



House of Commons  
CANADA

# **Subcommittee on Solicitation Laws of the Standing Committee on Justice, Human Rights, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness**

---

SSLR • NUMBER 003 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Monday, January 31, 2005**

—

**Chair**

**Mr. John Maloney**

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
``Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire'' at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

## Subcommittee on Solicitation Laws of the Standing Committee on Justice, Human Rights, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness

Monday, January 31, 2005

● (1735)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. John Maloney (Welland, Lib.)):** Ladies and gentlemen, I bring the meeting to order. We'll discuss further evenings after we're finished tonight. I encourage you to grab a bite from the back, because we may be here for a while.

The order of the day is our witness Catherine Latimer.

Catherine, you have two assistants or colleagues with you?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer (Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Criminal Law Policy and Community Justice Branch, Department of Justice):** I do, yes.

**The Chair:** Could you introduce them as well?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** With me are Lucie Angers, Patrice Corriveau, and Suzanne Wallace-Capretta, should you have any questions with respect to numbers.

**The Chair:** Our usual procedure is a ten-minute presentation, give or take. You've been here many times before, so you know the routine, and then we'll go to questions.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Thank you.

It is a great pleasure to be here with the committee.

As you may know, the Minister of Justice, Irwin Cotler, wrote to the chair of the Standing Committee on Justice, Human Rights, Public Safety, and Emergency Preparedness to support and encourage the work of this committee. He has identified protecting the vulnerable as one of his key priorities as Minister of Justice, and as tragic events continue to show us, few are as vulnerable as sex trade workers. He is eager to learn the results of your study and to receive your advice on how to improve the safety of sex trade workers and communities overall.

Minister Cotler would want officials in the Department of Justice to assist you in whatever way we can. I hope we can be of assistance to you today and we would welcome other opportunities to support the important work of this committee.

I know that Mr. Richard Mosley and Ms. Lucie Angers appeared before you in October 2003 and provided you with an overview of the criminal laws, of their history relating to the sex trade, and of findings and recommendations made in various reports relating to those laws: the Fraser, the Badgley, and the FPT reports. Rather than reviewing those in detail, I propose that background information be provided to you, and given the ten minutes we have, give or take, I

thought maybe it would be wise to first focus on a recap of the status of the current laws relating to the sex trade; secondly, describe approaches relating to the sex trade being pursued by the Department of Justice in a variety of related areas; and third, signal some of the criticisms, findings, and recommendations that have been made relating to the laws applicable to the sex trade. Then we would attempt to answer whatever questions the committee might have of the justice department officials.

The current law, as you probably know, is that prostitution itself is not illegal in Canada, but there are a number of related provisions connected to the sex trade. It is an offence under the Criminal Code to keep or be an inmate in a common bawdy house; that's under section 210 of the Criminal Code. Procuring and living off the avails of prostitution are prohibited under section 212, and communicating in a public place for the purposes of engaging in prostitution is prohibited under section 213 of the Criminal Code.

We have some statistical information on the trends in the application of those laws, which we can make available to you if you're interested, and then I'd like to talk about some of the recent measures the Department of Justice has taken in relation to these issues. As you know, it's a very challenging social issue and it really needs complex and multi-faceted approaches for us to address the problem.

One area the minister has signalled as a priority of his is trafficking in persons. This is a lucrative and inhumane form of organized crime, often involving severe sexual exploitation. In the October 5, 2004, Speech from the Throne the government committed itself to tabling legislation to protect against trafficking in persons. This offence involves the recruitment, transportation, or harbouring of persons for the purposes of exploitation, typically in the sex industry. It can be across borders or within borders. It is something we're very concerned about.

Canada does have a program to raise awareness, and we've taken a number of preliminary steps to try to get on top of this particular problem. As a component of the Minister of Justice's priority of protecting the vulnerable, he has signalled that this is an area where action will be taken to prevent this practice, allow the prosecution of perpetrators, and assist the victims of this sexual exploitation.

One of the areas the chair in particular is quite familiar with is the youth justice renewal initiative. This began in 1999 and the new law came into force in April 2003, which is the Youth Criminal Justice Act. Given the high rates of youth incarceration in Canada, this new regime had a de-incarceration, de-judicialization objective: unnecessary criminalization of youth is discouraged, and this includes the revictimization of children exploited in the sex trade.

• (1740)

The department has done considerable research on youth involved in the sex trade. We'd be happy to provide all of the background research pieces we have to the committee if that would be of assistance.

We had a round-table discussion in March 2002 that involved criminal law professionals in the field, advocates, individuals who'd been involved in the sex trade as young people, and others to try to come to terms with how best to approach the rather unique set of circumstances involving the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

One of the things we had done in the renewal of youth justice was to encourage police to consider alternatives to charging young people with any of the sections 210 to 212 types of offences. Our view is that if young people are involved in the sex trade, they've already been victims of a variety of forces, and subjecting them to yet another process is really not the most effective way of dealing with this.

Section 35 of the Youth Criminal Justice Act allows those in the youth justice system, if they believe the more telling issue is one related to the welfare of the child—whether that has to do with housing issues or the need for support—to refer the young person to social services for an assessment.

