



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

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 36 — March 9, 2001

Regina



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-fourth Legislature

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PREVENT THE ABUSE AND EXPLOITATION
OF CHILDREN THROUGH THE SEX TRADE
2001**

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
March 9, 2001**

841

The committee met at 9:30 a.m.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Good morning everyone. Welcome. We're happy to have you here this morning. I am just speaking first because I must apologize for the delay. We were waiting for a committee member to come. There are two committee members that are not with us right now and one of them was delayed because of problems on his home farm and the other member should be here very shortly but we've decided to proceed to ensure that we have enough time to deal with everything this morning.

I'd like to welcome you. We made some introductions here already but I think it's valuable to just go through introductions of the committee members again and of yourselves if you wouldn't mind.

We'll start over here with Ron.

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

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

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

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Peter Prebble, MLA, Saskatoon Greystone.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Arlene Julé, MLA, Humboldt. And absent at the moment is June Draude. She should be here shortly. She's the MLA for Kelvington—Wadena. And Don Toth will be here close to 10 o'clock and he's the MLA for Moosomin.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Why don't you introduce yourselves as well although we know you all.

Ms. Durnford: — I'll start then, Mr. Prebble. My name is Bonnie Durnford. I'm the acting deputy minister of Saskatchewan Social Services and I'm joined today by a number of my colleagues from my department and colleagues from some of our partner agencies. So maybe what I'll do is just introduce the folks around the table initially and then we can maybe go around the wall and let folks know who all is here.

So to my immediate right is Christine Deiter and she's the director of the Regina Safety Services Program. And then Dave Hedlund beside Christine and he's the regional director from Regina region for the Department of Social Services. And Inspector Garry Heel on Dave's right. And Garry's with Regina Police Service, the criminal investigation division.

And we've got numbers of folks around the room so maybe I'll just let them go around and indicate who they are.

Mr. Carney: — Bill Carney, director of communications for Saskatchewan Social Services.

Ms. Warren: — Good morning, I'm Dorothea Warren, with family and youth services division with the Department of

Social Services.

Mr. Losie: — And I'm Denis Losie with family and youth from Regina region.

Mr. Williams: — And I'm Brian Williams with the deputy minister's office of Social Services.

Mr. Morin: — Bob Morin, Regina Police Service.

Mr. Webb: — Murray Webb, government youth services division.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Nice to have you sitting at the table again, too, Murray.

We want to thank you all for coming. It's very generous of you all to come together collectively this morning. It should be very helpful for our discussion. We appreciate that very much and thank you for patiently waiting for us to get started.

Bonnie, I take it you're going to make a formal presentation and involve whoever else you want to in that process. We're very much looking forward to that. It's, I think, an update from a presentation that was made a year ago.

Ms. Durnford: — That's right.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So we'll maybe start there, and if you'd just proceed in whatever way you'd like to.

Ms. Durnford: — Sure. What I'm going to do is give a general overview of some of the progress that we've made since the last time the Department of Social Services was before the committee. And then I'm going to pass it over to my Regina colleagues who are going to give you a much more specific look at the work that's being done in Regina since last January, and some of the progress that we've made in Regina on this particular issue. And Murray's going to run the technology for me.

So I'll start just by reminding folks of where we were at the last time that we presented. I'm sorry, can you hear me or should I speak up a bit more?

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Actually I think you're speaking fairly loud, but I find I'm having a little problem hearing, so if you would speak up it would be helpful.

Ms. Durnford: — Certainly. The last time that we met in January of 2000, we were focusing on giving the committee the information about the changes that we had made at that point to The Child And Family Services Act, and giving the committee some information relative to changes that had been made to the Criminal Code of Canada.

Just to remind folks that the changes to The Child And Family Services Act were made as a result of a number of consultations that we'd held with community members and with youth groups over the course of the preceding summer. And the major message that we heard, and the major message that we tried to

reflect in the changes to The Child and Family Services Act, was that children who are exploited through prostitution are victims of child abuse. And that became sort of the foundation for all of the work that we did.

At the last presentation, the other piece of work that I think that we spent some time talking about was the provincial policing policy that had just been introduced the previous fall by the Department of Justice and the companion document by the Department of Social Services.

Our efforts since that time, since the introduction of the policing protocol and the Department of Social Services document, were to implement the policy and the process and the partnerships that were essentially contained in those documents, and to implement that direction around treating these children and youth as victims of child abuse. And so we really have spent a good portion of the time working on implementing those strong partnerships between police and social services and the community, and I hope that that's what you'll see reflected in the Regina presentation this morning.

So the focus today is to talk about the progress that we've made and the challenges that are remaining, because there's still . . . I think we recognize that this is a work in progress and there's more to be done.

Just as a bit of a background as well, I think the sense — and certainly I'm sure the committee has come to hear a lot of different stories and issues with this, but I think the complexity of the issues that underlie the issues of children being abused through sexual exploitation, it's a very complex problem and is often related to poverty and family dysfunction and as underlying causes for some of the activity. And we really need to — I think in terms of the kinds of programs that we offer through the Department of Social Services and the kinds of initiatives that we are engaged in — we really need to begin to try and address and continue working on addressing those kinds of issues.

So we've got, you know, sort of broader—based strategies within the department that are looking at child and family poverty, that are looking at redesign of our child welfare system and of our young offender program. So we hope that those changes and the directions that we are pursuing under those program efforts will provide a foundation as well to respond to the issues that are identified for these children and families.

So the principles guiding our work . . . As I've indicated, we're treating the involvement of children and youth in prostitution as sexual abuse, which, in the focus for all of the work, is that these children are victims rather than offenders. Perpetrators who exploit children and youth will be held accountable for their actions, and so we need to have a strict law enforcement policy and strict enforcement plans there.

And in terms of our own role and our own responsibility, case plans for these . . . for these children and youth need to be developed and individualized, and they need to be culturally sensitive and based on the holistic needs of the young person.

So those four principles, I think, have really formed the

foundation for all of the work and will form the foundation for the next part of the presentation.

So Dave will pick it up from here. And the presentation that you will see will then be based on the following themes: the ideas around community development and community—led solutions, how we can use our existing and are using our existing legislation, and how we are intervening on a timely basis, and how we . . . the issues that we see with regard to access to appropriate services. So I'll turn it over to Dave now.

Mr. Hedlund: — Thank you, Bonnie, and good morning to the members of the committee. It's good to be with you. I wanted to make a couple of introductory comments about the Regina context, just comments I guess that define the situation in Regina that might be a little different from other locations.

First of all I wanted to mention the structure of the Regional Intersectoral Committee which operates in Regina. There are intersectoral committees in other Saskatchewan communities too, but it's a fairly unique forum in Canada that we have operating in Saskatchewan and in particular in Regina.

Here we have 26 members of the major human services agencies or major human services funders, all levels of government involved, and other major community agencies like the United Way for example — senior level of people in those departments and agencies all around this table. So we meet quarterly.

And the way we're structured is to move discussions about topical priorities into a series of round tables. And the reason I raise the forum of the RIC (Regional Intersectoral Committee) here is because we've chosen sexually exploited youth as one of the topical priorities for the interagency committee — the RIC as it is known, Regional Intersectoral Committee. So that's one point I wanted to make that that forum exists in Regina.

The other point that I wanted to make is that — and this may be fairly unique to Regina — the city council about five years ago initiated the Crime Prevention Commission, and that, from the beginning, that group was chaired by the mayor and had as a standing member the chief of police.

Up until last fall or last summer, last fall, all the other members were members from the community, but a decision was taken at the committee that they needed to involve institutional members as well. And so over the summer and fall the CEO (chief executive officer) of the health district, the president of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), senior people from both city—based school districts, and myself as regional director of Social Services were added to the committee. And some of the new members, the community members that circulated through or were brought onto the committee actually have quite a bit of background in crime prevention areas as well. So there's quite a new focus on the Crime Prevention Commission.

But what point I also wanted to make is that, from the beginning, that commission had seen sexually exploited youth as quite a strong priority as well. So there had been community initiatives supported by the Crime Prevention Commission.

When the province introduced its five—point strategy some years back, I guess it was three or four years back, the Crime Prevention Commission did a joint release of their strategy which had a lot of overlap as well.

So basically what I'm suggesting is that there is, in Regina, a fairly strong interagency structure in which an issue like this one and other ones as well can be supported through the interagency efforts of the major service deliverers in the city.

The second point on the slide says simply, listening to youth. And I just wanted to make the point that, in an issue like this one especially, it's really important, in our view, to make sure that the people most affected by, in this case sexual exploitation of children, are involved in some way in the solutions.

I imagine that your group, the committee, is familiar with this report, Sacred Lives, the Kingsley report. One quick quote from there that you likely will have heard before:

Community involvement with youth provides new and innovated solutions and strategies to address issues in situations where traditional approaches have not been effective.

I expect you'd agree with us that a lot of what we've tried to do over time hasn't been as effective as we'd like it to be and we're looking for solutions and we need to involve the people affected, as I said before, in creating those solutions.

On to the next slide, Murray, if we could go there, community development — it's Community Led Solutions. Each community has different needs and we're all at different levels of development. I'd say that's quite true for different communities across the province, but it's also very much the case for our own city, and I'm sure you've heard testimony to this effect.

But it's very different to live in some parts of Regina than it is to live in other parts. And the sexual exploitation issue manifests itself in very different ways in some parts of Regina than others. And some would say that it's almost exclusively confined, at least in its visible form, to one area in the city.

So as we say here, it's a very different situation from community to community, and so too are communities different in their capacity to respond to those issues.

In our view, government's role, as we say in the second point, is in part to set direction, to establish frameworks that communities can respond within. And I guess that's partly what's encouraging about the formation of this committee is the legislature is saying we have some responsibility to do what we can as a province to set up structures that communities can respond within. So we certainly applaud that initiative.

The third point references integration and I don't suppose this is new to anybody. In some ways the more important the issue is, the more critical it is that the stakeholders come at it in a joint way or a collective way. And child prostitution, sexual exploitation, is very much an example of that. There's so many stakeholders, so many people that have a role to play and it's

critical that we play that role in a coordinated way.

Next slide, please, Murray.

Here we start to talk about the use of the legislation that's in place, and the first point is that we are aggressively applying our authority under The Child and Family Services Act to protect children. I say that strongly. We have always done that. We do it today.

Many people would suggest that the way the department uses that very powerful piece of legislation is maybe too strong, not specific to child prostitution and sexual exploitation necessarily, but we certainly get feedback to the effect that that rather intrusive capability that we have as officers under that legislation can be used too strongly.

Of course we get criticism that it's used not enough or not strongly enough on other points but we certainly do exercise that authority frequently and in a very powerful way in the lives of the families and children that we work with.

And in a parallel fashion I'd suggest that the police are also using the Criminal Code in a rather powerful way as well in the lives of children and families that are involved in sexual exploitation, and we'll come back to some detail on that.

As Bonnie's mentioned earlier, we've been partnering — not just provincially but certainly locally — with the police in the provincial policing policy. And in our view and the view of Social Services, that's been taken very seriously by our police partners in the city and we've seen fairly major changes, I believe, in how the police approach this whole issue. And that's been good to see.

We've done that together. We've worked in Regina on a lot of things together with the police and this is one more, I think, where we've sat down together and tried to figure out how to make it work in the best interests of the children affected by sexual exploitation.

One of the outcomes of that, I think, is that we both get better at what we do. We certainly need the police's assistance in investigation of child abuse situations, including this kind, and I think the police in a number of cases, when we get to this, and the examples that we give, have benefited from the fact that our people can give information that results in charging and working through to conviction of perpetrators.

Next slide, please, Murray.

Here we identify a few of the principles and I won't take much time on these but just to sort of set the stage a little bit for what we talk about later. The principles that we think of as guiding some of the intervention work that we do. We take services to the youth through aggressive outreach that's meant to be in contrast to the idea of setting up a service somewhere where people have to come and ask for it or come and participate in it. Our sense is that we've got to go out there. We've got to look for sort of the outreach element. We've got to look for the situations that need our attention and time and effort. We'll talk more about that later.

We utilize established community networks to identify street-involved youth. And that's clearly part of how we get the information that we need. And again Christine will talk about that more and will speak to it probably in the police portion of the presentation as well.

We need to link youth to current services. That's, I guess, what we do. If we identify issues that need attention, our repertoire of response is the existing services in the community. We need to look at whether they're the right services or enough of them. But those are the tools that we use, making those links. And as I said before, we partner with the police for a teamed approach.

A few comments on the next slide, Murray. On intervention, I mentioned before that one of the tools that we do have at our disposal is apprehension in The Child and Family Services Act and that's clearly used in application to children who are involved in the sex trade.

We have — as you'll hear a bit more about — the outreach capacity and the ability to monitor in some detail the ebb and flow of what's actually happening on the street with respect to certain individuals and where they're working and how they're working and who all is involved.

A third area. We have the capacity to provide financial and residential services for older youth — a 16— and 17—year—old program. And I'm not sure if you're all familiar with this but we can, through our child and family services legislation, make a voluntary agreement with a 16— and 17—year—old person and establish for them a safe, supported environment where they have access to social work support, and somebody will help them work through an age-appropriate plan for their life. If they're not able to be at home there's an option for still some adult guidance in their life and a way of moving forward with some financial support for that age group.

And finally on that side, we've talked about the coordination between service providers, and I'd mentioned right at the beginning how critical that is. I did want to take a little side trip here though just to comment on the . . . I guess I'd think of it as a continuum of what's appropriate in the life of a young person. And I was thinking about how with normal children you think of normal stages of development. What a 10—year—old expects of us in the way of involvement in decision making that affects them is quite different from what a 15—year—old expects from us in the way of involvement about decisions that affect them. And that's in the normal family life kind of environment.

But just because youth or young people are involved in very destructive behaviour, it doesn't mean that they don't have some of those same feelings and attitudes about how intrusive we are or how involved we are, how directive we are in their lives. So that the tools that we have that are the most intrusive or the strongest, if you like, are more likely to be effective with the younger group, in our experience.

And it's the idea that the older a youth becomes, the more our services need to be attractive to them, or the more they need to sort of draw them into involvement, as opposed to sort of force them into involvement. So we see that on a case—by—case

basis all the time. And the closer, not necessarily with sexually exploited youth, but the closer that youth get to 16, sometimes the more difficult it becomes to work with them in any other way but a co-operative way.

And I think that's a strong message to us about what's ultimately going to be effective in the sexual exploitation area. And I don't know why that would be a surprise to us. It shouldn't be.

So that's my side trip. Murray, we're onto the next slide.

And now we're to the point in the presentation, the next few slides deal with the community resources and activities that we have. And it really is my pleasure to have this lady sitting beside me today. She's been a pretty influential person in the Regina community in a number of areas, and we've been quite pleased to have her involved in the safety services program in the last year or so. I've sort of lost track how long it is, Christine.

But Christine is a very well-known figure in the north central community, which is the community I referred to before. And part of why she's well-known is because of her role as director of safety services. So we're just asking her to take us through the next slides where we talk about the services that are in place in the outreach and support area in the city. Christine.

Ms. Deiter: — Hi. I'm very happy to be here and present here. And I'd like to thank you guys for inviting me here and being part of this.

I guess we'll start out with the outreach. What we're doing right now with the safety services program is we're integrating it with ACCAR (Action Committee for Children at Risk) program and we're combining both programs to encompass a more communication line open. What we're doing is . . . I'm sorry, I'm just really nervous. I'll just go with my notes, okay.

A Member: — Just relax. We're all just ordinary people.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I know that, but you guys are all wearing suits.

Okay, I guess I'll start off with the safety services program and the ACCAR program. We currently found that we work better together if we are together. We're going to physically be located together in possibly a house, and we're basically supported by an advisory committee with representatives from Social Services, the city of Regina, the Crime Prevention Commission, Regina Police Service, North Central Community Society, Mobile Crisis Service, and of course community members.

The RV (recreational vehicle) runs Tuesday to Saturday: sometimes starting at 6, sometimes starting at 7, sometimes starting at 4 on Thursdays. It all depends on what we have to do that day and what the need is out there.

We basically have anywhere from 30 to 50 people coming in. During the summer we have . . . the highest we've had was 58 contacts in one night, and that was during exhibition time —

after exhibition. On average the past month, over the past month, we've seen . . . we've counted, physically counted 25 kids out there working at one time.

That's 25 kids standing out on 5th and 6th Avenue at one time. And people don't realize that they're out there and it just really makes me upset when they say that there's not a big problem out there. But 25 of the prostitutes, we figure about two-thirds of them are under 18, all the time.

So when we go out there and do the count — we do a lot of counts because we don't want people to discredit what's going on or . . . what do you call it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, undermine any of the problems that are out there right now.

What we're doing right now too is we work really close with the police in finding any of the missing kids out there and also with Social Services in regards to the missing kids.

We also work with a lot of the First Nations agencies, some of the agencies out there looking for kids. An example is one of the agencies got a hold of us and they were working with this family for a long time and they finally got mom into rehab. And they got the kids to agree that if mom goes into rehab they'll go with her to the program in Manitoba — unfortunately — go to Manitoba and spend a year there and go into family healing there.

So while mom was gone to rehab, the girls took off and they were on the street. So the First Nations Family Support Centre gives us a call and says: do you know where these girls are? And yes, we know where they are and we know who they are, and so they asked us to give a message to the girls that mom's in rehab, they're ready to go on Tuesday, you guys come home and we'll be there and they'll all go. And that's what we did. We found the girls the next night. Knew exactly where to go.

