



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

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 32 — December 12, 2000

Saskatoon



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

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PREVENT THE ABUSE AND EXPLOITATION
OF CHILDREN THROUGH THE SEX TRADE
December 12, 2000**

675

The committee met at 9:30 a.m.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. And welcome, all of you, and thank you so much for coming today to be here for this very important committee meeting.

We have with us today from the Saskatoon Police Service, Joceline Schriemer. Joceline will be speaking to the committee about the wraparound process. And we also have with us Patti Sebastyen accompanying Joceline, and Patti will be giving us an overview of some educational initiatives that have taken place to assist children on the street.

So we welcome the both of you to the committee's meetings today and we're very, very pleased that you could come. Both of you have put a great deal of energy, time, and love into the lives of children at this point and we know that not only are we grateful for that, but certainly I know that everyone in Saskatoon and Saskatchewan are most grateful to you.

So just before we get started, ladies, I'm going to go through some introductions of the committee members and then we'll ask you to introduce yourself and just give us a little bit about your background so that committee members are familiar with where you come from, who you are, and what you're up to.

We're just going to start at that end of the table.

Ms. Jones: — Good morning. I'm Carolyn Jones. I'm the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Saskatoon Meewasin.

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

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And of course I'm Arlene Julé, MLA for Humboldt, co-chairing this committee.

Peter Prebble is the other Co-Chair. Mr. Prebble has unfortunately had a slight accident; he sprained his ankle this morning and is out getting crutches right now. But we are told that he will be here in a very short time, so hopefully he can join us before your presentation is over. And if not, certainly I know that he'll pay a great deal of attention to the presentation that you give us today.

And we have over on this side . . .

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

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And June Draude's at the back of the room just entering so we'll . . . Do you want to wave, June, or something. So June is the MLA for Kelvington-Wadena and she's with us here today too.

We have some legislative staff with us today that we'd like to have . . . and we'd like to have you introduce yourself to Joceline and Patti if you could.

Ms. Woods: — I'm Margaret Woods. I'm the Clerk to the

committee.

Mr. Pritchard: — Good morning. I'm Randy Pritchard. I'm the technical adviser to the committee.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. And back here with *Hansard* is . . .

Ms. Klein: — Donelda Klein.

Mr. Sywanyk: — I'm Ihor Sywanyk, audio technician.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Right. And at the back of the room we have another lady.

Ms. Wells: — I'm Kathy Wells.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. All right. So, Joceline, we're just going to, as I mentioned, we're just going to ask you to please introduce yourself to us one more time. We know that you've done a presentation to the committee, but just for the sake of the records, if you could just give us a bit of the background and let us know some of the work you've been doing.

And if you want, from there on, you can just go right ahead with your presentation on wraparound. Or else Patti introduce herself and then proceed as you wish.

Ms. Schriemer: — I'm Constable Joceline Schriemer with the Saskatoon Police Service. I've been a member for approximately 12 years. I've spent 10 years working in patrol on the west side of the city and I've spent the last two years in community schools.

I'm responsible for five inner city elementary schools. And as a result of my work in the schools, something called the absentee assessment team was put together in an initiative by the police service and very much supported by our police chief.

My background is primarily health. I'm an EMT (emergency medical technician) and worked EMS (emergency medical services) for quite some time and then went into policing. I'm married with two children who are teenagers and they've got their brains back, which is a really good thing.

And I'll turn the mike over to Peggy.

Ms. Sebastyen: — I'm not going to be Peggy today . . .

Ms. Schriemer: — Or to Patti.

Ms. Sebastyen: — That's okay. I'll be Patti. I answer to just about anything so it won't make much difference.

I'm a Catholic teacher for the last 25 years, which makes me older than Joceline. In those 25 years I have always worked with somebody's definition of at-risk kids. I've done the Fifth Avenue Alternative program for eight years and the farm school program for eight years and prior to that worked at one of our alternate high schools which was what Sion was at that time.

In terms of what I'm going to do now, we're working on opening a program called the Opening Doors program which is going to be very specific and we'll talk more to it a little bit later to dealing with kids who have not been in school, kids not in school, and where we're going to go with that. I'm not real sure but we'll figure that out.

In terms of personally, I'm the mother of four grown children who I'm not sure they've all got their brains back yet but they're working at it; that's for sure. And I look forward to being able to do this actually today and talking with you and speaking with you and letting you know where we see education at least from this end going and how it will work together.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you. All right, Joceline, we'll invite you to just go ahead.

Ms. Schriemer: — Okay. Initially I was scheduled to speak to you from 9:30 to 10:30 and Peggy, also known as Patti, was scheduled to speak to you from 10:30 to 11:30.

Our projects are linked and our solution or recommendations that we're going to put to you today are linked. So what we did was we put together a presentation that we will give to you and take up that time together.

So . . . I don't know. Are you going to be able to see the power point presentation, Ms. Jones, and Mr. Yates? Okay.

Now we've called this Sexual Exploitation and Education Indicators — A guide to early intervention. And I have to nod at Randy because we don't have a remote. And it's presented by . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. Yes, just go through that slide.

So Cst. Schriemer . . . Cst. Susan Grant from our planning section did the technical stuff on the presentation. She's very good.

And we're in partnership with the Saskatoon Catholic school system and, as Patti explained, her new program, Opening Doors.

So absenteeism or truancy — absenteeism is the politically correct word — is a direct behaviour indicator that identifies a youth at risk. It is evident in elementary school . . . Go ahead . . . So youth at risk, when we talk about youth at risk, they're at risk for these behaviours: criminality, substance abuse, and victimization.

Now the correlation between school non-attendance and criminality, addictions, and victimization . . . We've done research. This is not stuff pulled off the Internet so to speak. This is defended, academic, published research from the university.

Fifteen point nine per cent of sexually abused children drop out of school. Fifty-five point two per cent of sexually abused children are truant or absentee; 45.5 per cent of adolescent prostitutes drop out of school; and 77.8 per cent of adolescent prostitutes are truant. So what this is saying to us is that the

indicators for these things are in the education domain.

Next slide, please. Now indicators as far as substance abuse go. What addictions counsellors do in relation to adolescent substance abusers is diagnose by looking at these five areas — peer group drug use; serious school misbehaviour; other forms of delinquency; truancy; and conflict with parents. Now again, two of these indicators are showing up in the education domain.

So let's look at substance abuse as it relates to adolescent prostitution — 90 per cent of adolescent prostitutes have substance abuse issues. Now that's anything from huffing or sniffing, to drinking, to smoking pot, and some even use IV (intravenous) drugs.

Now let's look at sexual abuse, either family or stranger — which is sexual exploitation — as it is linked to substance abuse. A large majority of sexual abuse victims turn to substance abuse. So, if we can see the indicator of substance abuse in the education domain, we can then link to the sexual exploitation issue.

So education and youth at risk. A low education level is a contributing factor to a girl's vulnerability towards prostitution. And these quotes are taken out of a northeastern United States study. Failure in the classroom compounds increasing sense of isolation from traditional values. A teenager who has received little academic reinforcement is unlikely to place much value on education. So it's environmental; we need to be looking at family, not just child.

The average level of education in a female correctional facility is grade 8. Now that is a very important statement because what we're seeing is when the kids start to be sexually exploited on the street by way of prostitution or even sexually abused in their homes, if there's education issues they're starting at about grade 6; and by grade 8, they're disconnected with school and they do not make the transition between grade 8 and grade 9. So if we're going to concentrate our efforts at grade 9 and high school, we're missing early intervention. We need to be in the elementary schools.

This is a very recent study in the late '90s out of Saskatoon and Regina, the sample group was 401 young offenders, which stated that returning to school results in low involvement in prostitution; 95.8 per cent non-Aboriginal and 93.3 per cent Aboriginal. So what that says is education is very much linked to the solution.

So let's look at the system cost of this at-risk behaviour. Victimization. We have police, victim services, health care, tribal council — many different areas and agencies that are funded through the government dealing with one victim.

Criminality. We have the justice system, Social Services, we have victim services, and we have tribal council. And those are just some of the agencies dealing with a youth criminal.

So drug and alcohol addiction — we have police, health care, addiction services, and Social Services, and there's a lot of others. Social Services is very much involved in this and later on you'll see why. But addictions either at the parent level or

the child level might lead to neglect, which is then a Social Services mandate.

So the observations in 1999 March when I first was in schools, was that in my inner-city elementary schools — and my partner, Al Sellers, who has some inner-city elementary schools — the children that were absentee, the children that had low attendance, were very transient and would frequently transfer schools. They did this because as soon as somebody comes knocking on their door trying to address the issue of the kid not attending, they'll move or they'll transfer schools.

Now the whole . . . the system we have, the whole team changes when a kid transfers schools. The assessment period starts again. We have kids that have been in nine different schools in one school calendar year.

Also the second point was most of these kids were streetwise. They knew the street and they knew one another from the street.

And this was the shocking revelation that led to the formation of the absentee assessment team, that some of the female children were or had been associated to child prostitution. Now please understand this is elementary school — we're talking 14 and under.

So also in that we had a group of 18 female elementary school children with absenteeism issues. And we were able to find out that 10 of those were identified as being victimized by prostitution. Now that translates to 56 per cent, which reflects the early-stated research that 77.8 per cent of adolescent prostitutes are truant.

So then what we did was we took 15 absenteeism referrals — so from one elementary school we took 15 kids that had attendance issues. Now we ran the kids and the caregivers, who they were living with, through various systems. And we found that 53 per cent of them were child victims of crime; 53 per cent experienced domestic violence in their home; 80 per cent of these children's family is on assistance; and 53 per cent had the Department of Social Services worker assigned.

Now in Social Services it's set up so that every person who's on assistance has a financial worker, but not everybody has a family worker. A family worker is assigned only when there is a dysfunction or an issue recognized where they want to work with the family to address.

Seventy-three per cent of either the child or the parent had a suspected substance abuse issue — that's enormously high. Twenty per cent of the children were reported as a runaway at least once. Thirteen per cent had contact with the justice system as an offender.

Now when we . . . when we're looking at kids we do not always have data on them if they're under 12 and not chargeable as far as a criminal offence is concerned. So I would suspect if we had accurate recordings that that would be much higher.

Now 13 per cent experienced victimization by child prostitution. Now not all of those 15 children were female, so I suspect if they were we would see a higher indicator in the child

prostitution area.

So then I took the children and matched them by age and sex. If I had an eight-year-old male child in the first group, I matched him with an eight-year-old male child from the same school so we have the same demographics. In the second group . . . the second group being no absenteeism issues, the kid is attending, everything's fine. And we did the same thing, and you'll note that the statistics drop by sometimes over 50 per cent.

So 53 per cent absenteeism referrals, absenteeism problems versus 26 per cent child victims of crime; 53 drops to 40 in domestic violence; 80 per cent drops to 40 in Social Services assistance; 53 drops to 14 in family workers; 73 drops to 33 in substance abuse; 20 versus 20 versus twenty, and I think that's not dropping because what happens a lot is when you're dealing with a family with complex issues, that sometimes a 12-year-old will disappear for three, four days and the parents do not report him missing, whereas in a functioning family, they will report soon after the child doesn't come home; 13 per cent versus 13 in justice issues; and 13 versus zero in victimization by prostitution.

So the average age of entry into prostitution is 14 years old. That is grade 8.

So youth at risk, what are the indicators — truancy, education domain, school dropout, school misbehaviour, and the child's behaviour also in school as far . . . And the teacher spending time with them notice things like bruising or injuries that could be physical and sexual in orientation from a child that's being victimized. So if the indicators are in the education domain and they're showing up in elementary school, I think logic would dictate that that's where we need to concentrate some of our efforts.

So youth at risk. We know they're in elementary school.

Okay. How are we going to do this? We need true systemic collaboration and we need true systemic cooperation and this needs to be holistic. And that's what wraparound is, it's holistic.

Now as far as the systemic cooperation and collaboration, we'll speak to that later because that is lacking.

And who needs to do this? We all need to be doing this — Justice, Education, Health, Social Services, Aboriginal community and the regular community. We need to all work together. We need to all take responsibility.

Now this is a communication model based on a case that I was dealing with which sparked the idea of the absentee assessment team. This little girl is 13 years old. She has attendance issues in an inner city elementary school. She's attending probably 20 per cent of the time. She lives in a home where mom is married to a stepdad. They are not on family assistance. Stepdad works and so there's no Social Services involvement.

Now there's no Social Services involvement from the family services perspective because Social Services does not recognize truancy as a neglect issue.

So what was happening was the child was being dealt with independently from the family. We had workers coming out of our ears. Nobody was talking to each other. It was a real mess and very costly.

We're paying for all these people to go visit the family. We're paying my salary to be dealing with this little girl who I know is working the street, but we're not doing it in tandem. Next slide please.

So the idea came about then, that if we're all dealing with this kid, why don't we do this together? And if truancy is linked to child prostitution, we need to be in there as soon as we can when the indicator shows itself.

So that was the absentee assessment team proposal, and it's far-reaching. It's way outside the box, and our administration supported it wholeheartedly and has really moved this issue of children not in school and child prostitution to look at it in a holistic way. So what we did was we got members of these agencies to sit at the table and be a group called the absentee assessment team.

So this now, in the absentee assessment team model, is the communication model. So a facilitator, who facilitates the wraparound with the family, is assigned to the family from the absentee assessment team. There is a link to the resources sitting at the absentee assessment team table.

Now in our present system, if I wanted to talk to Social Services, depending on if there was a worker assigned to the family or whatever, I might have to go to the worker and wait for a call back, or go to intake, or child and family, or child youth services, mental health. I would have to go through their intake. It's a horrible, fragmented system that exists, and you can't work holistically in that model because you're spending too much time tracking people down. So we have everybody at the table to answer the questions, to give us resources, to hook us into what we need for the child and family.

So the proposal was, as far as the absentee assessment team was concerned, that we use an interagency team approach collaboration, child and family focussed. If we're looking in indicators at the elementary school level, we need to be involving the family. Truancy is a symptom. It's not the problem. It's the symptom. It's the indicator. It's no different than having a headache, going to the doctor. The doctor has to decide whether this is pathological, whether it's substance abuse, whether it is an aneurysm, whether you've got meningitis. He can give you a Tylenol but that's not going to solve the problem. He needs to know what's causing the headache, and that's what we need to do is identify and address the core issues that surround the child and family and the indicator of truancy will right itself. The family will become healthier.

And we need the ability to track the child in Saskatoon. Presently there's no tracking system in our entire province as far as truancy goes and kids not attending. We do not have a tracking system of any kind at present.

So what we agreed to do with the absentee assessment team is

that if we take a referral from one school, that if the child changes school in Saskatoon, that our facilitator and our absentee assessment team remains the same. We follow the child no matter where they go so you're not having a bunch of new assessment people coming in. Once the child leaves our city, however, we've lost them.

Now the key element, how are we going to do this? How are we going to work with families? We're going to use a process. It's not a program, it's a process called wraparound. Now the wraparound process occurs at the child and family team level. That's where wraparound occurs.

Now the wraparound process is strengths-based and I understand that Dick Cornish gave you a presentation on wraparound in Regina. Is that correct? I read the *Hansard*. So I'm not going to really go into it. I'll leave that and you can ask questions at the end as to, you know, what your questions are if you're not understanding. And I have actually some stories and examples where I can graph how the attendance improved through working in wraparound with the family.

But the thing about wraparound is we have life domains. When we talk to a family and ask them to identify the areas that they need help on or have needs in, we go through what's called life domains.

And I know that it's been referred to before, so just to clarify it I'll just pass these cards around and it gives you an idea of what life domains are. Go ahead, Randy.

Now this is the Opening Doors program and I'll turn that over to Patti.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Holy, what a hard act to follow.

The Opening Doors program was . . . initially we started to talk about it last June and a couple of the superintendents from the Catholic school system came to say to me, look, like we're on this committee, we're on that committee, we've been on these committees for two and three years. Everybody keeps talking about kids not in school. You know, what does that mean? Are we talking about young kids? Are we talking about older kids? Do we know what's going on with them out on the street?

If the belief is that educators really know what kids are doing out on the street, etc., that isn't necessarily true. We know they're not at school. We know there's trouble. We know all of those things but sometimes we don't know the rest of the picture.

So in June they basically said to me, listen, you know, we know there's kids on the street, we know there's kids out there, we need some kind of a program, we're willing to put you into this program.

Well I kind of laughed, right. I mean if somebody tells you there's 1,000 to 4,000 kids on the street and they're going to put me into a program — oh good. You know, what am I going to do, right? There's me, period.

And so we sat down a little bit more and I said okay, let me talk

to people, let me see what we can actually do. Because in all of the programs I've run prior to this, truly, education has worked in isolation. If I ever got a social worker on the phone or if I got an addictions person on the phone or a probation officer, it was me doing all of that to get to them. It was never, let's all sit down and let's get this organized and let's talk about it together and work with the kid and the family.

So I've done a lot of research; and I must tell you, I've talked to a huge number of bureaucrats in the last four months and I'll be more than delighted to have kids in front of my face very soon. And that's a true statement, let me tell you.

Anyhow I talked to so many people that I really believed we were going to be looking at talking to kids in that 12-to-14-to-18 age group and every indicator I've got to has said to me, don't do that Patti. We're starting to begin this process with the absentee assessment team, beginning to work in schools, beginning to work with kids; go back to the 14- to 18-year-old group. Those are the kids that . . . you know if the absentee assessment team, if wraparound, if everybody acknowledges what needs to be done at that level, that sort of K to 13 and 14 will be taken care of.

We have nothing. There's a huge gap here. What are we doing with these kids that are 14, 15, and 16 now, who haven't been in school since grade 5 or 6? So we've decided that what we will do here is we will work with the 14- to 18-year-olds.

I've spent a fair amount of time talking with kids 14 to 18 on, you know, if school was going to be where you'd come back to, what would it look like? What would you be needing from it? What would you need to get out of school? Some of them have told me they don't want to have a grade 12. They would like to have a grade 10 in order to be able to go to Kelsey to be able to go to any other kind of a program.

Some have said, I only need a couple of classes in grade 9 or grade 10, and I can move forward from there. Many are saying they don't want to go back to a school that has 12 and 1,400, or 800 kids in it, because they don't fit.

So you've been working the streets, or you've been doing whatever you've been doing for the length of time, or you've been in jail for a great deal of that time, how do you walk back into a school that's got 1,200 kids, or 800 kids in it and be okay about who you are. You don't.

So what's this school going to actually offer? It's going to be my best attempt to meet the need of the kid at the level they walk through that door. I know there's going to be huge literacy problems. Lots of these kids can't read; they can't do math.

How can you go back into a grade 9 classroom, even an alternate classroom? It doesn't work. How do you . . . how do you work the street for as long as you've worked it, be in your drug and alcohol world for as long as you've been in it, and walk into a classroom of 35 kids, or even walk into a classroom of 25 kids, where you know you don't fit and you don't belong.

The Opening Doors program is going to . . . I have to give you Patti's big picture, okay. I've got to tell you where I think it

should be. And where I think it needs to be — is it needs to be open 12 months of the year. It needs to have a total and complete wraparound process involved with every single kid who walks through the door. It needs to be open from 8 in the morning until 10 at night.

Because everybody's not going to get up initially when we start at 8:30 and say, oh good, I'm getting ready for school today, especially if you've been out working until 2 or 3 in the morning. But, can I get up by noon? Can I get up by one? Probably. Could I come and spend a couple — three or four hours at school? Probably I could; or to a program that's going to do what I need it to do for me.

So that's what my big picture is. Does anybody have a clue where I can possibly get that many staff and that many people to be able to operate such a thing? I'm hoping you do.

The actual child prostitution, the sexual abuse kinds of issues, personally, I think we need . . . I think we need a separate school. A completely different kind of a school.

When we were in Victoria . . . we had the pleasure of being in Victoria for a week and looking at many of their programs that are there. They have a school there that is strictly a girls' school. And that girls' school is specifically for sexually exploited children, where they start to pull together everybody that needs to be pulled together with that . . . those girls, that whole team is there, and slowly get the girls off of the street; get them back into school; get them back on track. Figure out what their needs are in order for their lives, and all of the domains in their life, to start getting balanced and then eventually some of them went back to school. Some of them went on to just do their GED (general educational development), some of them, you know, they carried on with their lives but they were then okay with their lives and they were on track.

Very hard — I've run programs where we have had prostitution, sexually abused children, sex offenders in it. Very difficult to put everybody in the same room and not have bad things continue to happen in there.

Because it's very hard to put a 15-year-old or a 16-year-old into a program that doesn't allow them to be around any younger children, for one thing. Or for girls or boys who have been working the streets, and who aren't really convinced they need to be off the street yet, and so of course, you know, a lot of . . . some of the grooming stuff starts to happen. They start introducing around to who their pimps are, and so now you've involved more kids that weren't involved in the first place.

So to just have one program to be able to meet all those needs, I don't believe that can happen.

One of the things you need to know about interagency support right now is that when I initially started to work on this, the very first people on track were Saskatoon Police Service and Dave Scott. He . . . Patti, what do you need from me? How do you see us working in this program? He hooked me up with Joceline at that time and I'm not sure he's real happy about it since then because now he's got sort of two pushy women

around him, but that's okay too. It's good for him. So that started to happen.

I already have a corrections person who has committed to spending time at the school as soon as we open so that any kid who walks through the door and who is on probation will have the same worker. That worker will immediately have those kids. Even if they had a different worker before that, that won't matter.

I've done some work with the addictions people who have committed to me an addictions person and they will be . . . they've done some training with us so now we can do a lot of the preliminary training so if we are in need of an addiction person immediately or an immediate facility, they will give it to us now. So that in is there.

I've had some contact with George LaFond and how tribal council can be of, you know, whatever need they can meet for us and he's committed to that.

Those are the people that have committed to working in the program. I probably don't need to fill in the spaces for you because you know who's not committing to be in part of the program. Do I?

Okay, that's where we're at with this program.

Social workers, we're having a big issue with because they again, the case management, the case file things, don't seem to be on the agenda here that we can do this and we can do it together. I don't know how to make that happen. I guess if personally someone would give me a fantasy of my world right now, I've worked in it for a really long time, there's something's rotten in the roots. Can it be fixed? I believe we can fix it but something is really rotten in the roots. We're not doing together what we need to be doing. People aren't willing to go out of where their perception of power is for them. They don't want to give up what this perception is. It's not about family. It seems to be about me making sure I do my own little job. That has to stop. We have to stop doing that.

Where do I believe that mandate has to come from? I believe it has to come from the top. It doesn't seem . . . I mean I can get a few of these people on track. I can get a couple of these people working with me, but in the big picture, if everybody isn't working for the same set of goals, we're going to have a good program for a little while. We're going to help some kids. You bet we are. We're going to . . . we're going to save some money. We're going to get some kids being healthy again. But not near the number that we could possibly be doing it with.

The program itself is going to open. We have the facility tied down and the lease happening. I have a facility on Second Avenue. We are going to be looking at kids in January because some renovations things have to be done and we will actually be having real kids — thank you, God — in February. And we'll start the process from there.

It's totally a flexible program right now. I mean, I personally think if someone came to me and said, Patti, listen, we really see a need here of it just being for sexually exploited children,

that's what we would do. And that's where we would start. It's not going to pick up lots of the kids that are out there.

The other thing you have to know is there's a whole mess of kids out there that don't have addictions problems, that don't have correction problems, who just don't go to school. They just don't fit. They just don't belong. We don't have a small . . . I would see this Opening Doors program as having many satellites come off of it. Many satellites — five, six, seven different satellites that could work from it . . . work through it. We could meet the needs of many more kids if we started to work together and we started to make our programming facilitate the needs of the kids.

We will definitely be working on a wraparound base. The other base that we'll work on is a perceptual control theory base which allows people to begin to understand what they have choices in, what they have control over, and how to meet their needs that they need to be doing in that. So I can hardly wait to do it.

And just if I don't get a chance to say it at the end, any time you wish to come after February 1, you're all more than welcome to stop in and have a coffee with us.

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

Ms. Schriemer: — So in discussion between the two projects our recommendations to you are that you do early intervention. So you expand the absentee assessment team model and do it city-wide. We're only in two schools right now. We don't have resources that we need. We're having a little trouble with agency commitment, working differently with those resources. But I think it's part of the solution — it's not the solution.