We've also funded a website on the commercial sexual exploitation of children, and it contains information for those involved in the justice system on this particular problem and how to address it. We're very pleased that the early results show a significant reduction in the number of youth being charged with prostitution-related offences. Over the last while there's been an 80% reduction in charges being laid against young people. We find these results very encouraging.

Nevertheless, we are aware that programs are not generally available for youth in need, for street youth. There's a particular absence of programs for youth at risk between the ages of 14 and 18. It is not easy for young people to exit the sex trade and get the significant support they need in that regard, so this is still identified for us as an area of social policy that continues to need work and assistance.

Victims: we do quite a bit of work at the Department of Justice in terms of victims of crime, and we're beginning to look at those involved in the sex trade in that light. We have made resources available to assist the family members of those related to sex trade workers who were killed in relation to the pig farm—I guess that would be the telling way to describe it. We're very concerned that we make sure the victims get the support and assistance they need. We're keen on that.

Another area where we're quite active and increasingly so is aboriginal justice. Recent reports like "Stolen Sisters", the concluding remarks of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, and Senator Chalifoux's committee report on urban aboriginal youth stressed the vulnerability of aboriginal people in relation to the sex trade.

We've embarked on a number of programs, research projects, and consultations. One of those, for example, is the Kani Kanichik of Winnipeg, which will receive about \$80,000 from the youth justice renewal fund to design and develop culturally relevant intervention programs for sexually exploited female youth between 12 and 17 years of age. In Edmonton there's another program for adult offenders we're looking at. It's a type of court for those involved in the sex trade. We're very keen to see if we can come up with some culturally relevant interventions that assist, and we would be happy to provide the committee with a list of the research projects, consultations, and other measures relating to the sex trade we've undertaken in the Department of Justice.

There have been, as you know, significant criticisms of the existing laws relating to the sex trade. Criminal law reform is always an iterative process as we strive to ensure justice and fairness in an evolving society.

• (1745)

You're now considering sex trade laws through a slightly different analytical perspective from the one we used to look at them before. There are opportunities to make some significant recommendations on how that area of the code might be improved.

The real questions are if the Criminal Code provisions result in sex trade workers being subjected to unnecessary risk, and how we can strive to address those particular risks. Various reports, including the Fraser report, have criticized the prohibition against bawdy houses. Others have criticized the prohibitions against communication, suggesting that they unnecessarily imperil sex trade workers. There has been little criticism against the prohibition against procuring and living off the avails, but certainly the other two provisions have been criticized on a lot of fronts.

We think there is a significant analytical difference, perhaps, in dealing with young people who are minors and are involved in the sex trade, and those who are adults. A lot of our attention has been addressed to youths involved in the sex trade, and we'd be quite anxious to work with you in trying to address the full range of issues in this area.

My colleagues and I would be happy to answer any questions. If you want more details on the history of those particular provisions, we would be happy to provide those as well, but that's essentially an introduction to where we are.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. You have offered to provide us with additional materials. That would be very helpful.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** We'd be happy to do that.

**The Chair:** Okay, we'll move to questions now.

Libby, would you like to go first?

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** We're a small committee, so I guess we don't have to go by all the protocols.

Thank you very much for coming today. I'm glad you're here. I was present when we had that earlier briefing in October.

First, I very much agree with you that there has been a fair amount of attention paid to those who are underage or to youths who are at risk in the sex trade. That's good. It's very important. A lot of the federal-provincial-territorial studies and work have focused on that, but there are still serious issues there, and I don't want to minimize them. But the part that has been so glaring and has been this invisible crisis, really, one that erupts in the public realm every so often with situations like the missing women in Vancouver, is the adult scene.

I was interested to see that you posed it as a challenging social issue. I agree with that. One of the problems we're facing is that for so long this problem has been managed as a criminal justice issue. I think that is at the root of many of the problems we're now facing. So when you pose the question, and I would agree with your question, about whether or not the Criminal Code provisions result in sex trade workers being subject to a high level of risk—I think it was generally along those lines—I would say from the information, the experiences, the people I've talked to, and the community I work in, the answer would be an overwhelming yes. The law itself is now causing a huge amount of harm.

Number one—and you referenced it—I would point to the communicating law. In fact, I've been calling for a moratorium on the enforcement of the communicating law. I know there are stats showing that possibly fewer women are being charged, but the visibility of police on the streets, moving the sex trade workers around, and the threat of the enforcement of the communicating law are actually causing dangerous situations. Women are making decisions about whether or not to get into an unknown car and be driven away to God knows where in five seconds, with really nowhere to go legally, right? A bawdy house is illegal, and on and on it goes.

I really think that's the reality. I sense that there's a shift within the department to recognize that, because for a long time it was that this sort of acknowledgment didn't exist.

I wanted to ask you specifically about the communicating law and whether or not, through the justice department work or analysis that you do, there is a sense that this law that was brought in...when was it?