And it's just simple things, we're simple people . . . where you can look. And my staff found them, relayed the message, and as far as I know they all left last week.

But we're doing a lot of that, a lot of the integration of services and we're finding the more that you link up with the different agencies and the different . . . like the social workers, the more you link up with them, you're going to have a better response and a more well-rounded response to the kids out there.

Let's see, what else can I say? Just really shy. We have a lot of contact with . . . a lot of contact and a lot of trust with the kids out there. The trust building basically comes from that we are truly out there to help them. We've asked . . . we have a lot of protocol with the Regina Police Service in regards to helping them out with different things, and the only thing that we ask from them is they don't come into our RVs or come around us with their clothes and their cars. That's all.

We have been placing children and youth in different shelters and different areas such as the YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association), a few homes here and there. But we find that there's not really anywhere that we can put them at most of the time. A lot of them that are underage — we are basically

developing a place for them, and hopefully we'll have it open in April.

What else can I say? I don't know — I'm lost.

A Member: — I think you could go on to some of the other services and how you work with them.

Ms. Dieter: — Okay. Some of the other places that we are working with is the Cornwall Alternative School and their outreach program. The Cornwall has been provided a small grant through the safety services program to continue with the outreach program that they have aimed at keeping the kids in school and supporting the kids to get them back into mainstay school.

The principal at the Cornwall estimates that 80 per cent of the female students and 50 per cent of the male students are at risk or involved in the sex trade.

The importance of keeping these kids in school cannot be overstated as the options of the street holds no future for them at all.

ACCAR continues the work providing short-term intervention with family. ACCAR has a full-time coordinator and part-time service providers who work up to 12 families who have children and have been identified as risk. Now with ACCAR we got moving into our place, it's really working out a lot better where we engage the children on the street and we talk to them about changing their lifestyles and being a part of their lifestyles but we also have an alternative to give to them with the ACCAR group and giving them family support with the ACCAR thing. So it works really well. It really works well.

We have a lot of mothers and reserve people and family members looking for their kids on the street too, and we help them out in finding their kids and then offering the services as well. A good example is in Muskowekwan — they have a youth substance abuse program, and I believe they came up to the city one day to take their kids to a movie and have a good time and four of their kids took off from the movie. Well lo and behold they phoned Mobile Services. They couldn't find these kids anywhere.

Well the RV staff seen them and identified the kids right away before they even knew that they were missing and Mobile Services called up my staff and my staff went and picked up the kids, kept them, and the First Nations reserve came and got their kids, but they were just impressed how quickly we were able to find everybody and know where everything is going on.

So we do a lot of work with the integration of that. I do see a need for some kind of protocols to establish with the reserves in regards to the transiency of the kids going in and out, back and forth, and there has to be some kind of communication set with the reserves in regards to locating their kids, taking some responsibility of their kids that are coming in and working a few tricks here and there. Or mom and dad bringing them up to the city to work a few tricks and then they go back. To me there has to be some kind of protocol set there as well.

Let's see what else can I tell you. Community development: ACCAR has hosted a series of Let's Talk Neighbourhood meetings in north central community to discuss issues relating to the sexual exploitation of children. Each meeting had attracted over a hundred people. Many of them are parents, grandparents, and family members of kids who are at risk. The overwhelming message from the community are their concerns and their wants and what they want better for their kids out there.

The Social Services network also includes . . . We have a network where we basically try and get along and try and talk, but we suffer with a lot of territorialism there. But we do, we do sit down and talk. We do. In theory all our outreach workers, the different outreach workers such as Rainbow Youth Centre, street workers, and us, mobile services, and Souls Harbour — when we're out there, we all work together in regards to any collaborative efforts.

We'll work with SWAP (Street Worker's Advocacy Project) when we're out there — the SWAP van. If a girl comes and she needs help or if she has a bad date to report, we'll get a hold of SWAP and SWAP will come right to our RV and take the bad date there or else we'll . . . A couple of times too we followed around a bad trick, and we knew his plates and whatnot, and we helped out with SWAP and we went together and we found this person and we just hand the information over to the police and whatnot.

Rainbow Youth Centre, we also have a lot to do with them in regards to that. Our staff, the staff that we have chosen are both, are all of a part of a different youth organization such as one of my staff was from Rainbow Youth Centre. The other one works part-time at mobile services. Another one works at Tapawichi. But what I've found was getting the staffs that are related to all these different programs really enhances our program because they know who to talk to, the communication level, the protocols established, and whatnots. So that's a really good integrated effort.

And also because we're so hooked up to everybody else, it really works out great that we know what programs are there. We know . . . the communication level that we have right now is really strong and that's what's needed out there — some kind of linkage communication messages to get to the youth.

Some of the things that we are trying to do, what we are planning to do is have a youth council for north central. We started it yesterday actually. Started talking about it and what we're going to try to do is have the youth set up a council and what they want to do first of all is we're going to start off with Aboriginal Day and give them the empowerment to develop their community and make it a better place for them. So Aboriginal Day, hopefully we're going to have a street dance and have all the kids out there and make it really exciting for the kids and make it for the kids what they want, and have them out there and let them have pride in their heritage and also give them the sense that this is your community you guys. You know, look after it and maybe let's make it beautiful. Let's take our community and embrace it as a community.

And I think that's all I can really say right now.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Good job, Christine.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — That was a very good and thorough presentation. We'd just ask you to go on.

Mr. Hedlund: — All right. What I'd like to do now is introduce Garry Hoedel. As Bonnie mentioned, he's the head of the crime and criminal investigation division and I'd just like to preface Garry's comments, picking up on one of my earlier comments. It's not always easy to have a bunch of social workers trying to relate to a bunch of police. And over the years I think the different perspectives that we come to our work from have been by and large resolved and we're at the point now, after working on a number of common things, where an issue like how we implement the protocol and how we work together is maybe complicated, but it's quite doable.

And our partners at Regina Police Service are very, very valued partners in the service system in the city, and Garry, of course, has been quite pivotal to that in this particular area. So it's my pleasure to introduce Garry at this time.

Mr. Hoedel — Good morning. I'd like to thank Dave and his staff for giving me this opportunity to basically express Regina Police Service, in particular Bob and myself, who are tasked with responsibilities of working with Social Services and responsible for this major challenge.

You're going to hear from the few things I'm going to say is I'm going to maintain the theme that we have to have partnership and we have to have integration, and I'm very pleased to say that working with Christine's group and with the Department of Social Services, it's working very well. I believe we're making progress. There's no doubt that the current Regina children justice system that we have in place with Social Services has helped make this transition very easy. We know most of the people involved; we each know our roles; and we understand . . . we've got a common goal, which I'll explain a little later in the presentation.

I'm going to . . . I made some notes here and I'm just going to refer to some of them. I believe the management team has made progresses in the following area. We've provided guidelines to a coordinated enforcement strategy to combat this issue. The guidelines cover intelligence gathering, investigation techniques, training in public education.

We've basically taken the role that leadership is an activity, not an . . . is not a position.

I believe we've offered protection and support to the victims. I also believe we have to do a better job to offer this same type of protection to the 16— and 17—years—old. I'm quite confident with the people under 16 — we're doing an adequate job.

As I stated earlier in the theme, the shared resources, during our sting operations we have a theme — nothing we do for children is ever wasted. We have our vice people that actually do our vice stings. However, if investigation becomes involved in the abuse, we will turn it over to our family service section, which is the Regina Children's Justice Centre, and they will take on the investigation. Usually it's long term. And that's where

Social Services and our investigators work together on the file.

I believe the integrated approach is to focus on children in the sex trade. And, if we don't correct this problem, there's no doubt they're going to be our users of our social service and our justice infrastructure in the future.

Our goal is to build a true and honest understanding of the issues surrounding these crimes against a vulnerable segment of our society, which is our children.

I'm just going to give you some statistics since we started working with mainly Denis Losie's group and what we've done on our vice stings. Since July 14, 2000, we've had four meetings. We've had eight vice stings in which we included Social Services. Of those, we had 75 charges; 52 of those 75 charges were soliciting charges — 18 against males, 34 against females, 7 against people under 17 years old, which makes about 20 per cent of people that we charged.

We also take the position that we're going to treat these victims as . . . or these people as victims. However, when we do charge some of these people under 18 years old, it's always in consultation with Social Services. Because we understand sometimes we lose focus on what we're doing, and it's nice to bring in Social Services to see what needs they can provide. Because putting before the courts isn't necessarily the only way of correcting this.

And so to this date, I'm very pleased to report I think that is working. We've had no major problems. Had a few little bumps, but so far everything is working really good. And I hope we maintain that relationship and stay on par with that. Because I think the longer we're on that trail, you're going to see more success.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Are you done giving us those stats, because I haven't followed them if you're done?

Mr. Hoedel: — Sorry, I missed that.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Are you done giving us those statistics? Because if you're done, I haven't followed them. So I just want to go over them again if you could. The numbers of . . . you said you laid 75 charges.

Mr. Hoedel: — That's correct.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — That 52 were related to soliciting.

Mr. Hoedel: — That's correct.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, and then you broke those 52 down for us.

Mr. Hoedel: — Eighteen male.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, 18 male. Now on the soliciting, what exactly on the soliciting is this? Are you laying charges for people who are involved in communications?

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, so 18 adult males?

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. And 34 adult females.

Mr. Hoedel: — No, 34 but seven of those 34 were young offenders.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay, are young offenders.

Mr. Hoedel: — So although you're hearing a theme that we treat these people as victims and don't charge, there are occasions that we have to because of circumstances. And whenever we do charge, we deal with Social Services.

We also have an informal protocol. If we happen to decide to charge a young offender and can't consult with Social Services immediately, we will eventually talk this charge over with them. And if it is seen as a better way to deal with it in another method than in court, we've come to an arrangement, we will get hold of prosecutors and deal with the charge.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. I followed all that but that hasn't gotten at what I'm looking for. How many charges were laid against . . . for persons, for instance, violating The Child and Family Services Act?

Mr. Hoedel: — I don't have that.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — No, no, no, sorry. In terms of the new provisions in The Child and Family Services Act with respect to sexual abuse of children under 18 on the street, how many charges were laid against men for violating that section? Were there any?

Mr. Hoedel: — No, there wasn't.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. How many of these charges involve laying charges against men for seeking sexual contact with children under the age of 18? Were there any?

Mr. Hoedel: — No, there weren't.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay, that's what I want to get at. That's what I'm saying in terms of the information that's missing. Like, why isn't that . . . why aren't charges being laid? Could you just not catch anyone or, like, what's the problem?

Mr. Hoedel: — I've got that later on in my presentation but I'll address it now. Every solicitation charge when we charge a male, our ultimate goal is to look at, this is sexual assault. That's what we look at, that's our approach, our attitude. Unfortunately what we have is only a victim. In most sense, the victim will not testify. That is a problem we're having with it. We view solicitation as serious but we look at, initially from the onset, that's a sexual assault. Unfortunately at the end of the day, we've only laid the solicitation charges.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. We do have an opportunity during our questioning later, to question you on this. But gee, this is just such an important part of it I have to follow up.

There is the wording of . . . The wording in the Criminal Code is communicating for the purposes. So obviously it's not only the girl that would be communicating. The offender — if we call him an offender or her an offender — is also communicating. Why do you find it difficult to be able to charge him with communicating for the purpose when in fact you have reasonable grounds obviously to believe that many of them are communicating, you know, and will end up committing an act of sexual abuse against a young person.

Mr. Hedlund: — Maybe . . . I don't know if this is helpful or not, Garry. You can decide. The context here is the sting operation. Is that . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — That's what we're talking. We're talking stings. When we charge — maybe I haven't made that clear — when we charged male solicitation of 18 charges, it was one of our girls on an undercover role. The same with when we charged the females, it was one of our males in an undercover role. We're not talking about we observe a car or a vehicle pull up to a person we suspect that's applying the trade and going from there.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — In that case, you had indicated that there were 18 males, adult males, charged. So they would be charged with soliciting a prostitute or a girl . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — That's our undercover police officers.

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

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I guess, Garry, what we're begging you . . . (inaudible) . . . I guess is . . . Well I mean I tell you, the level of frustration in the committee is growing on this because it doesn't matter where we go in the province, it seems like the police force is paralyzed in terms of acting. And we're going to make what we are determined to make, I want to add, any changes to the law, recommend any changes to the law that are required, at least at the provincial level, to try to make it easier for you to do your job.

But I guess we are almost at a loss to understand why the police aren't stopping men who are . . . Let me put it this way. Why are you not, as the cars pull up, as they do in Saskatoon and Regina all the time, as you say on 6th Avenue in Regina, on 21st Street in Saskatoon, I guess my question is, why are our officers not stopping the johns as they pull up with girls in their car, asking the driver if they'd like to step out, asking the driver what the nature of the relationship between the girl in the car and the driver is? And if the driver can't provide an adequate response or chooses not to respond, why aren't the police saying, would you like to come down to the station with me because we're going to investigate this matter? Every single time. Why isn't that happening?

Mr. Hoedel: — First of all, I don't know if you totally understand. I would challenge you to say that is happening, but

obviously not the way you would like to see it every time.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — . . . happening sometimes. I mean, why are there no charges?

If, as Christine says and she's absolutely right, there's 25, 30 kids a night out on the stroll in Regina and presumably there's at least 25 johns a night picking them up — probably more like 75 — how come every night there isn't 10 or 12 people being taken down to Regina police station, johns, for investigation? And how come there aren't any charges being laid?

Mr. Hoedel: — We don't have the sufficient evidence to lay the charges.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — But when I just questioned you before, that the wording within the Criminal Code is that anyone can be charged for communicating for the purpose. And now we have it for, you know, the sexual abuse of children is . . . whatever, it's an offence.

There is obvious communicating going on. It seems that the girls can be charged for communicating, soliciting. But on the other side of the coin, the johns are not being . . . that same avenue is not being used to charge johns.

They should be . . . we should have the opportunity, under the existing legislation, to charge them for communicating because there is reasonable and probable grounds and often even evidence there by a young woman being in a car who has obviously been on the street and has been seen on the stroll and she's in the car with the john. So if that isn't reasonable and probable grounds to determine that that man is a john and he's communicating with her for the purpose of what we would state is sexual abusing her, eventually, then I don't know what more evidence you could possibly have.

So it seems that it's all in the context is, you know, that you have to deal with what is communicating, you know, and you have to determine that and you have to have . . . you're saying right now that there has to be evidence that there is actual active sexual intercourse or whatever going on before you can charge them. We are saying that from some other jurisdictions, in fact, that they have been able to take a john down to the precinct and to be able to charge him with communicating, because that's what he's been doing.

Mr. Hoedel: — What you have is, you have reasonable grounds to detain say, in this case, a john. There's no way if you don't have the evidence to arrest, if the person that that john is with will not supply us the evidence to lay a charge, there is no way a police officer is going to arrest that person and take them down. Okay.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Now, now just . . . let's pursue this a little further, Garry. Sorry, I know we're interrupting the presentation, and for that I apologize . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know we're interrupting your presentation and for that I apologize. But this is at the centre point of this whole issue so I think we have to pursue it. And the perfect time to pursue it . . . Kevin, I'll recognize you in a second . . . the perfect time to pursue it, I think, is now while

we're all together collectively. I'm so glad you've come collectively. I really, really appreciate that.

What changes — forget about the Criminal Code for a minute let's look at provincial legislation — what changes do you need in The Child and Family Services Act in order to be able to pursue a full investigation, and if necessary, detain a man overnight who's pulled up in a car with a child in it? If the child won't testify but the man can't explain the relationship between himself and the child, what changes do you need in The Child and Family Services Act so that you can pursue a full investigation?

And you may not be able to answer that today but please try to get us an answer in the next few days, because this is right at the centrepiece of this whole thing. We simply . . . I mean this is bizarre, really, what you're telling us when you think about it. Because we've got about as integrated an approach as we can hope to have in terms of good co—operation. We've got good people on the ground working to do this. All of you are competent, caring people who are working long hours in your field to try to make this happen.

We've got the ability to make amendments to The Child and Family Services Act, so if you need other amendments, please recommend them to us, because we're very happy to look at them seriously. But, surely, we've got to get ourselves to the point where every man who's pulling up in a known stroll area with kids getting in — and we all know what's happening or you know we're all totally aware of what's happening — we've got to get to the point under legislation where the police have the right to do a full investigation.

Now the Justice Department officials tell me . . . we just had a briefing from Laura Bourassa, who tells me again that she believes that there's no need for a change in the legislation, that the police have the right to do that full investigation now. What I keep hearing from every policeman who testifies before these hearings is that they don't feel comfortable doing the investigation; they don't feel comfortable holding the potential john. So tell us what changes in provincial law you need to be able to do that and we'll try to get them for you.

Mr. Hoedel: — First of all, it's not the word comfort, that we're not comfortable. We go on legal aspects. And unfortunately we fall — you're not going to like to hear this — but we fall under the Criminal Code for the arrest part and the constitutional.

I'd have to . . . just to give you an example. Now I'm not sure what provincially. I know we need more authority and I don't know how that would interfere with the Criminal Code.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Would they make you an officer under The Child and Family Services Act?