So support and expand the absentee assessment model. And don't end at grade 8, because the average level of entry into sexual exploitation is 14. A lot of the girls we talk to start in grade 6 start missing school. By grade 8 they're disconnected. They never make the transition to grade 9.

So if we're going to wrap them at the elementary school level, we wrap and move them into high school. Stay with until they make that transition, which would be 15 years old, which also fits with The Family Services Act so that you have a separation between under 16 and 16 and over. Okay?

Expand the opening doors model. As Patti explained, the Victoria model, girls alternative program. Girls in . . . what's happening in Saskatoon, and I'm sure it's the same in Regina; you have inner city schools in the stroll area. Some 13-year-olds and 12-year-olds who have attendance issues because they're working, they go to the safe house, for example. Well where do they go to school? We send them back to Pleasant Hill on the stroll — does that make sense?

We need a special education program for these girls. In Van Nuys, California it's called the Children of the Night project. They specifically have an education program for sexually exploited youth, because when those kids go back to school they're ostracized in the normal flow. Kids know what other kids do. Kids talk. They don't feel comfortable. They don't feel

accepted. And they don't have access in regular school to all of the support systems that they're going to need, as Patti explained.

And we need to build an interagency wraparound model to address this issue for ages — the slide is wrong — it should be 16 . . . it should be 16 and up but we put 16 to 25. And that again is we need holistic so it must be interagency. Wraparound is a good process. It's proven to work long term. And the cut-off again because of The Family Services Act age 16 would make more sense.

So those are the recommendations. And this is like fuzzy stuff for you. Early indicators equals early intervention equals positive solutions equals healthy children equals healthy society.

And this is our absentee assessment team motto on the next slide: "Never doubt that a small group of citizens can change the world. Indeed it's the only thing that ever does."

So I'd like to thank you very much. And we're done.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you Joceline. Joceline I'm going to ask the committee members to ask any questions at this point that they may have.

Mr. Yates: — I have a number of questions over a broad range actually. And I'm going to start first with the education system.

The education system, the model we have today, has largely been in place for more than 50 years, you know, sort of even the divisions between elementary and high school in most of our communities. And it may have been relative at one point, those were appropriate divisions at age, after grade 8, go to grade 9 and so on and so forth.

Do you believe those are appropriate divisions in the system today? Because that transition from grade 8, 9 is very difficult even on shall I say normal children in the environment. I have children at that age and have older children that have gone through it as well, and it's a very difficult transition for children.

And, as you say, you have a large number who don't make that transition from 8 to 9. Is it, in your opinion, you know, having been an educator and worked in the system a long time, if that transition was in grade 10 say, a year later, do you believe we'd have more children who would at least complete one additional year of education?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Well I guess I have two points of view on that. For some kids, that works perfectly fine. Okay. So they can make that transition really easy. I think for some kids . . . Our elementary schools in many cases are not preparing kids for a high school — like the difference, the huge difference, that happens there — and keeping them in an elementary school environment wouldn't necessarily fix that.

But if we had . . . sometimes I think we need a grade 9 and 10 class in certain areas of the city where . . . that would be a lot smaller but where it would start to make kids get ready for what

high school needs and expects of them. I don't think we need it everywhere, in all parts of the city. I think for some kids it's harder to make that transition. And if we did have that, I think it would . . . a lot more would go on to grade 11 and grade 12. They would be better prepared.

A lot of times a lot of our elementary schools are just warm fuzzy places. And then when you do hit high school, you know as well as I do, like all of a sudden you've got five different teachers, bam, bam, bam, bam, like, holy smoke, you know. And if you're anywhere at risk at all in that, for numerous reasons you get lost.

Mr. Yates: — My next question has to do with . . . do you see a need perhaps in changing the school system so it's more needs-based, that kids are assessed in elementary school for the type of perhaps high school environment that they would go into, seeing that all kids are not the same; some children's aptitudes are different?

I'll give you an example. There are some spaces in both Regina and Saskatoon schools I'm sure that are for kids that are more inclined to, you know, trades or automotive and not inclined in the academic area as much. And they're far more successful if they're in an environment that's more . . . and they stay in school versus going to a mainstream school environment which many of them would drop out of.

Do you see it being beneficial in the long run to have assessment at younger ages, perhaps grade 7 and 8 in consultation with the parents, sort of streaming kids to environments where they may be more suitable?

I'm not saying taking every kid out of the mainstream environment but . . . I have a son in grade 9 today and he'll tell me that there's 20 per cent of the kids who are uncomfortable and don't seem to fit in to that environment.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Well I think education is doing the best that it can do with what it's got to work with right now. Of course I don't think we're meeting the needs of all the kids. But I also don't think that it's just education's job to do that.

And let me tell you, in talking with a lot of parents, if you started telling them in grade 7 and grade 8, if you go back and, say, someone comes to you and says, you know, I don't think your son is going to cut it here in the long term; I don't think he can make it; I think we should be putting him into this stream; you know what you'd be saying? Take a hike, honey; what the heck do you know about it; like my kid deserves a chance to, you know, to figure that out as they get older too.

So you're touching on some pretty bad stuff there when you're talking about involving . . . If I believe that, if I believe, that would make me the judge person, that would make me the judgmental person. I've seen a lot of kids change when they turned that 14, 15, 16, 17, and they've been able to cut it academically as soon as they've made the decision to do it.

But if I already get them on the stream where they can't effect a change — so you've gone through this now; you know what, effectively you really don't have an academic grade 9 or grade

10 — what have you left for them for the rest of their life, if they do want to make that change.

Mr. Yates: — My next questions have to do with the system that we have today makes it relatively easy for a child not to attend school, either through being truant or absent. There's very little accountability, I guess, in the system. I'm not blaming teachers, not blaming anybody. But the system as a whole is huge and there's very little accountability there for particularly a younger child who's missing school. You may not even know. And there may be whole groups of children that have never registered in school. And we don't know any of that.

Do you see the possibility of the education system playing a role in that? This has to be much broader than a single element of our society if we're going to deal with this problem. But do you see a role in the school system, with teachers being able to play a role if there was a system put in place that we could track absenteeism of children using health cards or using some other system where they have to be registered?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Of course. We'd have to. I mean there would be no doubt about it.

Mr. Yates: — You don't see any reluctance . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — No, absolutely not.

Mr. Yates: — My next question has to do with the issue of Social Services not being onside with working on this community wraparound program. I'd like you to elaborate a little bit and give me some detail that I can talk to people about this issue.

Ms. Schriemer: — Okay. We need to clarify that. With the absentee assessment team wraparound project, Social Services is a partner and we have representation at our table from Social Services.

Now do we need more representation? Yes. Do we need Social Services to work differently? Yes.

Mr. Yates: — How?

Ms. Schriemer: — For example, we do not have — we've asked for but have yet to get . . . we've had . . . let me clarify that. We have a commitment from Social Services; we need a child protection person. We have a staff worker; we need a child protection worker, a family services worker on the team. Now because of problems we haven't had that person come and sit at our table since the start of the new school year.

But it's more than that. It's not just having the person there. It's the way Social Services works. Now if we have this social worker at our table, okay, and if we get a wraparound — say we're going to wrap the Julé family — now the Julé family has a family service worker. What we would like to see happen is the file would transfer to the person at our table. If Joceline is the family services worker and the Julé family had the family services worker but it's Mr. Yates, then we would like the file to transfer from Mr. Yates to Joceline so that we have a continuity at the table. Okay?

That's not happening. If we are going to successfully work together in regards to sexual exploitation of children, which is part of the children not in school issue, we need to have professionals working with that issue all the time. That's what we need.

We need to have workers from the different agencies doing just that. They're doing it anyway but we're sending it all over creation. It's totally disjointed. And I ask you, come for a ride along with me. Come, you know, do some work with these families and see the system. It's scary, you guys, and it's really expensive.

For example in our community schools, we have social workers that have to have a Bachelor of Social Work, working in the community schools. Their function is to work with families, okay. So we're paying a social worker to work with these families anyway. To work on things like children not in school, how do we reconnect the family and all that kind of stuff, right?

But they don't have the authority under The Family Services Act — because they're not DSS (Department of Social Services) — to have a little clout and go into the family and have the authority to really work with the family.

Ms. Sebastyen: — They can't make decisions at all.

Ms. Schriemer: — Not in regards . . .

Mr. Yates: — With education, right?

Ms. Sebastyen: — They're part of education.

Mr. Yates: — So they're government employees, just like the other ones . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — Correct. They're education hired.

Ms. Schriemer: — What happens, and you tell me if this makes sense and I might be criticized for saying this, from the education system or whatever, but I mean you guys this is just straight logic.

We have money coming from the government, going into education, to hire social workers to work in the inner city schools, okay. They have no power under the social services Act. So when they're working with a family and little Johnny is not going to school, and maybe little Johnny is out working the street or maybe little Johnny is getting done by his uncle sexually, if there's any suspicion of abuse, that social worker has to go to DSS and report that to either intake or the regular worker.

So now you have two social workers. Does that make sense? Take the social workers in the inner cities, in the community schools, and put them under Social Services and give them the authority to case file manage; have them work out of the school. They will get to know the family, they will get to know the teachers, and you're going to have a much better handle on things.

And what would even be better is if you have them do

wraparound with the family. I mean we have so . . . and then you have the other thing we have is money coming from the central pot, going to education to hire outreach workers.

Now I have yet to have someone explain to me successfully the difference between a school social worker and a school outreach worker. An outreach worker doesn't have a social work degree, but they do the same thing with the family, so what's the point? It's a piecemeal, band-aid approach. You know, here, have an outreach worker and that solves the problem. It's not working, guys, and it's really expensive. And if I were queen for a day, I'd be changing that because it doesn't make sense.

And people will tell you that it does make sense; people will tell you that they work with families differently than Social Services. That's crap. Because I see it. I work with it. I see the families in their home. I see the schools. I see the criminals. I see it all, because my job allows me to. It's not working.

I had a conversation with a bureaucrat about that very issue. And this person was totally against having these people under Social Services. Well it doesn't make sense. It totally doesn't make sense.

And what you need to know is that in reality we have people protecting their little turfs and not wanting . . . Change is scary. Change is real scary and there might be some resistance. But if we really want to streamline stuff and we want to do it in a cost-effective way, stop throwing money away. Because that's . . . You know, those social workers do really good work, but wouldn't it make a lot more sense if they actually, you know, had some power and worked the files.

We have social workers in DSS that are so overloaded. Their caseloads are phenomenal, and they're not proactive. You know what I'm saying? They're reactive. Because they're so overloaded, that's all they can do is react to the trauma of the family.

So if we have social workers in DSS that have caseloads that are too high, and we're paying social workers anyway in the school system, does it not make sense to take some of the workload, give it to the social workers in the schools?

And we talk about community school models and we talk about the role of the school task force. You need the integrated services. Community schools aren't integrated services. They're in isolation. They have school social workers, school outreach workers, school counsellors. That's not integrated services.

We have counsellors in schools we're paying for. I tried to get a kid into Mental Health to do an assessment. I mean, he lights fires, tortures small animals, and wets the bed. What does that tell you?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Strangles his sister.

Ms. Schriemer: — Yes, strangles his sister. I couldn't get an assessment done for 11 months and I'm a police officer phoning, saying, help. What does the regular Joe Blow get?

I get really passionate about this. We can do this, you guys. We have the resources. And instead of building a whole new model, take the strengths of what we have and just change where we're allocating the resources from.

Ms. Sebastyen: — And don't forget that social workers aren't just in community schools; you know, by the definition of community school. Our education social workers are a part of all of our schools everywhere. So I just want to make sure you don't think that they're just in community schools.

Ms. Schriemer: — I have a graph of a wrap that we did in the absentee assessment team to show you kind of — oh is that as bright as it gets? — and just to show the attendance and tell you a little wrap story so you can really get a handle on this Wraparound stuff.

This was an Aboriginal woman with two kids. The bars represent two children. The second child didn't come to school till November. Now the attendance is in percentage, so as you can see we're dropping under 50 per cent December/January.

The referral was made; met the family. She's an Aboriginal woman from outside of province. Cree's her first language; her children's language is Cree as well. And she's going to university. Big-time attendance issues; the kids weren't getting to school primarily in the mornings. This was hampering the education especially of the male child because he had English in the morning and he wasn't able to handle the language.

So anyway we first contacted this family and met them to start the wrap in February. The attendance kind of goes up a bit in March, and that's called the Hawthorne effect. And how you're going to be able to track what you're doing with families is you need a stated outcome and you need to track it and that outcome has to be sustained. So what happens is there's something called the Hawthorne effect where any intervention, any positive intervention will elicit a positive response but the response will not be sustained.

So anyway we have a little upslide there and then, you know, we're getting to know the family and we identify the issue is, she's not sleeping. She's up till 4 or 5 in the morning; she can't sleep, therefore she can't get the kids up in the morning; the kids are having nightmares; blah, blah, blah.

What's going on? A lot of things — maybe domestic violence, alcoholism, drugs, whatever. None of that. She was a very traditional Aboriginal woman and she identified finally with trust to me that when she left her reserve that someone put bad medicine on her and she can't sleep and her children are having nightmares, and that's what was causing the problem.

So in wrap you take the strengths — she's traditional, spiritual. The solution was, take her to a medicine man. So she had a medicine man in P.A. (Prince Albert) that she knew and wanted to work with, so I drove her to P.A. She saw the medicine man and that happened in April. And as you can see the attendance shot up and was sustained for the rest of the year.

Now that might sound a little crazy to some people. But when you look at her belief system and her holistic view, it's very

much a reality to her. And the solution was strengths based and focused.

And I'll just go through one other. This is two kids again. This is a single mother with really complex stuff. There's addictions, domestic violence, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. As you can see, the attendance is 50 per cent and under. The first contact was in November. You see a little rise, which is Hawthorne, and then it drops down a little bit because it takes time to trust and build the wrap team and start executing plans.

The plan was executed in January — you see a constant rise and they're getting healthier. They're going up to just about 90 per cent attendance from under 50 per cent. Quality of life issues are better. Now in May there's a drop. But that drop corresponds with a crisis in the family that the wraparound team handled. And so even in crisis, the attendance did not drop as low as it was before we started wrapping the family.

And that's to give you some idea about wraparound and how we can track outcomes. Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you. Just before we continue, we have our other Co-Chair hobbling in the room here. So welcome, Peter. And we'll wait until you take a seat here before we continue.

All right, we have other committee members that would like to pose some questions to the two of you. Don Toth.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, thank you. First of all I'm just going to follow a bit on what Kevin was saying again on the educational system. And I guess the first question I have to ask is how we ever got to where we are today? And the reason I ask that is because I come from a rural setting and in our area anyway we do not see the problems that we're talking about, what we've been talking about, in the urban setting. The problem that does arise as far as absenteeism is in some of the schools that happen to have a large degree of First Nations involvement in them.

But in most of the schools that I'm very familiar with I see a couple of things that probably still go back to a lot of the traditional ways we've educated children. I see very supportive families. I see families that are supportive of the educational system. And I see some real values that still come through.

You talk about . . . In fact, the two graphs you just talked about and then the information that you sent around; one thing that I noticed and we've certainly heard a lot of is the spiritual values. And the elders have raised that a fair bit even in their culture. When you talked about this one family and the . . . what was it now . . . where they were, where a spell was put on them or whatever. That's a reality. That is a reality and we need to realize that.

And so I have a hard time understanding why we have so much absenteeism because of the fact that in the rural community that I come from, in the area we don't really see that as a big factor.

I begin to wonder if, as we've tried to water down the spiritual values of our nation, if we aren't seeing some of the results — and certainly prayer in the schools and what have you. And

Patti comes from the Catholic school system and I know I hear a lot of strong and positive supports and even where families have moved from the public to the Catholic school system because they see there's some value and there's some values still held there.

So I have to ask you: is this something that we've gradually progressed into? We moved away from the real support mechanisms in the school and as a result we're seeing more problems arising especially as you get into the urban setting. Or is this something that's just coming to the forefront that's been there all along?

Ms. Sebastyen: — I don't know if it's all of society has moved. I don't know if we've become so it's about me and it's about what I want to do and you can't . . . And so that other kind of teaching stops happening. Is it about I have a right to my values and I'm going to just keep them and you can't do anything different than that? And that doesn't come from kids. That comes from this generation.

You know, I mean you've got to remember back — I mean you're probably not as old as me — but I mean if I got in trouble at school, which I did often, I was in way more trouble with my dad. Now I have kids who get . . . you know, doing behaviours at school that are unacceptable and you go talk to the parents and they go, oh well.

So it's not about education. It's not about that. Is it my job to teach values and beliefs? Well, first of all, do I do it? Yes. Is it my job? I've had many parents tell me it's not. So I don't think we're talking about a move in education. I think you're talking about a whole systemic societal thing that seems to have gone on. It's about me, you know. You can't tell me to do that. You know, my dad will phone the lawyer. Oh well, here's a quarter, go phone.

But you know all teachers don't say that. You know, there's a real fear out there. I mean I got tell you from when I started teaching to now, teachers don't close doors in their room. They don't stay in a room alone with a kid. I mean you wouldn't think to dare put your arm around a kid.

I mean, you know, there's not a whole lot of old teachers left like me who personally figure that if Pine Grove needs a teacher, I guess that's where I'll end up. But, you know, that fear is really there, so who put that fear into teachers? The system? So I can't talk about God, I can't talk about spirituality, I can't talk about beliefs.

Mr. Toth: — Well I guess I'd have to agree with you there. We have moved a long way. We really haven't . . . we talk about building a better society, in fact I think we're going the other way. And part of the problem is because I believe we're not offering parents that support, and certainly teachers have been put in that mode as well.

I think back to when I was in school; I had the same kind of discipline. And to be very honest with you, we've taken the type of I guess giving our children the same support and if you will, there's disciplinary action in our home.

However, we've reached a society . . . and this is where I really have the problem with DSS. Someone makes a comment about some abusive or some, say, disciplinary action at home. And if a teacher picks up on whether or not it was intentional or was it disciplinary, all of a sudden we have a reaction from the bureaucracy per se, to the point that the parents or teachers are so afraid of extending some love.

I'm not exactly sure where the police service fits into this too, but the unfortunate part if a concern is raised then all of a sudden the police services are then to go with or be a part of administering some sort of justice.

And for one, I'm afraid the pendulum is swinging a little too far the other way, and that's why I think your suggestion of wraparound I think is important. I really appreciate the fact that you've brought forward the fact that we need to start working together, because I feel there's just too much dysfunction in our system.

And also in some cases, too many cases, I wonder how many of the problems arise now because you said are individualism. Dysfunctional homes. How many . . . we don't have the two-parent system any more. We have too many kids having to face that trauma of separation.

And in the cases that you are running into, what would be the percentage of dysfunctional homes or homes where separation has become a part of the mould, would it be much higher of the problem children you're facing versus the children that aren't in the system?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Probably statistically it would be higher, but I mean I'd like to comment on you saying, you know, you live in a rural area. I did a program called the Farm School, and we worked a partnership with Saskatoon (East) which, you know, the Clavet . . . like that whole area, and they certainly had absolutely no problem putting kids into this special program and getting them the heck out of their schools because of the dysfunction that was going on and the behaviour that was happening in their school.

So I don't think it is just an urban thing. I think it's everywhere.

Mr. Toth: — I think if you take a close look at it, it isn't at all but it certainly is expanding.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Exactly.

Mr. Toth: — It's expanding. And in my mind we're actually regressing rather than progressing, so as a result we're discussing these types of programs. Coming back to some of the earlier presentation as well, you mention 90 per cent of the children you had dealt with were substance abusers, and my question is in regards to child prostitution.

As far as substance abuse, did the substance abuse begin before or after a child became . . . or got involved on the streets?

Ms. Schriemer: — In some cases before and in some cases after. The longer a girl is working, if you talk to them, the more they'll get into substance abuse because the more bad memories

they're having to put down.

And the substance abuse, as far as the young girls go, is usually in the form of alcohol. And when a 12- and 13- and 14-year-old is drinking on a regular basis, that's a substance abuse issue. And it's the starting point and it progresses further and further, the longer they're on the street.

Ms. Sebastyen: — And I would have to add to that that a hundred per cent of all of the sexually exploited children, all of the males and females that I have taught over the last 25 years, have all been involved in some form of substance abuse. Every one of them.

Mr. Toth: — How many of the children we're talking of here would be First Nations versus white? Would it be a higher percentage?

Ms. Schriemer: — The larger majority are First Nations, and that's a reflection . . . I mean, that's nothing new. I'm sure you've been told that before.

Mr. Toth: — Yes. I guess . . . And just to allow other members some questions as well, but I would have to suggest that working with the family is better than pulling from the family.

If I gather from the Wraparound, the idea is to begin to work with families to build family relationships and bonds that give the children just a higher value of themselves so that they'll be there then going back to school and they can present themselves with, I guess, a little more pride.

And I say that because I think for too long we have, if you will, jumped on the bandwagon. We pull a child from the home, and then when you finally put them back into the home, you still have not addressed the root problem. And that root problem may be abuse, may be substance abuse and what have you.

And so I strongly feel that at the end of the day, if we're going to get our heads around the so-called child prostitution issue or some of these other issues, it's going to have to be done in the context of the family and working with . . . Because until we do that, we'll never . . . we'll never really find an answer, I don't think.

Ms. Schriemer: — No, you're right. We have to work with the family. And that's the whole, you know, message in the absentee assessment team and in the Wraparound model.

However, if the child is living in an environment that is really toxic, that child needs to be removed.

And, you know, Social Services are dealing with some really serious and horrible issues. And, like police, they have laws to follow and rules of evidence and they have to testify and prove their case. They're accountable. And sometimes, because of media and because of inaccurate reporting, an issue doesn't get told in the factual manner. So in Social Services' situations, as in police situations, sometimes you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't.

So I think that what the government could be doing is

supporting Social Services in cases where an apprehension is absolutely clear. Instead of throwing the worker to the dogs, let's support that. And let's say no, just a minute, you know. We can't go into the details that we know because of confidentiality. We can't come out and talk about them publicly, but what they did was right and it was right for the child.

So, you know, it's a tough call. But we need to be realistic and quit pussyfooting around, you know.

Ms. Sebastyen: — And you don't keep a family together at all cost.

Ms. Schriemer: — No.

Mr. Toth: — Unfortunately, if that was the message, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to portray that.

To be very honest with you though, I think we need to make sure that we've got the guidelines in place that really are supportive, where there is really . . . the evidence indicates that child removal is the only option. But I think we need to really, really not only strengthen those, but I'm just concerned that — coming back to our earlier comments as well — you put your arm around a child and a comment is made. We need to differentiate, make sure that we're dealing with what is a real problem versus what may appear to be.

Because I get the calls on the other side too, of someone who hasn't had a chance to see their children for eight or nine months because of a system that just doesn't evolve, over so-called accusations, and we don't have a mechanism that really allows for . . . and the child's asking why is . . . why can't this parent or whatever . . . why can't I see them.

And so we need to make sure that we are supportive where you need to be, where you have the action, and at the same time continue to support the family. But at the end of the day, we need to work with families, because we had witnesses actually say — and young girls who are on the street — their comment was, that's still my family. Even though it was very abusive, that's still my family. So we've got to find a way to address the problem in the home so that that child can be part of the family.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Kids, no different than adults, get their love and belonging needs met, however they can.

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

June has joined us, as well as Ron Harper, so welcome to both of you. Carolyn, you haven't had an opportunity yet to ask any more questions. You're fine.

Ron, you've come a little bit late, but from what you've picked up, do you have any comments or questions?

Mr. Harper: — Not at this time, thank you. I'm afraid I was a little too late to get the gist of it.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay, I want to just talk with you a little bit about this because I think it's truly wonderful that

you have the insight and the vision as to what needs to be done, as far as education in our modern day and age. And the fact is that in our modern day and age, we do have a number of children who have special needs. The reasons for that are many and the roots go back . . . the roots or problems associated with this go a long way back.

We've had a lot of women historians that will talk about some things that have happened historically a long time ago that feed this kind of exploitation, and feeds victimization and that kind of thing. So, I always say it's necessary that we understand where we are today, and to do something about it today.