• (1750)

**Ms. Lucie Angers (Senior Counsel, Criminal Law Policy Section, Department of Justice):** It was 1985.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes, 1985, as a result of the Fraser commission. It supposedly was meant to resolve the high visibility of on-street prostitution, but it has probably driven it more underground and made it become more invisible, and it has created this enormous danger and risk. I wonder if you can talk a little bit more about the communicating law and whether your department has looked at that section particularly.

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** As you know, when we came here last time to testify, I was here to explain a bit about what had been the work of the federal-provincial-territorial working group on prostitution. It

did a lot of consultations from 1992, and finally tabled its report in 1998. You're right in mentioning that one of the problems that was found was that the consultations told us that you have to focus on two issues when you go back to consider the law and all that. They said you have to see how you can reduce harm to the community—the condoms, the syringes, and all that—but you also have to prevent violence against prostitutes.

One thing the working group did find was that none of these objectives were fulfilled when we did study more carefully what were the ramifications of the law. On the nuisance, yes, it certainly did solve some problems in some communities. But as you know, it did displace the problem to other areas.

As you know, one of the problems we found was that the enforcement of the legislation depended on the police being called and being told that there was a problem, and when the problem was “solved”, it was after it had been displaced to another community. One thing the working group did find—and that was obviously before the Vancouver incidents—was that more and more the trend was to have the prostitutes going into industrial areas, into areas where they didn't have the protection of having people floating around.

The working group did conclude, as you know—because I know you read the report—that the legislation did not have a serious impact on street prostitution. As you say, there are two different issues, and the one I think you're focusing on now is more the issue of street prostitution.

In terms of where this leads us, there was no consensus in terms of repealing section 213 and all that. As you know, when Minister Crosbie, who was minister at the time, introduced what did become section 213, it was to address the nuisance problem; it wasn't to address the overall prostitution issue. As we discussed last time, depending on who you talk to, some people will tell you it did work from their community perspective. But once again, if you speak to the people who are most affected by this legislation—the prostitutes themselves—it didn't.

• (1755)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I really don't know of any law under which you take something that is considered to be a “nuisance”.... And I will acknowledge that there are impacts of the sex trade in local communities; it's a complaint-driven process. But you take something that's considered to be a nuisance and create a whole environment in which you actually put the people who are creating the nuisance in incredible danger, and then say you've solved the problem. I find that so contradictory, and it has taken such a long time to really have this contradiction emerge. It has taken the murder of many, many women for people to realize that the law itself, our position, is very contradictory. It's a political question, it's a legal question.

Has any recent work been done or is there any work now being done on the communicating law in terms of analyzing how it's being enforced or what its impact is relative to the situation in Vancouver? In the paper the other day, there was a story about another prostitute found murdered in Edmonton, frozen to death. Edmonton has had a whole rash of cases as well. I forget how many it is now, but I think it's something like thirteen.

Is there any analysis going on now in terms of what should happen with this particular section? It seems very urgent. I just don't know why there aren't some interim measures that could be taken.

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** Our colleague, Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta from the research section, has been asked to put together some numbers in terms of how the law has been enforced generally throughout Canada in the different regions and whether it did have a more significant impact on men as opposed to women, which it does appear to have had, and bearing in mind that data, how can we better address the problem.

But once again—and it was certainly the problem of the working group—how do you establish consensus, and do you need to establish consensus in order to address the problem and make everybody happy? That's certainly one thing we found with the different stakeholders we met. Putting everybody in a room—prostitutes, social workers, whatever—and discussing the issue from a law enforcement perspective does bring everybody to the point of saying, where do we go from here? Then you bring in the provinces and territories and municipalities, who say yes, repealing the bawdy house law might be an interesting option, but maybe not in my backyard.

So it's a very difficult issue, but yes, we are certainly doing some analysis in terms of what's happening.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** As I mentioned, there are different analytical lenses that can be brought to bear on this, and certainly the numbers would give you a sense of whether or not the laws as they exist are being fairly applied to those they're applying to. But the bigger question you're asking is, is there a broader social impact of those laws such that the harm we thought or hoped would be addressed is really being offset by larger social consequences or risk factors for a significantly vulnerable sector in the population? It is a difficult problem, because often when you bring people together to talk about it, the sex trade workers don't exactly have the same power base as some of the others who are concerned about the implications for their neighbourhood. Sometimes you have to sort of make sure you have the right lens so that the justice issues are brought to the fore, and that's a challenge.

I know we're looking very intently at this committee, because I understand you're going to be travelling and you're going to be talking and finding out what's happening in other countries. We certainly have done some research about what we know about what's happening in other countries, and what models seem to work and what models might not work, with a view to seeing if anything reasonable could be adapted for our country.

I agree with you, there is a sense of urgency. The longer we wait, the people who are vulnerable continue to be subjected to risk. But we do need to come up with a solution that will work. Is it the communications law? Is it the absence of bawdy houses? Would it be

better if the whole thing wasn't put out on the street? It's a tricky analytical issue, and we're actually looking forward to the recommendations of the committee to see if you can come up with something.

• (1800)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Libby.

Perhaps the research materials you just referenced might be helpful as well.

Mark.