Mr. Hoedel: — I don't know.

Ms. Durnford: — With the policing protocol, at the time that the policing protocol and policy was established, there was a decision made to use the Criminal Code as the vehicle for charging perpetrators in these cases. And the reason that that

decision was made as the preferable approach was because the penalties are more serious under the Criminal Code provisions than they are potentially under The Child and Family Services Act. So that was a choice that was made at that time around, sort of here would be the preferable way to proceed.

I think what Garry is describing, and I think what I've heard Laura discuss previously and other prosecutors as well, are some of the evidentiary problems that come up with being able to actually substantiate the Criminal Code charges. And I think, you know, we can do more work on what's possible to do under The Child and Family Services Act but the rules are the same for charging under The Child and Family Services Act. So if there's evidentiary problems under the Criminal Code, the potential exists for the same issues under The Child and Family Services Act because you're still trying to prove the commission of a particular offence or a particular activity. So, you know, I understand your point.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — One is on a balance of probability and the other is . . . so the level of proof is not as high. I know Kevin and June have been dying to get on here so I'm going to turn it over to them for a moment. Thanks, Bonnie.

Mr. Yates: — When we've had these discussions around the province with various police agencies and law enforcement officers, we've come to a common theme that there is an inability to deal with the problem today for evidentiary reasons. The Criminal Code isn't giving the opportunity to sufficiently deal with the problem as it presents itself in our communities.

So what we've talked about are a number of ways to give police officers, perhaps additional authorities that fall within the provincial jurisdiction.

As an example, we can make amendments to The Highway Traffic Act giving you authority to stop a vehicle at any time without probable cause, to ask for identification of all people in the vehicle, and if they can't produce it you can do an investigation. You know there are ways within provincial jurisdiction to prevent the act from occurring. You may not at the end of the day be able to charge, but prevent the act from occurring.

And if those types of things go on on a regular basis of course, there's a deterrent for people participating in those types of behaviours because they don't want to, every time they go to 5th or 6th Avenue in Regina, be stopped and have to show their identification. If there's a young lady in the car, they have to show their identification. They can't show identification, then in fact under The Highway Traffic Act you have the right to investigate or impound their car for 24 hours or some method in which in order to inconvenience the person in such a way it becomes a deterrent for that continued activity.

We're looking for creative solutions to help deal with the problems in our communities. And those are . . . They don't all have to be within the bounds of the evidentiary problems we have, although if there are things we can do in that way we like to explore them. But we are looking for ways to help stem the problem and act as a deterrent — things that help you, not things that make it more difficult for you. Because if it makes it

more difficult for you, it won't work. You know, it won't be helpful.

Mr. Hoedel: — Since I believe I know where you're coming from, let's just refer to The Highway Traffic Act. You're saying you don't have to have reasonable grounds. All The Highway Traffic Act has is it gives . . . We have reasonable grounds. Whenever you're driving a vehicle the law has given us the right to stop that vehicle to check for operator's licence, registration. There are only a few sections in there that give us the right to arrest under The Highway Traffic Act, and it's not done very often.

The best answer I can give you here as far as under the provincial statute, under The Family Services Act, I would say you give that authority to Social Services. We will act, the police — and I'm talking for myself, I'm not talking for the Regina Police Service — you allow us to . . . (inaudible) . . . the Criminal Code. And I'm going to talk a little bit about the Criminal Code.

Solicitation is a summary offence. For a police officer to be able to arrest, we have to see the act. Okay. That's why we have to do the stings. Just seeing a person stop and talk to a person who we suspect is selling sex doesn't give us the grounds. It may give us the grounds to approach them, but if they don't want to co-operate they can both take off and we don't have the grounds to hold them.

So from my perspective I'm saying, if you want to give any teeth into any legislation, you give it to the Social Services because we rely totally on them. That's why we've got the partnership. We'll bring the people; we'll deal with the offenders. The victims — I think that's where provincially you've got to give Social Services a little more power to deal with the victims, because I believe that's the only way we can make inroads in stopping this problem is with the victims.

With the people that are . . . or the consumers — whatever terminology you want to put — the johns, they're going to be out there. If they're not committing that crime, they're committing something else. My focus here, and Bob's focus with Social Services, is let's protect the victims.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — . . . the committee has rejected that focus, Garry. Just so that you know. Just so we can have an honest and frank exchange. I really appreciate you saying what you've done. I think that's very important. I think I have no question about the fact that we will recommend that that focus has got to change. We've got to catch the perpetrators of this particular crime because if we don't, you know, all that's happening otherwise in all our communities as we see it is that there's all sorts of caring people who are trying to help all the kids who are out on the street and you take that . . . When you take one set of victims off the street and you try to provide them with support and healing and caring and there's a whole number of additional things we need to do in terms of services for these kids.

But if all you're doing every year is replacing them with 2 or 300 new victims, you know, we're just in an endless cycle here. And the only way we can break this cycle is to arrest the johns

and put them in jail. And we are, I think, as a committee we are united in that view and we are looking for a way to nail these guys. And we need your advice on how to do it.

We are going to do it. We are absolutely determined to recommend to the legislature that we are going to nail these guys.

Mr. Hoedel: — I'm pleased to hear that. But what I'm telling you, is what I have been focusing on, or what our people have been focusing on . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I totally understand. I'm not being critical of you in any way. I very much respect the work you're doing, and we're delighted with the integrated approach that's being taken. But I'm just saying we're just seeking your advice on how can we help you as a police officer. How can we help Regina, Saskatoon, and P.A. (Prince Albert) police services in particular, despite the limitations of the Criminal Code, to nail these guys? Tell us what changes in provincial statutes you need to help us do it . . . so that you can do that and we will try to get those changes for you.

And I realize you need some time to think about that. I'm not expecting you to . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — The first thing that I would be saying — I'm not going to deflect what you've asked me — but that I see as more as the roles of the chiefs of police in the province along with Justice rather than myself. I'm given a . . . I know I would give you a wish list that every police officer would want. But we have to be practical.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — But I think we do need to hear it from your collective group. I mean you must have . . . we've already talked to the police officers by the way and we've already . . . the chiefs of police, we've met with them all; we've asked for their input and similarly of course we've talked to Justice.

But we're interested in your views as a collective. Not just yourself, Garry, but all of you together. If you've got any thoughts on changes in provincial legislation, including The Child and Family Services Act, that you want that will facilitate this work being done, please to tell us. Because one way or another we're going to come up with recommended changes. And by the way, I think they will likely include changes to The Child and Family Services Act. We'd like to make the recommendations with the benefit of your good advice.

Mr. Hoedel: — Well I welcome that news. Anything that you can suggest or change. And I realize that you need some input from us. We welcome any . . . but to ask, you've kind of put me on the spot right away. I wasn't expecting to . . .

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — If it's any consolation to yourself, you might need to know that there have been other officers such as yourself sitting at the table with committee that really did have to take a great deal of questions that maybe weren't in their purview at the time.

But it's because we recognize that police do need to have some

extra authority or some extra tools to be able to tag these people and to lay charges in a way that . . . where they can use reasonable and probable grounds. Because for you or officers out there to only be able to charge someone when they are witnessing the act being committed or darn close to it, you know and we all know that doesn't work. And so we're really needing to have, as Mr. Prebble has mentioned, some information about what can help.

But we have other committee members here that are wanting to ask a question too. And I think you're going to be taking the load of questions coming here. But anyway I'm going to turn it over to June Draude because she's . . . oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Hedlund: — Ms. Julé, if I could . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . not quite no. I'd like to take up the challenge. I think we haven't approached the challenge that you've given us as a team. We've mainly worked with the rules that we had, as Mr. Yates suggested. It would be interesting to get together and respond to the request that you've made and see what we'd come up with. I think I could.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And please don't feel . . . I mean there's no media here, nobody's reporting anything. So I think we can have this kind of frank, you know, exchange. I don't want you to feel . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — Just to make a comment while you're talking about the provincial Act. I know Manitoba has the fact that, they got a john, they're given under the Act to seize the vehicles. My understanding now is that's being challenged. So all I'm suggesting to you, and I hope . . . probably smart enough to realize that any Act that you're going to put in place is likely going to be challenged. Because it's seen as not as high as the Criminal Code and the human rights and charters and all of that.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — I think that both Alberta and Manitoba when they put their legislation in were aware that there would be challenges. But it was so important that they chanced it. They went ahead with it anyway. And there's been a lot of good work done and a lot of johns charged and so on because of those Acts.

Now there may be one or two challenges. And I mean the challenge may prove that there has to be some amendments as there was in Alberta. But the amendments are made, and it's still a very valuable piece of legislation to assist the police and to assist social workers and everybody in their work.

So, you know, it's valuable to put forward some groundbreaking legislation or something that is sort of outside of the box anyway, because further thought development and process can then be advanced from that point.

But, June, you go ahead and ask your question now.

Ms. Draude: — Everybody's asked all my questions. First of all I wanted to let you know that this committee, even though we're sitting on different sides of the table, we were all united in what we think has to happen here. So if we ask questions, it's nothing except for the fact that we want the best for children.

And what's happening in the last 15 minutes for me is I can see excitement in your faces as well, because you know that we want to reach the same goal. There's nothing involved in here except our children.

And I just wanted to comment on something that Bonnie said. I heard her . . . you said something about it was decided that we were going to go under this Act. My question is, what was the option? Was there a chance to go under another Act or do something different?

When Kevin said we were looking for some advice, we're begging for your advice. You're the ones that know what has to be done. And so we've had 178, probably more than that, witnesses. And we've asked everybody the same question, and everybody seems to think that we're just; we're asking you to think within the purview that you have right now. We're not. This is your first probably chance since you were part of bureaucracy to think outside the box and say, you guys, this is what should be done; now finally do it and listen to me. So we're listening.

Ms. Durnford: — Okay. Well I think, I mean, this has been a very helpful discussion for me to understand what the perspective of the committee is, starting . . . you know, after your 178 presentations or witnesses it sounds like you're starting to form some opinions. And that's very good.

So I think what we'd like to do is to take this opportunity that you've extended to us essentially to see if we can come up with some different ideas for your consideration. I don't know that we have anything to offer right today in terms of a potential solution but we'd certainly like to spend some time thinking about it as a group and do some consultations with our colleagues at the Department of Justice.

Back to my previous comment, Ms. Draude. At the time that the Department of Social Services and the Department of Justice worked on the policing policy, it was very clearly felt amongst our colleagues in the Department of Justice that the Criminal Code was the preferable way to proceed. Because of the seriousness that's attached both to the penalties under the Criminal Code and potentially when there's convictions to the effect of a criminal conviction. I mean it's a much more significant sort of penalty that's carried and, if you like, stigma that's attached to a criminal conviction then to a conviction under a provincial statute.

And so, because of our sort of concern and thought around the seriousness of these kinds of offences, the decision was made, at that point, to look at the Criminal Code as the charging vehicle.

Now at the same time we did amend The Child and Family Services Act and one of the penalties within The Child and Family Services Act, but I would say that it's not being used because of this preference around the Criminal Code attachment.

Now I've clearly heard the message that you're looking for some solutions under provincial legislation. So that's certainly the message that I think we can take back and say is there

anything further that we can do here and provide you our best advice on that front, and try and clear up some of the, you know, if there's evidentiary issues that are similar under a provincial prosecution as they would be under a Criminal Code prosecution, we can at least advise you as to those things. So that's certainly something that we can do more work on.

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

Mr. Toth: — Yes. And I'm sorry, I'm a little late. Being a cow/calf man, if you've been farming, you know what I'm talking about.

I just want to let you know though, as a committee member, while I'm very concerned about the children out there and the abuse of children, I take a little exception to when we use the words creative ways of trying to address the situation out there.

For the longest time, I still think one of the things we need to be . . . while we need to be concerned about the people who prey on children, my firm belief is we need to start addressing some of the reasons why children are on the street as well and I think that's an issue we should not lose sight of.

And I appreciate where you're coming from too, Gary, the frustrations that police officers feel in addressing these problems.

And I guess . . . we had a group in yesterday and probably one of the easiest ways to address some of these concerns is if there was a comfort level that children on the street had, if they really felt that they could speak out about the abusive situations they're facing, whether it's coming from the environment that put them on the street or from the people that are on the street and abusing them.

And I think if we can find a way to create that comfort level so that these young children could start speaking out. And in a situation like you say some of the officers have talked about where they've had even children in vehicles, but because the children will not speak up. And I think that may come from the fact because they don't feel comfortable and they don't feel . . . They may feel that they have then become the victim versus if they would speak up against the john.

And I guess part of the questions we're asking as well is how do we reach out? How do we create that comfort level and that level where these children feel that they really have the authority to speak out and say, yes, this person just asked me to commit a sexual act with them?

Mr. Hoedel: — Change the mindset of when you talk about the victim, the label of a prostitute, because what that does is that puts them into a shell.

And I don't want to forget another thing. You were saying why don't we do this and why don't we do this? We use The Highway Traffic Act. If we're not using stings, we have initiatives where we have the officers go and stop every vehicle there, but we use The Highway Traffic Act. But all we're doing there is chasing them away. We're charging them under The Highway Traffic Act.

So what we're doing is we're trying to use everything we have within the guidelines of our law, because we've got our own jobs to protect as well.

Ms. Dieter: — I think some of the things that we have to remember about the victims and the kids in the car is they have pimps. Whether it be their families, whether it be the drugs that are putting them out there, they do have pimps. These kids are stuck in an emotional abuse state where they're not going to be loved by their families and they're not going to be accepted by their peers if they're not out there and if they're not working. They have to pay for their way.

And I think that's a lot of things that people forget is there's two sets of rules here. There's the rules that are out on the street, and there's the rules that we want to change and want so much to try and change. But what you have to do is empower these kids with the knowledge that it's okay to talk.

What I see is a lot of . . . out there, I hate to say it, is I see a lot of street justice where I've heard of young girls being chased down by johns. And they go running to the gang houses, and the gang guys will come out and beat up the johns. And that's what's going on right there. And to me it's doing better for the gangs to look after those kids out there a lot of times because they have more trust in the gangs than they do with anybody else. That's because that's their peers, that's their families.

And I think understanding the whole thing about how the girls are forced to work out there and the kids are forced to work out there because it's their environment. They know nothing else — they know nothing else. They're not prostitutes. They're not so-called prostitutes. They're just kids, and prostituting is something that they do to support their families, to get the love that they need from their peers, to be accepted. Prostituting is something that they do because of that. And they're not going to rat each other out — they're not.

Mr. Toth: — I guess that's the question that has to be addressed at the end of the day so that as a police officer is investigating, they've . . . when that child sees that police officer, they see that, can see that officer as someone they can trust, but they probably don't. Yes. And that's a big question that we need to . . . how do we arrive at that?

Ms. Dieter: — There's a lot of development coming up in the near future that is so exciting to make these community ties with the police and whatnot, to collectively, collectively work together, such as I hear that we're . . . Regina Police Service were trying to have a cadet program, cadet program going after the high-risk youth. To me that's just great. I'd love to see these cadets be involved in a community and looking after the kids — walking the little ones to the store, walking the grandmas to the store, staying in the park with the kids so I could send my kids to the park to go and play.

I live in north central and I know what it's like living there. I know what they're going through. It's survival, day to day. These victims are not going to say anything because they are victims all the way through. But the thing is to empower them and make them feel that they're not victims; that this is their choice, and they can do it.

Mr. Toth: — But the overall problem as a committee we're trying to grapple with: number 1, addressing the problem of johns seeking the services; but number 2, really there's that strong emotional situation out there of children and the reasons they're on the street. And so any suggestions, I guess, as we've indicated would have to . . .

Ms. Deiter: — I chased them. I live there and I do chase them down, and I honk my horns, and I give the finger, and I'm just rank out there. My husband kills himself laughing and, oh, God, you're doing it again, aren't you?

Mr. Toth: — And I personally believe that empowering and working with people in the area versus just another department and empowering Social Services to put another body together, there again we have a government department versus what you're doing and some other people are doing. The fact that they're out there and they know the children and can . . . working with them to develop a program that enhances that.

Mr. Hedlund: — I guess I would add that it's a very complex problem, and I hope we don't try to solve it one way only. And I very much agree, Mr. Toth, with your comments. And there are many people in the community, many agencies in the community that are, for more reasons than child abuse through prostitution, trying to address those determinants of these serious social problems.

It would be very nice if there were some tools for this particular social problem that we could attack from the unfortunate side. It seems like it needs to be multi-faceted.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — You see, I think what we've got is a multi-faceted approach but with an enforcement side that isn't working very well because we don't just seem to be able to get the charges we need under the Criminal Code.

Mr. Hoedel: — What you have to remember is that we gather intelligence that some of these johns are going straight to the houses. So, depending on the type of enforcement action you want, you sometimes force the whole issue underground, which even makes it difficult.

But at the end of the day — Christine's right — we need the victims to come forward. No matter how much power you give us, at the end of the day we're dealing with . . . Right now we're dealing with a gang problem. We're charging people. The other day, just yesterday, we had 12 officers in court just, because people were coming to testify, just to chase away the gangsters that want to be intimidating. And that's what these girls are going through as well.