Patti, I just wanted to ask you a little bit more about your Open Doors program. Thus far, have you dealt — and I hate using the word dealt, okay — have you had more male or female youth entering the doors.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Up until now?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Generally in all of the programs I work with, that just swings. Sometimes there's . . . sometimes there's more boys at that point in time, and sometimes there's more girls. I would say that the balance is pretty much there.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. When you were describing how the program would work, and you said that the Open Doors program could have many satellites to it so that specific target groups of youth could be assisted, and helped with their education, I'm trying to understand — given that you have said that, you know, that some of the young people might come for two or three hours a day, maybe for one hour a day, and maybe not until later in the afternoon, or maybe after supper maybe, who knows when they would come — how do we assess the amount of benefit that that child is getting throughout the period of time they come? And how do we assess that in accordance with our grading nowadays? And is this whole thing based on a certain academic achievement and a grade standard?

Ms. Sebastyen: — I'm hoping that that's not going to be the only method. In my big picture of this world, that isn't going to be the only one.

Some of the kids are going to . . . I mean I have this vision that some of the kids we're going to be able to work with, with six or eight weeks on some life skills kinds of issues, and be able to turn around and say, listen you're 16, you're 17 years old, you know, now you can go into a . . . hope to have some kind of partnership with work-ready kinds of things that are happening out there and say, you know, this kid doesn't want this, they just need enough of these skills to, you know, to be able to get into the work-ready project.

Some of the kids may want to walk in and just be able to get ready to write a GED (general educational development) and have the maturity to do that — to go and write it. And then carry on from wherever they want to go from there.

Some of the kids haven't been in school since grade 6 — they don't know what the heck they want to do. They can't even

make that decision yet. So I'm hoping that I'll be able to say, you know, you need to be spending some time here; we need to work on your basic skills.

And as you begin to get a relationship with the kids and help them figure out where they want to go, then we'll go from there. No, it's not going to be straight academic — it can't be. It's impossible.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So basically you're building the whole person. I mean . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — You bet. There's no other way.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes. So that's good to hear and to understand because I think in the past it's obvious that we've dealt with academics when children are placed in schools or even the way society recognized the need for an education. It wasn't so much an education about everything in your life . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — Right.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — . . . because at one time there were substantially wholesome healthy homes that provided the education about your emotional life and gave . . . you know, provided some life skills and that kind of thing. And the very fact of the matter is that it would be wonderful if those homes all existed now but they don't.

Ms. Sebastyen: — I think the other thing that you need to know or the committee needs to know is that this program when we initially started to talk about it, Patti's first comment to the superintendents downtown is that if I have to ask a kid who walks through the door are you Catholic or not in order to take them, I won't even touch the program. And my board's response was absolutely not.

This is about kids not in school. This is not going to be a direct referral from, you know, your behaviour went a little whacked over at E.D. Feehan, and so now you're booted out and you're in Patti's program. I will not be taking those kinds of kids with those kinds of behavioural issues.

This will be about kids who are not in school and who have not been in school likely for at least six months or more.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So you talked about you — the Open Doors program — linking with the wraparound or it being sort of one and the same thing so . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — Yes.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And you'd mentioned the age group I think of this, from 14 to 18 or . . .

Ms. Sebastyen: — Right.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — . . . up to even beyond 18 if necessary.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Well right now when there's just two of us in it — I, myself, and an associate — that seems to be all we're

going to be able to handle initially is about 12 kids, 12 to 15 kids.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And, Patti, I was going to address my next question to Joceline but she's had to leave the room for a few moments, so can you help me with this a little bit.

When she was talking about the frustration of being able to, or not being able to, get the support of Social Services to, I guess, accept the need to understand that we have to change our way of doing things, we have to look at this, this sort of integrated, integrated workforce, I guess, that is working together as a team to address, you know, one child's needs, can you give me an example . . . Joceline, you're back, I'm just, I'm going to address this to you. Can you give me an example of what it is that social workers would do in a school now if, if that, if a specific school recognized they needed a social worker in the school and hired one, that school division would hire a social worker. What is, what is the problem? Like, what is the extent of the work that that social worker can do and what can't they do that would be different if wraparound was in place and you had an assessment team with a social worker on it?

Ms. Schriemer: — Okay. In our present system, we have social workers in some schools. Okay. Now they can — and we also have outreach workers, okay. The difference in roles, I'm not really sure, because a social worker that works in a school meets with the family, works with the family to help them in some way address some of the needs that that family might have regarding, say, food or clothes or, you know, things like . . .

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — . . . as far as you know then is a social worker's role in the school limited to conversation with that family within the school or an advisory role within the school boundaries?

Ms. Schriemer: — Well, no, they go out and do home visits. They'll go outside of the school and do home visits. And so does the outreach worker. Okay. There's really not — in my opinion, in my research — there's not a big role difference. Okay.

So if, for example, that same social worker were . . . had the authority under DSS to work within the mandate of DSS, the families that are going to that school, for example, that have family workers assigned to the families, okay, and that's done because of some issue, okay? So if the Yates family has a family services worker from Social Services assigned to it because there's a substance abuse issue and consequently some neglect going on or a suspected sexual abuse, whatever, the social worker, if we gave him authority under DSS would case file manage that Yates family going to that school. Okay? And many, and many other families that have family workers. They could take those families and work with those families, be connected to the school and get current, valid information on how the kids are doing, what the teachers are saying about the kids, da da da da da.

In our present system, education has to phone out to Social Services, okay, and we have some meetings with them some

times. It's a matter, it's a matter of integrating the services. It's a matter of hooking Social Services right into education instead of creating another Social Services system within education because that's what we've done. Does that answer your question?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — I'm really having a hard time in understanding it. And that's simply because I have worked in the school system a little bit. And what I saw is a school psychologist comes in, I saw the resource room teacher working with behaviour-problem children, and I saw the social worker that was trying to deal with the family come into the school also. And all talking to that child and trying to pull in the family, not successfully though.

Ms. Schriemer: — Was that a Social Service's social worker or an education social worker? It makes a difference, because that's what we've created, Arlene.

Ms. Sebastyen: — I've sat at meetings with kids where there's been a financial worker, a contract worker, the family worker, like there was about five or six of them sitting there.

Ms. Schriemer: — An addiction's worker, a school counsellor.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Oh I could go on and on.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So how would it be different if we had this sort of team? Like, you'd still have to have those components, those people there in place that are from those agencies.

Ms. Schriemer: — What would the difference be? Okay the difference would be, if a DSS social worker was working in that school, okay, and case file managed those kids, during the meeting — we have a meeting of the support people in that school — during that meeting they would be updated, there would be more accurate communication and interaction because your team is there, it's the same team.

Whereas now we have, you know, five school social workers that have five different schools. I have five different schools, and the counsellor has three more different schools. So every time you're meeting with the family, even from the same school, you're dealing with twelve different people. So we can do this by school or we can do this by issue.

Like, do a pilot project in Saskatoon, expand the absentee assessment team. Give us the resources we need. Right now we're working our regular jobs and the absentee assessment team. You know, an education counsellor doesn't have time to do wraps with the absentee assessment team because she's too busy or whatever.

So if you have this static team, okay, you can have that team deal with sexual exploitation issues or absenteeism issues. It's like a team of specialists. You know what I'm saying?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So you're looking then at the child or the youth and you're saying, you have the team there to look at the issue that is pertinent for the time. As things progress or as the process goes on you will be able to identify if

there is sort of a problematic area that seems to be coming to the forefront and you would be able to then tap into the appropriate resource person or you'll have the whole team look at the child and determine what kind of needs have to be met here. Is that what it's about?

Ms. Schriemer: — Yes. Like, things have to be more streamlined.

Ms. Sebastyen: — And it would be very nice to have a social worker who could make financial decisions, like not six of them out of the same office from there too. You know like, oh gee, I can't make that decision — the financial worker has to make that; oh I can't make that decision — the contract worker has to make that; oh I can't, like give me a body.

Mr. Yates: — The fundamental difference is the decision is made within the team then and not outside the team then. And that's pretty basic.

Ms. Schriemer: — Correct. And you're not having to make 10 phone calls to track down which person is in charge of this issue at this school.

Mr. Yates: — You can't make a decision if the people who make the decisions aren't within the team, or the authority doesn't rest within the team, it rests with somebody on the outside. It's pretty simple.

Ms. Schriemer: — You got it.

Ms. Draude: — I'm sorry that I missed part of your presentation because I'm . . . and I'm looking forward to going through the information.

So when I get in here and I'm hearing you both talking about it and I'm looking at the wraparound program and the Open Door program, and it sounds like they're either working very well together or they're covering a lot of the same grounds.

It seems to me that when we've gone around the province, there's so many well-meaning agencies. In one area they told me they had 13 to 15 different agencies trying to deal with the same students or the same children or the same family, and now we're talking about six or eight different workers trying to deal with the same one. And at the same time, I know that social workers are overworked and stressed right out.

Are we just getting so complicated here that nobody knows what's happening? Or is there some way . . . is there an easy blueprint? Is there a KISS (keep it simple stupid) phenomenon here that we could be working on?

Ms. Schriemer: — You hit it right on the head. We are so specialized. We have become so specialized that we're dysfunctional. We have specialized us to death where instead of looking at a person holistically and all of the things that make you, we are looking at just the heart or just the addiction or just the sore toe.

And you know we have financial workers and we have family workers. So some families were paying two workers to work

with the family, where in the past, a long time ago, one worker did that. It was called general case management. And apparently there is a movement going back to general case management. And that needs to be done. We've just specialized ourselves to death. We've got outreach workers and social workers in the school system and school counsellors and school this, and then we have a whole system outside.

Ms. Draude: — I have two other comments. You know that a part of the mandate of our committee is not just to bring forward the issue but it's to bring forward recommendations.

So if you had to bring forward a recommendation on making it — keep it simple here — are there things that can be done that's not going to topple the system? I don't want to do something where we're going to . . . people are going to get lost in the flow. But there's got to be some way of working with the people because everybody you talk to and everybody we hear about, cares about these children.

And if we don't start looking at them very quickly, the numbers that we have that are missing from school every year is increasing. I'm hearing we've got 4,000 children that are . . . Sometimes the numbers sound exaggerated, but I'm starting to believe it's true. Is there something that's simpler?

Ms. Schriemer: — Yes, wraparound.

Ms. Draude: — That is it?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Yes, the programs that meet the needs of specific kids. And you say you don't want to topple the system. Personally I would. But, you know, in truth, when the root's rotten, you've got to do something different. And we have to quit being what we were 50 years ago. We're not where we were 50 years ago. Society's changed, everything's changed. You know, Joceline uses the word that we've become too specialized. I think we've become too closed. We've become, this is my little power base and here I am, and I'm not going to look out of this and, honey, you ain't getting in.

Well, like those walls have got to come down or we're not ever going to be successful at what we . . . And if we start another committee, oh my God, you know, I give you all a lot of credit. I don't know how you can do what you do. I've done it for four months and like I said, give me kids any day. But you know, like, we can't keep perpetrating nothing.

Ms. Draude: — My critic area is education and I hear that over and over again from children . . . from trustees and from teachers who are saying, we're talking about integrated services here, not just for children that are in desperate need, but for all children there has to be some integration of services, where the walls of the building you work in . . . that we work in, as government and bureaucrats, are half walls. So that you can look over it and talk to somebody instead of having to write a memo that doesn't get seen.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Or better yet climb over it.

Ms. Draude: — Yes, that would be a good thing. Now, my one question that I have left for you is, FAS (fetal alcohol

syndrome) and FAE (fetal alcohol effect), I know that this is an issue that . . . is something that's horrendous because this is something that's totally preventable. Now when we're talking about exploitation of children, I . . . that can be preventable too, but something like this has got to be preventable.

Have you got any . . . first of all, do many of your children and their parents, are they . . . do they have this syndrome and have you got any thoughts on this issue?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Well, there's . . . I've done some research actually in this last three or four months on FAS and FAE and there's lots in our school system, there's no question. Are they actually documented with having FAS and FAE? You know, the bottom line on the whole thing is that if you don't have a mother who says, yes, I did that, you don't have a final diagnosis. Are they there? Absolutely, we all know they are. Have I taught lots of them? You bet I have. Are we . . . is it preventable? Sure, absolutely. By not drinking, by not drugging when you're pregnant.

How can we do that? Education is one of the ways. I mean, unless you're willing to take that person and say, you're drinking, here you go — you're sitting in this room for nine months. I take away your rights because you have no right to bear a child that's going to be like this . . . I don't know how else we can do it. It's purely an education thing and I only see us as being able to do that.

In the actual education domain as teachers, we don't have specialist teachers to work with kids who are FAS and FAE. What we know about education in dealing with these kids is that they need to be being taught at one, two and three in a stable environment, with consistency, with all of those things, in order to learn values and in order to learn beliefs. Well that doesn't happen either.

So, yes, it's a big issue all right in this province, and everywhere for that matter. Yes.

Ms. Schriemer: — The issue too, is when we talk about FAE and FAS, the conversation always goes to, well what is education doing about it? Well, my statement is what does an FAE and FAS child tell you about the family right off the top. They tell you there's a substance abuse issue. That's a health issue, right?

Now, if there's a substance abuse issue and the abuse caused damage to the child, that therefore is an abuse, a neglect issue, which is a social services issue. So, again, we cannot solve this problem in one area of government. It's impossible. Everything's connected.

Mr. Yates: — Well, I just . . . it's more of a comment and I would like a response to it. Do you see this wraparound process as really a process response to the dysfunction of how we deliver services? Dysfunctional system because everything is disjointed, you can't . . .

Ms. Schriemer: — No . . . well, yes, everything is disjointed. And what wraparound does is if we can use wraparound, we can take the strengths from our existing system. We don't have

a totally screwed up system, you know. Not everything is bad. We're fragmented. We're duplicating, you know. We need to change that.

But if we're going to wait to do our work till the government system changes, we'll be waiting till the cows come home.

So what wraparound is, it's you're able to effect change now by drawing on the strengths of our existing system. Because for some families the existing system does work. For complex-needs families and sexually exploited youth, who are complex-needs people, it doesn't work.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thanks, Arlene. I really want to thank you for the contribution you've made to these hearings. And I guess my question, which you've begun to answer, but I think we all need to struggle with this, so I'd be interested in your thoughts on it.

We know we've got about 250 children in the city who at one point or another during the year suffer sexual abuse on the streets. And obviously that's just a little fraction of a number of dysfunctions that we're facing. But anyway that's the group that we're particularly focusing on in these hearings.

And a related group, a bigger group, is we know we've got at least a thousand kids who are under 16 and who are not attending school on a regular basis or not in school at all in the city. And maybe that's a low estimate. But we know we've got at least a thousand.

So just to focus in on those two groups because there's a fair little bit of overlap between them right now, I guess, you know, as you've said Joceline and I agree with you, there's lots of things about system that do work and at the same time it's fragmented and not functioning as well as it needs to when you're talking about kids with very complex needs. So I think members of the committee are generally very sympathetic and supportive of the wraparound approach.

And I guess what I'd like to focus in on is, and this has been . . . And let's talk about Saskatoon specifically because that's what you know most about, and I'm pretty familiar with the array of services here in the city as well. So I guess what I'd like to ask you is, you know, we've got, for instance on this specific issue of kids in the sex trade, we've got Egadz working; we've got Saskatoon Tribal Council working; we've got Social Services working; we've got Saskatoon District Health Street Outreach working; we've got yourselves and your organizations working — and that's just the beginning of the group. There's a lot of other agencies and organizations that I could add to the list.

But what I'd like to know is how do we get ourselves to the point in your mind, what's your advice to us, about how we make sure that every child who's on the street has at least one person that they're connected to who's watching out for that child and who is taking a coordinated case management approach to that child so that we can help move them off the street? You know, how do we get to that point in the city? What's the organizational structure that we need to put in place with all these resources that we've got — and we can add to my list obviously the resources we have in the regular school

system, the resources . . . the addictions counselling resources. We have a lot of other resources that we have.

How do we make sure that for every one of the 250 kids that we believe is involved in the sex trade right now, there's somebody assigned to each of those children and there's a coordinated approach with respect to each of those children to make sure we are doing everything we can to move them off the street, move them back into the school system, give their families the support that they need. What do we do to make that happen?

And obviously wraparound is a very important piece here, but I'd be grateful for your thoughts about not how we do it with 20, how do we do it for 250?

And Patti, I'd be interested in your thoughts on this too, so.

Ms. Schriemer: — Sexual exploitation on the street and that's the question you asked and we'll speak about that, but also I think we also need to point out that there are sexually exploited youth that are being sexually exploited by family members or whatever . . .

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Right. I was going to make that my second question but I just didn't want you to have to bite off too much at a time.

Ms. Schriemer: — Okay. So as far as the girls working, okay, being exploited on the street; number one is the average age of entry is 14. We know, through experience and statistics and research, that we can see those indicators in elementary schools. Okay?

So what I would do is I would take a social worker under DSS and I would put one in every inner city school, every inner city elementary school in Saskatoon. Okay? They would work within the school and case file manage the cases where there are family workers assigned to those families. If there is an issue in the school relating to abuse of any way that has to be reported to DSS, that would be the person that would be looking into it because they're at the school. Okay?

Now over and above that, I would then build a team — call it the dream team, whatever — and that team would have a bunch of facilitators, okay, people trained to do wraparound. Now they don't have to be social workers. You do not have to be a social worker. I can do wraparound and I'm not a social worker. And I'm a cop and I'm going into homes and people are saying oh yeah, well let's try this, way outside the box thing.

So you know you have, say a team of 10 wrappers okay, and they can take 5 to 7 cases. So that's 70 cases. So if there's 250, maybe we need more wrappers. But not everybody is going to be wrapped at the same time.

So you have this dream team, okay. Now that dream team has a coordinator that is hooked in to Egadz, the safe house, the City Centre project, Opening Doors.

So in that elementary school, okay, the social worker is there and the school is there. There's an absenteeism issue identified, okay. The indicator is truancy. Why is the kid truant? Well I

think that information or referral would go to the coordinator who would have a meeting, say with Egadz or police, and we could identify whether or not that kid is in the sex trade. And Egadz will have to share information, say yes or no.

If the kid's identified as being sexually exploited, a facilitator is assigned to the kid and they're wrapped. And part of that solution is maybe the kid would have to . . . the social worker, okay . . . We need to be doing this based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs and your bottom needs are your basic needs. So the first thing we need to do with a sexually exploited youth is decide on whether or not their basic needs are being met. If they're unsafe in their home or they have no place to live, that's a basic need called shelter, then we need to get actively involved and move the kid to the safe house.

Because we have the resources. It's a matter of linking them. And we're all working together. I mean, we're sitting here together. Well, we'll have a meeting once a day and go through the list and concentrate our resources. It's communication.

Like I think it would work. The department has a project that's not going yet, but they're building a model. They've built it and have commitment for this project called Operation Help, and Egadz is part of that and our police service's idea under vice. But apparently you're meeting with them tomorrow so I suggest you might want to ask them about it because I don't know enough to go.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — You've done a really good job of answering that question, Joceline. Thank you.

Patti, I don't know if you've got any additional comments you want to make before I ask the second one.

Ms. Sebastyen: — No. Joceline and I have gone through this enough times. You don't need to hear the same things from me over.

Ms. Schriemer: — We agree.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Now just expanding that further, a little further, to look at the kids-not-in-school population, which is bigger, and also the question of kids who may be suffering sexual abuse at home. I mean obviously the approach is going to be similar but I don't know if you want to make any additional comments which would address this.

Because I think we've really kind of got to look at the whole picture, if you know what I'm saying, ultimately. We've got have an approach that's going to make sure that there's someone watching out in a coordinated way for every child who's not in school, every child who's suffering sexual abuse in their home or in the community at large, and every child who's suffering sexual abuse on the street. And I guess the question is how we do it.

But I don't know if either of you have any thoughts on . . . Patti, maybe you want to start on the question of kids not in school. But I'd be interested in both your comments on this.

I mean how do we . . . You see what I'm worried about is that

we've got . . . these pilots are very important and I very strongly support them. But the thing about the pilots is that ultimately we've got to tackle the big question, which is we've got . . . you know, if we think we've got a thousand kids in the city that are not in school — and I believe that it's at least that — then how are we going to make sure that not just that we touched 20 or 50, but how are we going reach all 1,000?

The first thing we've got to know is who those kids are, obviously. And the second is that, you know, the team has to make a decision about when we do a wraparound with respect to each child. But how do we go about setting up a system that's going to respond to the needs of a thousand kids?

Ms. Schriemer: — Well you're never going to have to deal with a thousand kids at one time in reality. We're going to find them little by little.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — But we're going to deal with 3 or 400 at a time, so what do we do?

Because I mean I can go out and tell you 50 kids. So I'm assuming that between all our collective agencies, if we did a survey in the city and we asked every public health professional, every teacher, you know, every social worker, every child protection worker, etc., you know, give me a list of kids, and we added them all up and then we took out the overlaps, we could identify a thousand.

So we're going to have to . . . we've got to have the capacity not necessarily to deal with a thousand at a time, but to deal with a large number of kids. And how do we take this approach, which I think we're clear about at the individual case level or the small group level, and expand it to responding to the needs of hundreds of children at one time?

Ms. Sebastyen: — Well I think one of the things is that the reality of the situation, Peter, is that if the process of wraparound and the absentee assessment team was put into place, it's there to meet the needs of K to 8. And you know what? We're going to lose a whole bunch of kids right now that you're talking about these thousand on the street. We're going to lose them. We're going to lose them in society. They're going to end up in jail. They're going to end up dead with whatever they're all doing. And that part is the reality.

If we make the attempt . . . I think the Opening Doors program would be able to, if somewhere or other there was funding or education. Obviously the Catholic school system couldn't do it, is to start some satellite programs. We could probably meet the need of 3 or 400 of these kids, at least to snag them at an educational level or to have programming we can put them into fairly quickly.

But now again I'm talking that 14 to 18 or 19, right? So we could do that right away and we could make that happen. You say, Patti, here you go. I'll set them up for you. I guarantee you they'll be running by next September. Okay? But we're going to still lose a bunch of those thousand kids right now that are on the street. Hopefully they'll come around at some point; hopefully, you know, intervention will happen and things will change.

But if we don't start, if we don't initiate, if we don't start the doing and quit the talking, we're not even going to be meeting the needs of these kids coming up, and we've got to get back there. That's my opinion. We've got to do it.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Now, Patti, on the kids not in school front, we've got Radius in Saskatoon.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Radius is a referral service. Radius means that my school board says, they indicate Johnny isn't fitting in; we can't meet their needs in the school; they're not behaviourally, you know, whatever. We refer them to Radius and we pay you to take them. It's a fee for service, okay?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — All right. But what I'm trying to say is we've got an Egadz program. We've got an initiative that the tribal council and the public school board started together. We've got your initiative. We've got Radius. And again I guess what I'd like your advice on is, we've got a lot of very valuable resources already functioning in the city, each one of which is only able to deal with 15 kids, let's say, approximately, at a time.

And what I'm trying to figure out is how we make full use of those resources and all the other resources that we've talked about — I don't want to go over the list again — and get a coordinated approach and a wraparound approach working that's large enough, and you talked about the satellites and I agree, to deal with at least 3 or 400 kids at a time. How do we set that up and structure it?

Ms. Schriemer: — Yes, we have a lot of resources. Yes, we need to hook them together. And the first thing we need to hook together are the two school systems. We have to get them working in tandem.

The other thing we need to do is get DSS on board for this issue of children not in school. Because we're talking children not in school, part of that population is sexually exploited youth.

The Victoria model that we went to look at, one of the things there is they have a police officer paired with a gender-opposite youth worker. So I would be paired with a male youth worker. And the job of that team is to go to the street and identify the street youth and to bring them in and hook them back into the system somehow. Now our chief is looking very seriously at that model and is considering doing that here.

Now okay, well what do we do once we find these kids? The City Centre Project is opening up on December 20. The City Centre Project is a partnership with the Saskatoon Tribal Council, Saskatoon District Health and the city of Saskatoon. It's located on 20th Street.

Now because of the partnerships, what we have in that building are addiction workers, dental, public health, education and Catholics partnering with them as well. You've got youth workers; you've got recreation, da-da-da-da. So the logical blast-off point would then be the City Centre Project. But we would have to have DSS come in.

So DSS would have to provide some of their people so that an

intake or an assessment can be done right there. So if I find . . . if I'm working the street and I find a kid and he's not in school, and I say hey, come with me to the City Centre Project and it's kind of like a one-stop shopping blah, blah, blah, use it as a blasting-off point.