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do have some questions. Ms. Latimer mentioned that unnecessary incarceration of youth is discouraged. Could you define "unnecessary"?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Sure. If the young person can be held accountable for the offence they've committed, without recourse to incarceration, then we would argue generally that measures of accountability short of incarceration would be preferable.

There is a lot of evidence—and I'm happy to provide it, John, if you're interested in that—on the harm that is caused by young people being subjected to incarceration. We have a long history in the country of seeing incarceration as a kind of training school, a useful, remedial thing. The social science research certainly runs against that strain. Our view is that the young person ought not to receive greater and harsher penalties than adults receive in similar circumstances, and if the young person can be held accountable for their misdeeds outside of an incarcerative approach, that should be preferable.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Thank you.

I'll just share with you my perspective, and then I'll ask a closing question. The experience I've had with youth being drawn into the sex trade industry comes from a task force I was on. The Province of British Columbia had a task force that went around, and it started one up in the community I lived in. I was on city council, and then I was asked to become involved in this task force.

We were told that often youth will be lured into it through the ploy of befriending a youth, telling the youth what they like to hear, buying the youth new clothes, radios, watches, and jewellery, and inviting them to parties, and in a short period of time they can take them out of their family environment.

I have five children, who are grown now, but I can see how it could happen that they could be duped and taken out of a safe environment into what appears to be a very exciting and alluring environment. In a short period of time, there's a commitment, manipulation, and an introduction to drug addiction, and they find themselves in a very serious situation where there's an obligation. This boyfriend, girlfriend, or friend who got them into this was basically just looking for new people.

From that perspective, there was a hope that youth would not be incarcerated and put into another dangerous environment, as you were describing, but rather that they could be taken out of that environment. Deep down they may want to get back with their families, but because of shame and manipulation, that is not seen as an option. But they can be taken out of that environment and put in a place where they can be debriefed and healed and then returned to what they really want in a safe environment.

Could you comment on that perspective of not necessarily using our typical incarceration? Are there programs out there we can use to remove the youth? A police officer would arrest the youth to get them out, but would then provide them an opportunity to get out if they really want out.

• (1805)

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** I think your diagnosis of how kids are lured into the sex trade is quite accurate, in that it can often be a very manipulative process on the part of the people who are trying to exploit them. I would indicate, however, that a lot of these young people are not coming from solid family backgrounds. A lot of the young people who are most at risk are the ones who are out on the street, who have run from their families, who have bad, abusive family relations, in any event, and are particularly vulnerable to some semblance of affection coming from someone. They don't look behind it to see the potential exploitation that might come with it. I agree with you, it's a very difficult, emotionally ensnaring situation that they get themselves into, which often ends up being coupled with drug addiction and a lot of other things that complicate the issue.

Helping young people exit from those circumstances after they've gotten into them is a challenge. Different approaches have been tried. We do have some research on certain things. We've tried a number of test pilots. One of the things that seems promising that we would like to pursue is linking young people in those circumstances with experiential youth who have made it out of those circumstances, because they understand the path out better than other people do. Having some kind of mentoring of these young people who are trying to get out with people who have succeeded looks like a promising avenue.

In terms of putting these kids into some kind of institutional, therapeutic care, history would show that there have been a number of cases where that has not worked. Young people, back in the days of the Juvenile Delinquents Act, particularly young women, were often incarcerated for sexual promiscuity. It's a challenge to try to make sure this kind of approach doesn't end up violating the rights of the young people and doesn't end up as an incarceration type of approach, despite whatever good motives there might be going in.

We're happy to share what we have in terms of techniques for helping young people exit the sex trade, but it is certainly a challenge. It is a very complicated issue, and often these young kids don't have a strong, stable family link to help pull them out, which makes it even more complicated.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Is there a time limit?

**The Chair:** I'll be as generous with you as I was with Ms. Davies. You have three minutes.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** I have a follow-up comment on the youth being lured into the sex trade. In the test cases we were looking at, it was socio-economic groups. It was right across the spectrum. As many were lured out of good, safe, loving families as came out of a troubled environment. Across the country it may change, but this is what I was shown.

I'd like to focus for a moment on the johns. I saw a couple of examples of ways of dealing with johns. One was in the city of New Westminster in British Columbia. They have a johns court. It seemed to be very successful. I have not seen any follow-up information on that, but it appeared that it was very good. The johns would sit in an all-day court and hear from parents of children who had been used in the sex trade and maybe even from some people who had come out of it. So it would be parents and sex trade workers who were no longer involved in the sex trade. They would hear from these women, and in some cases boys, how they as johns caused the continued suffering and endangerment of the youth and of adults too. After being held accountable for a whole day, the likelihood of them again buying favours was greatly diminished. It was very interesting seeing that. A lot of them broke down and sobbed. It was eye-opening.

The other example I've seen involves local media publishing the names. There would be a sting operation, and johns would be arrested and their names made public. But there's the whole issue of our charter.

Perhaps you could comment on those two examples, which focus on removing the demand for the sex trade by dealing with the johns.