So I understand where you want to come and I welcome anything that you'll help, but boy this is going to take a long time. Where we've got to focus is on that child. We've got to get that negativism, being called a hooker or a prostitute, the labels . . . That's why I've got a little later on in my presentation, you hear the numbers, how many girls are out there. Police numbers are always lower because the only time we'll say that we've got X amount is we've got to support the charge. Because that's a negative label. We've got to have some credibility in the law enforcement agency.

Yes, we're not stupid. We all know when a girl's working on the street what she's doing. But we're not going to label them, especially if we want to work with Social Services, to say that we're caring, and all this. That's why we don't publicize when there's an 11-year-old gets picked up because that's private. It's for the person; it's for the family.

I think what Vancouver did, publicizing that 11-year-old, that's dangerous. Media likes to hear that stuff, but that, from my perspective as a police officer, how can the police say we're here to help to the family now.

So I agree with what Christine said. We've got to change this concept of people wanting to come forward and then not being feared after, the few that are going to break that cycle. Because I know people, I've been around long enough, I've seen three generations of abuse. I know grandma's been on the street, I've known the mom, and now I know the child. So this is . . . it's a long-term deal.

Mr. Hedlund: — One of the examples I was going to refer to briefly, and it's a Saskatoon example, and perhaps the committee has even heard about the Operation Help initiative. Is that familiar to some of you?

But one of the side effects, I understand, from that . . . maybe not a side effect, but one of the results seems to be that the young people that are involved in that sort of wraparound approach, I guess, if you called it that, has been a willingness to get involved in testifying against johns. And I thought that was quite interesting, and we'd be interested in hearing more about how that project developed.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes, yes. You know, we've done quite a lot of talking. I think we're going to revert back to allowing you to finish your presentation, and you can be sure that we'll probably have more questioning and discussion than anybody would have dreamt possible here, after your presentations are concluded.

Mr. Hedlund: — Garry's about a quarter of the way through, right.

Mr. Hoedel: — Well I've touched most of it, but it's all over the place.

Mr. Hedlund: — Do you want to just pick out some of the main points to . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes. Actually what I wanted to do is . . . I maybe didn't make it clear, those were vice stings. And whenever we did have a vice sting, we notified social services and they've been more than willing . . . we could never tell them, number one, how many of the girls were going to be out there, but they were always out there, willing to help us. Whenever we had a girl to turn over to them, they had some place to put them.

When we first got into this initiative, the workers, that's the first thing they were saying — we'll do our job; Social Services doesn't have the funding, they don't have the room for it. Well I think because we did this we proved out workers wrong. There

haven't been that high numbers, and Social Services has come through. And every time we've had to turn over a girl, either to families, a mobile, or Social Services, they've taken them. So that isn't an issue any more.

Ms. Jones: — . . . do you have an age . . . (inaudible) . . . under 18.

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes, we're talking the ones under 16.

What we've done is the ones over 18, between . . . excuse me, the ones between 16 and 17, if we've charged them, at the end of the day we sent the file over to the family services to review it, or we've taken the girls home. In most cases found out that by the end of our sting, they were back out on the street. But we've always notified, document—wise, Social Services regarding those.

Just give me a little time . . . I've expressed a lot of the things that I've already discussed. As well, in our sting operations, we only have three people attached to our vice unit which are undercover people. But what we've done, is we've provided training to our uniformed people that work in the north central area. And whenever we have a sting, not only do we use Social Services, we use those people as well. And even our patrol members are starting to work with Social Services because they're identifying those people that are out on the street. I'm talking our uniform members — when they're not helping on the stings — they recognize the girls that we've charged, they recognize the pimps, and they also understand the problem that's in our area. So I see that as a real beneficial contribution to this whole issue that we've been working together on.

So I think most of this stuff that I've expressed I've stated already. The last thing I'd like to talk about is I understand the committee is going to hear from two officers from Vancouver that established this website to track all the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. We've been on it since November only. We believe it's a good tool. What we found, though, is we would like to see dangerous offenders, sexual dangerous offenders put on that so that idea has been forwarded to them. I don't know if it can be possible.

Again we're going to get back to Peter's little issue. When we charge a consumer, because it's solicitation, normally we don't have a picture. So we can put a name on it but we don't have a photograph. So if we chase say the john out of Regina and they go to Calgary, we may have the name but not the photograph.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — There is a pretty thorough description though of johns as far as any markings on their body, of their height, their weight, their complexion, you know, their license plate. From what I understand, there's a lot of detail there.

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes, there's no doubt about it but a picture is still worth a thousand words.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Yes, exactly.

Mr. Hoedel: — Okay?

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — There is, I guess, the provision of the picture in a lot of cases for young kids at risk that are being tracked through DISC (deter and identify sex trade customers). There's pictures for them I noticed.

Mr. Hoedel: — I think this is a good program. It's just started. In Regina, we've just been on it now for four months so I can't really give you any success stories unfortunately.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Just in reference to the DISC program, do you think that it would be beneficial to have extra financial resources for specified staff in this area so that that staff could concentrate on this program and making sure that it's working efficiently, effectively, and really workable to help kids?

Mr. Hoedel: — I'm not really in a position to understand. All I know is I don't know how it started and that I'm the wrong person to ask. But as far as additional resources for us, our own staff put it on. All we are . . . is we add to it.

That question would probably be better to the two people that are coming to ask them. I'm not sure about that.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Thank you. Just proceed.

Mr. Hoedel: — Basically, I'm open to any questions after the presentation.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Dave, if you want to carry on with the rest of your presentation.

Mr. Hedlund: — Sure. I've only got about five minutes and I think Bonnie just has a few closing comments and then we can go wherever you'd like to go with it. Okay?

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Sounds good.

Mr. Hedlund: — Thank you. We're in Regina, next step slide. Never know quite where we are, behind me there.

In Regina, we've identified some of the next steps. I think this really is in line to some extent with Mr. Toth's comments. We're expanding the outreach . . . we'd like to expand the outreach safety services capacity to enhance our coordination and linkages to the current services. In that regard, we're setting out to hire a full—time social worker, which would be added to Christine's staff.

You know we're thinking of that, don't you?

Ms. Deiter: — Yes. I know that.

Mr. Hedlund: — Good, and partly what we'd hoped to accomplish there is — moving into a second point — to build a stronger capacity to get the detailed information about what the dynamics of the sex trade actually are at the current moment. It's always shifting, as I'm sure you've heard people describe.

We're interested in working in a more . . . I shouldn't say more co—operative, but just to be more involved, I suppose, in the day—to—day patrol work that the police do. There's no reason

why we couldn't have a social worker riding along some of the time with a police patrolman. Christine's staff could also be included in that role and we're thinking that the people in our department that know a lot of these kids and know their families might be quite helpful in establishing and developing the intelligence that the police are looking for.

Moving on from there we would like to improve the — I guess we'd call it the protocol — but the way that information flows back and forth from all the partners. We're pretty good at it, but it's still a bit informal I think. And I don't know if we need some sort of an automated database or what it should be, but it would be better if we could move information quickly. And we'd like to see this new role assist with that, and all of us will play a role. All leading to the third point, the idea of tracking and monitoring the youth and the others that are involved with them in the sex trade in the city.

A few other things related, or sort of carrying on from there, we'd like to involve a number of the staff that have been connected with ACCAR, in establishing some early intervention type programming with kids that are just getting into the sex trade. We think that we could formalize that type of work and maybe head off some of the involvement that we think is kind of on the horizon for some kids. So we haven't done that formally; we'd like to move along on that trail.

And we also, as Christine alluded to, we need to develop some more reliable safe place resources. We've got access to some, but it would be nice if we had more, and we'd like to work further on that.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — What is coming in April? Christine was saying something about an April house.

Ms. Deiter: — What we're envisioning is safety services and ACCAR getting together and opening up a large intervention centre, for lack of a better name. We haven't picked out any names. What it will be is it'll host both ACCAR and safety services program and also, hopefully, be a place where we can do our file management with Social Services, the police, and the different First Nations place.

I also see it as a resource centre for information for the kids, empowering them with information of all the different social programming that they can access. I think that's one of the biggest things is getting . . . letting out the information and letting know what's going on in the hole.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — This will be a safe house though, this is . . .

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, actually we're going to have one bed, right now, just to start off with. One bed, or one room where a family can go.

I think another thing that we have to remember about the child prostitution, or the whole label of child prostitution, is we have older adult prostitutes that are 18, 19 and whatnot. And these are mothers of children that are two, and three, and four years old. And they have their kids at home, and we're just forgetting about them. These kids are going to be at high risk of doing

exactly the same thing that their parents are doing.

So I think a lot of the things is not remembering the adults that are . . . that are there, that are working there and encompassing the kids that they do have around them. I'm thinking of universal treatment for families, family treatment centres, different things like that.

You know, I think that's a big thing, is forgetting that the adults also have kids and these kids are right . . . going to be right there; they're totally at risk at of doing everything.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — There's an interconnectedness that's necessary; it's necessary for everyone to realize that.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes. So it's really hard for us at the RV to turn away any adults, because we know that they have children. So our job is to work collectively with everybody to help out as much as we can.

The intervention home hopefully will have a place where an abused mom that's a prostitute, could come with her kids, just for one night to get out and get away.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Christine, can I ask you just quickly where the funding is coming from for that home that you're talking about?

Ms. Deiter: — Hopefully, Social Services. And actually what we're doing is . . .

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — And the building where ACCAR and safety services will be housed in together, you're hoping that funding comes from Social Services?

Mr. Hedlund: — Social Services has, through the sexual exploitation funding, had money into both of these projects, the safety services project and ACCAR. If the home was provided, the city is actually, in my understanding, become very co—operative in looking to fund a house or get access to a building that could have rent much reduced.

So it would likely be a combination of the municipal authority and some of the Social Services funding that would look after that.

Ms. Deiter: — And also we're looking at different partners to help us out in the whole initiative as well. We are doing initial talks with SIGA (Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority) and FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) in understanding the responsibility of part of the social development in the city. So just putting a bug in their ear right now, but they have basically said that they'd like to be a part of the whole program and would like to help us out.

Then we look at the other places, such as Rotary Club. The Rotary Club donated a large sum of money to the program so we could purchase a new RV. That's great. More.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — That is great.

We're going to just maybe see if we can wrap up the

presentation. There are some members requesting that . . .

Mr. Hedlund: — Yes. I would have skipped over most of the rest of it and just made a couple of summary comments in a minute, if that's all right.

By way of summary, I think it's come out in the discussion, but we feel like we have reason to be optimistic and I think proud of some of the work that's been done. But all of us are very seriously concerned about how much there still remains to do and I hope that twin message has been expressed.

The case examples that we were going to give indicate that these kids usually come from families that have extreme complex packages of need that have gone on a long time and the solutions for them require very intensive effort on the part of all of us coordinated together, usually also for a long time. And it's a big challenge on a case basis. It's a challenge on a community basis. And it's certainly a challenge on a public policy basis for all of you and all of us.

So I guess I would just end Regina region's presentation by thanking the committee for spending some time with us and turn it back over to Bonnie.

Ms. Durnford: — Well this has been a very helpful discussion for us. I think, as I said at the outset, I think that we're seeing our work still is very much a work in progress. I think we've made some substantial gains over the last year in terms of doing the things that we had initially set out to do around community development and community outreach. And I think Christine has spoken very powerfully to some of the gains that we've made on that front.

But I think we still have some challenges ahead of us and things that we're going to need to do better. And I think the committee has clearly touched on the issue around how do you manage the demand side of this particular issue. Because a lot of our efforts have been focused on dealing with the victims and trying to sort of deal with the supply side, if you like, on that front.

You know, as we look at sort of the range of services that we provide, we have, I think, some things that we have to consider around older youth, around the 16— and 17—year—olds, in trying to manage that balance that Dave's already described of these youths trying to sort of be independent, be more autonomous from adults, but at the same time still engaging in significantly risky behaviour. So how do we engage them and how do we work with them on a regular basis?

Christine and David both talked about the issues around safe places and particularly safe places for the 16— and 17—year—olds. We also have I think issues around treatment that we need to spend time thinking about and how to make our treatment services more amenable to these groups of kids.

And finally, I think the healing issues that have been identified; and finally, I think the foundational pieces that are going to make sort of the change over the long term is how do we have positive outcomes for these kids and how do we link them to the things that we know are going lead to positive outcomes, and that's education and training.

We can't simply stop and only talk about treatment services. We need to figure out how we can link them back to school and into jobs. Because that will be the long—term solution for them.

So I just conclude my remarks there. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

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

I think it's wise right at this moment to take about a 10—minute break. There's members that are asking for that.

So thank you for your presentation. Please do return because there will be some questioning, I'm sure, that will take place.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — All right, we'll resume our hearing. Mr. Prebble will be with us momentarily. But we'll just open up the questioning to committee members that would like to enter into discussion with our presenters today. Ron?

Mr. Harper: — Yes. First of all I want to thank each and every one of you for being here and the excellent, excellent, very informative presentation. I thank you very much for that.

I personally agree with what was stated a little earlier here that there is no one single solution to this issue. I think it's . . . will require multi—faceted approach. I believe there has to be some short—term solutions and some long—term solutions before we can come to a meaningful address of the problem.

I am of the belief that there are . . . that the activities that we see on the street is only sort of the tip of the iceberg or the tip of the cause of the situation. I would be interested in your opinion as to what are the root causes that cause children to be on the street.

Ms. Deiter: — Can I answer that? Residential school impact. If you have any understanding of the residential school impact, we have generations of kids that don't know how to parent — generations of parents that were taught in the residential school not to hold their children, not to give any love and encouragement to their children. So naturally they taught that to their kids, because they had no idea how to parent.

The next generation taught the same thing — not how to parent. So what we have is a bunch of kids that have kids . . . When you look at a lot of the . . . It's just a parenting, a big parenting thing and understanding the value of our kids and understanding the value of having these children.

I think a lot of the things that we have to go back to as a community person and as a First Nations person are the traditional beliefs and ideology that a parent . . . that a child is a gift from God, and to understand that and to bring that back to the First Nations community as well.

To me, that was one of the big . . . one of the big issues right there. What you have is generations and generations of kids that have no worth, no self—worth at all. And when they're

oppressed through prostitution, when they're oppressed sexually, they have no self—worth at all.

So I think, to me, that's probably one of the . . . the biggest factor right now, the biggest underlying factor right now is the residential school impact. And I don't know what to say about that . . . anything else more to say about that.

Mr. Hoedel: — Also I think substance abuse. Just about everything related to prostitution is drug—related, say in the high 90s. Look at all gang activity, especially the outlawed motor gang. They've got . . . they're looking . . . the victims are looking for a family structure much like what Christine is saying they didn't have. And the drugs is kind of an offshoot of what she said, but . . .

Ms. Deiter: — It's all a sense of belonging and a sense of community, and they don't have that sense of belonging when they're by themselves or they're with a dysfunctional family. You have the kids running to a gang because they have no family.

And then to be accepted in the gang, the girls are going to have to go and work; the guys are going to have to go and get . . . you know, sell the drugs or watch the girls or whatever. But it's just a part of the lack of any family structure or the lack of any real ideology of community in north central at all.

Mr. Harper: — So what would it take to fix the problem then? If we were to address the root causes, if we wanted to focus in and address the root causes, what will it take to fix it?

Ms. Deiter: — Empowering the community to help themselves. We do that through community development and social development. To me, the power is going to be with the youth. We're going to have a big generation of youth coming up here, First Nations youth. To empower them right now to be community leaders and teaching them how to develop their community and take pride in their community, or even to start some sense of community so that it's not gangs and that it's not gangs or it's not a criminal activity it's related to, but be more productive.

I think some of the things that they need is a chance to dream. Right now it's just day—to—day survival for all these kids. Day to day, day to day, maybe hour to hour, and it all depends on their drug dependency as well. Drug dependency, IV (intravenous) use is so widespread it's unbelievable.

And what kills me is we don't have enough treatment beds for the kids or the families or the families with kids. A lot of the mothers really are anxiety driven about going into treatment because they feel that their kids are going to be placed in care or they don't have anywhere to take their kids or be with their kids.

So to me a lot of the things is accessing — accessing services, treatment services for the kids. Like drug and alcohol services for families; drug and alcohol services for the kids that are right out there. Education — education is the key for everything right now, is just empowering them with information, empowering them with education so that they can help themselves.

Mr. Hoedel: — Can I add to that theme on education? I'm not sure what you mean by education, but the education I'm talking about is the education how society looks at picking up these people are wrong.

And I think we have to take an aggressive approach, as society, as we did with impaired driving. In my days, impaired driving started just when I started police work. All this education. We never had such a thing as one person sits back and doesn't drink and drives us around and all that. The generations now that are coming up, my children, even the kids that are talking about school, they're looking at drinking and driving totally different than my generation. And that's because of the education — the strong, aggressive education plan.

And I think with . . . We have to have, as a society, how it's wrong; not only morally, but I think we have to focus on it's seen as child abuse. You're victimizing a society that's very easily exposed to being tempted into crime and all that kind of thing. I think we have to go that . . . But it's going to take long . . . It's going to be long term. We're probably going to be dead by the time it really kicks in.

Ms. Deiter: — I won't.

Mr. Hoedel: — You're one of the younger ones.

Mr. Harper: — So then in your opinion, what should the recommendation of this committee be as far as implementation of programs to address the need on a short—term basis and on a long—term basis? What would be your list of things that should be done?

Mr. Hedlund: — Maybe we'll create a list that we provide separately. There's others of us here who may have comments to make and I'd invite them too to join in.

