate?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. I would like to see prostitution out of residential neighbourhoods where children are at risk.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Right.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I mean it's not normal for a child to see or grow up with a hooker on the corner, because they do perceive that as normal.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Okay.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — So I mean I don't think that it has any place in a residential neighbourhood. And we know that the problem is not just going to go away. So let's save some of the children in our neighbourhoods and move it out.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Apart from a red-light district, which I have to honestly say I think would be unacceptable to a lot of people in Regina and Saskatoon in this province . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — We already have four of them, so how is it unacceptable? We already have four red-light districts.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Well I guess what I'm . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — You ask anybody in this city, they'll be able to name at least one red-light district.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Okay. We're using the term somewhat differently. I agree, we've got several strolls at work in our residential neighbourhoods.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I've done a lot of work on



this issue in Saskatoon and I've spent a lot of time thinking about how we can move the stroll out of residential neighbourhoods.

I'm using the term red-light district in the context of a fully authorized zone in which prostitution works. And I'm saying to you that I think that would not be acceptable to most people in the city.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well then we will just rename it as the stroll.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Sure. So give me suggestions about how you . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — And we should move the stroll . . . The warehouse district would be a perfect spot for a couple of strolls.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Sorry?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — The warehouse district, between Dewdney and . . . what is it? — 4th or 8th?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — So you're saying, move it into a commercial zone, move it into a warehouse area, but get it out of a residential neighbourhood. Is that what you're saying?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Correct.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Okay. With respect to your comments about mandatory jail time, I take it you'd . . . First of all I hear you saying you want mandatory jail time for anybody who is convicted of seeking sexual activity with someone under the age of 18.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Correct.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — And I also took it from your comments that you want to see the age of consent move up from 14 to 16.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — That's right.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Okay. As you can see, I'm mostly just wanting to clarify what your recommendations are.

And I take it from your comments that you want to see the province look at some vehicle for being able to confine children when they're picked up on the street. Have you got any specific suggestions in that regard?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I don't really have any specific suggestions. I mean they need to obviously go into some type of safe house. They might also have to go into some kind of rehab program. But, I mean, if their parents are putting them out there, you have to step in and get them away from their parents. Or I mean if it's an uncle putting them or a cousin or whatnot, you know you have to step in and take them out of a dangerous situation.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I have just two other questions and those pertain to your comments on housing and

welfare rates.

You were saying that you see poverty as being sort of a major driving force here in terms of a reason why kids are on the street. And you were talking about your concerns about the lack of low-income housing and concerns about the inadequacy of social assistance rates.

And I'm wondering, do you have any specific suggestions about what you want to see done in your neighbourhood in this regard and what you want to see the province doing?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well there isn't enough adequate low-income housing. I mean for somebody that is on welfare, you have few, few, few places that you can rent that are what welfare pays for rent. And a lot of those houses or apartments or whatnot are substandard. Some of them don't even have plumbing in them.

The city or the government needs to be addressing that issue and building some low-income housing that, you know, is standardized. And I mean a lot of these people have to take money out of their grocery money just to pay the rent. And that's why a lot of these younger women that have children are out on the streets, is because they're taking grocery money to pay their rent. And they need to buy milk and they need to buy bread for their kids.

And if they haven't already lived through the cycle of a parent being in the trade, you can bet that they're passing it on to their children by starting it.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Okay, I'm going to pass it to you, Arlene. Thank you, Tanya.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Tanya, I just wanted to follow up on a couple of things that you mentioned also. And you mentioned the inability of the police to intervene when a 12- or a 14-year-old is out there on the streets. And, you know, from what I am told, the police are naturally working in a certain area, whether it's with vice or whatever, over and over again. So they can identify the people that are out there. They can also identify, for instance, children that may be new on the streets and possibly help them out of it if they had the tools to do that.

What kind of . . . what do you think should happen in order to empower the police a little bit more when they identify a child that's in danger and in fact out there working, and johns are going to be driving by pretty quickly and picking up this child. What kind of laws, or do you think . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well they have to have the power to hold a child, which they don't. And I mean even for young women that are . . . you know, I'm sorry but if you're 14 years old and you're a week past 14 well, you know, I mean they can throw you in jail. But that doesn't help these young women get off the street because now they have a criminal conviction, which is holding them back for employment.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — You know, what you're mentioning is . . . it really stimulates a lot of thinking because what you've just mentioned to us is that the police seem to . . . in the past have had the right to intervene and take someone who might be selling sex on the street and put her in jail. So

they can for that reason take her off the street.