• (1810)

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** Yes, we did. I even went to john school, notwithstanding the fact that I wasn't arrested for that kind of offence. I did go, and it was part of our considerations within the federal-provincial-territorial working group on prostitution. We did go and see what it looked like. We did speak to the johns there.

The working group tabled its report in 1998, as I said, so probably there is much more evidence now in terms of whether it works or not. At the time it was certainly criticized by a number of people, because the recidivism rate in terms of convictions under section 213 has always been relatively low. It's more or less 2% of the men who recidivate or who are caught under that same type of offence. So from that perspective it's not clear whether it would have an effect in any event.

Also, some were saying that the customers, and most of them are men, would end up receiving lower penalties than they would have gotten otherwise, because they only go to the john school for either an evening or an afternoon. They don't have to tell anybody. After that they think about their behaviour and all that. However, the people we have spoken to and the people who did favour those schools were of the view that it did.... You're right, because the johns were saying, oh, I hadn't realized it had that impact on you; I hadn't realized that you come from a background where you have been sexually abused and all that. It certainly did make their perception change in relation to what the prostitutes themselves were experiencing.

But once again, in relation to that, I imagine there will have to be a more up-to-date study of what has happened, and I'm not aware, unless my colleagues are, of whether that does work or not.

In terms of a more "shaming the johns" type of campaign that occurred in different cities across Canada, you did mention the obvious charter issues in relation to that. Another problem that was pointed out to us was that in a lot of cases the media did not want to participate in those kinds of campaigns. It was more or less putting the picture of the john on a little sheet of paper and putting it in the convenience store. That was kind of mitigated. On that one, the working group did recommend that it be kept under review to see if it was working or not, but I'm not sure in relation to that....

Maybe my colleagues want to add something.

• (1815)

[Translation]

**Mr. Patrice Corriveau (Senior Policy Analyst, Criminal Law Policy Section, Department of Justice):** To date, two major studies have been done on clients. One was conducted in France in September 2004 by Saïd Bouamama and is entitled "L'homme en question, le processus du devenir client de la prostitution". The other was conducted by a Swedish man named Manson. Both conclude that a prostitute's regular clients only represent 30 % of all clients. So 70 % of clients, more or less, will use prostitution one or perhaps two or three times in their lives, but never again. That does to some extent call into question the efficiency of these programs.

Moreover, although I do not know just how valid these statistics are, here is an important one: The percentage of clients who are also parents would appear to be 55.6%. I imagine that a father is aware that his daughter could end up in a situation like that. So we must be careful when we talk about the efficiency of the programs.

[English]

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** I would imagine that generally the clients of sex trade workers are being charged under 213, which is the communications provision. Many clients may be availing themselves of sex trade workers and not being subjected to this if they're going to escort agencies or a variety of other things. So you're only getting a certain type of those who are availing themselves of sex trade workers. It's hard to know what you're picking up with that number and what the sensitivities are.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madame Brunelle.

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to see you here today. I am a new member and I am responsible for a new file. I think that we must adopt an approach that is not moralistic and that talks about respect and openness in these areas so that we can deal with them concretely and efficiently.

Ms. Latimer, you told us that the minister wanted to protect vulnerable people. It seems to me that this is very much a question of protecting people from violence, protecting their lives and their health. Young people must often protect themselves from their own

families, and run away from homes where they are forced into incestuous relationships.

You said there had been a decrease in the number of charges laid against young people. Are there fewer young people involved in prostitution, or are the police forces intervening less frequently or in a different way? It seems to me that there are more and more problems, and problems that are increasingly complex, with respect to homelessness, drugs, and runaways; and these are problems that often lead young people to prostitution. There is a multitude of problems, and at the same time less intervention.

Do we have any recent data on this topic? Can we intervene at the social level to take charge of people and help them?

[English]

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** I think you've raised a very interesting point with regard to young people involved in the sex trade. It is a larger social problem, and many players need to participate in addressing the issues.

The Department of Justice and criminal laws are not well placed to be the primary force for dealing with this particular social phenomenon.

Certainly our approach to this problem in youth justice is that these young people are already victims, and it doesn't seem appropriate to be re-victimizing them by bringing charges against them. So this practice has been discouraged under the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

The fact that there are a lower number of charges, as you point out, doesn't necessarily mean there are a lower number of incidents of young people involved in the sex trade. I have no reason to believe those figures have changed.

I think to address that you really do need the types of social supports that help young people who are on the street, who are runners, who are in foster care and not coping well, who are needy and at risk. There are measures that can be taken in terms of crime prevention, but I think we also need to be working collaboratively with child welfare, housing, and a variety of others to make sure that the basic social services are in place for these young people.

I can give you an indication of the reduction in the number of charges. In 1998, the year before the youth justice renewal initiative kicked in, 189 young people were charged with prostitution-related offences, and it has fallen in 2003 to 40 charges being laid. That's a significant reduction, from 180 to 40.

• (1820)

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** That means that police forces have a different attitude towards the problems of young people.

You said something that surprised me, that we cannot criticize procuring. Can you give us some more details on that? By criminalizing the pimps instead, would we not have the start of a solution to this problem?