So what you do is you do the assessment according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Get the kid stabilized as far as shelter and food, and then education would have to commit, both education people, and they would be like assessment people, okay, on this team.

And they would say, okay, we have radius. We have this, we have that, we have that, and we have that. What are the kid's needs and what do we have available? Okay, so with the existing resources we have, we can put the kid in a program that addresses his need, okay.

In that model also, what we need are a bunch of facilitators to do the wraps, to do the work. So now everything is connected, okay? If the kid needs the Egadz back-to-school program, that's where he goes. And then the facilitator, once the kid's initial needs are assessed and met, is this a child protection issue? You know, what happens? You've got to do that first and then you progress. And the kid's not going to connect to school because that's up on Maslow's of hierarchy needs.

You can't educate them until they're safe and fed, right, so we address that first. Hook them into the education, the facilitator does the wrap. And you could even have the sexual exploitation team working out of that so you've got two sets of facilitators — one set addresses children not in school. Some of them might be sexually exploited because they're a male that's done by dad for 10 years and they quit school and he's living on the street and he's doing B and Es (breaking and entering), right.

And the other one would be specific to sexual exploited kids on the street in the sex trade, because they have specific needs as opposed to the victim of incest. Because sex trade workers feel it's their fault. They're on the street saying yes, you know, so they're different and they have different needs. So in that arm for the sexual exploitation part, we would need a program, an education program, specific to sexual exploited youth.

But we can take all the existing services in our city and we can make two teams and if we get co-operation and collaboration, you guys, it would work; and I believe it would work well and we could handle a higher population. Maybe we're not going to handle a thousand kids, Mr. Prebble, but right now we ain't handling any, you know.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, thank you, Joceline. Thank you both very, very much. I'm going to turn it back to Arlene.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Was there a hand up over on this side of the table?

Ms. Draude: — I just wanted to make a comment. I haven't heard either of you talk about or refer to the community schools which I think is trying to deal with more of a broader picture in education and sort of dealing with some of the issues you're

talking about. And then the Nutana model for the older students which I think would maybe collect some of these thousand students that are above the 12-year-old and 14-year-old.

Can you comment on how you see the community school system working into the Nutana model?

Ms. Schriemer: — Okay. I'm going to do community schools because that's where I work, okay. The community schools idea is very, very good; however, it is only as good as its administration, okay. If you have a principal that is not community minded that does not link to the community, does not facilitate the partnership, you have a school that spends more money, that's all you have.

And the community schools get more money because they have outreach workers and school social workers and all that kind of stuff. I mean that's great, but really what you're doing is you're taking money from the government, putting it to education and having them create their own little island and their own little world because they're working in isolation. Right?

Well, if we want true interagency work, and that's what we need to do, we need to connect all these systems. So don't give education a bunch of money to go and create a little world on their own.

Put a DSS social worker in that school so that you have the connection to Social Services, integrated schooling services. Put a mental health addictions worker in that school, you know, so you have the branches coming in, right into the school. So you're having an interagency model. It's going to be like the police officer in the school.

I mean why not give education money to go hire their own cop and put him in the school because that's what we're doing when it comes to counsellors and social workers and all that other kind of stuff. And we need them. And that's why education did it because we need them. But we've created another system within a system that's not connected and not working in tandem with our whole other system.

So the community school's project is really good, but move true integrated services into the school. And that would make it even better.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Just to add to that. I think our community schools, initially when they started, really were trying to meet the basic needs of the kids. And so they really went for the, you know, we're going to make sure these kids are fed, we're going to make sure they have a safe place, we're going to make sure that they're going to get the warm fuzzy stuff they . . . you know. We've done that. It's happened. Our community schools have met that need. It's time to bump it up and get going with the next part of it.

Ms. Draude: — Yes, like Nutana.

Ms. Sebastyen: — Okay and in terms of the Nutana model, I mean, I know what it's about and I've been there and worked, talked, and whatever with Mike LeClaire. I think the only piece you need to remember, the Nutana model is wonderful. It

works. It's meeting the needs of a whole bunch of kids. But you need to remember that it's meeting the needs of kids who want to be there. They're choosing to be there and they're deciding to be there. And they're showing up and they're coming.

When I talk about things in terms of my program, these are kids that aren't choosing to be anywhere right now. So I think sure, we could use two or three more . . . All schools should be places kids want to be and get their needs met. So I guess if you wanted to say, what does that mean? That means you should make them all like that. Every single school should be like the Nutana model then.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — All right. Well, Joceline, and Patti, we have to wrap up this session. You have been a great source of valuable information. And your suggestions and recommendations are absolutely not only brilliant, but certainly contain a vision that I believe can be very instrumental in sort of resurrecting, not the problems of past societies, but focusing on the strengths that each of these young people have and the strengths that we already have at hand.

And I truly do understand when you put forward the need to have co-operative collaboration. And that would mean an interagency network that would be willing to do that. And we have certainly a lot of work to do on this committee as far as bringing forward final recommendations for the spring legislature.

But as Mr. Prebble mentioned, there's a number of people that have got a great deal of belief, I guess, right now that this wraparound process could be very instrumental in helping to meet the needs of children to attain a wholesome and happier and healthier life.

So we thank you very much for coming. And have yourself a good day.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I just want to say . . . I just want to add my thanks. And I just want to say that we stand formally adjourned until 1:30 p.m.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We'll bring our hearings back to order and our first witness is Michael LeClaire, who is the principal at Nutana Collegiate. And Michael, we are delighted to have you here and really looking forward to your presentation. And I know you've had a chance to meet members of the committee personally so we don't do introductions. We want to just make sure you get as much time as possible to do your presentation and I'd like to turn it over to you.

Mr. LeClaire: — Well, thank you, thank you, Peter. Just for some clarification, I used to be the principal of Nutana Collegiate. I have now been seconded by Education to be the provincial consultant for Integrated School-Linked Services for our province.

Now, and I would also like just to beg the mercy of this of this panel. I was unaware that I had to present a written brief. At the present time, I'm . . . my office is in a renovations stage. I've

asked to stay at Nutana Collegiate instead of taking an office downtown. I thought I would stay in Nutana just to see some of the things that we have worked on unfold. And I thought that this year was a very important year and I didn't want to lose touch, I didn't want to lose touch with the kids and I didn't want to lose touch with the staff. So if you could, if you could please understand that.

In so doing, I was unaware that I had to submit a brief. I did this morning write this up. I really beg the indulgence of this panel; I whipped this off in about an hour and a half. If there are grammatical mistakes, please excuse them. I was in a rush. But I also wanted something for you to take home in case you needed some further clarification. So what I'll try to do is I will try and briefly outline a journey that we've had that we really believe have had a tremendous impact on young people and on their families. So if I may begin.

This was a dream that started about 1989, and as we all know that necessity sometimes is the mother of invention. We had a high school called Nutana Collegiate that had about 237 students. We were on the verge of being looked at for closure. At the same time, we had an — excuse me — about the same time, we also recognize that the students that were coming to Nutana Collegiate were coming for a particular purpose. For the most part, they weren't doing well in other schools and they just happened to end up at the smallest collegiate in Saskatoon.

We did something really innovative. And we did it because, probably because out of fear to begin with. No staff wanted to lose their job, number one. And number two, no Saskatoon community member wanted Nutana Collegiate to close because it is a traditional institution within our city. Taking those two factors, something very interesting happened. The staff got together and said what should we do and this brought about a whole change in, I believe, in education today.

The biggest change was as we asked our students who there were, what they needed, what their dreams and aspirations were. What their goals were, what their strengths were. And it came to a point where now we call this the student profile.

What we did with the student profile was to take the results of the survey instrument and built a program that meets the needs of young people. Young people, at that time, said two things to us. Change the way you're delivering education because it's not meeting our needs. As one of my business colleagues said to me, they're not buying what you're selling.

The second thing is they said we come to school as human beings. We don't come to school as students, we don't come to school as customers, we don't come to school as clients — we come as a human, a person. And with that, because of the very nature of where we're coming from, we have a multitude of issues that impede our school performance. So you have to help us address those issues.

Now being good educators at that time, the staff and the principal, at that time, decided, let's stick to what we know best, let's stick to education in its more narrow sense of the definition of education. And they surveyed numerous delivery systems and came up with what we call the Copernican system in

academia, or for most people, most people look at . . . it's what called the block scheduling system or the quarter system. Essentially that means that students come for one class in the morning for two hours; they come for one class in the afternoon for two hours, and after 10 weeks of instructions, they write final exams.

What that's done though, it creates four entry points and four exit points. So students, many of our students, because of the very nature of who they are, don't start until after freeze-up and yet they start in quarter two. They're still meaningfully engaged in education. And the Copernican system has a tremendous amount of other benefits that we can talk about later if you would so wish.

It also really facilitated a difference in teaching pedagogy. It forced teachers, high school teachers, to do something different. When you only have a student for an hour in front of you, you can have a lot of direct instruction, but you put a student of the nature that we have, high-risk students and you try to lecture for them for two hours, you will lose them. This forced students' centred learning. So students became active participants in their own learning.

One of the things that the kids had told us, the young people had told us, was that it was really important that somehow you make the link between what we're learning in the class to its practical application outside the world of school. And we went through a journey to do that and I think we have really made a huge dint in that concept.

The second part though that the student profile had identified, was the numerous personal issues that continued to impede school performance. Poverty was probably one of the number one areas but there were many other things. There was of course, there was — obviously, why you're here — that prostitution was one. Sickness and ill health was another. A multitude of social and emotional and behavioural problems and a multitude of health problems.

We began to attract, we began to attract numerous students because of the quarter system and with the introduction of what I call the human services aspect. We began, we really began a journey of creating a school home out of a schoolhouse where young people, especially young people at risk, had the opportunity to be successful. The only way that we felt at the time, in about 1995-96, that we could possibly be successful would be that we would join hands with community agencies and community partners to raise and educate our youth.

We began to realize that teachers can only do so much — teach. And that's what they're trained to do. We needed the help of other people. We needed the help of social workers. We needed the help of Justice. We needed the help of health workers.

So we started to form this concept called integrated school link services. We believe at this point in time from our research across Saskatchewan or across Canada, that we're the only school of this nature in Canada that has what we call a full-service school at this level.

Here's what happened though. If you remember correctly I said

there were approximately 237 or 247 students a decade ago. Last year we saw 1,605 different students.

Here's the nature of our kinds of young people that we have attracted. Thirty per cent are First Nations ancestry — over 30 per cent are of First Nations or Metis ancestry. Thirty to forty per cent of our young people no longer live at home. Eighty per cent are at risk of not completing school. Eighty per cent have already attended two or more other high schools, some as many as 11. Ninety per cent of those 80 per cent have had failing or poor educational experiences in those other places.

Almost 50 per cent — it was 47.8 or 47.6, I can't exactly remember anymore — of our students are directly responsible to the Department of Social Services; you know, almost 50 per cent. So out of that 1,605 almost 800 were clients of Social Services in one shape, form, or another.

An interesting and a very alarming statistic: 39 per cent claim an addiction to drugs or alcohol. Most use drugs and/or alcohol on a frequent basis.

The average age of grade 12 two years ago was 19.6; last year it was 19.2.

One of our partners, the College of Nursing, did a survey. We just sampled 330 students and I don't know the exact numbers but I think I'm fairly close. Out of the 330, 124 had been sexually abused at one time or another in their lives, and 136 claimed physical abuse at one time or another in their lives.

So that's the . . . Oh, another interesting statistic. When I started there in 1995, I think there were something like 72 student mothers. Last year we had 144 student moms within our school.

We have a day care that has over a hundred on the waiting list. And in our day care there are 17 spots that are filled — well you can imagine, it just fills like this — for 12 infants and 5 toddlers.

We have a parenting program. We have a multitude of services that I can certainly get into when there are questions, if you would like that.

The whole concept though of integrated schooling services — they're based on essential principles and you have them in front of you and I don't want necessarily to read them all — but that whole concept, the whole concept though was based on trust.

When we started forming the partnerships we had to form the basis on what? We were begging the services of others and we recognized that whatever we did, we had to do it together. We had to do it in a collaborative, interdepartmental way that would allow agencies to do what they needed, would allow the best services that a student be able to get, but would also allow us to start looking and doing business in a different way.

We recognize that we were looking at a different governance, but it would be kind of shared leadership, shared ownership, shared responsibility, and shared accountability. That we would work together to create a new vision for community. That we had to understand the needs and strengths — our needs, our

strengths, our students' needs, and our students' strengths. We also had to recognize this on our own self.

We believe totally in the holistic form of education. Meaning that when you teach and educate a young person or a child you educate all four quadrants — physical, mental, spiritual, social, emotional — because every human being needs those things. They need to live, to love, to learn, and to leave a legacy. That's a concept of a human being.

Somehow we had to make sure that we looked at all those things; that we wanted to . . . we understood that this was a process that was going to take a tremendous amount of time. We are still involved in this process, as Peter well knows.

And that this type of integrated service would require additional resources. I am pleased to say that our graduation rate is twice the number what it was three years ago. Retention rates continue to increase at all times.

We have now become so sophisticated, I believe, in our survey instrument that we have had to adopt another partner from the Department of Psychology. Her role as a researcher is to help us and teach us survey construction, and now help us to interpret statistical analysis. I'll give you just a brief window of what this would mean.

Out of our survey came the concept that we were doing very well with our young First Nations females, but we were not doing very well with our First Nations males. So knowing that statistic, I mean we have to look at program development, how can we start reaching some of our First Nations males within our school. Well that would just give you an idea of what a survey can do when it's properly done.

I guess in conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, if there's anything that I would really like to stress, is that whole concept that the student profile, that really getting to know who . . . what the issues are and who the people truly are, what their aspirations are, what their needs are, what their strengths are, what their goals are, what impedes their school performance, what can we do differently. We really have to look at that.

To me that is the essence, one of the essences, of student empowerment. And we do this in such a sophisticated fashion, all the students know it's going to be student profile; today's the day that we're doing the student profile. And we literally, we bill the school every two years. We have to change our programs. Obviously if you're . . . now I'm starting to use the three lingos, as my clients change, as my students change, and as my customer change, so do I have to start changing my delivery or my structure; otherwise I'm going to lose them.

I really, truly believe personally, and I think I speak for all — maybe not all educators but many educators — that education, I really believe, is the thing that can really make a true difference in the lives of young people.

Now the concept that I really am pushing for of course is a concept — and I'm not sure if you've had an opportunity to talk to the Role of Schools Committee — okay. But that whole concept that it's . . . what we really have to start looking at I

believe in Saskatchewan is the concept of community school. Community school in its broadest sense — not community schools in its narrow sense or the definition from the Department of Education where you have to meet certain criteria to get certain funding and then be designated a community school.

I'm saying that community school should be adopted because it is the community that partakes in the education of their young person, their child or their young person. That's the concept. At school it fosters belonging. It develops a sense of ownership, purpose, and pride. And I guess those are the concepts and traits not found in at-risk youth.

If you talk to your child prostitutes — the people who have been so severely abused — they never talk about pride, never talk about a sense of belonging. They're an estranged group of young people that just have no ties. Sometimes it takes such work to get any feeling from them.

So that whole concept of community school philosophy or what we're calling school plus also has to expand to high schools. Community schools right now are only in elementary schools. We really believe they have to move to high schools.

We really believe, we really also believe, that we need a diversity of different ways of reaching young people. The structure and the facility of school itself may have to look different to attract some of these young people — meaning that we're going to have to look at some type of programs, alternate only in the form though, only in the form that would meet their needs, and still challenge them educationally.

One of the concepts that we have kept at Nutana that I really believe is the whole concept that just because you are a person who has had a tremendous amount of difficulty in your life, whose schools performance has been impeded for all the reasons that you know so well as a panel, does not mean that you cannot learn. And I really believe we have to help them, kicking or screaming, across that finish line and get a grade 12 education for the most part.

Some may never attain that at this particular point in time in their life. But we have to reach out and find what they would find meaningful. We have to ask them what do you need in order to be successful. If it is a program running out of downtown in an office building or, you know, wherever, then let's do that. Because I think that's the only way we can make a true difference — one of the only ways.

I also believe that it has to be done on the basis of a human services integration model, that having on-site services within Nutana really enhanced the quality of the services provided. It not only maximizes the window of opportunity for working successfully with the individual, but on-site collaborative services do something else. You are effective as a single organization. But when you reach out and work together, when single organizations work together on behalf of the same common vision, it far supersedes what any individual or any agency could possibly do.

We have come up with solutions, ladies and gentlemen, that we

would never have thought of as educators. But because I sit beside an addictions counsellor and a social worker and a primary health care nurse and a youth facilitation expert, when we come and face a problem, we come from our . . . each of our own respective disciplines. And our product really makes a difference.

So that's the team concept, and of course, that's the whole concept of integration . . . or integrated schooling services. I really believe that it would be important that this would necessitate the involvement of the HSIF (Human Services Information Forum) and also of RICs (Regional Intersectoral Committee), another community partner. I really believe that RIC has a tremendous amount of opportunities here to play in this particular role.

I've even taken the liberty and the courage to say that I really think that the present role of government, it would have profound effects on this. And that also profound effects on the role of government could play in aiding and developing such a model.

So we realize that, you know, it has to come, it has to come two ways. It has to come from the top down and the bottom up. We recognize in Saskatoon we have an issue. We recognize in Saskatchewan we have an issue. What we're saying is that in order for this change to take place, you need government support from the top, policy formation, jointly done, policy formation. We need the work obviously at the grass roots level. We need support there.

But somehow it can't stay local and it can't stay at the top. We have to kind of join together in a simultaneous, strategic plan so when you work it's just like cogs on a wheel. They click. And we really believe that this is one of the foundations of making a concept of truly intersectoral work meaningful. And it has to be at that level. So both levels, up and down, if you want to put it that way for lack of better words.

I want to make in closing though the statement that we know, as educators and as human service providers, that the child or the young person cannot achieve holistic health and holistic education in isolation from the family. We recognize that we must work as a community with the family in this community setting and by supporting all those within to reach what I call holistic healthiness.

We recognize that parents whose children are involved in the sex trade need some way to regain their dignity. Some form to become caring and effective parents. To somehow positively re-engage with their children and find ways to become productive and responsible citizens.

We always feel at school that things are undone when they go home. So it is a . . . there is a difference here — and I'm sure you've probably heard this before — but if we only do the work in one with the young person and neglect and don't do anything with the home, everything just doesn't work that way, folks, in our opinion. We have to kind of work together.

That would be an extremely hard journey. We would recognize how much work there would be involved, but that is the only

way we believe that there will be significant differences in the lives of children, youth, and their family. I propose that Integrated School-Linked Services is a method that would help to do that because it is a whole community working with all children and family. And at the end I'd like to use an old adage that seems to be appropriate that community problems beg community solutions.

Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Michael, thank you for an excellent presentation. And I think what we'll do — what we normally do, if this is fine with you — is have committee members ask you questions. So I'd like to invite members of the committee to do that now. June, do you have a question? And Kevin. We'll take June and then Kevin.

Ms. Draude: — He said one question so I have to scan my list to see which one I think is important.

This morning we had a presentation from . . . and I guess other presentations as well have talked about the need for integrated services in some shape or form. And I talked about community schools to this witness this morning and they were in favour of them but they did feel that community schools were trying to tackle the solution themselves as educators and bringing on departments, social service workers and so on, within that system rather than trying to work within the whole big system.

Now, first of all, I guess I'll ask you what your comment is regarding that.

Mr. LeClaire: — Okay. I'm hoping, June, that I'm going to answer this question to your satisfaction. There is a difference between the traditional, what I would call the traditional community school, as we see it per se right now in Saskatchewan and the level that I'm asking people to make in terms of integrated schooling services schools. Not that they didn't engage Social Services or Health, but they've engaged them in a different way. Integrated schooling services, you bring the people on-site. It's almost like a one-stop shop where you can literally go. There are no waiting lines.

If you need to see the addictions counsellor you just knock on the door and walk in. The nice thing about it, the addiction counsellor can see you . . . sees you every day and has an interaction with you every day. There's an immediate follow-up.

The other nice thing about it is that the addiction counsellor then can meet with the social worker, because most of the time it is a recipient of Social Services, though not always, can walk down the hall and talk to our Aboriginal liaison worker to find out if there's anything that we need to do at home.

Do you understand the concept? And I guess in our mind that brings about fairly effective and significant change. At the same time of course you talk to the teachers to find out now, how can we rework some of this stuff so the kid can still be successful in school.

Ms. Draude: — Okay, so then you're . . .

Mr. LeClaire: — So is that . . .

Ms. Draude: — I think so. Basically what you're doing then is saying the heart of the community then is the school with people working out of that. Whether it's the physical location doesn't matter as much as the fact that the school has the hands-on to children at an early age and would know if there is concerns in the family. Are you saying that as well?

Mr. LeClaire: — What's the last part? I'm sorry.

Ms. Draude: — That they would know if their children are maybe at risk earlier than any other agency would?

Mr. LeClaire: — Oh, yes. Yes, because we have, you know, I mean the people just knock right on the door. That's the nice thing about it. People ask me, why don't you just hire a couple of social workers? Why do you need the Department of Social Services there? Why couldn't you just hire social workers? But that's not the concept.

The concept's that they're already the Department's clients, number one. Number two, they're the only ones with the mandate and the policy to do the things that need to get done. If there's a child protection case, they can immediately respond, whereas a social worker from the school would only have to phone back to Social Services, Social Services back to the . . . and we've lost time. And sometimes immediacy is really important.

The other thing is you also get the power and I'm looking at power in a very positive sense of the department. All the things that go on in there, all the programs, you get immediate access to those things and they have a multitude of support programs for young people.

Ms. Draude: — This is my last question. Is Nutana . . . I know you consider it a success. Like the number of students wanting to go into Nutana I understand is increasing and the number of parents who . . . or the number of people who would like to use the services. Can you tell me, you know, what you consider your success rate?

And when you say that your graduation rate has doubled, what percentage of your students graduate now?

Mr. LeClaire: — Well, that's a very good question, because it's very difficult to answer that in terms of . . . And I think you have two questions there, but . . .

Ms. Draude: — I do. I snuck them in.

Mr. LeClaire: — It's hard to pinpoint what we would call graduation rates, because they come in and come out so much. That's the issue here.

All we know is that we graduate twice as many as we did three years ago. We had about 52 graduands three years ago with a population of about . . . we saw about 1,200 students. Now we're seeing 1,600, but we're graduating of . . . I think last year we had . . . 113 is our exact number.

Some of them are just taking a little longer to graduate. See, it's an okay thing at Nutana to graduate in five years or six years or seven years even. We even have some that are seven years in high school. This is their seventh year.

But you see they only come for two quarters because they work. They have enough pride within themselves, enough economic independence for themselves that they say I can't afford to go to school all year. So what I'll do is I'll wait till after earth . . . I'll work up to freeze-up, until end of quarter. Yes, end of quarter one. Quarter one usually starts about November 2nd, 3rd or something like that. And then they leave in April because that's . . . you know, it's the end of freeze-up and jobs are opening up again so they'll work for another . . . now, you would . . . how do we measure a success rate that way?

I would measure that as a success, a tremendous amount of success.

To answer your other question, one quarter we turned away 178 students. I know, folks. And as a school, public school system, that was not what we wanted. I mean, trust us. But we had to realize we are staffed at 650 students. We went over one year to 725 and we started to lose the very thing that we aspire to.

Now we believe that it's people and relationships that make the big difference in your lives. If there's anything that's going to do that we need the opportunity to make anonymity extinct. You can not do that when you reach over . . . in our opinion, reaches over a certain number. We've held to 650. Even 650 is too much. I would love to see it at 600. Six hundred we could probably even do a better job, but we recognize that these times are difficult.

The 178 students that we ask why don't you go to another school said we can't because, if we don't go to a school that gives us the support that we need outside the academic support, we're going to . . . just as well wait. We'll wait in line for next quarter. So we'll continue doing what we wanted.

Now some, obviously, did go into other schools, but it's a different problem to have. Not a good problem. It's not a nice problem; it's just a different problem.

Mr. Yates: — Thanks very much . . . a very good presentation. It's nice to hear that you're working on one of the problems that we face in our society here.

My question has to do with children who are . . . how do they get involved in the school? We talked about the program. We talked about there's 178 more students than want to be there. How do they become aware of it? Are they referred by Social Services in cases? Do they need a referral to get into your school or can they just walk in? What's sort of the process of involvement here?