But when the object of the game would be to take that child off the street in order to, you know, start her on a road of protective healing, then there is no right for the police to do it.

So you kind of wonder why these kind of laws are in place in the first place, and that's something, you know, that I . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. But with what's going on in Alberta . . .

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes, right.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — They're at 72 hours now for confinement, right? And they're trying to boost that up higher.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I mean and a lot of the girls that say they want to stay, but they do not have the resources to keep them. Nor can they . . . I mean, they can't keep them past the 72 hours so they have to turn them back out onto the street.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes. I've certainly done enough study of the Alberta Bill and, in fact, was hoping that we might be able to effect something like that in Saskatchewan. But it's also necessary to look into the implications, into the laws as the rights and so on of agencies as well as police, to make that law happen, you could say.

The whole law and the intent of it was to protect children so that we could sort of switch our attitude and see this as a way to protect children. So police could intervene to protect children that they see in danger.

But that implies also that you would have to have all the steps in place, all of the process would have to be there, so that once that child is, in fact, tagged as being in danger and taken from that danger situation, then it implies that there would be comprehensive healing treatment in place already.

So I mean that's something that we're trying to work out here as a committee, to determine just what it is that we need in Saskatchewan, what the nature of the healing treatment might be. Because it is, from what we've heard, it's different in the North than it is from the cities, than it is from rural areas. So there's a lot that we have to work out and a lot of this study takes some real in-depth thought.

So I just wanted to mention one other thing that you had brought up, and that's that you would recommend that when a john is tagged as basically rotating in the same stroll area, picking up children time and time again, that there are community groups that have taken down licence plates, and that in Prince Albert and Edmonton, in fact, the registration of that car is identified and a letter written to that family member, or to that john . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — In Prince Albert, the chief of police mails out letters to the registered vehicle of the car. So if that happens to be you, and your husband's picking up prostitutes, you'll get the letter.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes. Right. Okay. And actually we talked to the P.A. police and they did indicate that to us also. They said that they have to be very careful . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. The chief of police in Regina is not willing to do that. And I have spoken to him on that.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Have you . . . Does he say why not?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — He wouldn't want to break up any families.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — So then . . . Okay. I hear what you're saying.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — He's not a lot of help. He's not a lot of help.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Obviously it's under the purview of each city.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Yes. He's not willing to do that, no.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay. Well possibly the province can look into something with that. I'm not sure, but we can certainly . . . because it's a suggestion.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — And I mean I don't know why the names are not made public. I don't understand. You can get the name if they're convicted.

But you tell me how many men go through the court systems when all they can pay is a \$400 fine and get a little slap on the wrist. How many men are going to go through the court system? None. Why would they? Why would they risk a conviction? And I mean you can't publish their name unless they're convicted.

And it's not public knowledge unless you're sitting in that courtroom when the judge comes down with his gavel saying guilty. It's not public knowledge. It's not made public knowledge.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes, Tanya, you had mentioned that there's a problem in our society with, you know, secrecy surrounding the child sex trade.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — That's true. There is.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Everything else is brought to the light — not everything else, but a good number of things — when we get into the courts and so on. But those people that are guilty in this aspect are often . . . So we have to ask why, you know.

It seems like there are people being protected, but it sure isn't the children.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — That's true. I mean there's more protection on the man who's picking up a 12-year-old girl than there is for that child.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay. Okay. Well we thank you

ever so much for bringing forward your views. I really appreciate them, as I know all the committee members do, and we certainly will be taking note of what you've said. And I guess . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — And so has the committee looked into or gotten any recommendations on confiscating vehicles?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes. Actually, Tanya, we also heard from people in Manitoba and Alberta regarding the measures and the strategies they've taken to combat this problem, and that is something that has come forward to us.

And we've had those kind of suggestions as well as other suggestions, some of which you put forward, that have been repeated over and over to us. So those are things that we'll definitely be looking into.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — And like, as far as prostitution houses go, I mean how would the police be gaining access to something like that to break it up?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Bawdy houses, prostitution houses?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. Where they hold children. They'll lock an eight-year-old girl in the bedroom and sell the key to the highest bidder. I mean, so what is . . .

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — This is something we have to be considering as far as legislation. And we'd have to work in conjunction with the federal authorities, because unfortunately the federal government has a lot of clout when it comes to making laws and penalties and the province administers those laws and the penalties. And so the judiciary has some latitude in what they can do with the pedophiles and the offenders and so on.