In answer to the long—term response, I think there are a lot of us in the province that are quite optimistic about the early childhood intervention initiative. I think the likelihood is that that will be targeted at high—risk communities.

If you look at where that money flow or where I hope it flows, it likely is going to be the same communities where we see this particular issue manifested the most strongly. That's a long—term solution but you're not going to get at some of these deeply imbedded social problems unless you're starting with kids before and right after they're born to give them the chance in life that they need.

I'd add that to the list as we develop it here.

Ms. Durnford: — I think on the long—term case, the other thing that I would speak of, and I think this was the point that Christine was making, is relative to education. There is a growing population, a very quickly growing population of Aboriginal youth in this province, and I think it's a real opportunity for the province to try and change the outcomes for that group by making sure that our education system is able to respond to them and able to include them and to produce the good results that we know comes with a good education.

And you know, in the department we often talk about the opportunity to match this Aboriginal youth population up against what we know is going to happen in the labour market in the province over the next few years. And this is a golden opportunity, I think, for us to try and put those two pieces together and say we're preparing this group of young people for these jobs, and to start to shape our public policy to help us get there right now.

Mr. Harper: — With the mechanisms, the tools, that are available and being used by Social Services today to address this particular issue, how many children were you able, through Social Services and their mechanisms, were you able to save off the streets last year?

Ms. Durnford: — Perhaps I can respond to it. One of the things that needs to be understood in this conversation is there is a network of child protective services across the province operated through Social Services and some of our partner agencies. Many of the kids that come to our attention for various reasons, whether it's, you know, problems with their parents or whether it's because they've been charged with an offence under the Criminal Code, many of these kids have involvement with street life and they come to us for various reasons. But one of the factors that we end up dealing with is their involvement on the street. And that's a theme that I would say permeates many of our systems, both in our child protection system and our young offenders' system.

So the scope just to say, you know, how many did we remove just because of street life, the facts would be that many of the kids that we're involved with have that kind of background — family dysfunction, they come from poor families, unfortunately largely Aboriginal families. Seventy-five per cent of the kids in foster care would be coming from First Nations and Metis families.

So you know, that is the population that we deal with throughout all of our programs. So our challenge is to be able to shape our programs to try to respond to all of those issues and try to move the kids along to the kind of positive outcomes that we know is possible for them.

So get them back into school, in a sense, make sure that their child development needs are being met in foster care. Get them relationships with their extended family. Return them home where it's safe. So those are all of the things that we have to do on a continual basis.

Mr. Harper: — My question, I suppose, is based on trying to establish some mechanism to gauge whether or not the programs through the various agencies that are being offered out there right now, to what degree are they being successful? Is there a mechanism to measure that, to say that this program is 50 per cent successful, 25 per cent or 100 per cent? Is there a mechanism that you can provide us with saying that this approach that we're using works?

Ms. Deiter: — I think some of the things that you have to remember is the child involved in prostitution and the youth involved in prostitution, it's going to be a long-term healing all the way through. So we can't say that oh, we saved this one

off the street and whatever.

But in regards to our RV and safety services program we've had a lot of the first interventions where the kids are being forced out there by other kids. And we phone up their parents because they have no idea what's going on or we'll phone up . . . I remember one child we ended up, she got left at the exhibition and she went from house to house, house to house, hanging out — she's 14, 15 — hanging out, hanging out. And one house told her to go and earn your keep, and she wouldn't. So she went to another house, got beat up and forced out.

She never pulled a trick, but she came to our RV and we sent her back home, back to Duck Lake. Got a hold of her mother on the reserve. And they were just freaked out and so happy that we found her and whatever, and we sent her off on her way.

We have a few — about, I could say, about 10, 11 cases like that — that we have directly . . . the very first time that they're being forced out there, come in contact with us, and us giving them an alternative or us phoning, you know, getting a hold of people or sending them away, sending them out of the 'hood — that's the big thing. That's what we're doing.

But those are for the very first, the very first level — the level 1's we call them — where they're just at risk and they're not really engaged in the whole prostitution. The long-term girls that have been working out there since they were 12 and now they're 17, 18 . . . Jeez, it's going to take at least four, five years to get them off and totally functional again, to be a contributing person to their . . .

Mr. Harper: — The programs that are available today, are they adequate to provide that continuum of service for that person who wants to get off the street and has substance abuse problems and so on and so forth? Is the programs out there today adequate to meet the continuum of service it may take for that individual to clean up, to change their lifestyle, and to find the opportunities other than that on the street?

Mr. Hedlund: — No, I don't think so.

Mr. Harper: — Okay.

Mr. Hedlund: — Bonnie had laid out some of the, I think she titled it challenges, but if they were adequate I guess we wouldn't have the problem. I think one of the challenges within the challenge though of adequate resources is what should the resources be? You know, if we're dealing with the kinds of things that Christine talks about as the root causes of the range of serious social issues we face, in contrast to what we've done historically as a dominant society trying primarily to help Aboriginal people — that's sort of how our service systems work — what should we be doing as an alternative to that?

I'm hopeful about some of the cultural approaches that are being talked about. Some of our Aboriginal partners are talking about developing cultural healing centres. Denis could talk about the Cree lodge environment that's been created out in the valley east of the city; very positive results with some of the kids who have been street involved, certainly.

So I think there are challenges about how we shape the responses besides just more of the same of what we've been doing.

Mr. Harper: — One final question. I would like you to give me an example of what would happen if, say today, an hour from now, a 14-year-old girl approaches a street worker and says I've had enough, I want to get out of this lifestyle, I want out. What happens?

Ms. Dieter: — Okay. On the community level if she came into our RV and said that she wants to get off, my staff, basically what we have been doing is getting them into treatment. Because that's the very first and initial thing for all social workers is to deal with the physical ailments first. So that's dealing with the addiction, the drug addiction, which is almost always IV, IV use. So we usually put them into detox; all depends on how old they are but we put them into detox and then go to a longer term healing place such as Angus Campbell. We've been using them as detox and whatnot.

And then after that, in theory, the ACCAR program — we've done it with a few kids — with the ACCAR program we'll be doing the follow-up with the family, working directly with the child and working with the family basically getting them into better programs, services, and working directly with the family as a support worker.

Mr. Harper: — What would happen — pardon me, only one more question — what would happen in the case where you were able to identify that that 14-year-old girl is out on the street and being put out there by her family?

Ms. Dieter: — Well we'd phone Social Services.

Mr. Hedlund: — Some of the examples they had actually weren't so different from the case you propose. If there was no safe place for a 14-year-old, we would apprehend her and likely in Regina place her in Dale's House.

Mr. Harper: — And how long would she stay in Dale's House?

Mr. Hedlund: — The basic program is six weeks. But one of the examples that I had in our presentation, I think she was there for five months. She went through reorienting some of her personal goals and was supported through a court process that occurred with the person that was charged in relation to her soliciting.

Mr. Harper: — And what happens after a stay in Dale's House?

Mr. Hedlund: — I'll use the example. This particular example the girl did get involved in the cultural camp that I spoke to, and I think the people that worked with her saw that as quite pivotal to the changes that she made. She had a couple of slips back where she went on to the street again for a very short time, but she had a good enough connection with some of the folks that they were able to recruit her back off the street.

And I think, Denis, it's nearly two years since we've heard from

that girl. And our information is that she's stable in the community. About 18 now.

Mr. Harper: — Thank you very much.

Mr. Hedlund: — So there are some of those stories for sure.

Mr. Losie: — In this case, much of the reintegration factor involved her mother and extended family. So the staff of Dale's House, the family preservation staff, the elders and the staff . . . (inaudible) . . . lodge, the staff from the Cornwall Alternative School, all of these folks were part of a safety net. And with this young lady the safety net was kept very high.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Can we just ask — we certainly welcome you to make your comments in conjunction with what's being said — but if I could just ask you to come to the microphone because it's important that we have sort of a continuum on this conversation for purposes of . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. Carolyn, I think you had some questions.

Ms. Jones: — I did, thank you very much, Peter. And thank you for the presentation. It was actually very encouraging to see how you're working together and I think, as a committee, we know fully well the importance of the integrated approach. And not just police and Social Services, but Health and Justice and many other groups — all of the outreach groups.

A couple of comments — and Christine, I appreciate what you say about the residential school syndrome — but as a committee, we know that not all of the people . . . all of the young people on the street are First Nations people. We've heard very sad stories of young girls who come from absolutely functional homes and who, for whatever reason, still end up on the street. And you know you can call it youthful rebellion, whatever, and so that isn't obviously the only cause. Perhaps Garry's comment about they're all looking for a family structure may well be a more appropriate one, even though some of the people have a good family structure and still end up there. But I think there will always be some . . . someone who is the exception.

I think that the . . . that racism is one of the things that needs to be included in educational programming. And indeed, I think education on sexual abuse period — child sexual abuse, marginalization of women — all of those things have to be included in a successful education program.

And those are just observations that I wanted to share, but I want . . . I don't want to look like a pit bull, but I want to go back to deterring johns. All of these things I think are given as things that the committee wants to address in terms of the integrated approach, and addressing root causes. But I think one of the things that we hear, and you have said a number of times, that there's a different approach for 16- and 17-year-olds, 15-year-olds who are beginning to find their own way. And one of the things that they tell us — and particularly in their response to any notion of apprehension and secure treatment — is their absolute anger and dismay that johns are not dealt with in any way. And so they see themselves as being victimized and

punished for their activity, where the perpetrators are allowed to go free. And it's not so much that they're allowed to go free as we don't seem to be able to catch them. We don't seem to have the tools that we need to stop sexual abusers from initially abusing and, secondly, able to do something about the fact that they have abused.

And the sting operations that you describe still seem to be catching people who are approaching adults, and that's useful in identifying johns — and indeed, prostitutes — but it isn't very useful in preventing the exploitation of youth. And so I'm going to be a bit of a pit bull and invite you to think again. And again, I don't expect you to come up with it now.

But as a group who works well together, as a committee I think we really want to hear ways that we can help you — both Social Services and police services — to bring sexual abusers . . . And I'm focussing on the under-18 victims at this point. Some people have a different opinion of over 18. I know it's still not a nice trade, but somehow they're not as vulnerable. They may have started out as being vulnerable youth and certainly we don't condone that activity either, but the stings can do something about that to a degree.

What we're lacking is a way to stop the abusers of children, and I can't go back to that often enough.

And so although I don't really have anything more to say, I want to commend you for the work that you're doing. Think about the attitude of victims who see johns as being scot-free, who see that the people who are perpetrating this abuse on them don't seem to face any consequence.

And I think that's part of the difficulty that you have in dealing with them. They say why should we be in secure custody when the john, who just abused me, is out on the street and his name isn't published and he doesn't seem to have any consequence for his action? And I think that's part of the challenge that you're facing.

So I still want to go back to what can we do as a committee to assist Social Services and police services and Justice to make a consequence for johns and to make it easier for you to deal with them? So I just want to put it back in, bring you back, focus you back on that.

Mr. Hoedel: — I'll just comment on a couple of things you said. You were asking Christine about you understood the ones that were coming from the residential schools; what about the ones that come from structured families? What I found, I've been a police officer for 27 years and I'm going to relate a little bit overall crime of people that come from, young people that come from structured families that get involved in crime.

A high percentage — and I'd say 90 per cent — of those people that, whether they're involved in the sex trade, shoplifting, hanging around with boyfriends that are getting caught in stolen cars and that, just about everyone . . . especially if . . . I've got to be a little gender-biased here, just about every female will allege some kind of abuse whether . . . it doesn't have to be sexual, but it will either be physical or verbal abuse.

When you go back to the parents to try to flesh that out more, there might be a contradiction there of just about — I'm talking now females, okay — just about every time in my experience is abuse of some sort they're alleging. So in the education campaign, I would suggest not only sexual abuse, we've got to get the abuse aspect — verbal and physical. So a lot of these verbal stuff as you hear in the recent problems we're having in the schools down in the States of the shooting, it's all intimidation. It's mostly calling the people names and that, when you hear from the media and from the classes I've taken. So low self-esteem and that, it's the verbal part.

So I think in the educational component, we've got to get that out somehow.

Males, under the same theory, some of them are — in my experience — it's not so much the abuse, it's that they're . . . I don't know if the hormones are kicking in or they want to get a bigger challenge or they just want to be rambunctious. But from the female, just about all of them are . . . is an abuse allegation.

And with respect to johns, I hate to say it but probably police aren't very smart when we're trying to identify johns. The way the law is, the only way we can identify johns are stings. Because as I stated earlier, the victims don't want to come forward. And when you look at what's presented at the court, most of the johns are a result of stings, police-driven.

And I know you're asking how do we solve that problem. Maybe we're so ingrained. We always rely on the law because of all the allegations of abuse of authority and that; we have to hide behind that. And I think when you're going to talk to most law enforcement, we're going to hide behind it because just the way society looks at . . . we're going to come to you and say we need the power. Thanks for the provincial power. But where we need the power is federally, so it's universal.

Ms. Jones: — I guess the other thing I wanted to add to that is that I don't think we should be shy about trying to enact provincial legislation that may be challenged and may be overturned. Because in doing that you're raising awareness. You have something in place — until somebody challenges it — that you know you can act on for a while. When it is challenged, you find out on what basis it's challenged, and therefore you have a better opportunity to fix it so that it's able to resist challenge.

And it's a whole public education thing that, you know, raises the awareness which is part of . . . I think part of our mandate is to raise awareness, educate people, work in an integrated fashion to eliminate causes. And I think we all know it's not going to be a fast, overnight fix.

But what we want is to give you this basketful of tools to deal with it, and I think we just need legal and legislative approaches as well as the root-cause solutions.

So I'm nagging you.

Mr. Hoedel: — Under the provincial . . . Go on the guidelines with what you just did with The Highway Traffic Act — for driving an unregistered motor vehicle is now \$535.

You've got to hit the johns in the pocket and so make . . . I think for society to accept, I'm talking — society doesn't condone this kind of behaviour — raise those prices.

Ms. Jones: — Okay. I'll pass now. Thanks.

Mr. Toth: — Yes. Just one quick follow—up, Christine. You mentioned about the ongoing intergenerational problems we face here and you mention about currently young women who are on the street and they have little children. My question is what happens to these little children when the girls are out on the street? Are they home by themselves?

Ms. Deiter: — They are being babysat by family members. I think one of the things that we have to remember is with First Nations' families and Aboriginal families is family is everything, extended families. We don't have any per se nuclear families living in houses. We have extended families where you're going to have grandma, grandpa, auntie, uncle, cousins, nieces, nephews always around the house and the family is the big thing.

So relying on the family to watch their kids always happens, which is really good because a lot of the families do look after these kids, you know, care for the kids of the working girls and whatnot.

So the child is always going to be looked after. But still the main caregiver is a prostitute and is working to feed the child through prostitution.

Mr. Toth: — And I guess that's the part that I have a hard time trying to grasp in my mind. If you've got the extended family, is the extended family then showing support for the activity or . . .

Ms. Deiter: — But it's not so much an act, it's just a lifestyle — it's a lifestyle. To understand what they go through, you know, you go to a house where one of the girls is a prostitute, another one may be a drug dealer or whatever, but there will be about . . . they won't wake up until two, three in the afternoon because that's their lifestyle. They don't understand anything else, and they've never been submitted to norms or morals. It's all lifestyle and it's all what . . . their environment.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you. I have some questions for Garry. I appreciated your comment about the child that was brought over in the Vancouver incident with the young girl. And I understand that she was actually being exploited again through the media.

But one of the things that happens because of things like our committee and your intervention is it takes public support and pressure to start making a difference. And whenever you do have something like this happening in the media and there's a public outrage about it, then we can start, whether it's government feeling more flexible about putting finances in or whatever, then maybe something can start happening.

So I think that this committee is actually making a difference even . . . regardless of our recommendations. Of course we need them. But the public is becoming educated more about the

whole incidence of child abuse. So I think that's important.

But you talked about the outreach staff and a ride—along earlier on. And I think that's important, but is there any thought to community members themselves, whether it's people that Christine deals with on the streets? The important thing about it would be seeing the other side of the picture, and again the education aspect of it.

I know as MLAs we go along on ride—alongs and it's always an eye—opener, and I think that there could be some benefit to having ride—alongs from community members outside of your own staff. Because you said yourself that the word doesn't get . . . go through Social Services, it goes through the people that are living out in the community. So I think there could be some benefit from that as well. I don't know what your thought on that is.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I think what we're doing is we're going to try an integrated approach with the outreach program where we're going to have different, hopefully different, agencies come in one night a week to be a part of the outreach program. Such as All Nations hope to come in and do the AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) awareness, needle IV, prevention stuff, education, letting them know. Healthiest Babies, I want them in there as well, too, because . . . Jeez, they're all mothers, and they're all going to be mothers, and the miscarriage rate for street workers is at 75 per cent. And then you have the fetal alcohol syndrome and whatnot also involved. But I believe integrated outreach efforts would be just great.

Ms. Draude: — Now one of the problems I have trying to deal with what's happening in the cities — I know in rural Saskatchewan, this big word, amalgamation, made everybody crazy last year — but in the cities I'm hearing about up to 40 or 50 different organizations that are all dealing with the same aspect. In Saskatoon, I think they told me, there's 38 different organizations that have some input into this problem of child abuse or prostitution.