Are we getting high-risk kids? I guess what I'm trying to find out, are we getting all high-risk kids or are we getting some kids who just . . . are looking for an easier way than the traditional school system? Taking up spaces perhaps in a school like yours which should be for high-risk kids. Like I'm talking about local kids in the area. You know are you getting some that are . . .

Mr. LeClaire: — Yes. So we pull from all over the city, okay, so we don't pull from a geographic location per se like a neighbourhood. In fact, very few kids from the Nutana neighbourhood go to Nutana. Most go to Bowman or Walter Murray, or Holy Cross if they're separate school supporters. Very few come to Nutana, though some do. But most of those that do are fairly at risk, though not all. We have some students that are just regular students.

Most come on their own. We have just developed a reputation and carved a niche in our society that it's an okay thing if you're an older student to come to Nutana and complete your education.

Now some students are referred through their various agencies. Obviously because we have many of our partners, one for example being the John Howard Society, would say to a student maybe, I think if you come to Nutana you may get the things that you need that would enable you, in the positive sense again of the word, enable you to become more successful. Because you're going to need those supports and we can help you because we're there. We can help you with your issues that impede your school performance.

We have a screening process in our school system that identifies and targets certain students. And they're asked to come to Nutana, they're not told. They're asked to come to Nutana, and that seems to work very well. And again we're looking for students who have a tremendous amount of difficulty, more so emotional and social behavioural difficulties, and come from dysfunctional families. We seem to do a pretty good job with those kids.

Mr. Yates: — My second question has to do around those kids that are asked whether they'd like to go to Nutana. I asked this morning, we had another presentation, about identifying earlier in life — as early perhaps as elementary school, grades 6, 7, and 8 — high-risk children, children not likely to complete school and if they were streamed into a program that more met their needs would they have more success. And I got told that that would . . . you know you'd get reaction from families and so on and so forth, and I'm sure you would from some.

But are you having, do you think with the referral system, asking children, a fairly high success rate of children taking it up and coming to Nutana?

Mr. LeClaire: — Yes, for the most part. For the most part we have a high percentage of students you know that are referred to stay with us and come to us. Is that what you're asking?

Mr. Yates: — Right. And I want to ask the other side of the question. Those who are asked if they'd like to go to Nutana and don't, what's their success rate in their regular school system? Are many of them dropping out or . . .

Mr. LeClaire: — That's a good question, Kevin. From our understanding at this point in time, some do very well; others don't. They try but just seem to fall through the grades eventually. The support's not there and holistic vision isn't there.

And I'm certainly not laying the blame on any of the schools because we have reached out into our community to gather the support necessary to shore them up, if you want to put it that way, to have a safety net — every time they fall, they fall.

Maybe I'll give you an example. For example, we have . . . I've been trying to think of this young girl that we're working with who was not very school-ready, even for Nutana. But we didn't kick her out and say, I'm sorry that you're just not able to be here. We said, I'm sorry you're not able to function academically now but you still need some help, so what we're going to do is we're going to put you in an adult setting where you're going to be working along with some adults in an employment . . . in a job-readiness sort of a program.

We'll teach you some life skills, we'll teach you the things, we'll still hold onto you, but you still need to see the addictions counsellor and you still need to see the social worker, and you need to see them probably two or three times a week. And that young girl, I can guarantee you, will graduate in a year and a half, after, you know, developing a program, that concept.

Mr. Yates: — My final question has to do with . . . You talked about going to the block system of schooling. Did it require the modification of all of the curriculum or the contents of the curriculum in order to . . . as part of your program, or did you take the regular program and fit it in?

Mr. LeClaire: — Yes.

Mr. Yates: — Just took the regular program and fit it in?

Mr. LeClaire: — We took the regular program and fitted it in.

Mr. Yates: — Okay.

Mr. LeClaire: — Now we do have some modified, but not much. We really strive to stay to the regular program, meaning that our students, when they graduate at Nutana Collegiate, can go to the University of Saskatchewan, they can go to SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology), or they can go to Yale. That's their choice.

That's when they graduate. They graduate with that kind of credentials.

Ms. Jones: — I'm wondering . . . It's obvious that to really interact with the students, that it should not be too large a setting, and some of our high schools are quite cumbersome in terms of size and population.

And if this was extended to the whole system, how would it relate in terms of . . . I guess to begin with, how does Nutana fare in terms of a student-teacher ratio? Is it much more intense, much lower student population per teacher? And how would it translate if, you know, if the dream came true and it were implemented throughout the province? What would it look like?

How does it translate in terms of teacher? Or not just teacher, because I think you also have all of these other folks that are integrating their services into a school. So I mean you can almost see a whole lot of little places with a whole lot of

students and workers in them.

So do you have any idea, any concept of what it would look like if the dream came true?

Mr. LeClaire: — I think so. I've had 26 years experience; 11 out of that 26 years have been in three . . . two out of the three largest schools in Saskatchewan. I spent seven years in Mount Royal and four years at Walter Murray. A pretty good idea of what the big schools are like.

I think we're going to have to start looking at . . . What I want to make loud and clear is the Nutana model works for Nutana because it was devised by Nutana for Nutana. I think what Mount Royal and City Park, or Carlton or any other high school in Saskatchewan will probably have to look at what best meets their needs and develop a model that would address the issues that they face.

So again it would be . . . I don't see them to be identical. This is replicable; Nutana Collegiate is replicable any place in terms of integrated schooling services; that we have a firm belief because we have identified those essential principles and they're outlined for you. And Peter has a copy of the lessons that we have learned along the way that we are willing to start to share. And that, I would believe, would be my new job in terms of supporting those people interested in integration of schooling services within their building.

The other comment is that you do not need a lower teacher/pupil ratio and we are not staffed that way. Though when you're dealing with an at-risk population such as a population that now exists in Nutana Collegiate, 25 of those students does not equate 25 . . . And if I may pick on one collegiate, and I'll pick on one of our collegiates, let's say Walter Murray students or Bowman students. The needs of those young people far surpass what a teacher can give, and that's why we had to reach out and ask other community members to help us with this concept. If they truly believed that youth were our future, then let's deal with that. Let's somehow find ways of making them all successful.

I foresee that Walter Murray may have a completely different method but . . . sorry, completely different procedures, maybe, in getting there, but I would see there'd be a lot of similarities in the service delivery model. But it would have to be something they would devise — they and their community.

So parents have a huge input in this, in this concept.

Ms. Jones: — In your particular school though, your . . . are there many parents involved? Or many of these, many of these young people are on their own already.

Mr. LeClaire: — That's right. And they're parents themselves.

What we've done, because of the very nature — and a good question — that's the one place that we really have worked hard and have not made the gains necessary in my opinion. It's very hard to connect with those parents. They feel estranged from school; many have come from the residential schools and they just do not want to darken the school's door.

So we have had to find other venues and other ways of reaching out to them and ask them to come. We have parent focus groups, for example. We always feed our parents. We believe that this is a school home, so when they come we feed them. So we have . . . Our parent nights are more on the terms of an educational concept than they are of a participatory concept right now. We're not there yet. We've reached out more to our kids who are parents themselves and who are young adults. They're the ones that are shaping their future.

If this was in a regular school and you were looking at how would we do this in a regular school and if I was the principal and that, I would probably engage parents. And knowing full well, having served as a principal or assistant principal in other locales, that would not be a difficult thing to do. Parents would really want to take some pride and some ownership and some sense of belonging, some shaping of destiny in future for their schools. They would do that, given the opportunity. I really firmly believe they would do that.

A Member: — Now . . .

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I'm sorry Carolyn. I'm going to . . .

A Member: — You're going to cut me off, Peter?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, because of time. It's almost 2:30 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no, Michael. I'm sorry, committee members, to do this.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, I still have a couple of quick questions here. First of all, you gave a figure of 30 to 40 per cent of your students are not at home any more. Now is that as a result . . . they're older students and on their own or are there other reasons for some of these students not being at home? Foster care or something of that nature?

Mr. LeClaire: — Don, many have chosen no longer to live at home. That's probably a vast majority that have decided to leave what they called a dysfunctional family, and they thought they would be better on their own than they were by themselves.

Mr. Toth: — But what age would be some of those individuals be? Would they be fairly young age or older?

Mr. LeClaire: — No, most of them are older. There are very few that are 16 are on their own. Most of our kids are 19, 20, 21 and they're on their own.

Mr. Toth: — Another question I have is in regards to the number or the students that you have attending your school and the mandate of this committee. You have individuals in the school who are trying to make life better for themselves who may have been on the street at some time?

Mr. LeClaire: — Yes, many.

Mr. Toth: — What percentage — 50 percent?

Mr. LeClaire: — I don't know. Because some of them were on

the street and then came back and then into school, back into home, back into the street. Twenty to 30 per cent have really come from very disruptive, very dysfunctional, catastrophic places and relationships. I'm always amazed at the resiliency.

Mr. Toth: — As a result, just one quick, final question. As a result of attending Nutana, do you say there would be a large number . . . percentage of those who have been on the street who have come, then maybe have gone back for a bit, back to school. Those who would graduate would . . . have you noticed or is there anything that would indicate that they have actually left street life completely and they've got with their lives and become . . . actually think more highly of themselves and have really have been progressive members in society?

Mr. LeClaire: — Don, I guess I've seen so many success stories. One quick one. Morphine addict coming off the street is now in . . . with all her — a young mom too, severely addicted, has been straight for almost two years now. Graduate of Nutana a year and a half ago and is in university and doing well. We have lots of success stories.

Hookers that have come back. We try to, you know, tell them not to ply their trade any more, try to get into some meaningful and engaging work and, you know, second and third year university today. Some also . . . not just always university but some good work. One happens to be a legal secretary for a law firm in Saskatoon. That's pretty good.

Mr. Harper: — No, Peter, I won't ask any questions although I do have a number of them. But I do want to thank Mike very, very much for his very informative presentation — very informative.

Mr. LeClaire: — Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Michael, I've just got a couple of questions that I want to ask you. And then unfortunately, although we could continue this for some time we're going to need to wrap up.

But with respect to the Saskatoon situation, is it your view that we should . . . Let me put it this way to begin with. I'm thinking about . . . I'm hearing what you're saying about the number of students that had to be turned away from Nutana. I'm also looking at the number of students that we know in the city who, unfortunately, are really past students in the sense that they're of school age but not in school. And we've kicked around numbers of a thousand, possibly more than a thousand.

And we're seeing a lot of kids drop out in grade 8, grade 9 — particularly grade 9 seems to be sort of a high drop-out year. Is it your view that we need a west side school that does some of the same kind of things that Nutana does, a sort of a smaller west side high school in the city? Or a second, maybe it isn't on the west side, but a second school like Nutana in this city with a view to addressing some of the issues that this committee is mandated to look at? And not only those but . . .

Mr. LeClaire: — Okay. I have to think about this, Peter, for a second. I think we could probably use some of the existing schools within our west side right now and give them the

opportunities to start forming the concept of integrated schooling services. At the same time, knowing now the experiences that we've received is that perhaps we may have to look at different alternative educational programs linked with the school but not attached to the school per se — so storefront operations. We have five at Nutana.

We have five satellites that are attached to Nutana because some of these kids just will not darken a doorway of a school again. So if they don't — fine. What will they darken? They will darken a house on whatever — 5th Street, you know.

Put a couple of crackerjack teachers in there, link them up with the necessary services that are needed — health, social services, justice, finance, whatever — and then let's work with those and either get them school ready, if that's what they choose, or get them to a point where they become responsible, productive citizens in society.

Now here's an educator saying, you know, wait a minute now, maybe . . . I'm just saying that not everyone will want to at this particular point in time in their life go back to a regular high school and do this. We should be forming partnerships with post-secondary in a big way.

So we should look at this not from K to 12, but from prenatal all the way to the point where they no longer need shoring up, folks is what I'm saying. That's the vision. And somehow we have to work all together in this concept.

So that gives you maybe more than you asked for, Peter.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, I know, but I'm glad you have, Michael. Because I mean I guess I, in part, asked the question because of the size of the existing schools. And wondering whether it is a smaller school in which this needs to happen. You know, a school with 3, 4, 500 students. Or whether we can in fact utilize our, our larger west-side high schools to achieve this purpose.

Mr. LeClaire: — Well, I really think we could. We'd have to do some different things in order to help them out but I'm not sure if we have to go build something — another, another building. But I really believe that we could probably afford to look at alternative programs, you know, and somehow get into a partnership — cause that's what this is all about — in partnerships with other people.

Like the apprenticeship system. I mean, this as an aside. I mean, that's some good things that can come out of there. Why aren't we really working more towards this? Are we really separate? K to 12? Or, you know, actually, K to 8; 9 to 12. And we can't look at it like that. We have to look at it more holistically.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — My last question is one that I asked Joceline Schriemer who presented on wraparound this morning and I wanted to get your advice on the same question.

The question pertains to how we are going to reach all the students that we're not touching right now? And of course Nutana is touching a lot of these students. But if we know that we've got a thousand kids who are not in school right now,

many of course of whom Nutana isn't touching, and we know we've got roughly about 250 kids a year who are sexually abused on the street, some of whom are still in schools. Some of them are at Nutana, some of them are in elementary school, some of them are in other high schools in the city.

But I guess what I was asking Joceline this morning is how are we . . . what's your advice about how we mount a strategy in the city for making sure that we identify and provide the necessary support to every child who's been sexually abused on the street and every child who is not in school. And of course you combine those two together and we're looking at more than a thousand kids.

Mr. LeClaire: — Well you know, off the top of my head, folks need a tracking system. We need some way, we need some way to track these young people. And I'm suggesting that Health be the people that do that since everyone has a health number. Somehow we get access to this and we do it as an inter . . . and we can do this, according to legislation as of May, 1997 I believe, or June, 1997, for the purposes of Integrated School-Linked Services; we can share information for the betterment of clients, students, etc.

Then we would need, we needed someone to coordinate all these . . . There are some services and programs out there, folks, within our school systems and our present community in Saskatoon, they could address many of these issues. But it's, I really feel that it's, it's done here, it's done there, it's done here. It's like an octopus and there doesn't seem to be any . . . that their arms are cut off from the head. They are wriggling out there. Somehow we have to reconnect them somehow to that head so that we can literally dance with the octopus, if you want to put it that way. And there needs to be some coordination of efforts. Somebody has to do that. Somebody with, also with the mandate or the authority or the permission to do this.

At the same time, there has to be in my opinion, there has to be a recognition that one size no longer fits all. We have to go back to them and ask them, what do you need in order to be successful. I mean, this is back to this student profile. Somehow we have to get on the street with people who would be willing to do that and say, what do you need in terms of education? What do you need in order to be successful? What do you want?

And I think we've talked to some young people who said I don't want to go to a regular school but yet I still want to go to school because everybody believes school is important. So somehow we have to create these.

And they'll be probably different in Riversdale as they would be at Pleasant Hill because Pleasant Hill needs to do what they need to do in order to address the issues they have. We just have to support them.

But there has to be a coordination of effort and wraparound is one of the ways that we can do that that seems to be — what's the word I'm looking for? It's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon me? Yes, it's integrated. It also makes a lot of sense. It's not fearful for the young person because it's their buddy that they know that's doing this. And yet there's a number of other

people and professionals helping.

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

Mr. LeClaire: — Does that give you . . .

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Oh, yes. No one person is going to have all the answers at this point.

Mr. LeClaire: — No, no, otherwise we wouldn't be here.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Michael, thank you for a wonderful presentation, for your advice, and for all the work that you've done in our community. Thanks for coming here today.

Mr. LeClaire: — Thank you for inviting me here today.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We're going to take a two-minute coffee break and please just get your coffee and come back. And we should keep on rolling.

And Carol, you'll be next, Carol. Thanks for waiting, Carol.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Now I know you know some of us but we should do introductions and then let you introduce yourself. So we'll start with June.

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

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

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Margaret, do you want to introduce yourself?

Ms. Woods: — Margaret Woods, the Committee Clerk.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And Randy.

Mr. Pritchard: — Hello. I'm Randy Pritchard, the technical adviser to the committee.

Mr. Yates: — I'm Kevin Yates, the MLA for Regina Dewdney. And beside me, out having a smoke, is Carolyn Jones. And beside her is Ron Harper.

Ms. Dalton: — Are they legislators as well?

Mr. Yates: — Yes, they are. Carolyn is the MLA for Saskatoon Meewasin and Ron is the MLA for Regina Northeast, the area which is the stroll and that is in Regina.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So Carol, we're delighted to have you with us and welcome Jacqui. Welcome back to the witness chair as well. And we'd just invite you to introduce yourselves and we're really looking forward to your presentation.

Ms. Dalton: — Thank you. I am here on behalf of women

across Saskatchewan and many of them are living in Saskatoon and area. And naturally because we're located here.

I'm a mother of three birth children, a stepmother, and an adoptive mother of three more so that's a total of six. I'm a survivor of child sexual abuse, a political activist, and it's been my privilege to work in this community, the large community of Saskatchewan, to try and create institutional change, to draw attention to the realities that are faced silently by one in four women.

We have been at this for 10 years, so that says a lot about this community — the depth of concern and commitment. I'm feeling a little nervous. It's such a difference in power, which is such a huge issue for all sexual abuse survivors, because sexual abuse can only take place when there's a powerless child and a powerful abuser, be it male or female, adult or youth.

I would like to send greetings to each one of you and to Arlene as well, who's not here. Greetings from our elder, Laura Wasacase, who would have been sitting beside me where Jacqui is now but for the fact that she is with women this afternoon. And that was something that had to take priority.

Also we have greetings from Anne Elliott, our project coordinator at Tamara's House. Anne and most of our active members, volunteers, and staff are this afternoon developing and planning our community development volunteer program for the upcoming year. And that was also prior scheduled.

I would like to give you greetings from each of our volunteer board members: Carol Olson from the Saskatoon District Health Board, you may remember her; Irene Frasier who is a traditional spiritual teacher but also a leader in our community and works for the National Parole Board; Kathy Zaitzoff, past member of the Saskatoon District Health Board and a very active member on a number of boards in our community, professional and health care field.

Isn't this funny how that happens when you're sitting here feeling nervous. Never happened to anyone else I guess.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We'll take a moment and we'll let Arlene take her chair. It's nice to have our other Co-Chair back.

Ms. Dalton: — Lillian Dyck — just seeing Arlene has reminded me because the last time I saw Arlene she was about to speak at the Women of the Dawn conference, about a year and a half ago I think now. But Lillian Dyck is a member of our board. She is a very well-known First Nations professor at the University of Saskatchewan and a two-time winner of the Women of the Dawn award.

Margo Couldwell who has not only been a teacher at the university but has worked for many years in this field and is currently full time with youth services — another board member. And my apologies for any board member that I haven't mentioned. But each would like you to know that your work is very important to this community and to this kind of success that we have been able to have in small measure at Tamara's House.

I would like to thank Arlene and Peter for co-chairing this and for personally making the time and effort to come and see what is going on, in person, at Tamara's House. You just can't underestimate what a big help that is and what an encouragement that is. And so I want to acknowledge that kind of leadership, and thank you very much.

Don, the last time I saw you was in a PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus that no longer exists, and one of your colleagues ended up being charged with sexual abuse of a street person and young woman.

I remember his concern being expressed to me personally when we were presenting to all the members, but to one caucus after another, cry out for the children. Does anybody remember that? The cry out for the children who when they're sexually abused and try to turn to our justice system, find little or no credibility in a courtroom, and oftentimes are retraumatized and frankly worse off for the experience.

It is very difficult after 10 years to come again to this representation of the legislature. And I know you're, you know, representing the best and the most committed in this area; but the fact remains that you have not partnered with the community. For a legislature and a bureaucracy that continuously talks of partnership, even making conditional support to communities, conditional overtures of possible future support financially, when they don't partner with community we cannot succeed together. We can only do this work together.

As Michael so eloquently expressed earlier — Arlene, you weren't here for Michael's presentation for Nutana — but both Jacqui and I were sharing our appreciation of the work that has been done there by the community. And I have to tell you a little anecdote because this is kind of one of the fun things that happens when good things are working and people are working together.

They have a program for parents, students and kids, SAKS. And as Michael said, daily contact, trust is being built, relationships are being built. And Tamara's House had a need for a provincial-wide commercial to launch an appeal for fundraising to individuals across the country but mostly across Saskatchewan. And we made an invitation to the young women, the young mothers and teenagers at Nutana that are in the SAKS program, to come out and be a part of this commercial, knowing that this would be a really exciting thing.

It was very, very professionally done and yet was a really empowering thing. The woman running the program told me that through, you know, interviews and screening and application forms, she was aware that almost 98, if not 100 per cent of the participants were survivors of child sexual abuse, but it was still a silence topic among them and that it would take a lot of courage on the part of anyone to be part of that commercial.

And I want to acknowledge that two wonderful young women from Nutana came out and were in that commercial, again not identifying themselves as having had that experience, but supporting the work that Tamara's has been doing; and in fact becoming a role model for healing among their peers and taking

a courageous step forward in their own personal journeys and breaking the silence.

So that little anecdote feeds into what Michael has been saying and what we will be saying. What is the common experience that underlies these complex problems that are shown in our community. And, Ron, you were saying, you know earlier alluding to that, Ron was, and it seems overwhelming.

And I think after 3,000 years-plus of doing nothing, we've kind of got what we all deserve — a big mess. I mean we're in a worse mess than you know this Florida election that's going on down there, by far, on this issue.

And politically we can do something if we work together. But we are not going to do anything if we keep on pitting community groups one against the other with minimal support, financial support, on an issue like this which is a burnout, let's be honest. It's extremely difficult. You must be feeling that by just doing this legislative subcommittee, let alone working day-to-day with atrocity work.

And the injustice that continues on this issue, the incredible injustice. The fact that when a person is shattered by sexual abuse, when their own bodies are used for the sexual gratification of an adult and the whole world remains indifferent, apparently utterly indifferent. When someone is called on the carpet after 23 years and offspring — thinking of Dennis Foster, who obviously comes to mind — Schneeberger, you know, not just infamous legislators. But we are talking about people. This province has got very famous cases and very few of them are behind bars with keys tossed.

And the people who have to live with this are the sexual abuse survivors who are quickly over 16. And once their sexual boundaries have been shattered as a child and nobody apparently noticed, and the family gatherings carry on, and Mr. and Mrs. Perpetrator who's still in the family carries on with respect, or Mr. and Mrs. Powerful in Society carries on, it's very understandable to me that people take power over their life in any twisted way that they find works for them. And one of the ways is to damn well get paid.

And I think we've got to recognize that this is strictly just another coping mechanism, another negative coping mechanism, but that's all it is. It's people saying I might as well get paid; I'll get out there. And of course, it's compounded then with drug abuse because the feeling of getting used is rotten and you might as well be numb. And a very easy way to get numb is to get stoned. And it doesn't matter what you're using.

Now some people cope with this inner agony and inner pain by just hitting the books. Some people become very academic. They actually succeed immensely in an academic setting and personally suffer immensely in silence. They appear to be just like us and so do the perpetrators. We are them, they are us. They are our brothers and sisters and respected members of the community, as well as our brothers and sisters that might as well get \$10 or \$5 or a pack of cigarettes for a sexual favour.

And we need to break silence on this in a huge way which is why Tamara's House labelled ourselves. We wanted to break

silence on this. We must break silence. And it is a beacon of hope for a lot of people until they can find the personal strength to get there.

And we've had women say it's taken them two years but just knowing we were in this community, that we've survived as a non-profit organization without any funding, to the shame of this government and all the previous governments for the last 10 years. That this hasn't been supported. If there's any shame, it's certainly not on a person who's taking money on the street. It's for those of us who have the ability to do something about this and have not chosen to. And I hope that . . . I mean, I'm not wanting to beat you up because you're doing the most that anybody is. But you have a message to send back here, and so I hope you'll understand that I do say this respectfully even with my anger and my appreciation, all mingled.

And I have to represent the women who have been marginalized, ridiculed, stereotyped, medically diagnosed, pigeonholed, silenced, and ignored. What have we been doing for the women? Well, as soon as they turn 16 and start acting out, they can be labelled with any number of medical labels. And if they want help in this society right now, that's what they can do is go along with it, say they've got some medical disease, get into a psychiatrist who will be able to give them heavy medication and shock treatments.