But as far as laws pertaining to police and the latitude they have to be able to go into a place where they see a . . . or they've heard a child is in danger, that's something that I think the Alberta people as well as us, as well as Manitoba, are trying to look at, is what we can do to assist the police, to empower police to move into situations like that. But in Alberta, that was the exact problem when it came right down to it. The police did take that legislation. Under that legislation . . .

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I mean lots of these children, lots of these children are in prostitution houses, not necessarily out on the street. They'll have one girl out on the street who directs the traffic to the house.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Okay, well we thank you and we will be looking into all of those . . .

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Sorry, Arlene, I want to pursue this because this has not come up before and I think we should hear what Tanya . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, no, no; not in terms of discussion in Regina. No, I don't believe it has.

So I'm wondering . . . maybe I'm wrong about that, Arlene.

Tanya, I'd like you to elaborate on this question of prostitution houses in your neighbourhood.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — There's lots of prostitution houses in the neighbourhood where either men will just pull right up to the door because they know it's a known prostitution house, and they will just go in and do their business. But there's also lots of child prostitution houses too where they will have a girl out on the corner and she will be young. And if they want more young girls, she'll give them directions to a child prostitution house.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — And are you aware of a number of these operating in your neighbourhood?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — There are. Definitely. Definitely. So I mean you can touch them on the street, but I mean there's still going to be underground prostitution, you know, where . . . I mean they're not going to, chances are, put the eight-year-old out on the streets. They're going to keep her, you know. And I mean that's just really, really . . . I mean it's just sick beyond belief, what they do to some of these young girls.

And most of them, I'm sorry, but they're destroyed for life. Emotionally, you know, I mean you just don't recover from something like that. There's no way that most of these women will ever grow up to be productive people in society, you know.

And I'm sorry but we have to kind of look at that as a whole picture, I mean, what happens to these people. Because the men just got the \$400 fine but we've destroyed a young woman's life virtually forever, because she'll never come back from this in a whole way. It doesn't matter how much healing she goes through.

**Mr. Toth:** — Yes, I just have one question. Have you talked to any of the girls on the street?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Yes.

**Mr. Toth:** — And what are they telling you? Do they want to be there? What kind of response do you get from them? Are many of the girls looking for a way out?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Lots of girls are looking for a way out but there is no help for them. I mean if you don't have two pennies to rub together, and what? I mean you can't tell your pimp you're leaving. And if you do try to leave, you can bet he's going to track you down, and when he does, he's going to beat the shit out of you.

I know this one girl that I . . . I spoke with her quite a few times, and she was pregnant — eight and a half months pregnant, working out on the street. She was 17 years old. And her pimp told her that . . . one day he gave her a knife. He told her, you're going to steal a car for me, and threw her out of the car, beat the shit out of her. She was all black and blue. And she didn't know where to go. She came to my door, and she asked me for help. And she said I can't, I can't steal a car from somebody, I mean I can't do it.

And I mean I took her to the emergency, and they fixed her all up. But I mean there was no help for her. Mobile Crisis got

involved. And I mean she finally did get away from him, but not before he kidnapped her baby and held her baby hostage for two days.

She finally had to move out of the city just to get away from him. I mean, coming back to testify is, you know . . . I mean it was not easy for her to get out, because that pimp is going to look for you. And he's going to search Regina. He can't find you here, he's going to look for you in Saskatoon, he's going to look for you in Calgary. They have connections, and they're not willing to let go of their property that easily. It's not easy to get out.

And I mean it's not easy to ask for help. And when you've asked for help and you can't get it, how many times are you going to ask for help before you feel completely alone?

**Mr. Toth:** — Just one more comment, and maybe that comes back to some of the discussion we've had earlier that . . . Well we talk a lot about the johns, but it sure seems that anyone who would — and using the term pimp — prey on a child, I think, if you will, they are the greatest prey; pimps, or the people that are just putting them on the street.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well definitely. But I'm sorry, also the men that are picking them up. I mean there's no way that you can look at a 10-year-old girl and say Jeez, I thought she was 21. I mean it doesn't happen — it doesn't happen. If you ever seen a 10-year-old girl, I don't care what she looks like — she's not 20, you know.

So I mean these johns can play stupid all they want. They know exactly what they're doing. They're picking them up really young because the fear of AIDS is lessened; the fear of STDs is lessened; hepatitis B. Hepatitis goes through a condom. You're not immune to hepatitis — it goes through a condom. But if you're having sex with a 10-year-old, chances are she hasn't been around the block enough that she's going to be dirty, right?