Now that to me seems like there's got to be some way to amalgamate, integrate, some of these agencies because it must be difficult for the children even — if it wasn't for you — to know who to deal with. Now is there any effort through your department to try and get a handle on this so you know what every department is doing? Like the whole idea of administration and bureaucracy, when you have all these different departments, must be getting to be a little overwhelming as well.

Christine and I were talking earlier about funding that came from the federal government over . . . through a different program. Well as soon as a government program comes down, somebody has to administer it. Part of that funding is going to the administration part of it. So are you working on some way to make more uniformity among some of these programs?

Ms. Durnford: — Absolutely. When Dave started in his presentation, he talked about the Regina Regional Intersectoral Committee, and that has been a focus for numbers of government departments over the last five or six years particularly, and to try to get at the very point that you've

described, Ms. Draude, in relation to service integration. Because we've heard increasing numbers of stories, both in rural and urban locations, about numerous workers being involved with families and not having any kind of coordinated approach. And that's led to a lot of work and the establishment of these committees across the province — there's nine of them.

The membership initially started with representatives from the departments — so Department of Social Services, Department of Education, Health. But over time the membership has expanded considerably to include police, to include the health districts, the school boards at the local level, tribal councils participate. In Dave's case, there's the United Way participates in various forms.

So the intent is to bring sort of the major kind of institutional players and community members together in planning tables to start to try and work around some of these issues around service integration. So in Regina they've adopted, you know — Dave can describe them — the round tables. One of them is relative to this issue; another one is relative to youth criminal justice and how we can better respond to young offenders and better integrate those.

Numbers of committees have looked at how to integrate services through schools. Others, many of them are now focusing on early childhood development and how to develop an integrated program and delivery system for early childhood services.

So I've had quite a bit to do with these committees over the last few years, and I think that I can say that great progress has been made in terms of looking at the service mix out there, finding better ways to do it. I think they've also got some . . . there's some things that we need to do still with them and to move them along.

But I would say the culture of working together has changed substantially over the last six years, and that's a theme that you see throughout. It's not a coincidence that we have community members, Social Services, and police here today being able to work and get along together and to be able to say no, we've got an integrated approach here. I think a lot of that has to do with the investment and time that has gone on over the last six years on any number of projects.

Ms. Draude: — I think I'm going to be, you know, from Missouri. You're going to have to show me that some of these . . . that it's happening and that we'll know it's happening when we see out in the real world that there is fewer agencies that you have to go through, fewer people.

When I call in to say I need to talk about this, I'm going to get sent down the line to 12 different people before the right person can tell me — Christine's laughing because she knows what I'm talking about — and it's a frustration. But I can see if there's an emphasis being put on it, then I think it's something that again should be brought forward so the public feels like they're part of the system. And I think that's one of the growing frustrations.

I have one last thing — monitoring youth. Now I know that it's

something that the education system is talking about because they're losing . . . you know, 600 to 1,200 children in Saskatoon alone aren't in the school system and there's no tracking device. I know that's possibly something that you're dealing with as well because we have children that go back and forth between various towns, maybe leave the province or go out to a reserve and there's no way to track them.

Is there any work being done on finding, monitoring — I shouldn't say monitoring because I hate that idea — at least knowing who some child is; and if they're not in the school system or if you find them on the street and you don't know where they belong, is there some way that we can track them?

Ms. Durnford: — It's a piece of work that I think you've identified as being needed to be done but . . .

Mr. Hedlund: — I was thinking of a couple of things. Certainly with the youth involved in the sex trade, we've talked a little bit about the intention that we have to do a better job of that through the new position that we're hiring and better working together.

I think you may be referring to the role of schools report too. I wasn't sure if you made that reference, but we were very encouraged to see that in the preliminary report that the notion of ensuring that there is some way of tracking the movement of kids in Saskatchewan from school to school. We haven't got a reliable way of doing that. I think if that existed, it would be a very good beginning to track some of the kids who we currently find falling through the cracks.

But I appreciate the issue; it's one that we have identified.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes I think the other need that I've identified is the need to keep track of the transient kids that are going from the reserves and back and forth, back and forth and whatnot. One day we'll see them on the street and the next we won't, or else they'll come back two, three months later with another kid or whatnot. But there is a need for some kind of protocol set with First Nations people to go back and forth.

Mr. Yates: — Thanks very much for the presentation this morning. It has been very enlightening and it's always good to have a chance to interact and have some discussions.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the issue of the education and awareness that has been raised on a couple of occasions, going back to some comments about the view of drinking and driving 20 or 25 years ago and where it is today.

One of the tasks that we have as a committee and we have as a society is to raise awareness on issues. And if we look five years ago, the public's viewpoint of the issue of the abuse of children on the street, sexual exploitation of children on the street and what was talked about, what was viewed, it was virtually an unheard of thing. Today it's being talked about, which is a very important step in the right direction.

If we look at where, going back to the comparison where drinking and driving was 20 years ago, we never would have seen ads on television talking about drinking and driving. We

never would have seen the types of changes that have been made in provincial legislation to deal with zero tolerance for first-time drivers. Because the public would not have accepted that 25 years ago. They wouldn't have accepted the changes that are now norms today to improve.

And part of what we need to do is to more aggressively educate the population out there about this problem. Because I'll tell you, my eyes have been opened. And I worked in the field; I worked with people who were involved in these problems in my previous life.

But having been involved in this committee and hearing and seeing what we've seen, it's a significantly different problem than even I viewed it to be. And we need to raise the awareness of this problem in the general population. And as it becomes less acceptable in society, the problem will be much easier to deal with.

So you know, where I'm going is that perhaps we need to, through departments like Social Services and others, actually run media campaigns about some of these issues, like SGI now does about drinking and driving, which would have been a totally unacceptable thing 10, 15, 20 years ago, to use public dollars to do these types of things.

But we need to be . . . When I talk about creative strategies, one of the quickest ways to deal with a problem, which is a large problem in society, how elements of society view others, is to do some mass media on it. And we need to be creative in how we want to deal with that. We need to let people know that children as young as 10, 12, 13 years old are involved in these types of problem and make it so it isn't as comfortable to sit in your living room and not have to sort of ignore the problem if it's not in your neighbourhood; so that they see it on the television, they see it in other places, and are more aware of it.

And that's what I was thinking about when I was talking about sort of some creative strategies this morning. This is not a one-sided, one way to tackle the problem. I think we have to start being . . . looking outside what our traditional boundaries have been in order to shorten the time frame in which society views the problem much differently than it does.

And if you look at the way the drinking and driving has been dealt with over probably a 25-year period, are the ways to shorten that time frame so that more of society sees it as their problem and in a much shorter time frame.

And I think that's just one of the challenges we have.

Mr. Hoedel: — What really kicks home in the drinking and driving is when the younger people got involved in the acts.

Mr. Yates: — Exactly.

Mr. Hoedel: — And I think that's what has to happen here. School kids have to be the focus, not adults, saying this is inappropriate. You've got to have that group doing it.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Is it Dave and Christine and Garry, are you all free to come back in the afternoon? If we

were to break and say come back at 1:15?

I know, Bonnie, you're free, right, to do so?

Ms. Durnford: — Yes. Well because I understand there's some particular cases that you wanted to discuss with us?

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Right.

Ms. Durnford: — Is that the case?

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes.

Ms. Durnford: — Because I think those ones we would just need to do with the Social Services folks.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Right. Okay. Now, I know Arlene and I also have a number of questions, probably eight or nine in all. And I'm just trying to figure out whether to do those before lunch or to break and say, start again around 1:15.

And, Christine, are you free to come back?

Ms. Deiter: — I don't want to. No. I'm sorry. As my husband and my kids are at home and . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes. Yes. I mean, because we can continue on and then break and just come back for Social Services only, or we could break now and come back. And I'm just trying to figure out which to do, so just looking for a bit of feedback.

Ms. Deiter: — Well if Garry can't come back, I guess we can keep going.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Maybe we should keep going then, and Arlene and I will try to be as succinct with our questions as possible.

Arlene, do you want to go ahead first?

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — All right.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And I just want to also say if there's a committee member that needs to slip away because of noon hour obligations, please feel free to do that.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Garry, you're the lucky one. Initially I'd like to just ask you some questions.

Garry, I noticed up on the overhead or the monitor that you have introduced us or told us that . . . where you had the DISC program in operation? Did you have someone come from British Columbia, either Oscar Ramos or someone, come to Saskatchewan to explain the program to you and to help train officers?

I'm asking that question because you'd mentioned in your comments that sometimes police officers sort of go by the book and there may be better ways — I guess I assume you felt there'd be better ways — for you to be able to identify johns and so on.

So I'm wondering whether or not the DISC program is something you have accepted as a necessary component in your fight against this kind of crime, or whether or not you have actually had officers here go through the training, along with the, along with the explanation of how the database and the program would work for you.

Mr. Hoedel: — Here in Regina . . . what happened in Regina is we heard about it, so one member took it upon himself to train himself to put it on. He's no longer in but he's passed it on to other members, and it's all . . . it just gives us input and retrieval. I'm not sure if I'm answering your question.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — My understanding . . . I just wanted to follow up . . . I went to Vancouver and sort of was walked through the process of how the DISC program, as well as or in line with a collaborative, co—operative approach between Social Services, the police, Justice, and those players, really does work very well. Not only for efficient and effective and quick information, but in assisting police officers to identify children on the streets that are at risk; to identify dangerous situations, to identify potential offenders. And I'm wondering whether or not that that sort of extensive training has been undertaken by police officers in Regina.

Mr. Hoedel: — No, it hasn't, if I'm reading you right. What happens is this program . . . we haven't really utilized it much. We've basically relied on . . . if other agencies or other police services notify us about there's somebody at risk, we'll assign an investigator to try to locate that person.

I don't know if I'm answering your question or not. But to say have we used it through a database, that kind . . . No, we haven't. It's all been through Internet working as far . . . or through networking is the proper way of stating it, is how we've identified or have been told about these type of people.

So like I said, this DISC is . . . We haven't really utilized it much because we've only had it for four months. To say . . . I see it as a valuable tool — anything's better than nothing. But anything more than that, I can't comment.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. And I recognized that it's been . . . it's difficult for you to have to answer for what's in the Criminal Code and what has been established as determining what is a crime and what isn't, and what kind of evidence has to be gathered and so on for charges to come to play. I mean, it's not certainly your sole responsibility to look into that.

But I want to get back to, maybe just to having your comment, your opinion on what I had brought forward earlier.

I always wrestle with this question. When there is terminology used like someone can be charged for communicating, okay, why is it always one—sided? Like why can johns not be . . . and why aren't they charged for communicating without having evidence, and the evidence being that there is a sexual act taking place in some form. Why cannot just communicating be used for the charge when communicating is asking the girl or forcing the girl or whatever, or manipulating a girl or a young boy to come into a car.

I mean why can there not be charges laid on the grounds that that person is at a point where they're going to be doing that; or that they have been heard to say or it has been seen by police officers that a young person is in the car already with someone. And for instance if the police officer has gone through his questioning of the john, if the police officer has been able to search the car.

I mean that has happened in different instances, and they find different tools, you could say, that johns will use sometimes — you know, rape kits, those kind of things. Why can, on that evidence, police officers not charge the johns?

Mr. Hoedel: — First of all, we don't have a victim. Then the next thing we have to do is we have to interview then the . . . let's call it the perpetrator. Before we can use that as evidence, we have to give that person the warning for it to be used in court. Okay?

Solicitation in the courts made it so tough that if you're the girl working the street and I'm the person driving, I stop and you get in my car and you ask me or I ask you, do you want to go out for a date, the fact that sex hasn't been mentioned and money hasn't been mentioned, you have no charge as far as the word communicating.

So what will happen is we'll see a girl get into a car and we'll stop. We know what's going to happen. If we interview them — well I just stopped for a cigarette or I just . . . Even if they say, yes, he's asked me for a date but if there's been no talk about money being exchanged, no talk about what the money is going to buy, you don't have a charge — or whether he's offered me a beer or whatever.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. In respect to the DISC system and information that has already been entered and tabulated as to past activity of an offender or a girl that's been out there, if in fact through that system you were able to come up with some evidence that this person had engaged in some kind of activity before, could you then use that evidence and simply say to this john, yes, there hasn't been any talk about money or sex, but from past evidence here that we have on you it is evident that this girl — because there's evidence on her too through the DISC system — that this is the kind of activity that has been engaged in, in the past, and on that evidence, you know, we are charging you with the intent to do harm to this child?

Mr. Hoedel: — I personally wouldn't do that. I'll use the analogy: you've got a guy that's just come out of jail for a number of convictions of a break and enter. Three o'clock in the morning I'm driving around and I see him, that person in the warehouse standing by a compound. So I stop that person and ask, what are you doing? Oh, I'm just waiting here. Well with your past history and that and because it's 3 o'clock in the morning, I'm charging you with intent to break and enter. That wouldn't go anywhere in court. And that's much the same.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — I just want to finish what I . . . I want to . . . I guess this is not a question but it's an observation that I have on society on how we view different crimes or intent to do harm or whatever.

With our conservation officers, I know I've heard of people — and I can't substantiate this because it was hearsay — but I've heard of people that are basically placed under arrest, as such, by a conservation officer for using binoculars to look at a deer even though they didn't have any guns out or anything to shoot the deer. And this would in off—season or in a place of conservation.

So there's an ability to charge that person with the intent of the possibility of shooting that animal even though there isn't any action like that taking place. And a major fine, you know, that's a result of that kind of thing.

Migratory birds. We have had people with major fines and charges because they have shot a migratory bird. Or that they, you know, they've been in a zone where migratory birds . . . and the suspicion and so on, and all of those things seem to be enough cause for charges to be laid. And still when we have people that are violating and in essence killing our children and the intent to do that kind of harm, it seems so difficult to find some sort of way of laying a charge against them before the crime happens.

I just mention it because I think that is a point that most committee members, and most people in this province and throughout probably the world, find very, very frustrating. That for some unknown reason we refuse to make people responsible and accountable for . . . offenders is who I'm referring to, for the intent to do harm to our children. And we seem to be finding ways to avoid making them responsible and accountable and charging them with anything.

Mr. Hoedel: — I agree with you. I agree with what you're saying. However it's not reality. The bottom line is normal society gets emotional over when victims or elderly people are abused or are victims of crime. Unfortunately the courts haven't accepted . . . there's a different standard for those type of victims versus the normal. They have one standard, and that's the problem.

I understand where you're coming from and most people think that way, but I'm relying totally as a police officer that the courts — and there is just no doubt what you're saying is the way most people — but the courts won't accept the one . . . you know, different standard.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — The other thing I'd just like to mention, and I don't want to put you on the spot, and I brought this up before and it's . . . even though the Criminal Code is a vehicle for laying charges sometimes, and that people that are charged under the Criminal Code for the offence we're talking about end up in courts and are convicted, the judges don't seem to lay it on them. The judges just simply don't seem to be able to put across a penalty, or they don't want to, that would meet the severity of this crime.

And that's another very frustrating thing because they have the latitude to do it. And I know they make their determination from all the evidence that has been gathered, but sometimes even when the evidence is right in front of them and very blatantly clear, you know, and these johns and these people that are damaging our kids are getting away with still a slap on the

hand.

So when people talk to me about the Criminal Code being the strongest measure and having all of this really heavy—duty provisions for, you know, penalties that can really have some effect, in essence, and as you said, the reality is not there. The reality is it's not having the effect when it comes right down to it. So that's why we search for things that maybe professionally we can do.

Mr. Hoedel: — In fairness to the judges, depending on what the charge is, they've got a range that they can deal with. Unfortunately, solicitation is summary. Now if we got evidence for sexual assault, you would see that a lot different. But the . . .

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — There has been, and the penalties meted out are still not matching the crime. It's just not happening, Garry.

Mr. Hoedel: — Yes. You're right.

Bottom line is we are relying on the Criminal Code. Because when we arrest someone, we're taking somebody's liberty and freedom away, and society has taken that very seriously. And before you can take somebody's freedom and liberty away, there's all these standards that have to be put in place and we've got to obey those laws.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — When we talk about education, I really feel that it's necessary for all stakeholders in our society that have a responsibility that has been given to them by the citizens of our province — and I include in this statement not any reference to any one of you, but to the judiciary — to become educated on what it means for freedoms to be taken away.

One's freedom, as far as I understand, is taken away when you violate someone else's freedom, when you have violated someone else's right to live, and to live in a healthy manner.

So we concern ourselves about the freedom of offenders, but they have stolen the freedom from children, and they are still being treated with more respect than the children. I find that that is something that maybe we have to really encourage as far as an education component for every . . .

Mr. Hoedel: — Every police officer, I think, will tell you that a victim has told them that the accused has more rights than a victim. We hear that continuously. And it's perception, but it's reality. And it is.

You get a simple, say a home break and enter. Your rights are violated. That's your home. And the Criminal Code says there is a penalty, but they're getting off.

I get charged if I'm impaired. I'm not saying impaired driving isn't serious. If I get convicted for impaired driving, my sentence is more than breaking into your home. Is that right?