And I am sending you a very strong message. If you as legislatures do not change this, you'll be sitting 10, 15, 20 years from now in the same position that the old legislators are for having done horrible things to people of intellectual disabilities.

We cannot treat people like subhuman. Shock treatments are unproven and they do have a negative effect on memory — short-term memory only. So you're not only a survivor who's having horror shows at night with trying to sleep, remembering what it was like being abused in Technicolor close-ups, shocking reliving of trauma, of child trauma, but then you've got somebody who's going to numb you out with medical drugs and have you walking around like a zombie, and put you in for 10 weeks of electric shock treatments, where your brain is going to be changed, only in the short term. So the trouble you were having finding your keys is absolutely compounded.

Now we have got courageous psychiatrists who have come forward and said this is not safe for survivors — the psychiatric ward is not safe for survivors of child sexual abuse. And we continue to put them in there. I had to go to a funeral last year of a woman who hung herself in the co-ed washroom of the psychiatric ward. I mean, please, don't wait for lawsuits to address this. There has to be some protection, equal rights.

Now why are we doing this for women? You know, I mean does that make us all out of whack here, because we're talking holistic support for people. Why is it that it's just for women that Tamara's House is working? And I want to say that we are dealing with the largest group of people that are sexually abused, that's the girl child. It's twice as often as the boy child.

We care deeply about the boy child, but we are not working on a top-down method, we are trying to empower the members of our community to get what they need with community support.

And we will welcome the happy day when a men's healing lodge emerges. And we work to support that, and we will celebrate.

We also note that it has been 10 years of asking and being refused funding, basic funding. Not a lot of money but we were forced into a situation as a non-profit organization and you probably know this. I'm trying to tailor our progress to sports and cultural lotteries money. This is wrong. We are constantly struggling to know if we can fund one full-time position next year. This is wrong.

How does that make people feel worthy? How does that help teenagers look forward into the future, that there is hope — when their mother was sexually abused, she's spacing out, and it's not her fault. You know she's just had to read the front line, the front paper you know, and I'm not just picking on Goohsen although he's a perfect target. But you know, I mean you have no idea what it's like to be a survivor who has to read this stuff and see where we're at.

I mean this can put a person back for a day or two. You may not be able to make stuff for that day. You know what this does for the kids when they come home. You know it's just . . . and these are single parents for the large part. I'm not trying to generalize because this is not an exercise I'm trying to typecast. But the reality is that there's no support for the husbands.

So if your wife can't get to bed until 4 o'clock in the morning every single night of your married life and you don't even know why, if you're not getting any kind of interaction with your wife because she's yelling no in the middle of things, you know things deteriorate in a marriage.

We have asked for funding. We have asked for partnerships. We have done detailed proposals to put into effect a program where we can work with the men. The women want the men to know but they can't do it all alone when they're having this time that they're going through, this crisis time.

And it's just like if we'd served over in Vietnam or any other war, and as soldiers we've seen trauma, horrible, horrible things, and when we come back years later it can really hit you hard. You can go into a massive depression. All of those kinds of things that we understand about soldiers or what happens to children, except they have no contextual understanding of how could they have been abused when they were just a little kid who loved somebody or who trusted somebody and that somebody was in a position of trust.

Eighty per cent of the time or more it's someone you know well who is completely trusted and had access, ready access. And we haven't come to the point where we even get it. The more young a human being is, the more disabled, the more likely they are to be used for the sexual gratification of a near and dear adult. So we are denying the most deserving in our community, or this lack of government partnership.

Now fortunately for Tamara's House, Health Canada, Status of Women, Canada, Population Health, Canada, has put a lot of investment into this project. They are really excited about it. They have seen . . . and it's sort of like when you're too close to

home you can't be valued.

I'll tell you what. They really are valuing this initiative, this healing initiative, in Ottawa. And they've put in program dollars. As a result of that we've been able to get, you might say, a core commitment from the Saskatoon District Health of 25,000.

And I see you're looking at our community action presentation. I'd like to walk you through that now because I want to give time for questions as well.

Front up and centre on the front page — folks is the reality. There's a cost to providing services, and we are doing our part in this community, as you can see. A total of voluntary contributions of over \$500,000 have been put in by the community.

We were asking for the provincial involvement of 163,000 and we got 25, not intersectorally, but from Saskatoon District Health.

Every intersectoral partner has a budget, territory, separateness, and as a result we are really messing things up. We're not working intersectorally. We all know about Pop Health. What is Tamara's House is actually doing? Here we go.

There's a healing centre. And that means you can come in during the day; you can come in without an appointment; doesn't cost you a thing. We have volunteer massage that we can give you to have that experience of safe touch for that relaxation. We can give you reiki, which is another healing energy work which women have told us is very beneficial to them. It's non-invasive; it's non-intrusive. It can actually be no touch. It can just be close to the surface of the skin. And it has been very well received.

These are the things that you can read through. We encourage a self-reliance of the women. And one of the biggest things a woman can do is walk in there and be asked what would she like. I mean to have the power given to her instead of having it taken from her and have somebody else telling her.

Now how do people get there? Are they referred? No, they refer themselves. Now as it turns out, word of mouth does get around so there are informal referrals. But we have deliberately made it informal so that people feel they're the ones in charge. And this is absolutely a cornerstone of healing. It builds up self-respect that then builds and builds into good decision-making.

And we're talking about women who are child-bearing age here for the most part. So a lot of people are tender-hearted about the children without realizing that the children are at tremendous risk without helping the mothers. And the mothers are at terrible risk of revictimization without support.

So they themselves are victims of violence, two and a half times more likely to be victims of violence again. In other words they'll be over at Interval House or they'll be in an abusive relationship that's ongoing with children there, etc., etc. You can just put that picture together and see . . . And how difficult it is for those mothers when someone in their family reoffends

and they have to revisit this reality in another generation.

And this is what is the full picture here. So when we say that parents are not involved at Nutana, how much can we expect someone who's, you know, writhing with personal shame to be able to go in front of educators and admit that their child is not functioning; their child is breaking the law, not attending school, using drugs, getting pregnant, making someone pregnant. All of these things are tremendously shaming.

If you can't find your base, which is the support within your community for your own core issues, you can just see how that grows and grows and grows. And we've said for years that the wonderful network we have for addictions is like the band-aid on top of what's underneath. Why are people drinking their faces off? Is it just because it's addictive? Or is it actually because they have to escape some pain that isn't being dealt with? Because we're all putting the lid on it and the mound under the rug is huge.

And this is not easy for people to deal with. They need a lot of support. Now our medical services have identified it takes four years from the time you actively begin to heal till you finish. And basically that's kind of an average. That can change. But that's what, you know, medical authorities will tell you. And that's been quite verified.

Now what we've got here is a waiting list to get into free mental health services, and again you have to identify yourself — which, by the way for a woman to identify herself, puts her at risk of losing her children, possibly in custody battles. It is another stigma. It is a huge barrier to healing. Plus, as I've mentioned, it narrows our concept of healing. Instead of encompassing First Nations wisdom, folks, we should have been humble when we got here because we had so much to learn — the holistic aspect, the indivisible body, mind, and spirit.

Now if we want to say that it's all to do with pathology and a mental aspect, we are missing the whole possibility that it is much more related than that. This isn't a medical issue. It's a social problem. And it's time as strong individuals . . . And it's our generation's turn. You know, I'm 48 now and I believed when I was a young person that I could make a difference in changing some of the insanity.

And you know what? Thanks to this province and these people I feel like I'm getting my little opportunity. And thank you for being here to reinforce that. As scared as I feel inside saying these things and challenging you, I feel grateful that we do live in a world where this is happening finally. It's the year 2000.

Tamara by the way is a transformed Tamar or Tamar who was King David's daughter. That was over 3,000 years ago, and she was raped by her half brother. When they told her dad what her half brother had done — his son — his failure to do anything at all resulted in tragedy, war, and Tamar living a life of desolation, complete desolation. And the reason we named it after her is because we didn't see much had changed.

And we want change. We want to support Tamars of today to transform themselves into Tamara. And, you know, gee whiz, I

am one of them. I am. Women have supported me. I was at the depths and look at what, what has happened for me.

So we've gone through too much yak here by Carol I guess, but . . . it gets to be a bit of a problem. Just wave, you know. I hope that people are getting a sense of what women themselves are creating for their own healing and how wonderful it is. As Michael was trying to tell you, the good news is that it really works — really works. And the bad news is that we're doing it on such a small scale. Now when Health Canada came on board with us — and we're, you know, jumping for joy for the first time — they gave us some money to do some networking across the province and there was not much that was more exciting than to be able to go into other communities — whether it was Canoe Lake, La Ronge, Humboldt, northern, southern, all corners of this province — and introduce a generic kind of approach to how do we build support within a community for survivors of child sexual abuse. How do we get people excited about supporting that? And how's that going to work in each community? How are they going to tailor it so that there is support? This is an incredibly, personally, difficult issue to begin to work on.

So what we have discovered is people come from across the province to Tamara's House, such as we are with the limited resources we've got. They tell us we need 7/24. We need to have some place to go overnight and we're at the point now — and you may know this from having followed the news — that we will be building this spring an eight-bed facility. But we need partnership on this. We ask and beg, implore, and pretty soon we're going to get, you know, nasty. But the last thing we want to do is frighten survivors who are dependent on these services that they won't be there. And that really has been a very big difficulty.

And I ask . . . well, I don't know if there's any press here, but this is one of the concerns we have as a group of women is that we don't spread fear, that there won't be anything if this government doesn't get off its tush. And . . . because people do jump off that bridge. I've had the phone call from the police. Real people who are valued members of our society have not got the support they need, have walked out of that psych ward and jumped.

Every one of those excellent community initiatives that's out there has got the same story. You know what, we're so underfunded and jerked around. And if there's a political action that goes along with this because there's nothing . . . no follow-up after all of this good work that's being done, then I dread to think . . . And that sounds threatening but I don't mean to . . . I just want to tell you the frustration is very much building and there's no more excuses, there can't be.

So this is what's happening for the people. The women are getting personal support; they're getting their case conferences where they call in their team so they are empowered. Not that they're scared stiff going over to Social Services as telling them what's going to happen, but that they are calling forward people and saying, you know, I'm having a really big problem because I've got to have a babysitter and I've got to get to either Tamara's House or a healing circle that may be happening at one of our other sister organizations — we have healing circles,

they have healing circles — but when services are required and when you need them, that's when you've got to access them.

The fact that we have tried for five years to get daycare support from the Government of Saskatchewan. We've had the daycare bureaucrat with all his first, second, and third level needs being met with his salary and pension and benefit package. And not to criticize the man, he's wonderful, but he's not empowered to get daycare for the mothers that have to get help. What is wrong with this picture? You know, we've asked if we could use the daycare facilities at the family support centre while we're running programs. But no, that's full, and they don't have any budget and you'll have to talk about next year's budget. So we asked for next year's budget and nothing goes forward. And so we're left with an intolerable situation and in that risk situation.

How do we inspire those young girls that don't even want to start their healing journey? They're not into it. You get their sisters and mothers to set an example of healing in a community supportive environment, and when they hear the good things that are going on that's when they come.

Now Jacqui and I, we put in a proposal last year, remember that, for some summer funding to connect the street work that Jacqui's doing with some of the work that we wanted to enhance a sense of optimism, of hope, and of healing for those same women who are sexual abuse survivors, now on the street. That was not approved. This is what we're up against. How can that be? And then we have the nerve — really the nerve — of people to say, well who are you partnering with. We wouldn't be here if we hadn't partnered with everybody we could possibly partner with in the entire community. The only obvious lack of partnering is with this provincial government.

So there's a lot of work that goes on in the healing centre. Women want to do art work; they want to secure it; after they've said their thing on the piece of art they . . . we've got a locking case in the healing centre, which is actually a blueprint locking filing cabinet. And that is the only way they can feel safe. Some people don't want to have even the art go home. They'll do the art; they'll get out the poison that's in their minds and bodies and spirit. They'll get it out on paper and then they'll file it in that locking cabinet. And they'll be able to go home lifted, elated, ready to enjoy a nutritious meal, make a nutritious meal for their family, and not cut themselves, not head for the bottle, you know all of the negative things. And I mean we could just list them off, I'm sure you must know that by the work you've done here.

And when they've gone home and they realize, you know, I'm not the only person that feels like that when there's a family gathering and you know who is, you know, glad-handing and backslapping around the pan. You know it's really, really good to find out that you're not alone. And eventually, what we've discovered is women find the courage to confront their abuser and they celebrate their healing journeys. We have so many celebrations you'd think we'd be constantly over there in tears, right, and it would be really a downer. We have our tears, but you know what, we have our celebrations, rejoicing the empowerment. I've seen women who couldn't speak for a couple of weeks of coming, who are now doing presentations far more coherently than what I can do. And it's been a joy to

see the transformation in their lives that community support gives.

Now of course the other bonus from the healing centre is we've got not only staff that are you know extremely well qualified, as well qualified as anyone in the city, but we also have a continuous group of volunteers. So we are training community members all the time, and they change, so we're continuously building a group of very knowledgeable folks.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — If you would be able to wrap up in the next three to four minutes. I just want to leave a little bit of time for questions and I feel your presentation is really important and that some members of the committee will have questions, and I don't want to lose that opportunity.

Ms. Dalton: — Thank you so much for your thoughtfulness on that.

Ms. Barclay: — I have to excuse myself too. We have a meeting with addiction services with our street outreach.

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

Ms. Dalton: — So flipping through, we've done a lot in complementary care. We have the first major research project, thanks to a health transition fund from the federal government. That has been mind-blowing. We have 78 survivors involved in that and it's been remarkable success rate.

That presentation is another story, but it's being done at health professionals, etc., youth addictions workers on a continuous basis now. We have research in these areas — Social Services, Justice, and a health focus. We're trying to find out how women can feel safe at work, how they get to work, be at work, stay at work, what makes it safe for survivors and how we can adapt workplaces. That's been very, very important. That came through the federal government.

Justice Canada again, came through the federal government. And that is a long-term study of violence against women by men and how the justice system interacts with them. Where are we losing — because there's such a high rate of attrition there of all cases. They don't get to convictions.

And why is that? The health focus is really interesting because that is ... and that's a Prairie Women's Health Centre of Excellence grant research project with a master student heading that up and a team of participatory survivors. They're going to look at the 10-year cost of medical services because the status quo is just far too expensive. If there's anybody here who's on the finance committee — is there anybody here on the finance committee, serving on any of those committees?

That would be a very appealing point of view to those people particularly. It's just very costly dollars and cents, the way we're doing things now — \$600 a day to be in a psych ward, more. And in fact more goes to the psychiatrists when they give you shock. So there's an added bonus for all psychiatrists who can get women on shock treatments. And we have millionaires in the city based on that.

That could be changed. You're very vulnerable to lawsuits. So that cost analysis is enormously important. That will be completed in the year 2001.

We do immense amount of community development. And I know you're all fabulous readers, and I'd really ask you to take a look through this so that you will see just how holistic it is and how complete.

To be effective you have to have to have a nucleus of administration and that is ... we are blessed at Tamara's House. We have a woman who's ... she's very gifted with people and administratively, and she has tremendous social work skills as well. She's just finished her native studies at the SIFC (Saskatchewan Indian Federated College). She is just a marvellous person. So we're very blessed in so many ways.

Why do we want the service? Is there a need for it? You know the needs assessments don't you? You've got those — Regina, Saskatchewan. It cost us a lot of money to find this out. We've done nothing with them. I didn't want to really come with them again because they're getting dusty but it's been, you know, a long time without acting. We estimate about 64,000 to 93,000 survivors of child sexual abuse in the greater Saskatoon area.

We're seeing cases at the child centre every year, approximately 800 — that's only the tip of the iceberg — of investigated child abuse cases. Yes. So if you do the math, all those years of doing nothing for the survivors — just do the math.

We really do, as Michael said, want effective intersectoral action to address the determinants of health, and you know what the determinants of health are. And we're inclusive, status-blind which is maybe an expression you don't understand although federally ... we have to know the jargon, you know. It's incredible. You have to tailor everything to what people know and that particular phrase may not be as well known to you, but the status-blind part means anyone, all inclusive, regardless of status, race, and so on, holistic. And it is true development from the community because it's bottom up so we're not doing something that somebody else said. We're really creating services that survivors want, and survivors themselves are key and involved at every level at all aspects.

Now the why. Why? You want to know why? Because it works. And we've had a track record that is unique in this whole country. It's valued from across the country. Everybody wins — the community and the women. It's already happening, so come on board. Get behind a good thing that's already going.

That's kind of funny there. Why us? More bang for the buck. I don't know whether that's very politically correct but I think you get what I mean. We do a lot of fundraising. You don't have to pay for it all yourselves. It's not all a tax dollar thing. We're just asking you to help. We're not asking you to shoulder it all and do it for women. Women want to do it for themselves. We want your help.

And why now is because we need that momentum to continue. There's a wonderful up momentum that's happening. Let's capitalize on that. Let's keep it going. We have a beautiful facility that's being donated to this whole province. It'll be up

and running by June and we need to have staff and we need to have partnership and involvement. So keep the momentum. It's cost effective. All of the bean counters know that that's extremely important to every taxpayer, to all of us. We have scarce resources in this province and we need to do the best we can with them. This is cost effective and effective — period.

And other projects need it.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — . . . in the next minute?

Ms. Dalton: — Yes. I'm at the last here.

The other project such as the Nutana, such as many other projects, this community centre that's in Saskatoon and many others that are in other parts of the province — they need this because underlying the problems they're discovering with their kids, with their moms, with their dads, the brothers, is child sexual abuse. And they want to have a safe, safe place where they can really dump that out with people that get it, that really support them. And that's what Tamara's House is.

So everybody benefits from having this. All of the other very valued organizations and works that need to continue as well and be developed.

Are we connected with anybody? Are we partnering with anybody? Gee, there's a bit of a visual. I haven't counted the arrows. It looks like about 20 different involvements. And that's all we could fit on a page, frankly. It goes beyond that. Again this is what it costs. This is what the community's giving. We're not asking for more than equal share.

Women marched on Ottawa. They marched on the United Nations to say we have a demand; we have demands for equality here. Equal sharing of resources. This is no more begging and pleading. We are entitled as equal members of society. And although sexual abuse survivors are largely marginalized and powerless in many ways, it's still incumbent upon our legislators to recognize that resource allocation has to be equal.

I feel like I've been so tough. It's not like me.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — You're impressive.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — All of those of us who know you know what a warm and good heart you have. Listen, the work you've been doing is all on behalf of other people who really needed that support.

Ms. Dalton: — And I have to be honest in saying that I have benefited through that work, and much more than I could ever have imagined.

This is a model — and I hope you'll take the time to open this chart out — this is a model that was developed by our territories, our provinces, and our federal government working in concert. It's a population health model. If you like charts you'll notice we're working on a local, provincial, federal, and national level. I should . . . well you can read it yourselves, all of the different things that are going on in those areas.

And there's too many blanks. We certainly want to do more. We've got lots of proposals and need your help to get more done and fill in those blanks.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Carol, I think we'll take questions. I'm sorry that there's not going to be quite as much time for questions as we'd really like, but let's take three or four.

So I'm wondering if there are committee members who have a question, and I'd like you to just limit it to maybe one because of our time constraints. Are there members who have questions?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Well, Carol, I thank you so much for coming here today but also for putting your heart into this work. And I know that there are many others that are joining hands with you in working towards healthier and happier women, men in society.

Carol, you've articulated so very well the need to have this sort of an opportunity for the many women who have been violated, and you've articulated so well what that does to a human being in as far as the trauma that it causes them and their difficult struggle on the way back to health and sanity.

I think that there are probably numbers, great numbers of women in this province, across Canada, throughout the world that would understand clearly what you're saying and the need also to make sure that we have some sort of programming, for lack of a better word, in place to help women to deal with this.

I especially appreciate the comment that you made about getting to the point where women are empowered — empowered to make choices for themselves, empowered to understand their own strengths and their own goodness but from recalling my visit to Tamara House when I visited with you and talked with you about this issue, it was pretty evident to me that the road back is long, difficult, painful, and takes quite a bit of time.

And so I think this is quite equivalent to a number of other scenarios that have been presented to us from people across the province that this has not come about in a day — this problem, this area of abuse and so on — and it's been historically something that primarily women have had placed on them for generations. And it's not going to be a short time on the road back, I guess is what I'm trying to say.

We have a number of suggestions that have come to us about intersectoral work, interagency work, and the necessity to look at children at every age level, at families — complete families when addressing the issue.

I would like to have your views at this time on what needs to be done or what your suggestions are in as far as recognizing and I guess determining what might be necessary in order to deal with people that would continue the abuse, so the violators of the children, be they men or women . . . And if you have any comment to the committee on whether or not incest offenders — people that offend through incest — should be treated differently than quote "johns on the street" when it comes to

laws against continued violation of women and young girls.

Do you have, any of you, on just . . . You know, we're looking right now at our society in Saskatchewan and we're finding that there's a number of measures brought to our attention that need to be put in place for healing. But we also know that the demand part of this is . . . you know, there's demand on the streets; there are johns.

Ms. Dalton: — Well, of course.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — And there's also the continual perpetration of this whole sick activity in homes through incest and . . .

Ms. Dalton: — Oh, sure. And when the child grows up and leaves the home, then the perpetrator is getting easy access to anybody anywhere, if it happens to be at, you know, a group where he might be trusted. And I say he, recognizing that some are women but the huge majority are men.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So what do you think that . . . If you could give advice to the committee on, you know, we recognize that this is a two-pronged thing here. I mean, there's the supplier and there's the demander and so what should be done about the demand?

Ms. Dalton: — Well to me anyone who's accessing a child — and we've said this for years — is committing the same crime. And whether they rationalize that crime by giving the little girl or boy a candy or a present afterwards in a home setting, or they're giving 5 or 10, 15, 20, \$50 to somebody who's a stranger on the street, or they're holding a child hostage through fear or threatening a sibling, you know, in order to get what they want, it's all the same pack. It's the same crime.

And the more that we can recognize that, the more we can recognize that whether a child is being used on the street, in their own bed at home, or at a church group, or at school in a tunnel underneath a church . . . or a school, wherever it is — in the science lab, at the doctor's office, at the hospital, in their bed at home, on the street — it is the same. And I think that immediately raises the self-esteem of anyone who's being used on the street. And I think the rest of us can understand that. The reality is it's the same thing.

And I think we've got somewhere in terms of saying not child prostitution — child sexual abuse. But you know what? A lot of folks out there are thinking that that is the only aspect of child sexual abuse now. It's amazing the amount of public work we've got to do.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — But, Carol, I guess that I would assume that most of the population in Saskatchewan and throughout Canada have heard that this is a crime to sexually violate children, to molest children, to damage children in this way. Even though that message is out there — and I think most people are cognizant of it — we still have this continued crime going on.

So what measures do you think that possibly the judicial system or the criminal justice system should be taking in order to send

a message? Because this message is obviously not going . . . is not coming across. It's continuing and at more horrendous rates than ever.

Ms. Dalton: — Well it grows in the dark. So my feeling is that we need to shed light in every possible way on the crime, on the criminal. Accountability, public accountability is a huge deterrent. In fact exposing this is one of the best ways that you can prevent it. Exposing the person.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Do you have suggestions of how that might be done effectively?

Ms. Dalton: — Well I do like impounding vehicles. I think that the legislation that Manitoba has developed has . . . I mean I haven't seen the fallout as how good that is, but it seems very good. And I would say that's certainly important.

There has to be an element of seriousness to this that is not noticeable in our judicial system. I mean you're lawmakers. Make this the serious crime that it is. It's costing us a fortune just in dollars, let alone human suffering — it's been immense. I mean we don't want to ring that one out any more because I think you've got it. But it's the dollars involved. Social services, health, education, and the workplace — how does it get more costly than that?

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

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I think we should stop because of time. And I'm very sorry, Carol, because I have a lot of questions. But you and I can easily . . . We know each other well and I can . . . The only thing I'm regretting is the chance to not put it on the transcripts.

Ms. Dalton: — Oh, I see.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — But apart from that we can, you know, we can chat.

Ms. Dalton: — Well I welcome all of you to come to Tamara's House at any time. We'd be very happy to give you a grand tour at your convenience. Basically even if it's a weekend we'll open up and do that — be happy to.

We are having a community dinner on Friday night for the women. We'd be honoured if any of you wanted to come. It's at Smiley's at 6 so . . .