And that's why these men are picking up these girls. They're sick; they should be put away. And I'm sorry, but I don't think that they should be able to have the slap on the wrist and go about their merry business as if nothing's ever happened and nobody will ever hear about it because it's a big secret.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — I just want to come back to the question of trick-pads one more time, Tanya, because I think this is very, very important. We have spent a lot of time in our work looking at the problem of child sexual abuse on the street. And I think we need to explore the question of these trick-pads more fully.

So I wonder if you could speak as fully to them as you feel able to in terms of, you know, how many are there in your neighbourhood that you're aware of? What's the nature of the operations? Are they primarily run by pimps?

We've had quite a bit of testimony about family members putting their children on the street. We haven't looked in depth at the question of trick-pads during the work of the committee. What action do you see the police taking in Regina, from your

perspective, around these trick-pads? Could you speak to those, just take your time and speak to those issues?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Right. I mean I don't think the police are aware of even probably an eighth of them probably out there. I mean they're not public knowledge and they can change from week to week or every couple of weeks, because most of these people are transient. They only rent.

So it's not like they're homeowners and they're positioned here for life, plus I mean it could be at the friend's house the next week, this guy's house the next week. And I mean they do place the one or a couple of girls out on the street and they will tell the men where to find the young girls then at these houses.

Lots of these houses get started . . . I mean lots of kids get hooked into prostitution by partying, you know. And they go party and they've got the drinks and they've got the drugs or, you know, whatever, and I mean that's how they get hooked in. And all of a sudden, well you've been drinking here and you've been smoking whatever with us, or you know, doing heroine or whatever it is that they do, and all of a sudden you've got a bill. How are you going to pay that off? Or else they get them hooked onto the harder drugs and well you can't have it unless you're paying for it and this is how you're going to pay for it.

Or I mean they . . . or else they'll rape a girl as an initiation and then they send them out on the street. And I mean all these girls are looking for is love. They're looking for some kind of family because most of their family environments are not stable. The money issue comes into effect.

I mean they see all their friends wearing Nike and Tommy and whatever else, and why can't I have that? But my friend has it, you know, and just . . . I mean if somebody in her family does it — well her auntie does it. Well her auntie is not a bad person so this can't be a bad thing to do.

And I mean I don't think that . . . I don't think the police know about even half of the houses that have prostitution going on in them, let alone half the problems associated with prostitution. I don't know.

I don't see the police as making prostitution a priority as in dealing with prostitution. I know they don't have a very many number of sting operations per year. And for the amount of men that they pick up, it doesn't even, you know, it's like a pin in a haystack because I have more men driving down my street every day looking for sex than the number of men that are picked up all year long.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Tanya, you've brought some very real things to us. You've spoken some truths that sometimes people don't want to deal with. We're a whole society; we're trying to deal with as a whole society.

But I want to get back to . . . like let's walk step by step through a scenario, for instance, of the problem with trick-pads, okay, girls that are basically made to sexually trade favours or whatever, and johns who are quite a bit older than them and exploiting them.

So obviously that's abhorrent. Anybody publicly that would hear that would cringe and would say this is horrible. What kind of a scenario if there was a so-called program in place that would alleviate that situation? What would you suggest?

For instance, if there was a group of people, a street team organization, community organization people that could identify, watch, sort of like a community watch when children are being hustled into trick-pads and so on and you know that the activity is going to follow, if in fact that would sort of be in place, would it be . . . what would be the next step then, how to take the child out of that place, or the children? What would be needed to do that?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — I don't know. I mean the police would have to catch them on a off night and just raid and capture everybody in the house. And I mean get the kids away from that environment. I mean, you know, as soon as the house gets word that something's going down, they're not in operation any more. And they'll move two blocks away.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — So the police then . . . do you believe the police then should have the power under the advisement of someone that is a community group on the street that there are children in a house that are in danger that the . . . do you believe then from there on the police should have the power to investigate that situation and take the children?

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Well they definitely should. They definitely should, because I mean what's Social Services going to do? I can call and say, I've got a prostitution house of children down the street. What's Social Services going to do?

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Right, okay.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Tanya, thank you for an excellent presentation.

**Ms. Buhnai:** — Thank you.

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

**Ms. Buhnai:** — And will you be mailing me out a copy?

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — Definitely, yes.

**The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé):** — Yes we will, thank you.

**The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble):** — You will definitely get a copy of our final report.

**The committee continued in camera for a period of time.**

The committee adjourned at 4:29 p.m.