What we're talking are different standards. I'll agree, the way our justice system is, the standards are so imbalanced. And that I think was what you're talking about. There has to be more

consideration, I believe, taken for our children and our elderly.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — According to your knowledge, and you really don't have to answer this if you don't want to, but I'd appreciate from anyone that has any knowledge on this, is there a requirement for judges to do in—services and so on to sort of continue to learn, to continue to look at different aspects of, you know, the general population, the general public's request for considerations to be given, such as the consideration I've mentioned — the freedom of the child as opposed to the freedom . . . protecting the freedom of a perpetrator.

Mr. Hoedel: — Talking to Crown prosecutors, they have conferences and that with judges and they discuss sentencing and all that. But to give you the exact detail of do judges have their own conferences, what does society think about what they're doing and all that, I can't answer that. I don't know.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Just one more question to you, Garry. Christine had made a reference that I think the SWAP organization for instance, if they were given information about a bad date, that that information would be relayed to the police. Did I get that right, Christine?

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, we relay the information on to SWAP but I don't know what SWAP does with the information.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay, but you did make a statement that information like information pertaining to a bad date might be referred to the police. I don't know who would be doing this exactly.

Ms. Deiter: — Oh yes, we'd be giving the information to the police as well.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — My question to you, Garry, is what do you do with that information?

Mr. Hoedel: — We'll investigate. If we get a complaint like that we'll investigate it. What happens in a high number of incidents, these girls will tell peer groups that they don't want any police involved in it. But if they're willing witnesses, we've got a place to start, and we'll investigate that.

Unfortunately — you're not going to like what I'm going to tell you — very few of them come forward and we prosecute.

Ms. Deiter: — To them it's just the revictimization again, all over.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — All right. Christine, I wanted to ask you a question about the action committee, ACCAR. How does ACCAR get their funding? How is it meted out? Is it all from Social Services?

Mr. Hedlund: — Denis probably is in the best position to speak to that.

Mr. Losie: — At this point, funds for ACCAR come from Social Services as do the funds for safety services.

We fund them on a service agreement with the City of Regina

Crime Prevention Commission, which is a liaison the activities of sexually exploited kids in the city. So Social Services has a service agreement with the city of Regina and then they work out, in terms of budget administration, the programs and funding for ACCAR and safety services.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay, how would the crime prevention unit determine how much money, for instance, that ACCAR would be budgeted for; how much they would get in a year. What are the . . . are there criteria that would have to be submitted by ACCAR in order to meet a certain level of funding?

Mr. Losie: — ACCAR and safety services have an advisory committee. And in conjunction with the coordinators of the two programs, they submit an annual request for funding through the Crime Prevention Commission who submits it to Social Services. And those funding requests are reviewed and taken back through that process, as we would with any service agreement with any community—based organization.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Christine, how many staff are there with ACCAR?

Ms. Deiter: — With ACCAR?

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — I think you mentioned it before but I just missed it.

Ms. Deiter: — Actually currently right now we have one full—time coordinator. She also is responsible . . . What we're doing is we're integrating both the programs. ACCAR will be a part of . . . well we're partnering with the safety services program in the same location. So we're hoping that our service providers will be utilized by both programs. Because we are supposed to be experts in this field now, that ACCAR basically right now has one and for safety services. This is until we set up the new house.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. That still doesn't quite answer my question because I'm asking how many people are staffed right now by ACCAR. You haven't come to the point yet where there's, you know, the two of you are really . . . the house is not there.

Mr. Losie: — Let me try and . . . As Christine says, until very recently ACCAR had a coordinator and they had a network of contracted service providers. So per se they had no staff with the exception of the coordinator. But they had a team of service providers who were contracted with on case—by—case bases to work with specific families.

That has had its ups and downs. At the recommendation of the advisory committee, it's changing. The proposal that's on the table now for funding is with the coordinator — a full—time early intervention caseworker. So there will be a full—time staff person engaged. The second piece of . . . or the second employee that we are looking to include to the ACCAR and safety services, is a full—time outreach social worker.

So the answer to your question is right now there's a coordinator and a staff person, with a second . . . (inaudible) . . .

staff person to be added. They will be working as part of a larger team with Christine and the outreach staff that are working with the RV.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. I mentioned that because I'm listening to all of these stats and so on and I think it was Christine that mentioned that, you know, 25 kids at any one time on 5th and 6th Avenue.

And I'm thinking well, holy Toledo, I mean, if mobile crisis can identify . . . or the van or whatever can identify those children and they're all in need of some sort of safety services immediately, and you've got one co—ordinator having this kind of . . . how can she possibly, or how can he possibly work with, you know, with the immensity of this with that number of people and do a proper job, if you don't have, you know, more than one person trying to co—ordinate that. It must be very difficult.

Mr. Losie: — I think what Christine accurately said, is that there was a night where they've identified up to 25 kids. I would suspect if we sought clarification, that would be an unusual night. Most nights there aren't that many kids on the street.

The other part of the piece that Christine talks about is that a lot of those kids are older kids. And that would be consistent with what the police are telling us. The police tell us that when they go out on the stings, they are hard—pressed to see one young child on the street.

So part of the work that we're doing and need to be very progressive on, and with the outreach piece, is teaming Christine's staff who identify who's out there by name, sharing that information with our Social Services people, with the new outreach worker, and with the police.

And this is why the step that we're taking now is to have that outreach worker travelling with the vice people on a very regular basis. And as we need to involve the outreach staff from ACCAR, the RV staff, taking forward the protocol that we have in terms of when we must and may share information with each other, so that every kid who's identified as being out there by name, by Christine, we would have a column that would say who's doing what with them. And we can check that back on a regular basis and that would be the role of the ACCAR early intervention worker.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Just one more comment, and I'll pose a question to whoever might want to answer it.

But we've established, and so have you, the necessity to co—ordinate services, to work together effectively, cooperatively, and in harmony, for the benefit of the children. Now I think that just about everywhere that that is attempted, that there are, as Christine has mentioned and other people have mentioned, there's territorial, sort of, you know, everybody is kind of protecting their territory as such. How do you think that that kind of an attitude will be overcome? And how could it happen in a more effective manner right now. Like, what kind of things need to be done in order to affect that happening?

Mr. Losie: — If I may again, I think three or four years ago the Crime Prevention Commission stepped forward and agreed to liaison on behalf of funders, the services in relation to sexually exploited children. So the co—chairs of the Crime Prevention Commission subcommittee on sexually exploited kids have agreed to liaison.

So they have a round table that all of the service agents in the city are invited to come to, participate in planning, strategizing, and service development. We've also said that funds that will be allocated to work in this area will be monitored and managed through that liaison through the Crime Prevention Commission. So that's from the management level.

The second level of involvement is what Christine is doing in terms of her role with safety services in coordinating those community folks that are out there so they have a network that meets — and I don't pretend to know how frequently — but the street nurses, the SWAP people, mobile crisis, the Rainbow, they have a mechanism of where they do some joint training, information sharing on a more informal basis. So those are the two levels of liaison.

That's not to say that there still isn't some sense of ownership and territorialism because I think that that does exist.

Mr. Hedlund: — Bonnie referred to a function that this intersectoral committee sees for itself. We have been able to bring together large numbers of players who have an interest in topic X, and I think we've achieved some greater degree of co—operation by that.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — And I have to just go back to Garry for a moment. Garry, you know, what I've witnessed in British Columbia was the police and social worker in a car out on the streets at night. And I've mentioned that before. Do you think that that could possibly come to pass here on an ongoing basis, that kind of work? Do you think you could get to the point where recognizing how much more effective the outcome would be for helping children expediently, that that might be a reality here some day?

A Member: — Can I answer that?

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — I'd just like Garry to answer it first.

Mr. Hoedel: — I can see that work if whoever the officers are we put out there are focusing solely on that incident. Say if we've got 10 cars out there and have social workers out there going along with us, I don't think that that would probably work.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — I don't mean, like, even in a city the size of Vancouver, on any given night they only have one car with a combination of a police officer and a social worker in it. They have another car with a police officer and a probation officer. But because of the whole DISC system and the availability of information and the working together of those two people to assist each other, you don't need a whole lot of cars.

But I'm just wondering if even, you know, maybe one car just

to begin with here might work if in fact there was a commitment to the resources that you would need, and possibly even a designation.

Mr. Hoedel: — You kind of use it as an ad hoc link. A real good working relationship with family mobile. So even if the officers aren't targeting on a specific group and they come across a call where Social Services intervention is needed, we've had nothing but success.

So do we need what you're suggesting? I don't know. There would have to be kind of some guidelines in all those kind of things. But I think we have a real . . . presently, the size of Regina, we have a real good system in place.

Somebody else can answer if you feel . . .

Mr. Losie: — I just wanted to comment that part of our intentions with the next steps, with the new outreach worker that we're wanting to add to ACCAR, is we've had preliminary conversations with the officers in vice of having that worker spending a part of every evening in a vice car as vice staff are available.

So Garry has . . . we've talked to Garry about that. That's not a done deal. But that's the direction that we would like to continue our conversations in terms of enhancing that outreach follow—up.

Mr. Hoedel: — Just to further add to that, because our vice people don't work straight nights, and if they're not available, I've got a commitment from the inspector in the north central part that providing there's enough notice in time, we'll take some uniform people out of uniform for a period of time and go around with this person.

We're going to have to kind of evaluate this whole system. We've made an offer; we're going to work with them. It might not be vice. Vice will be first priority, but we also want to include the north central people, people that have that ownership.

Mr. Hedlund: — It's the people in the community policing centre in north central.

Mr. Hoedel: — So it's just in talking stage at this time. We really haven't put it together. But we'll have to monitor it when it does occur.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — One of the great benefits that I recognized there from that was the ability to access files quickly. Because, you know, if you have a social worker with you and that social worker can access the files that the police alone can't immediately. So it's just for expediency.

Mr. Hoedel: — I think we have that in place. I don't know what Vancouver has, but the fact that we have the Regina Justice Centre, we have that all in place, I think. I think we're forerunners in all of this, personally, with Social Service and the police.

The Co—Chair (Ms. Julé): — Okay. Thank you. And I'll just

turn it over to Mr. Prebble.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I know you must be getting tired and I apologize this is going on so long. You know, if I thought there was another opportunity to discuss Regina problems again real soon, I'd suggest delaying it. But I'm worried that we may not find that opportunity to actually all get together again.

So, just so you can be thinking about some of these topics and I'm not just springing them on you, let me just raise with you the areas that I'd like to discuss. One is the involvement of RTSIS (Regina Treaty Status Indian Services) as the urban authority.

A second is the whole question of whether we need a safe house in Regina. And then what other kinds of longer term shelter arrangements for children as we go through the healing process we need in Regina. And whether we need dedicated facilities for drug and alcohol and substance abuse treatment for children in the healing process in Regina or near Regina. Whether we can take the work that you've done and, within a year, have a more sophisticated tracking system for every child who's out on the street in the city of Regina. And obviously resources are required for all of these things. And whether there is interest among the group of you here; I think, with the exception of Bonnie — in fairness to Bonnie as representing the provincial perspective — but at the local level.

I've noticed a lot more interest in the Regina region, broadly put, in terms of all the witnesses that come before us, in moving forward with some kind of model around PCHIP (Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act) than there is in Saskatoon or Regina — just a notable difference.

I'm not a . . . Sorry, the Alberta legislation that is used in Alberta. There is more interest in the Regina region in this and in trying this in Regina than there is anywhere else in the province. And I'm wondering about how each of you feel about it, you know. Would you want to try PCHIP here but not in Saskatoon and P.A.? And I'm not ascribing to any of you personally this expressed interest. That's why I'm asking the question.

But it keeps coming up. Our Regina witnesses have shown far more interest in this issue than has been the case in Saskatoon and Prince Albert. And that somewhat surprised me so I wanted to test that out on you.

Those are the areas that I'd like to explore. And maybe starting with the easier ones, let's deal with the safe house first. Just simply put; do we need a safe house or some kind of facility where children can be held for a matter of . . . where children who have been sexually abused on the street and who are under the age of 18 can be . . . can find a safe haven in the city of Regina. And presumably they would be held . . . This would be not just assessment, this would be some sort of initial healing as well, I anticipate.

Christine, I'm assuming you have some sense of what the tribal council is doing at Saskatoon. And I think increasingly they are looking at keeping the kids a bit longer. And by that I don't

mean many, many months, but a couple of months sort of thing. Do we need that kind of a facility here?

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I do. I believe that we need a place for the section 10s; those are the kids that are 16—, 17—year—olds, basically on their own. I believe that if we set up a residential shelter, a long—term residential shelter for these kids to learn how to live and learn life skills, basic life skills, I believe that we really, really do need one for boys and for girls — especially for the girls. But also to think about having a family room and parenting because a lot of these girls have babies. And that's what everybody forgets, is they're teen parents as well.

So, yes there is a need for shelter for the 16— and 17—year—olds. For the little ones, for the younger ones, there is a need for shelter, but the thing about the shelter and the younger ones is these kids have families. And if you're going to get up and take them, you're just going to have them just scared all the time. I mean, this shelter idea for the younger kids, it's a good idea for short—term respite care with parents involvement or some kind of family involvement through there. That's the only way it'll happen; you have to always have the family involved at some point if the kids are younger.

But the older ones that already have decided to leave their families, yes, there's a need for their shelter as well; for a shelter for them, long—term life skills teaching, whatnot.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So here in Regina . . . just to clarify in the under 16, you're saying, there's less of a need, in your mind, but maybe some need.

I know, originally, the tribal council when they set up the safe house in Saskatoon, it was under 16. I'm assuming that's still the case now. But is there a need for a place of safety for kids to be taken at night, for instance. You know, where they can . . . I mean I know what that safe house in Saskatoon is being used for, is often kids will be there for three or four days and they'll, you know, come off their whatever substance abuse they've been . . . they're being immediately impacted by so they can at least make some clear decisions about what they want to do next.

I mean have you looked at that Saskatoon facility? And are you thinking . . . I mean, do you need something like that in Regina or do you not? If you don't, we want to respond to what you need in Regina. That's why I'm just . . .

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I believe we do. We do need a safe shelter in the city, but it has to be a really community—involved one for the kids. It's not so much a shelter because in Saskatoon they have the problems that the pimps are hanging out there all the time. And we can't have that. How are they supposed to . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I don't think the pimps are hanging out in Saskatoon all the time. I don't think that's . . .

Ms. Deiter: — Well it's an endangerment . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — . . . that's accurate.

Ms. Deiter: — . . . for the kids because it's so publicly known. I

think the whole ideology of having satellite homes and where we could just move the kids all over the place is a great idea.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So you'd rather see some kind of a satellite home network in Regina.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I would.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — As sort of a Regina . . . a made—in—Regina approach on this.

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, I do.

Mr. Losie: — The strategy that the ACCAR, safety services, and the community consultations that we've done over the last couple of years fairly consistently goes towards the direction of a network of safe places. And we've described it as that in most of our papers: as a network of safe places.

And the greater involvement that Christine and ACCAR and those folks, who are coming to those tables, can have in the implementation and operation of those homes, the greater the chance we have that these families can be engaged in their own safety planning. And that really is one of the immediate goals.

When we ran this concept by Cherry Kingsley, when we had the opportunity to meet with her a year or so ago, she was very pleased that that was the approach that was taken as opposed to a single safe place. We see that the safe place network that we're hoping that Christine and her folks will be able to work with us to develop will be indeed a complement.

At our ACCAR advisory committee yesterday, Brenda Dubois, who is a very strong advocate for families and has been for years, again reaffirmed for all of us how important it is to have those network of safe places so that when families are in crisis today, they have some place that they can go where they can be trusted without the need for police or Social Services.

We have the confidence in term of our protocols with Christine and her folks that if there are people who are in very immediate danger; they know when to call us. So the network of the safe places would be essentially a complementary service too.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, I think — because I don't want to assume that what works in Saskatoon is what Regina needs, and that's why I want to be very, very careful about this — I think at the, you know, at the . . . in terms of responding to the needs of the kids and also the needs of people who are working with the kids, we really need to take sort of a city—by—city approach on this.

And that's why I just wanted some . . . I really appreciate that clarification. We can explore these things in more detail obviously afterwards. But just . . .

Mr. Losie: — One other piece, I think that we . . . not to miss, is that we still recognize that long—term healing is an absolutely critical issue. We're watching with interest, and talking as often as we can with the RTSIS's folks, in terms of their Aboriginal Healing Foundation. And we again . . . Christine has identified that a lot of the kids who are in danger

on the street are Aboriginal kids. And we firmly believe, as Christine tells us, that the answers are strengthening those families and the long-term healing. So we see that as a very substantive key, and so certainly resources, healing resources for the entire family.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — That just goes right into my next question really, which was . . . I mean, we're talking — just for clarity here now — so we're talking about some kind of shorter term resource, satellite—home resource, where children would be held . . . would live in safety for a number of weeks or possibly months. Then in terms of the longer term process for healing, what is . . . what is it that you need in Regina right now to grapple with the issues that you're still facing in terms of access to drug and alcohol treatment? We keep hearing it's not adequate. Do you need resources here, or should we build more resources in Saskatoon?

Ms. Deiter: — We need resources here.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Christine, go . . . no, go ahead.

Ms. Deiter: — We need resources here just . . .

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — As I say, we can get into the nitty—gritty maybe in another meeting, but in terms of the preliminary work, is there an . . . is there an agreement across the region, here in Regina, that there is a shortage of resources? Because we keep hearing this from Regina folks, and I'm just wondering what is it, in general terms, that you need?