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Thank you. Thank you so much for being here and for a very important contribution to our proceedings. We really, really appreciate you coming.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you, Carol. It was good seeing you again, and I'm sure all of the committee members benefited a great deal from hearing all that you had to say, the knowledge you put forth to us, and for really impressing on us the need to value places like Tamara's House and to value women and children overall. So thank you very much.

Ms. Dalton: — Thank you. I appreciate the words and we look

forward to the actions that follow.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — That will be the ultimate test. Thank you, Carol.

We're going to take a break for just a couple of minutes and then we'll hear from Kearney. I'd really ask that we keep this break short. I'm saying that to members of the committee, including myself.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay, no more than 10 minutes. It's ten to four.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — No, no, no. No more than five minutes.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — No more than five minutes.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We need to keep rolling here. No more than five minutes.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Kearney, we're really happy to have you here. I should just say to other members of the committee that Kearney works for Legal Aid here in Saskatoon. And I've personally had the pleasure of knowing him for many years.

And he's been very involved in the issue of children not in school, and contributing in a volunteer capacity to a number of committees that have been working on this question and looking at how to address it.

Kearney, you might want to say a little more about yourself. Just before you do that, I just want to give members of the committee a chance to introduce themselves and then invite you to introduce yourself a little more and then make your presentation. June, why don't we start with you.

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

Mr. Toth: — Don Toth, MLA, Moosomin.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Arlene Julé, MLA, Humboldt.

Mr. Pritchard: — Nice to see you again, Kearney. I'm Randy Pritchard, adviser to the committee.

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

Ms. Jones: — And I'm Carolyn Jones, your back alley neighbour.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Kearney, we have also Ron Harper; he's a committee member. He'll be back with us in a moment. And just to my right is Margaret Woods. She's the committee Clerk.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We really, really appreciate

your coming. And we're looking forward to your presentation, Kearney. So . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, we are.

Mr. Healy: — Well, my name's Kearney Healy. As Peter mentioned I work for the Saskatoon Legal Aid clinic. And I'm very pleased to, and honoured, to be able to speak to you. My deepest respect for all of you. And this is an enormously thorny issue as just the little bit that I know of it and listening to other people talk, you know, whether on the street or wherever.

I know this is a very, very complicated issue. I know that each one of you have been elected, at least the committee members, have been elected as people to represent groups on a broad range of things. And to me taking on this issue is analogous to someone saying to me, Kearney Healy, you're now in charge of a nuclear power plant. And I hope you make a good go of it — do a good job of running a nuclear power plant. This is a very thorny issue.

I'm the mouthpiece for the girls who are out on the street. And I'm only talking about children here — and sometimes the boys. They come to me and tell me their secrets and ask for my help and let me know what they're all about. And I think I've seen a few things and I'd like to share them with you. And I know that it's not the answer to the whole question that you're looking at and I know that it's only a piece. But nevertheless, as their spokesman there's a couple of things I want to say.

I think that the basic premise, and I've only got a few basic premises, and I think that if we understand those basic premises — it's my argument — that if we understand those basic premises it brings us to a totally new position. And I'll give them to you quick.

The first basic premise is that success in dealing with these kinds of youth is not all that much different than success with other youth, and that is that you've got to let them have success.

We might be tempted to look at them as deficits, and look at their deficits and say, there's where we've got to intervene. And there's no question, a wise person looks at their deficits, or looks at the deficits of the children that they love and cherish.

But you want their alliance, you want their allegiance, you want their willingness. And in order to have that, you've got to look at their success. You've got to think these kids' success is important. If you're looking at the young person who's out on the street, you want them to know that you're interested in their success. That's the first thing you've got to worry about. That's what I say. I could be wrong, but that's my view after thousands of hours of conversations.

The wise person will pay attention to how the young person can have their short-term success and how that builds into a greater success. Because the ultimate goal of course is caring, responsible citizens who are capable of shouldering the burden when us greybeards get too old. That's what we want. That's our goal, right?

The second premise is that without exception, these young people need resources and they need access to resources. Without exception. There's no question about it. There's very

... there's a dearth for them. But amazingly enough, all the resources they need already exist in the community. They actually almost are intertwined. You can't have one without the other.

I mean they don't think they need anything if they don't know it exists. But they see what's in the community and they know that ... and that's what they need.

I mean it's simple. I had a young client. This is the words. This is the police report. The policeman pretends to be a john. Says to the young girl, you know, are you ready to party, blah, blah, blah — you've probably read them all and heard them all thousands of times yourselves.

The conversation gets to here. The policeman pretending to be a john says, and how much for what? And the young girl, 14 years old, says I'll do anything you want as often as you want for as long as you want for a pair of Nike shoes.

The resources that are out in the community are the ones that they know they need. If you need — and this was a few years ago, a couple of years ago — if you needed Nike shoes — and why she needed them is so that she could go to school and not feel embarrassed — if that's what people need, that's what they need.

If other young people need to go to the movies, they need to go to the movies. If other young people think that they can buy a car when they're 25 or 30 through their own efforts, these youth need it too.

I do a little survey. I guess I'm taking too long on this second point, but I do a survey. I'm asked to go to schools and talk to classes. And I ask them, I ask the grade 7's or the 8's or the 9's and the 10's, how many of you, if you're 25 to 30 years old and you really want to and you're willing to put the effort into it, you're going to save, how many could buy a new car if you wanted to buy a new car? Hundred per cent, hundred per cent hands go up. Oh, absolutely, Mr. Healy. If I'm really determined, I'm going to buy a new car.

You ask these girls, I'll tell you, you won't find one, not one who'll believe that when they hit 25 to 30 age group that they will be able, through their own effort, buy a new car. Now I'm not saying that everybody needs a new car. I'm sure you understand what I'm saying here. It's just that lack of hope; of being able to move onward and get into ... join the rest of us — that's the poison. It's that isolation and that hopelessness that's the poison, and you got to be able to solve that.

The third point is that the numbers of youth needing our help in Saskatoon — and I'm just a Saskatoon person right now — the number of youth who are needing our help in Saskatoon to get off the street, who are sexually abused, they're a very small number. I mean people can tell you it's a large number, and it's true. You know it's a large number looking at it one way. But look at it as a percentage of our resources, percentage of the population. It's an enormously small percentage, and what does that mean?

That means that if we care, the resources are already there. If

we care. Because it's not going to make a fabulous shift in resources in order to be able to solve the problems of these young people.

And fourth, the fourth proposition — and I'm done, you know, in terms of propositions — the fourth proposition is what we're doing now isn't working. And if we can accept all four of those propositions — and maybe I'm wrong about those — then the issue, I would say, is extremely simple. Youth need to be guided to having short-term success that they have some input that builds towards a long-term success. That necessarily will mean that somewhere along the road, we'll be looking at their deficits, but assisting them in overcoming the deficits.

They need the resources, but the resources already exist. They just don't have access to them. Their need for our resources is not extreme. So then the question really comes down to how can we as a caring community, how can we as a community, simply make sure that youth access the resources?

Therefore I would suggest that we need to establish for each child the ability to be able to give them a group of people who are intelligent enough and versatile enough and have enough skills, plus a group of people who are committed enough to that young person as a person, who are able to guide her or him to short-term success, long-term success, and to be able to access resources. Because they probably need, most youth probably need at least one of seven things, or probably all of seven things that I'm going mention — (a) better housing. They probably need better clothing and food. They need better transportation.

I've been out in the Egadz street van. It was 40 below. Here's this young girl out in skimpy clothes. We pull her over in the van; ask her why she's out. She wasn't allowed to be on Social Services. She had moved in in October; this is January. She wasn't allowed to be on Social Services. She's living with her sister. Her sister really can't afford to give her any money. She was thinking about going to school. The third quarter semester was going to start. Yes, third quarter semester was going to start later on in January but she couldn't get a bus pass. So she thought she would ... Yes, she was going to party too when she got some money, but she was, you know, going to get a bus pass.

When we told her we would go to Social Services and advocate very strongly on behalf of her to get a bus ticket, she says, ah, then take me home; that's good, that's good enough for me.

They need, obviously, access to counselling. They obviously need a support network. They obviously need educational supports and opportunities. And they need opportunities to make money.

So I'm sorry, I meant to say right at the beginning, I'm welcome to ... I would welcome comments, questions, and debate. So it seems to me, it seems to me then, it's simply ... I would almost suggest that maybe we should do something very, very, extremely simple. What if we were to simply pass a piece of legislation — very, very simple — just say much like a bill of rights. Just say that where you have a child who is under 18 who has been identified as a young man or a young woman who is being sexually abused on the street in the sex trade that every

government department shall do all that's necessary to assist that young person to get off the street and, if necessary, lend their expertise.

Every agency and every NGO (non-governmental organization) and every department that is getting money from the provincial government shall similarly lend their assistance or else give an explanation why they can not lend their assistance.

Moreover, where a committee exists or a group of people have formed to assist a young woman or a young boy in order to help them get off the street, then every government department or every agency that's receiving money from the provincial government shall answer every request for assistance promptly and with an adequate explanation as to either what assistance can be given immediately and how the request for assistance that was made can be answered either by them or at least an explanation of how that agency is willing to assist in contacting other agencies and making sure that that's done.

If I was to develop some terrible, terrible disease right now — and hopefully I won't — but if I was to develop some terrible, terrible disease that will require me to leave the province and get an operation somewhere else, in speaking to health care officials they tell me that it's not impossible to imagine that I might cost a million dollars outside our province looking after my health care needs. And it's just . . . the institution is built in such a way that that can happen.

And it's not the only institution. Should there suddenly be a thousand arrests tomorrow in the youth court, somehow they will find a way to accommodate that. Our institutions are set up in such a way that we can accommodate crisis. The problem is that we've set up our institutions in such a way that they only respond to crises of a certain kind.

We as a community have not said a young boy or a young girl of 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 — and take any other number — we haven't said that is a crisis that needs to be responded by each and every institution.

If I'm going to have some terrible, terrible disease that would cost a million dollars outside of Saskatoon or Saskatchewan, that's within their mandate. They'll spend that million bucks on Kearney Healy.

But should there be a little girl, 9 years old, who's developing a venereal disease or HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) or is having a kidney problem or is getting pregnant — well not pregnant, I guess, not at 9. Slow down, Kearney — we can't spend the money. Now why is that? And it's simply because as a community we haven't made it their responsibility, and yet as a community, we can make it their responsibility. It really only takes two clauses.

The last thing that I want to say, and I wish that it were true, I know that there is the Alberta legislation that requires . . . allows persons to be picked up on the street and held. And it may work; I don't know. If I were to give my guess on it, I would say it's not likely.

Because it's analogous to this, in my mind. If Coca-Cola

decided that they wanted to sell more Coke and a marketing executive said look, let's get people, we'll lock them in a room for . . . or in a place for two days and they can only drink Coke, then probably they'll continue to buy Coke for evermore.

In my view — in my view — that's what we would be doing with these young girls. We would be . . . I'm not saying it for sure. You know, I could be wrong about this. But in my view, there's the danger that the institution that we set up to do this, the institutional framework that we set up for that, may actually be more concerned about itself as an institution than it is concerned about the use.

And so consequently the spit that's going to come in the face — and it will come, I know my clients well enough — that when somebody actually yanks them out of where they expect to be and where they plan on being and saying you're going to go someplace you don't want to be, they're going to be spitting mad.

Will the institution respond as an institution? And my fear is yes, it will. And when it responds as an institution, then it will attempt to take its revenge or its . . . or we'll call it a consequence or whatever it will, against these young people. That will set up a dynamic where the young people will not trust it.

Now I'm not saying it has to be that way. I suppose with the right people and the right mandate, you may not lay charges, for example, you know. You may not use force, you know, etc., etc. With the right mandates, it's possible that you can focus the workers so that they can only focus on the well-being of the youth.

But I'll go back to my first principle. It's absolutely imperative that when you're engaging a young person — the young women and young boys that I know — that you make it very clear that it's their success, and you have to be working at that in word and action.

And that's not an easy thing to guarantee. It's certainly easy to wish for and it's certainly easy to propose and it's easy to pass a motion, but it's not easy to be there when the workers start taking shortcuts.

Maybe I've said that the wrong way. But it's not easy to be there. It's not easy to make sure that the people that are actually taking the youth off the street have the right personality — maybe that's the right way to say it — the right personality so that they are able to not fall back into an institution.

My basic premise is this. You must — we must — we must be worried about the success of the youth. And our institutions right now are not particularly . . . it's not a focal point of any institution.

So there's my rant.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you very much, Kearney. That was definitely to the point and you provided some very valuable observations, I guess, for us from your own knowledge base. We're just going to let the committee members question

you or debate with you, whatever they would like to do at this time.

Mr. Yates: — Thanks very much, Kearny. I have a number of questions. My first question has to do with your experience of course as a lawyer and working with these youth and your understanding of it.

I'd like to flip the coin a little bit and talk about the perpetrator, the abuser . . . and there's two sides. We have to deal with the kids and we have to deal with their needs. And on the other hand I think if there wasn't the abuser on the other side, dealing with those needs would be easier because there is an adage — and I'm a father, I have children — you can give your children what their needs are today, but if they get those needs met they want other things and there's still that easy access to money and to needs.

So I think we have to deal with both sides of the equation.

So what do you think the impact would be on the environment, the perpetrators, the abusers, if in fact the government looked at legislating a minimum, say, \$25,000 fine or something — a minimum fine, not a maximum but a minimum — and the ability to seize assets like homes, cars, equity, stocks, those types of things to pay that? You know, made the consequence such that people had to really . . . that the crime was taken very seriously. And those assets go towards helping the youth. You know, not back into the black tunnel of government but directly to services for those youth? What do you think that would have as an impact on the abuse of children in our communities?

Mr. Healy: — You know I think that I can agree with some of what you're saying, and I think that making the consequences very serious would be a very, very good thing and would be very effective.

The problem is, in my . . . not with my experience, you know I can't tell you about my experience any more on this, but in talking to other street outreach workers they tell me that where the penalties are strong enough, the culture on the street so to speak then shifts in order to develop layers of protection so that these consequences won't happen.

These young girls that I act for, I don't spend much time trying to get the name of their john. But I do try once in a while. The thing is that they like their johns better than they like us. Because these young girls are in situations of extreme poverty, they don't like us as much as they like the johns. So that consequently if you want to give somebody a \$25,000 minimum fine and seize assets, for example, I only see one way you're going to be able to do it. And that's with the agreement and the consent of my clients.

And that brings us back again to the basic, I think, the fundamental first principle that I think exists; that in order to help these young boys and young girls, you've got to work on their success and then at some point they may be able . . . they may be willing to roll over, so to speak, on their john. They may be, they may be.

I've spent long, long hours with other workers, taking young

girls who were on the street and constantly going to court with them and constantly talking with them, and got them to the spot where — people said they could never get anywhere; they were always going to be chronically in jail — to it's been a year or so since some of them have ever even seen a policeman's face in anger. And they still aren't telling me the name of their johns.

So the key, I think, in order to be able to make those penalties is to get the consent of the youth.

Now I think you're touching on a very important thing. You say rather than the government getting the money so to speak, the money would go back to the programs that would assist the youth and that's not bad although they don't think in terms of programs, these young boys and young girls. You know, they think of more immediate terms.

What if you were able to do something a little . . . one step beyond what you were suggesting. Rather than the money that comes from the john going to the programs or government coffers — but to the programs is one step better than the government coffers — what if we figured out a way so that they went to the youth in such a way that the better housing, that the better clothing, the better transportation, the better counselling, the better support network, the better educational supports are all being funded through that.

We could say to the youth, you tell us who the john is and we can set up a mechanism where you and your family — if that's what's appropriate and I'm not saying it always is — you and your family will live in a better house. There'll be more money for food.

Now at the same time, at the same time, what if we had a group, we had such a mechanism that a group of people were there to assist the youth. Somebody from Social Services, somebody from mental health, somebody from addictions counselling. Maybe a financial advisor. I don't know, maybe not. Maybe a job counsellor, maybe an educational person that can help them, assist them in catching up on education.

And there is a whole group that we're saying, okay we've got this amount of money. Now let's spend it on making sure that you succeed in school. Let's make sure that you're dressing well. Let's make sure that you have a little bit of spending money. Let's make sure that you have a chance at working at a job.

Now should you go back to on the street, we're not going to all of a sudden throw you, you know, out of your house. But it might not be the same clothing allowance; it might not be the same spending money. Now what if we could think of something like that?

Mr. Yates: — The scenario you laid out though is entrapment the way you've laid it out. Not saying that I don't . . . the principle might not be there, but to offer a child something directly to entrap somebody could create another series of problems.

Mr. Healy: — You could not . . . I mean we do it . . . I think we could . . . I think we're smart enough that we could do it so that

it wasn't entrapment. For example. For example, I own this hotel and I have chosen not to reinforce that particular section very well, and it comes and falls on you and you're injured. Now you can sue me. It's not entrapment for you to know that from this day forward, if I'm not going to properly reinforce the ceiling in this room that you can sue me. I'm not being entrapped. You're not entrapping me.

It's never been the law that one could sexually abuse a young person. I mean, if a 12-year-old girl comes to me — I'll make me the bad guy here, not you — if a 12-year-old girl comes to me and says, I would really, really like to get it on with you, it doesn't matter that she's telling me this. I got no right, no business, no moral, ethical . . . there's just no legal, there's just nothing for me to say yes. It's not possible for me to be entrapped into saying yes to a 12-year-old girl.

Mr. Yates: — I don't disagree with you. Morally you're on the very high ground there.

Mr. Healy: — Well legally I think, I think. I think it's legally that I'm thinking mostly.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — I think you made a very fine point there. That's something that it's necessary for everyone to acknowledge, to understand, because it seems to me that we have had a view whereby just about every initiative or whatever has talked about the rights of the offenders, the rights of the criminal and so on, and we've concentrated on that in the past number of years rather than the actual facts surrounding the law and the rights of the victim. So thank you for that. That's important to hear.

Kevin, did you have any other questions?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I think, Arlene, if you don't mind me interrupting, I think because of time we should try to limit it to a couple of questions each. And I apologize to committee members on that, but it's already actually time to hear from our next witness and I don't want to . . . I want to make sure we hear properly from Kearney but I think we should spread it around. Don.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, thank you. Just one quick comment. I think, number one, we'd have great difficulty in seizing a house because you're going to put another family out in the cold. And you basically mistreat another family.

But I do have one question in regard to the number of clients that you've seen, especially children on the street. Quickly, would there be a number who really want to get off the street? And if there are, what percentage?

Mr. Healy: — A hundred per cent would like something better. And when they mean something better, they mean something middle class.

How many are really interested in going through what looks like a maze, which may get them nowhere? Zero per cent.

So that when you're talking to a youth and if you can present a clear path from where they are to where your children are, I

think they'll follow it. But when you say, why don't you become middle class, why don't you go to school, why don't you get a job, why don't you buy new clothes and buy a car when you're 25 or 30, they don't see it like it's possible.

And that's what I meant by my story. You're as much as asking them to stick needles in their . . . well, needles in their arms is wrong. But needles in their eyes or something, you know. All they see themselves as doing is going to school where they're going to be . . . where their failures are going to become also evident; where the difficulties in being in school are going to be so apparent.

You're going to tell them they're going to still have the same pain but they won't be able to take the drugs to solve the pain. You'll tell them that they'll be poor and the only way they know to make any money is being out on the street.

So 100 per cent want to get off; the numbers that see a clear path are zero. And that's all the difference in the world.

Ms. Draude: — Do you ever represent on johns or pimps?

Mr. Healy: — Never. Well pimps, pimps I have. Now I've . . . She was a 14-year-old girl and what had happened . . . And this is our institutions — that's a good question — this is our institutions.

There are a 14-year-old girl, a 15-year-old girl, a 12-year-old girl, an 11-year-old girl who are all sharing an apartment on their own. And together they were pooling their money and going and buying groceries. And the 13-year-old, who was my client, was in charge of collecting the money and making sure the groceries were paid and the rent was paid. And for that she was considered a pimp.

You know, once again it's the institutions that are confusing our thinking. A pimp is a bad thing, except that that concept was . . . (inaudible) . . . But in terms of the traditional view of the pimp, which is the male who is not a part of that system except that they're profiting from it. Nor have I, you know, except maybe once in 20 years, ever acted for a john.

Ms. Draude: — Well my question is so many times in our hearings we've heard of this trade as supply and demand, and we're always talking about how do we keep the young people off the streets.

Well is there any way to deter the demand especially for our young people? Like what can we do so that the young people are just forbidden? Zero tolerance. I wouldn't go there. And I asked you if you ever represented these people because what can we do to make it so darn stringent that they wouldn't go there?

Mr. Healy: — And you know, I think that . . . I think exposure as your last witness mentioned is significant. I think that financial penalties is a very real, a very real thing. I like what Mr. Yates was saying, which was that rather than using the money for the government coffers, we find a way of getting it closer to youth.

I would like to suggest at some point a system where that money actually funds that particular youth getting off the street.

Ms. Jones: — Your comments focused a lot on the children on the street. And most of the questions have dealt with the abusers. Is it your experience that most of the children on the street have been already abused in their home? Are they victims of child sexual abuse? Does that kind of predicate or is that what their behaviour is based on? And if so, then how do we tie in the greater penalties to the abusers, the johns, with the fix, if you will, in the home? Because the whole family needs healing.

And the last witness that we had, and I mean I quite liked what she said: the abuse is abuse, you know, whether it's done by a john or Uncle Wayne or, you know, somebody in the church hall or in the school. So I just wondered if you had any thoughts on the perpetrators, the abusers, and how that ties in with penalties and fines and your experience with does it often start in the home? We're told it does. What's your experience?

Mr. Healy: — My experience is in accordance with that. Yes, I would say that often starts before they get on the street, that they're sexually abused. Now whether or not that's apparent, I don't know. You know, not necessarily; I can't say that that's for sure.

But I really want to encourage you to keep two things separate. There is the demand, okay. But first, and I think most foremost, is that you have to worry about the success of the youth. And if you're worried about the successes of youth, then how you . . . I agree with the last speaker, that the abuse is the abuse is the abuse, the abuse, wherever it comes from. It's abuse.

But how you deal with that in terms of that young person's success will mean that you will respond to each one of those different abusers in a different way. The john, I don't think, if you're worried about the success of the youth, can be treated the same way as Uncle Wayne in your example.

This is a child. This is a person filled up with connections . . . or who's developed connections with other people within that family and within those relationships. Might have not a bad relationship with Uncle Wayne, may have a horrible relationship with Uncle Wayne. I don't care. But it's still a familial relationship and if you're worried about the success of that child, you're not going to treat that relationship the same as you are with the john.

If it happens to be a teacher or it happens to be a doctor in the laboratory, in your last speaker's examples, they're different again. There's a breach of institutional trust there that doesn't exist with the john and doesn't exist with Uncle Wayne. That was a familial trust. So if you're paying attention to the success of the child, you'll treat each one of those as different. Yes, they're abuse for that child, but the success, in my view, of that child is quite a bit different.

If she has — let's say she — if she has a good relationship with Uncle Wayne, she's not likely to say anything if she thinks that you're going to treat her like you treat the doctor or the lab tech or the teacher or the john. Because it's her life, or his life. I just . . . you know, I'm just their mouthpiece and like I say in my

beginning, for you guys to tackle this very, very complicated issue is like someone telling me I'm now in charge of a nuclear power plant. It's a very complicated, complex issue.

I'm just their mouthpiece. I'm just the kids' mouthpiece. But I would just like to say the first rule is you want to build their success. You want to make their lives better and as you do it, the other pieces start to make sense. Whether it's the institutions or it's who's abusing who and where and when. All of those things make sense once you say, the point is we want a citizen here who's able to look after his or her children well, who's able to work and look after themselves and help their neighbours and their friends and their family.

So am I answering your question?

Ms. Jones: — I think my point is that we want to do all of that but we also want to prevent it from happening in the first place. And I'm only allowed one question so I'm quitting.

Mr. Healy: — Let me just answer the question.

Ms. Jones: — Oh, do.

Mr. Healy: — Let me just answer just a little bit of that, if you don't mind.