**Ms. Lucie Angers:** When Ms. Latimer said that we had been less critical of procuring, she was referring to the Criminal Code which, as you know, contains provisions on that. One very long section, section 212, deals with the issue of procuring, both for adults and children. These provisions have not been highly criticized, but there is certainly a consensus surrounding procuring in society. We certainly criticize any person who forces another person to submit to acts that constitute sexual exploitation.

That is what Ms. Latimer meant by that remark. On the contrary, it is one of the things that we noted in our research. As soon as we talk about abuse or exploitation, there is consensus in society: whether it affects adults or children, this type of behaviour must be criminalized.

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Perhaps three-minute rounds now, Libby.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I was reading through some of the material we received from the researchers about what's happening in the Netherlands. One of the things they did in the Dutch penal code—I'm not sure what year it was—was to distinguish between what they call voluntary and involuntary prostitution. Here, at least in Vancouver, we talk about the “survival” sex trade and then we talk about the other part of the sex trade, which we actually rarely talk about. I don't even know how big it is—the escort services, the massage parlours, which we completely ignore.

It does illuminate some very interesting observations, because if this whole regime of the history of what's happened is based on a sense of morality about what is good or bad or what is exploitative, then what we've tended to do is focus only on visibility. If we see it, we say that's terrible, it's bad, and we'll nail it through enforcement; but if we can't see it—i.e., it's through the escort services—then we tend to ignore it.

Actually in the Netherlands they do make this distinction. I gather from reading here, and hopefully we might be able to find out more about this at some point, they have different approaches about how they would deal with these different aspects. I just wondered if, within the justice department, you approach the question of what would be considered the “survival” sex trade differently from how you approach “by choice”, and whether or not there has been any research on that, whether you've been able to track how law enforcement has impacted that or not. I think that's kind of a big question that's out there that we haven't really debated.

● (1825)

[Translation]

**Mr. Patrice Corriveau:** I am not sure I understood your question.

[English]

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I think we have the Robbie Burns dinner piper upstairs.

[Translation]

**Mr. Patrice Corriveau:** For starters, the essential issue is knowing whether or not we consider prostitution work. At the Department of Justice we are looking mainly at two situations, that of Germany and the Netherlands, countries with a bit more of a regulatory approach, and Sweden, which has a completely different

attitude that we call neo-abolitionism. The purpose of both approaches is to provide women with maximum protection, but the basic principles are totally different.

In Sweden, for example, prostitution is always a violation of human rights that is treated as slavery. What does that mean? That means that a woman never really chooses to be a prostitute. Based on that theory, women are always manipulated. Even when they themselves call for decriminalization, the theory is that they are involved in prostitution against their will. Their involvement is linked to certain circumstances in their lives, such as violence and rape, as you mentioned earlier.

Germany and the Netherlands do not want to treat people like children, nor to victimize individuals. Their basic principle is that forced prostitution does, in fact, exist, and they crack down on that kind of prostitution. However, they believe that voluntary prostitution also exists, and they attempt to manage that kind of prostitution by eliminating the clandestine nature of it which, according to the proponents of this approach, increases vulnerability. They want to reduce the stigma surrounding prostitutes and foster better measures to counter the spread of HIV-Aids, and that is regulated. They are fighting forced prostitution, juvenile prostitution, and situations of abuse by imposing a series of legal obligations, such as having to obtain a work permit, and having to register in a brothel.

I do not know if that answers your question.

[English]

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** I think the question you've raised about the willingness or the exploitation component that goes into the sex trade is an important one, and there is a tendency to think that, by definition, young people involved in the sex trade are being exploited. As you talk about adults it becomes less clear whether all those participating in the sex trade should be considered exploited or whether there is a capability of making a rational determination that this is what you want, that among your various options, this is your best one and you're going for it.

I would be very interested in the results of this committee's work in trying to come up with that, because that's a big policy issue, how you deal with those particular issues.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mark, did you have any questions?

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** It's a question regarding the Youth Criminal Justice Act and how legislation deals with youths as opposed to adults. My understanding is that, with the Youth Criminal Justice Act, if a police officer were to bring a child home, if the parents were to say, “Why are you bringing my child home? What is the issue?”, and if the child were to instruct the police officer not to divulge what the nature of the offence was, the officer would not be able to do so under the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

It's fairly new legislation, so when I had an introduction to it about eight months ago, one of the concerns that was expressed to me was that this is the direction in which this legislation is taking us. Suppose there was a youth who had been involved in or had been manipulated into the sex trade, and now the police officer was bringing that child back home. Is that your understanding of that legislation?

• (1830)

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Not at all. In fact, there are provisions in the Youth Criminal Justice Act that include the possibility of police warnings and cautions, that include talking to the parents of the young person or whoever is raising the young person, about the conduct, to see if they can get some resolution of it among themselves. There's certainly no youth veto by which the young person can require the police officer not to raise these issues with the parents.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** That's good to hear. Thank you.