Ms. Deiter: — Honest.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes . . . no, no, that's what . . . our job is to . . . we have been persuaded that there is a shortage of resources in Regina, so . . .

Ms. Deiter: — Yes, we need treatment centres for kids.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — We need to look at what we need.

Ms. Deiter: — We need treatment centres, but we need a strategy to identify and understand the IV use and the needle use that's impacted on our First Nations kids. What we . . . we need specialists that will work with drug and alcohol effects — FEA, FAE (fetal alcohol effects), whatever — all the way through. We need outreach workers that will be visibly on the street, being able to talk to kids, being able to counsel the kids right there, out there where they're going to be. Because the kids aren't going to come into a big high—towered place, halfway across the city, when they can't even afford bus fare.

There is such a need for a long-term residential treatment. I'd like someplace where I could send them to go sober up for a while, and take a time out.

Ms. Durnford: — I think one of the big challenges that we've got, in terms of some of the professional assistance in this area, is how we've done it in the past. And having alcohol treatment services or mental health or Social Services, for example,

necessarily in offices where they're not accessible and not necessarily accessible to these kids and to these families, has not worked in the past and so I think we really have to challenge ourselves in terms of how the professional services are being . . . come across in the community and how they work with the folks.

Mr. Hedlund: — I was thinking, Denis, that the youth justice forum has identified the same set of needs for a different set of reasons or an overlapping set of reasons actually. And the other thing that's going on, I guess, is a health district coordinated interagency group trying to explore intravenous drug use, patterns, and possible solutions. I think we've got some networks that have some overlap, that are starting to look at these things but we're far from there.

Mr. Losie: — With respect to resources, most of the kids who our child protection and youth protection people are working with don't come to us saying, hi, I'm a sexually exploited child. They come to us with a plethora of issues that many of them have been a long time in the coming. So we certainly need resources, and ideally resources that could ask to serve as respite for the work we want to do in continuing to allow families to care for their kids.

So we do have resource demands. Our resource demands are incredible in this region. We also need to continue to go the direction we're doing in terms of addressing the large issues — poverty, unemployment, racism, school dropouts. So it's not just related to the stream of children who are sexually exploited. It's all of those issues.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, no, we recognize that.

Mr. Losie: — Of course, of course you do.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — But I think in terms of the work, I don't know if you've put together a plan in terms of drug and alcohol treatment, and the needs of sexually exploited youth as it pertains to that, or the residential needs of sexually exploited youth. But if you have a plan, again please give it to us because we will make some statement around this. We will not leave this area untouched.

Clearly, we've got a big problem in this arena as well. But it's a more, sort of . . . But we've also got, you see, we've got sort of two realities, I think, happening at the same time. First of all, we're already spending a lot of resources in this area à la all the various agencies that are working on this issue, right.

But we are not; you know . . . We got to do two things. First of all, we've got to stem the number of kids who are being impacted. Hence all our questions about the demand side of the issue. And then with, hopefully, a smaller group of kids who are still being impacted, we need to truly and generally address the healing needs of those children, which by the way we don't think we're doing right now — and I think you agree — even though we got all kinds of good people working on this issue.

So there's two things. How can we most effectively use the resources we currently have? And that may mean some reorganization of those resources. And secondly, how can we

truly address the healing needs of the several hundred kids in Regina who have been impacted by this?

And if, again if, you've got advice on this that you want to get to us quickly, please give it to us. Because in April . . . you know, in late March, April we are going to be making some decisions about this, and we would very much appreciate any further advice you want to give us that's specific to the Regina region.

Now on the RTSIS question, we've had a chance to talk to a lot of people involved in tribal councils. And in the Regina region they tell us we want to be more involved in this issue. We want to have more say in the delivery of services to Aboriginal youth who come from our reserves. And we want a role carved out for ourselves on this.

And my experience having gone through this again in Saskatoon is that — I mean there is a lot of negotiation around all this — but I take it right now RTSIS is not all that intimately involved in the services you deliver on the street. And my sense from the tribal council is that at a government level they want to be.

So I think we need to think through, again we need to think through what that's going to look like on the ground. You know, what's that going to mean? And obviously they need to be at the table to have that discussion. But I think we collectively need to have that discussion with them here at some point. And I just wanted to mention that to you. I don't want to really get into a big discussion on that without them being here.

But we need to talk about this because the reality is over the next five years that, I think, among the tribal councils they want . . . you know, they want to see themselves with a role to play here in the city of Regina in terms of service delivery or at least they want to have some assurance that the needs of their children are being addressed in a culturally appropriate way.

And obviously, Christine, you're doing some really good work in this regard. But I think just like Saskatoon has had to deal with the reality of the tribal council becoming an actor, I think Regina probably will need to do the same. And we will again, as a committee, do some thinking about that. And I think we want to do some thinking with you about that and obviously with RTSIS about that.

Given the hour, let's not get into that in any more detail now. But on the, I think . . . Well let me just ask you two more questions, because we all need to have lunch.

One is with respect to the tracking system. Can you . . . tell us what resources you need to do this. But can you get us to a point where, a year from now, we know every child who has been sexually abused on the streets of Regina, where that child is, what services that child has received and is receiving, who that child is living with.

And can we have a person, at least one person who is on top of what is happening in the life of that child? Can we get to that point a year from now? What do you need to make that happen?

Because I really feel, like, if we . . . everybody keeps telling us in Regina, you got 300 kids involved who are being sexually abused on the street at some point in the year in Regina. So, you know, I would like to know — I'm not speaking on behalf of the committee, though I suspect I probably am, but we haven't made an official statement on this yet — I would like to know that we have the capacity to make sure that there's one significant person involved in the life of each of those kids, who's helping to make it better, and that collectively, you can ensure the legislators in this legislature that there is someone on top of knowing what's happening with every one of those 300 kids.

And I know we're not there yet, but can you make that happen, and what resources do you need to make that happen?

Mr. Hedlund: — I wonder if the best way to respond wouldn't be to throw it to the RTSIS steering group . . . I'm sorry, I mean the safety services, the combination of the two. They'd be very pleased to have the invitation to do that and I think it's a goal that I think everybody has.

Mr. Losie: — That was a topic on our agenda yesterday.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Right. Yes. Okay.

Mr. Losie: — Our Safety Services RTSIS Advisory Committee.

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

Ms. Deiter: — Safety services ACCAR.

Mr. Losie: — Safety services ACCAR. You have RTSIS on the brain now.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Obviously made that point. Because I think we are not going to break the back of this until we have that level of knowledge. And the same goes with Saskatoon.

And right now, my sense is, in Saskatoon, that the Tribal Council has a list of kids that they know about, and Egadz has a list of kids that they know about. And I'm using Saskatoon because I know it a little better, but I just don't want to make you feel like you're being focused in here, on Regina.

A year from now, I want both those agencies to be able to tell me that they're working closely together and that they have a handle on what's happening with each of those kids.

And if they don't, then we're going to change whatever is required until we get to the point where they do, you know. Because otherwise we're just going to have kids slipping through the cracks all over the place. And that's what's been happening for the last 10 years. And we won't fix this problem unless, you know . . .

And if the legislature has to make it a statutory obligation that we do this, then I'm in favour of that. And if we have to have a report to the Children's Advocate every year on the state of each of these kids, then let us have that. Because without that

kind of sort of determined focus following up on each of these kids, you know, the numbers will just continue growing.

The thing's totally out of control as far as I'm concerned. You know, to have 550, 600 kids in the two major cities, and for them to be changing all the time, so that means over the course of a year or two we're talking about a thousand kids. Well let's follow every one of those thousand kids and let's know what's happening in their lives.

So tell us, give us some advice in the next two or three weeks on how we put a tracking system together. Don't worry about Saskatoon. Bonnie and I can worry about Saskatoon, and Arlene. Worry about Regina. What's the tracking system in Regina going to look like?

Christine has raised a lot of key issues. How are we going to track movement back and forward between reserves? How are we going to make sure that there's someone significant in the life of every one of those kids?

And maybe there isn't 300. Maybe there's only 230 or something. So I mean we'll find that out soon enough. But how are we going to make sure that we know about every single kid that's out there and what's happening with them.

And this leads me to my final question, and that's related . . . So you'll get back to us on this? Dave, will it be you?

Mr. Hedlund: — We'll just see that you get a response, but I'll coordinate it.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — I don't want to charge you with this, but just collectively if you could get back to us on what would be required to make that happen and what you need in terms of resources. Because we don't want to assume that you can just do this without . . .

But please look at using existing resources as much as you can. And then if that is not going to do the job, tell us, and then tell us what more you need. And that the same goes with all of these things. Let's use the existing resources we have as much as possible in terms of the shelter needs of the kids, for instance. Then if you need more, for goodness sake, tell us.

And I think the assumption is going to be, we're going to bring these kids as much as possible off the street. I mean it's going to take some time, but we're going to do it. Let's assume we're going to accomplish the goal.

So finally, on PCHIP. As you know, the PCHIP issue is hotly debated and there are very strong feelings pro and con on this. And like I said, we've heard more positive reaction to PCHIP in the Regina region, broadly speaking, from all the witnesses who've come forward than we have anywhere else in the province.

And one of the advantages of course with PCHIP is that you quickly find out who the kids are; cause you're picking them up and you're holding them. And so it's easier to get the names and that's one of the things that Alberta's doing. And it's easier to find out when kids are on the street right away, cause you get

them right away; they're picked up and they're held, and you quickly find out if they've been there before or not.

I'm sure all of you know that some . . . the disadvantages that are being debated. I'm sort of laying out the advantages — I'm not a proponent of PCHIP. But I do acknowledge that there is some good work happening in Alberta using PCHIP. And added to that has been the resources that have been available to the groups, the extra resources that have come with this.

But there are some gains that are being made in Alberta around this. There's also a lot of uncertainty in Saskatchewan about PCHIP really, and I think a lot of it . . . a lot of that uncertainty is in the First Nations community. But less so in the Regina area than anywhere else in the province.

So my question to you is: would you be interested in trying a pilot of a Made—in—Saskatchewan version of PCHIP, here in the Regina region, with all the resources that would presumably come with that in terms of trying to make this thing work? But it would involve some version, presumably, of holding kids. What that would look like, I don't know. I mean, you would create that.

And then we would have a discussion between Regina and the rest of the province over a two— or three—year period about, you know, is this working in Regina, how does it compare to Saskatoon and P.A., who would be using . . . who wouldn't be using . . . I mean, Saskatoon and Regina . . . Saskatoon and P.A. would presumably get the resources as well, but they wouldn't have the authority to hold children, whereas the Regina region would. And we would test it to see whether that makes a real difference in terms of outcome for kids. And obviously you'd control the details of how it would work. It would be in the hands of the . . . of your integrated, you know, approach in Regina.

But are you interested in having the authority to actually hold children and then sort of see what emerges from that? Obviously in a caring environment, and I'm going to assume that it's not the police who pick the kids up. I'm going to assume it's the outreach staff who would probably do it, and preferably Aboriginal outreach staff who would do it. And again, you may want to take this away and think about it.

But you know, I am personally not prepared to say we're going to go with PCHIP province—wide. But I'm just speaking personally here — I just want to clarify that. I'm not speaking on behalf of the committee. But I would be very interested, personally, to know whether you . . . there would be interest in the Regina region in testing the PCHIP model but a made—in—Regina version of that. So in other words, you'd be able to reshape it as is needed.

But the notion of actually holding children to prevent them from dying, for instance, to get them off whatever substance they may be addicted to in the short term, and to be able to sit down and make some decisions with them that would involve their longer—term or short—term, medium—term, longer—term care and then to be able to, therefore, presumably track them more easily in terms of where they go to make sure that they're attached to a worker who would continue to do

follow—up work with them. Now those are some of, sort of, the features of PCHIP. I'm sure you're all familiar with it at this point. But if you're not, you could familiarize yourself more with it before making a decision on this.

But I think this is a key, you know, this is a key decision about . . . the committee has got to decide, are we going to say no to PCHIP, are we going to say yes to PCHIP province—wide, or are we going to pilot PCHIP? My personal view is I'm not prepared to say yes to PCHIP province—wide.

I am prepared to look at piloting PCHIP somewhere, and it strikes me that the only real region where there is a lot of interest in this is Regina. And I guess I'd like to know, are you interested? And would you support it? Or do you not personally support PCHIP?

Mr. Hedlund: — I think what I'd suggest . . . I'd like to ask a question back to you, Mr. Prebble, and then make a suggestion. The first question is, if you could quickly outline where the impressions came from that you described, being the case in Regina?

And then the suggestion, I think, would be that we add the request to the group which I would call the round table, the youth—at-risk round table, to provide a response. I think that's the Regina group that's got the issue in hand.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — And, David, just to clarify. I've got absolutely no desire to impose the PCHIP model at all on Regina. I'm just asking, you know, have I got this impression accurately? And if I do . . . We've made a list of witnesses, Randy, people who are in favour of PCHIP. Have we got it here? I'm just going to get Randy to help me a bit here.

So, Christine, I hope you don't mind. I understood originally in phase one that you were in favour of PCHIP. We had that . . .

Ms. Deiter: — I was in favour of it. Now that I've been working out there for a whole year—and—a—half or two years, I'm not in favour of taking the kids off the street and taking them away from their families. I'm not in favour of that.

It's victimizing them again. And we don't have the community capacity right now to pick up the kids and lock them away — we don't.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — So, you've kind of shifted your view a little bit on that then.

Ms. Deiter: — Until we have the community capacity and there's more . . . Yes, we don't have the capacity to do it.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Well, no, no. But don't forget, being in . . . sorry. If you're against the idea of locking kids up, I totally understand that. We heard that evidence . . .

Ms. Deiter: — Yes. I'm totally against locking up our First Nations' children. To me it's just another form of apprehension to them. It's intrusive and it's re—victimizing.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Okay. And, see, I think

that's what we need to clarify. Like, I've got a list of witnesses here, many of whom are from Regina, who have . . . in fact, I would say that we've had — one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine — nine submissions in support of PCHIP and six of the nine have come from Regina.

Now, I'm noticing that some of those are . . . they included the Touchwood ICFS (Indian child and family services) agency. Some of them have been individual citizens or parents who've been impacted, who've had their kids impacted by this. I notice not a lot of them have been agencies, as I look them over here. More of them have been concerned citizens, individuals, parents whose children have been impacted.

And I had been under the original impression, and I apologize for that, that you had been as sort of supportive of PCHIP.

Ms. Deiter: — I was. I was but, like, for the little ones I believe that we can't really do it. But for the older ones, like, I could think of some of the clients that were so slammed up and whatnot that they couldn't really function at all and we felt the need for their personal safety and for their personal lives.

What we have done in the past is found out if they're on probation or if they breached their probation and we've been basically getting them picked up for fear that they would die themselves. And that's what we've been doing.

So I could say, like, for the real hard—core ones, yes. But, not for . . . there's instances. There's always circumstances where you will have to do that.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Well, maybe the task might be a little bit different then because it doesn't necessarily have to be . . . like I said, this is our Made—in—Saskatchewan version of what we think we want to do here, not necessarily what Alberta's done. But let's not reject everything that Alberta has done; let's look at it.

So if you see, in the Regina region, some benefit to temporarily holding people in a caring way, not in a prison cell or anything, but in what constitutes a lock—up facility for a period of time as part of your set of tools in addressing this issue, tell us if you do, and if you don't, tell us that too. If you reject the idea of involuntary lock—up, tell us that so that we're guided by it, because I think that's a very, very important question.

And I think in Saskatoon and Prince Albert the outreach agencies have essentially rejected the Alberta approach. And I guess what I'd like to know is what's the feeling in Regina. And is there some element of the . . . while you may reject the overall approach, there may be some elements of it that you want to incorporate into your work here. And do you want the capacity to lock, you know, to hold children under the age of 18, and if so, under what circumstances, even maybe the most dire circumstances like the potential of death?

So if you want to pilot or test that in some way, let us know. And if you want us to absolutely not suggest a pilot, let us know that too.

Mr. Hedlund: — We'll reply in the same time frame as the

other requests. Thanks.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, thank you, David. I really, really appreciate the fact that you've stayed till 1:30 to handle all of this, and I hope this is, you know, the beginning of sort of an ongoing consultation. And maybe next time we do it, my preference would really be that — I mean we're kind of in private anyway but — to just sit around the table, you know, in a somewhat different format and continue to struggle around what we do on these issues.

But if you could give them some thought and come back to us, maybe we could have another go—round on this. That would be wonderful. Thank you so, so much for doing this.

So we'll stand adjourned until, shall we say 2:30, and then the committee will meet in private? 2:30? Don, is that okay . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, there's the in camera stuff. That's right, Bonnie. Sorry, I'd forgotten for a minute. Bonnie, what would you like to do on that?

Ms. Durnford: — If we could handle it this afternoon, that would be fine.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Yes, do you want it . . . Does 2:30 work for you or is that . . . I don't want to mess your schedule up any more than it already is.

Ms. Durnford: — Would it possible to come back about 2, 2:15? Or is that too quick for folks?

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Around 2:15? Let's try 2:15 then.

Ms. Durnford: — Yes. I'd only have then till 3:30, but that should give us sufficient time. Thank you.

The Co—Chair (Mr. Prebble): — Good. So we'll say 2:15.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

The committee continued in camera.

The committee adjourned at 3:55 p.m.