As the last person said, it's the exposure that's the most effective thing that you could possibly imagine. It's the exposure. She will talk about Uncle Wayne if she sees that makes things better for everyone, including her. And so we can set up things so that she sees that. But it's the exposure that we . . . it's the exposure that will be the most effective means of deterring johns — doctors, and teachers, and Uncle Waynes. The key thing's for hundreds of years that we've discovered in the English common law is the stiffer the penalties in terms of criminal penalties, the less likely you are to get convictions. Lord Salmond said that a couple of hundred years ago.

And so don't think of penalties, think of making people's lives better. I like Mr. Yates's idea that we had . . . that we look at the johns as a rich source of revenue, if that's necessary; but not as a punishment. But as a way of making youths lives better. And if we can think of a mechanism and I'm not sure that the roof falling in on Mr. Yates isn't a key to the mechanism whereby we see them as a rich resource and we use it as a resource to make children's lives better.

And that if a john is in the situation where they have to pay vast amounts of money for a young girl, they take a 12-year-old girl out for a ride and buy her a new pair of Nike running shoes or some stupid thing, and then we tell them okay well, the bill is, Charlie, or John — I guess his name's John — John the bill is, you know, until this girl's 21 you're probably going to paying for the university education, you're going to be topping up her housing allowance, she needs new clothes, she needs food, you know, she needs a little spending money; you know, it's not going to be a big bill, it's not going to be \$20,000, it's going to be \$700 a month.

So I guess you'd better be selling that van that you picked her up with and kind of checking out your finances. You might

have to cash in . . . you might have to take a reverse mortgage at 45 — ha, tough luck. But this girl is going to be a responsible citizen at the end. We're going to make sure.

Now that would deter people.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you. And I'd like to reiterate that I like that idea too. I mentioned that idea quite some time ago, focusing on the needs of a child and how this child will have those needs come to pass and be paid for it. And I think there is a way. And I like your idea that maybe it should be a monthly payment, something like maintenance. Because it's absolutely . . . I think it's a major and a good deterrent.

You had, from what I understand, you had indicated that you had worked with a number of truant children — children not in school. And I wonder if you can tell me a little bit more about what you learned from them specifically when they talked about the difficulties in going to school or not going to school.

I know that you've mentioned that you're right here today; you're a mouthpiece for these children that have talked with you. But could you zero in a little bit for us, please, on just exactly what they say to you when someone talks to them about the possibility of them getting back into school and how they feel about that?

Mr. Healy: — Is this sexually abused children that you're wishing me to talk to . . .

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes.

Mr. Healy: — . . . or truant children, or school children generally?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Well actually, if you could touch on both, it would be good.

Mr. Healy: — You know, with sexually abused youth, what you find is a great deal of, I don't know, electricity or something. They're very jumpy. And it's difficult to get them to commit to a long-term strategy of any kind at the beginning.

So, you know, when they talk about not going to school, when I first talk to them, you know, it will be like that's so far away from where I am right now; I need a fix or a I need some alcohol or I need something. I need some pills; I need to get free — because often I would see them in jail. But ultimately, ultimately if you ask either of them why they're not going to school you'll get a group of answers.

One is no one cares about me going to school. I don't mean the parents; I mean there's nobody in the school. You see it really becomes evident when they leave grade 8 and they're about to go into grade 9, into a high school. At least in public school there's somebody who's taken, probably, some kind of an interest and they're kind of in a community. They go to high school, they're lost.

Secondly, there's lots of financial barriers. You can't afford the fees. You can't afford the special class project money, you know, you can't afford the books, you can't afford the bus pass.

So those are . . . You know any particular day I'm sure Nutana, which is a wonderful school, will tell you that there's a couple of kids who are dropping out because they can't get a bus pass. I can't believe these things. How can our institutions . . . I mean these buses run empty half the time, how can our institutions possibly not be able to accommodate a bus pass. But that's where it is.

It will be . . . There's lots of times, they've kind of made it through school. They did grade 1 — half of grade 1 at Princess Alex, half at Westmount, half at some other school out of the city — then they went to grade 2. They did the first three months at Buena Vista, then they went over to Mayfair, then they went to Caswell. And so there's lots of deficits.

One kid who told me the clearest story, he says, I'm sitting in the classroom and I'm in grade 10 supposedly, you know — and he understands the concepts in grade 10 but he can't read. He says, and the teacher's going down the row and it's my turn pretty soon, and I'm going to have to either stand up or maybe sit down and expose myself as somebody who can't read — and exposing himself is about how he put it too — or else I can get kicked out. So I kicked the guy in the head ahead of me. And he says what did you do that for. And then we're fighting and then I get kicked out.

And he committed a lot of crimes until somebody was sharp enough to get him into a reading, you know, a specialized private program — a youth worker did — a specialized private program where he learned how to read and now he's not any problem. And everybody's been singing his praises, because now he's dancing ahead because he was a smart enough kid. But we don't have the money for that any more.

So kids need success. I've got to really emphasize that. You're most likely . . . If you've seen a kid who's in trouble, you've most likely seen a kid who doesn't believe there's any chance of success. They need success.

And then there are certain fundamental institutional barriers that need to be worked on, massaged out. The concept, like the Charter of Rights, or a Bill of Rights, or something that just says this is a problem, we now direct everybody who gets money from us to start working toward solving that problem. And if you don't, we're going to remember when it's time for you to get your budget, so get on with it. Find out . . . If Kearney Healy can be worth a million dollars in Alberta or Minnesota or wherever getting medical care, surely you've got 20 bucks a month to hand out some bus passes on buses that aren't rarely full anyways, you know. Surely.

I don't know that I'm answering your question. I get so excited about this stuff, you know.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — You did answer it, very well in fact. I'm just wanting you to expound a little on what kind of a situation a child would be in that they can't get a bus pass; because you mentioned some of the children, a couple from Nutana Collegiate might — I think you said that — might be dropping out. And some of the simple problems are that they can't get to school. Those children may or may not be on social assistance, I guess, but I understood that if on social . . .

Mr. Healy: — They would be.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — They would be.

Mr. Healy: — Yes.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — But I understand from . . . at least I thought that if you're on social assistance that, you know, funding is provided for transportation.

Mr. Healy: — Yes. I'm sorry, I guess I haven't followed that one down . . . far enough down the path. Maybe Mr. Pritchard can tell you more about it, you know in detail, but I know that the situation exists.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay.

Mr. Healy: — And what the rationale is, I don't know. But let's take something much more significant than that. Let me take something much more significant. Most people who work with youth on the street will tell you they have an addictions problem — whether alcohol or something. I'm not sure that I'm totally convinced of that. I'm not sure that it's not their success that they're not having, but I don't know that. I respect these people and they say they have an addictions problem. Try to get them into an addiction centre. Try to get them some counselling. We can go months. Now how can that be? How can we allow an institution to say it'll take months before you get off the street and into an addictions program?

There should be a bill of rights. There should be a clear declaration. You will do whatever is necessary to get these kids off the street. It may be not a very good precedent, but I say this: if five years down the road we have 12-year-old girls who are sitting . . . standing out on the street with skimpy clothes on and 40 below weather, willing to be abused, beaten, run the risk of kidnapping, of death, in order to get a venereal disease or some horrible, horrible condition, and maybe commit suicide, and somebody says well, we should instruct everybody to work . . . do everything possible to make this better, I say well let's have a precedent like that.

Where we have little children who are being dealt with badly, let's establish a precedent that as a community, as a civilized group of people, we will do everything in our power and we won't count on those people saying, ah, I don't think I . . . you know, that's not my mandate, you can talk to somebody else; or you know, I've spent my money. Hah, I bet, I bet you have.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Kearney, you and I have had a chance to talk about this question so I'm really asking it so that you can put it on the record. I know you've spent . . . as Arlene was saying you spent a lot of time thinking about the kids not in school issue. And we've also talked about the question of your ideas about creating employment opportunities for youth.

And I'm wondering if you would address those two questions. And I'm sorry to be rolling them together, so just take your time in terms of addressing them, but I just kind of want to signal what they both are. One is creating employment opportunities for youth who are on the street right now, as a way of . . . an

alternative way of making money. And the other is your vision about how we should tackle the larger issue, in that the two issues overlap, obviously, the kids not in school issue and the issue of children being sexually abused on the street. There's a significant overlap.

But how . . . what your vision is about how we should tackle the problem of kids not in school in this community. I'm just wondering if you could speak to both those questions. And that's really the only question I want to ask, but it's a big question obviously, so just take your time in terms of responding.

Mr. Healy: — I take from the initial position is that what you're looking for is a youth to grow up to be a responsible person, so you're worried about their success. So it depends on the age of the child not in school. They're as young as six years old, seven years old in this community, of kids who aren't in school and they're in all different neighbourhoods.

So you got to worry about their success, and for each kid that's going to mean something different. But when you get to about 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, why is a kid wanting? They're wanting to be able to make the transition into adulthood and be able to be successful as adults, and so you've got to start paying attention to those basic needs.

The first one, no matter how you to put it, whether you got to make your bread or you've got to hunt, fish, trap, whatever it is, you've got to be able to make your way in the world economically. People have to do that.

And where you have people who don't believe that they can make their way economically, you've got a disaster waiting on your hands. And so it seems to me that with the younger children you might have to do something much like the wraparound program that is in existence right now in Saskatoon and hopefully will expand. And that in itself may go very well because it kind of rubs the institutions, eh? The wraparound team will go to the institutions and say, how come you're not doing this; change what you're doing; think of a new way of dealing with this. So that's a good thing.

With children not in school who are older, it seems to me that you need caring, compassionate, considerate teachers so that they have a connection that's personal and they believe in their advancement. And another key thing is that you want to teach them how to be able to succeed. And financial is important. Whether you call it a small business or whether you call it a co-op, I don't care, but it would be very good to help youth who are especially distant, to be able to learn how to make money.

So it seems to me that with sexualized young boys and young girls, one of the things that you really should be interested in is their health. What they're interested in is making money. They are. Honest. They're interested in making money. They don't like being poor. So what if you put them together?

But one of the things that . . . this is just my office, and it's just one example. My office, every month we buy a cake from Dairy Queen and we celebrate everybody's month birthday for that month. I'm sure everybody does that.

But what if you took, let's say 20 young people who have been abused on the street, and we hook them up with people from the city department of health. We hook them up with somebody from Saskatoon District Health who starts talking about healthy lifestyles, healthy choices. And as part of that, as part of that, we also hook them up with somebody who can teach them a few basic recipes for making cake, and then we sell the cakes.

Spend five bucks a time, or five bucks on a cake and sell them for 25 bucks. I guarantee you I could sell 200 contracts that quickly. The rest of the money is to be used for those youths in order to make sure that they have the money that they need today, but also moving them towards a greater success.

Now in order to do that they got to talk to these health people — they're their buddies — because they're not going to make any money. If somebody says, I'm not buying this cake, it's likely to poison me, you know. The health people have to say this is a top-grade cake and it meets all the safety and health standards. Then they could branch out into healthier kids. Now here's an option that we'd like our customers to consider. We can give you a cake that's even healthier than the one that we've been giving you and these are the reasons why.

And so it goes. As our creativity is able to work with these young people, we can move them farther and farther into creating healthy choices — whether it's in cakes or it's in something else. They're making money . . . Of course we would demand that they go to school before they get this job. I mean they would have . . . it would be part of school probably, eh? Yes, they're tied together. But I'll tell you this, I'll tell you this, the ability to be able to do that for a young person would make school extremely attractive.

And if you could look after the other portions of their lives that forces them out on the street, if you can do that, you would have a winning combination. They would go to school every day. It would be like . . . it would often be like a party as they're baking the cake. And when they bring the cake into the judge's chamber — and I know I could sell a cake . . . I could get the judges into buying a cake a week, for crying out loud — when a young person comes in with a cake and all the judges say hey, there's our cake, you know things will be totally different for those young people.

We are a very, very rich community. We're an exceptionally rich community. What's lacking is an absolute commitment that we're going to solve the problem. And the key to solving the problem — and I'm their mouthpiece and I only see a little piece of the nuclear reactor — but the key, I say, to solving a problem is the success of the young people themselves. From their success we can start getting all of the other things that we think we need.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — No, I think Kearney I'd love to continue the discussion but I think we need to . . . we've got one more witness and we need to be mindful of that.

I want to thank you very, very much for an excellent presentation. We all appreciate you taking time to come here. Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — I'd like to thank you also, Kearney. Some of the solutions, I guess, that you've described are certainly forcing people to think outside the box. And I think this is one other thing that we can do is we can look to other jurisdictions and see some of the ways that they have implemented to solve some of these so-called problems. I really do appreciate you talking about the success because that's what every person feels like. If you're self-supporting, it instils a sense of pride. And people are eager and full of excitement to address the next day in their life.

So thank you very, very much. That's been so helpful.

Mr. Healy: — Thank you. And thank you for listening to my rant and raves. And I'm hoping that you know what I'm saying about success because obviously each one of you are very successful people and you know the joy of success.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I think we'll go directly into our final . . . to listening to and having a dialogue with our final witness of the day. Tim, are you ready to come forward?

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Committee members, we are fortunate to have with us today Mr. Tim Kokesch. Tim is a concerned parent from Saskatoon . . . or from Prince Albert, I take it. He didn't have the opportunity, I guess, when we had our presentations in Prince Albert to bring a presentation to the committee, but we're so happy that you could be here today. And I don't know if you were travelling in this ice-cold weather Tim, but we commend you for taking the initiative and being here with us today because we know that you must have some very important information for us and we just really commend you for being a concerned parent.

Tim, we're just going to go through a really quick introduction of committee members, if you would allow that.

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

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

Mr. Pritchard: — I'm Randy Pritchard. I'm the technical advisor to the committee. Hi, Tim.

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

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Arlene Julé, MLA Humboldt.

Ms. Woods: — Margaret Woods, the committee clerk.

Mr. Toth: — Don Toth, MLA Moosomin.

Ms. Draude: — And I'm June Draude, the MLA for Kelvington-Wadena.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Tim, we're just going to invite you to maybe give us a little bit of your background and then proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Kokesch: — Okay. As you've heard, my name is Tim Kokesch, and just as a partial resume I put on this little handout to you there is that years ago, back in the early '80s, I was a parental care supervisor at the Paul Dojack Youth Centre in Regina while I was going to university doing psychology. I've done contract teaching for schools in Saskatchewan, mostly to do with outdoor education and physical education programs.

I'm an emergency medical technician and worked for a number of years for MD Ambulance here in Saskatoon as well as Parkland Ambulance in Prince Albert. Worked as a psychiatric aide at the Victoria Hospital in Prince Albert and still currently work as a pathologist's assistant at the Victoria Hospital in Prince Albert.

So that's just a bit of an idea of where I'm coming from. So you can see that my dealing with youth starts even, sometimes, just before birth right through their younger years and, unfortunately, sometimes, when their younger years end, on my table in the morgue because of abuse or many other things of course, as well.

My premise for being here basically is based on what I saw as your committee principles when I first picked this up from Mr. Prebble's office. And I must commend whoever put together this thing. To me, it hit all the points that are extremely important and relevant here. But, your premise of every child is everyone's responsibility — absolutely. And the second one, which I modify slightly — actually just drop a few of the words — the committee promotes zero tolerance towards others who contribute to the sexual exploitation of children.

And in this case, what I am referring to specifically happens to be a 6-year-old little girl who I consider to be a very sweet young little girl, and I put almost normal as you'll see as things go along. This girl has been involved with abuse issues to do with the mother's . . . one of the mother's boyfriends in the past. And he has chosen to exercise his right, I guess, for visitation on this child and has had visitation with the child unsupervised for a couple of years.

And to go quickly to the pictures, you can see that these are some of the things that the little girl has had to deal with. Picture one there, for example, she says . . . and these pictures, interestingly, are all unsolicited. The little girl, usually before and/or just after having to have a court order visitation with this guy will draw a picture. Just all of a sudden, you'll find this picture laying there and where did this come from?

Well, the first picture one and two, you can see, occurred September 21, '99. She drew these when she was just 5 years old and you can see that, well, the thing in his hand there, in this guy's hand — this is a male, as you can see by the anatomy there — is, she says, a beer bottle. When I asked her, I said well what's that? Oh, it's a beer bottle. I guess being someone who was convicted three times of driving while impaired; having a beer bottle in his hand would be a pretty usual thing.

On to pictures three and four. Picture three, she told me . . . I said oh, and what have you drawn there? And she says oh, that's him with me in the shower. And I said, well it looks like you have clothes on. And she says, well yeah, I felt

embarrassed drawing myself without clothes, so I put clothes on myself. And to that she also added, I don't like it when he hugs me in the shower. Now this fellow happens to be about six feet tall. She's a little five-year-old girl. I'm sure you can put the proportions together and see exactly where things were when she was being hugged, as she calls it.

Picture four, no explanation is required. I think it's pretty straightforward.

So the abuse issues with this individual, besides the physical and emotional abuse of the mother and other children, the mother . . . This fellow has children with other people as well. He would abuse them by verbally and physically hitting them, things like that, and even killed family pets. In this family they had a number of dogs and stuff, and they were sequentially strangled and/or found damaged and dead — strangely. It never happened before he showed on the scene and hasn't happened since.

You've seen the pictures. Now you'd say well, just make a couple of calls; get this all taken care of. Well over the period of I guess a year and a bit, almost a year and a half, the mother has called the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police), has called Social Services. And in fact back in August when this little girl initially disclosed to me for the first time about this shower incident going on with this fellow, I made the calls to Social Services and the RCMP, personally.

And after some discussions with Mr. Pritchard, the last call with Social Services was just last Friday, and the words, quote, from them were: "Well what do you want us to do?" That was just last Friday — "What do you want us to do?" There has not been any investigation by these people into the affair where it be . . . You know, in fact a social worker's face has not been seen by either the mother, the child, or myself. Social workers — they're happy in the office, I guess.

The RCMP initially, back in that September of '99 time, did see the little girl. But the quote to the mother by the RCMP was as I've written down there, "Until you can bring her in cum covered, bloodstained, able to write it down and tell us all about it, there's nothing we can do." That was their statement, and that's how they still stand on this issue with her. She apparently just does not have enough of whatever they're looking for — je ne sais quoi — in order to . . . for them to go even to the point of asking this guy a couple of questions.

This guy does not even know that this is being investigated or trying to be . . . been investigated for the last year and a half — doesn't even know it.

And the thing that surprises me is, as I make mention of here, is that, you know, for a real emergency response, the equation for action, you know, dial 911, say fire, hang up your phone. If you're at home — I just checked this out with the fire department — 30 men, 5 vehicles will be at your house in five minutes, you know. So far the response time for Rachel has been zero.

Social Services — well what do they respond to? I'm not sure. Do they need video version of the abuse or what in order to act

on it? I don't know. You know, police respond to barking dog complaints — they won't even go talk to this guy. Firemen will get a cat out of a tree. And I guess further to that . . . yes, so I can actually go into a lot more detail about things, but I won't. It's just more of the convolutions to the whole thing and stuff like that, which I think are made . . . just pretty much point form there, without having to go into exact details of which I could tell any one of you, any time you'd like to hear them, if you're interested.

And when I last . . . or when I chatted with Social Services at one point, one of their statements to me was, well it's third party sexual abuse. I hadn't heard of that before. Whereby the individual is no longer living in the residence, so there's nothing that they do is what they told me; it's not important anymore, I guess. Even though this fellow has a child by another person, a 10-year-old boy I guess now, and just happens to be involved with another lady who, guess what, has a 5-year-old little girl. And I'm sure you're all aware that sometimes these predators prefer certain ages and sexes and . . . just coincidental I guess though. They don't want to talk to her or him or anything.

The other thing was . . . something that was made known to me was, well you know, sometimes people lie about this. Well I guess the firemen don't worry about people lying, about making false alarms, they show up, they look for the smoke — oh, it's a false alarm; someone pulled it or whatever.

In this sort of case, what would be so hard for a social worker to show up and check it out? Oh yes, you know, all garbage or the mother's just mad or something like that. Well if that's the case one of the other things that . . . I see the Justice department's involved in, is this promoting resiliency in the children or families, identifying priorities, where they're suggesting well the conflict has a significant impact on children, yes. And this whole idea of dispute resolution, well they'd be right there right on the spot to say, okay, well maybe there's not sexual abuse but we're going to be right there in order to do some conflict resolution with this family, because obviously there's a problem. Just seems to be like a . . . being able to get twice your money out of the time spent sort of thing.

So my answer to this whole thing, I think, is just go out and investigate. Make a start or something. Use a little intuition and . . . one police officer I talked to when he was shown the picture said to me, you know if my little girl drew these pictures and brought them home, he says, I'm a policeman, but he says, I don't know what I would do. And I'm sure all of you would feel the same because I sure do.

So as far as the programs and things you're suggesting, and the change in laws and stuff like that . . . excellent and absolutely you've got to do it for sure. There's no question about all of that stuff, absolutely. But right here, right back to square one, as I've mentioned there, going out and investigating. Taxpayers have already paid for social workers who are, as far as I understood, trained to investigate. They could go out and actually do that. And they could talk to all parties involved, and talking is almost free, so why not.

Just to sum up, on December 23 . . . and I put on my little . . .

mark it on your calendar, on this day Rachel will be with the pedophile again, against her wishes. And as I say, I'm not just here to present this information, I'm actually begging for help. So if any one of you can point me, or direct me, or anything like that I'd be very much appreciative. And my name and phone number is at the top of the first page. Feel free to call and leave a message and I'll call you back. Thanks for your time.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Thank you very much, Tim. Once again, you know, we have yourself in this case bringing to our attention some of the horrific abuse that children are taking in this province. And it never ceases to amaze me, you know. The shock and the disbelief almost traumatize me, as well as I'm sure other committee members.

And I, you know, all I can say is I'm really very sad and sorry that when you brought this to the attention of Social Services as well as the police, for some reason there was an impasse and an inability or a reluctance or resistance to do their jobs.

I recognize the RCMP have their hands tied a lot of times because so much of the law surrounds evidence that's basically very factual and that you to have right in front of your eyes, and you pretty well have to catch somebody strangling somebody else in order to do anything. But, I mean, this certainly does point to the need to allow protective services, the RCMP or anyone else to be able to act on reports. And in fact, I thought again that with Social Services child protection they did have that authority and that ability.

And so I don't know if I have a question for you. I mean this is pretty self-explanatory. And obviously there's going to be a need for the Department of Social Services to answer to why, in fact, child protection workers are not able to do their job or reluctant to do their job. You know, we need to ask where the problem lies.

And I think that in the past, from what I understand, there have been a number of social workers that have brought some of their grievances forward and their dilemma in being able to do their jobs. One of them being too many on their caseloads so that they can't do much more than the paperwork, and sometimes not even that.

But this question that you brought forward from the child protection worker, like her response or his response saying, what do you want us to do, almost seems as though there's a lack of education as to strategies that they would have at their fingertips to be able to address these kinds of things. And I find that very, very alarming.

I'm just going to pass over questioning to any of the committee members if they have any questions.

Mr. Toth: — I don't think there's any questions. I think the message has been sent. And the matter of addressing something like this with the department, to be honest with you, is no different than another one that's sitting on my desk right now I've been trying to get some answers to.

Mr. Kokesch: — Oh yes.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — Are there any other committee members that would like to comment or question?

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Well, Tim, I think you'll understand why we don't want to get . . . it's not the mandate of the committee — and this is not to duck the issue in any way — it's not the mandate of the committee as a collective body to investigate individual cases of abuse, as you can understand.

But I think in the course of your presentation you've raised some very, very key points. And your point at the end about the fact that we're prepared to, you know, to send 30 men out to respond to a 911 call but seem to be much more hesitant about conducting an investigation around child abuse, I mean I think that sums it all up in my mind. So I thank you for the presentation.

We need to find some other way to ensure that your individual circumstances are addressed and I'll talk with you about that, maybe outside the hearings.

Mr. Kokesch: — Very good.

The Co-Chair (Ms. Julé): — So, thank you, Tim. And I just want to assure you that your presentation was very valid and was very helpful because it again reiterates that there's a connection oftentimes, sort of a cycle of abuse that goes on, and oftentimes these children do end up on the streets and do end up dying eventually because the situation has not been addressed. And it is certainly the intent and hope of the committee to come up with some recommendations that will start addressing this in a meaningful way. So thank you very much.

Mr. Kokesch: — Thank you.

The Co-Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And thank you, Tim, very much for coming.

So, members of the committee, we stand adjourned until tomorrow morning.

The committee adjourned at 5:25 p.m.