Could you describe the different legislative approaches to prostitution, comparing adults and minors?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** The Youth Criminal Justice Act effectively defines what is criminal by what is already included in the Criminal Code. The reason it does so is that, as I mentioned, there used to be a lot of status offences that attracted criminal law consequences for young people, that reflected behaviour that wouldn't be criminal if adults did it. The law is that if it's criminal for an adult, it's also criminal for a young person, but if it's not criminal for an adult, it ought not to attract criminal consequences if a young person does it. That's basically the distinction.

It raises some very interesting questions around these particular provisions and all the sex-trade-related provisions, because if a young person participates in this activity, technically it's a crime for the purposes of the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

We received some representations going through that maybe we ought not to categorize as criminal this behaviour that is understood by many as being the sexual exploitation of children and youths. It just ought not to be considered as a crime if someone under 18 is participating in it. It raises some other issues, but that's certainly something that might be worth considering. It's not where we went with the Youth Criminal Justice Act. So basically what's an offence for a young person age 12 to 18 is what's in the Criminal Code and would be an offence if an adult participated in it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mark.

Paule.

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** Recently, we have seen cases of exotic dancers and domestic workers who entered Canada and who became sex-trade workers. We know that the situation is controlled by criminals. Women end up in very difficult situations: their passport is confiscated, they live in fear, etc. In your opinion, should we amend the act to prevent these problems or should we take remedial action instead? Is the act really adequate in this regard? How can we prevent these situations?

[English]

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** You raise a very interesting point, which is essentially the trafficking of women into Canada to participate in the sex trade. It is almost always associated with organized crime activity. It's hard to get a handle on the actual numbers. The RCMP numbers, which not everyone agrees with, say that 800 people were trafficked into Canada in a particular year and 1,100 people were trafficked out of Canada, which means it's not just a transit point, as there seem to be Canadians who are also being trafficked out. So it's

an offence that goes both ways, which is quite troubling. It's all troubling, but this element is also troubling.

In terms of the legislative framework for dealing with that, a trafficking of persons offence was created in 2002 as part of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, but in terms of dealing with this problem domestically, I think there is a sense that there needs to be a domestic offence particularly tailored for this law. Certainly the October 5 Speech from the Throne indicated that the government was committed to bringing such an offence forward, and it is a priority for the Minister of Justice, so I think you may see something coming along in that regard.

In terms of whether legislation in and of itself is adequate to deal with the problem, the answer is that it is probably not. Criminal law legislation tends to kick in after the fact, and we would already have a lot of heartache, dislocation, and problems by the time the criminal law actually found somebody, charged them, and dealt with it. So the approach our minister is interested in deals not only with preventing the activity in the first place and assuring that the legislative framework is appropriate to prosecute those who are exploiting others, but also with dealing with those who've been subjected to this kind of behaviour.

A number of concerns have been raised about returning people who may have been sexually exploited in Canada to countries of origin, where they may come right back into the same organized crime connections that led them to come to Canada and without dealing with some of the very serious psychological and physical issues that may confront them. They may have lots of problems associated with the way they've been treated.

So it is a very complicated issue, and the department is working with, I think, about 12 other departments in trying to come up with a concerted plan that addresses the broad spectrum of needs associated with it.

• (1835)

**The Chair:** Ms. Davies.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I feel that in the work that I've done locally, I've got a really good handle on what's wrong. I know totally what is not working, and what the impacts of the law are. Others may not be convinced of that, but I feel I've got a good handle on that anyway.

Where I find it a lot more difficult—and I'm sure we'll have to have you back to discuss this further—is to navigate what some of the remedies are, and what jurisdictions flow from that. We've got the Criminal Code on the one hand, but we know that there's also provincial enforcement, and there's even municipal enforcement of those provisions, where a local force may decide to use enforcement or not, or the threat of enforcement, or whatever.

One of my questions is if a municipality decided that they actually wanted to create a certain licensing requirement, would they then be ultra vires in terms of the Criminal Code? If we're looking for some legal remedies—and you don't have to answer all of this today—these are just some of the questions that I think are going to come up.

I'm not clear in my own head how the jurisdictions work together or not. Do we have to amend the Criminal Code first, which then would allow municipalities to take certain actions? I think they're very critical to the solution here in terms of what happens in a local community. To get back to your earlier point about there being no consensus at the federal-provincial-territorial level, I think where we have to aim our energy is that consensus will be built at a local level, because that's where the problem is, and that's where people have to come together—and they are coming together—but this jurisdictional stuff gets pretty complicated. I'm not a lawyer, so I don't understand all of that. Would you offer some initial guidance around that?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Sure. We would be quite happy to come back to you with some models of how this has been done in relation to some other types of offences so you can see what that might look like. But let me give you an example of what you're talking about, an approach that might give you the flexibility to address it at a local level.

The gaming provision in the Criminal Code has an express prohibition. It says this activity is prohibited unless done consistent with a scheme authorized and regulated by the province. In effect, the regulation of the activity has been punted to a different level of government to decide whether certain things should be permitted or not. That may have some carriage here.

From a policy perspective, what we would be interested in is what the nature of that regulatory authority might be. What are you expecting the province or the municipality, or whatever level you're thinking about, to establish as a benchmark to make sure the activity is not criminal in the sense that it creates harm or unnecessary risk or whatever?

There need to be some components to that to get it over a certain level. For example, if you wanted to think about a scheme that said the Criminal Code would say this activity is.... Let's take bawdy houses, for example. Bawdy houses, or living off the avails, are unlawful unless they are done according to a scheme regulated and authorized by X, which would do. For us, it would be good to know what we're hoping to achieve through that regulation, like promote some safety for the individual, whatever you think is necessary to take it out of the range of criminal and reduce the risk associated with that behaviour. That's certainly a model we've looked at.

• (1840)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** That's what happens with gaming now. It's within the code, but there are certain latitudes in terms of how it can happen, as long as it's referenced within a provincial jurisdiction.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Yes.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Even municipal?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** The gaming provisions refer to the province.

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** To add to what Cathy has said, as you know, the problem with the provision in relation to communicating.... After several discussions, some municipalities, Calgary in particular, decided to go for a type of regulation in terms of what they felt was the nuisance associated with prostitution. The way they drafted their legislation was on the premise that prostitution was bad and that it brought a lot of bad things and all that. This legislation was struck

down by the Supreme Court in 1983, which said no, you can't go after something that is bad per se, like prostitution. You can control nuisance, you can control the way in which people keep their property and things like that, but you can't control an activity that is considered to be bad per se.

The federal government has jurisdiction over criminal law and procedure, but the provinces have jurisdiction over property and civil rights. When you look at nuisance, it does deal as well with property and civil rights.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Traffic congestion, littering....

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** All of these things.

It's the way you do it. Cathy is right. Section 207 of the Criminal Code does provide for a way in which the provinces can have some confidence in relation to that. The problem once again is that you can offer the scheme in the Criminal Code, but then you'd have to have provincial pickup.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Provinces would want to do it.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Can I follow that up?

**The Chair:** Certainly.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** We'll have to discuss this more. Does that mean it will be different all across Canada?

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** It could be.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I remember in Vancouver we actually did try to deal with pornography. We tried to regulate how it could be displayed and so on. It was eventually struck down as being ultra vires. I don't know if you remember the case. It was in the eighties.

I understand what you're saying. In effect, we would have to have federal amendments that would allow some sort of latitude in terms of a provincial jurisdiction.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** Regulating, yes.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** They would allow a certain area of regulating, but that's not necessarily something that would happen. It would be then the choice of that particular province or territory to do it or not.

It's going to be difficult. I've always thought in my own mind that it was something we could focus on in terms of municipal involvement, in terms of licensing provisions or zoning or.... I don't want to get into red light districts; I think they're very problematic. But if it's done on another basis, would that be something that could be contemplated? It could only be done if the province allowed that?

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** Until the Criminal Code contains.... The problem, and that's one thing Patrice was alluding to, is the whole problem of whether you decriminalize or you regulate. If you decriminalize, if you remove all the provisions from the Criminal Code in relation to sections 213 and 210, but presumably you keep 212, it is like you are saying that prostitution is okay; it's an activity like all others, and therefore it's up to the municipalities. Property and civil rights kick in and then they can regulate the hours, they can regulate.... I think that's what Patrice was referring to, and also you had referred to that in terms of Amsterdam and all that.

• (1845)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I think it would be really helpful if we had—

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** If you had the range of options.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes, because I don't necessarily understand the consequences of various legal changes, and I think that would be really helpful to know what the parameters are.

**The Chair:** Just on that point, would that lead to a patchwork of enforcement across ten provinces and three territories, and they all could have something a little bit different out of that?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** That's certainly what it could lead to. When we did the gaming provisions, that was certainly what it could lead to. So you could have casinos in Manitoba and not in Saskatchewan, depending on whether or not the gaming commission of that province wanted that kind of behaviour.

The difficulty, and it goes back to Ms. Davies' point, is a lot of this is quite local. There are different tolerances in different communities for different types of behaviour, and it's hard to know how to deal with it from something like a criminal law, which generally has uniform application across the board. So there are tricky modalities here on how to deal with the problem.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mark, are you ready to go again?

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** I have one comment and one question regarding local government.

It was a very interesting discussion we just had. Local government can restrict activities, if it so wishes, through zoning. They could have it permitted in a zone where it may not be practical to have it—for example, a mall—or it could be restricted through a business licence. There are a number of creative ways of doing that.

The question is regarding recommendations you may be bringing. It is a complex issue, but we heard of two different approaches in Europe. Are you coming with recommendations?

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** No, we're not coming with any particular recommendations. As public servants, we offer explanation of the law and information about what others have done and what the scope of possibilities might be, but we're sort of hamstrung. We provide our advice to the Minister of Justice, though I'm quite sure he would be very interested in speaking to you about various options.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Are there any more questions?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I have one more.

I was just actually looking for some information here, and what we haven't spoken about is the perspective. I know some groups are approaching it from sort of a human rights perspective. I know Mr. Cotler has had some information on this and I think he's expressed some interest in it.

I wonder what kinds of comments you can make on what the impact is here in terms of people's human rights being violated through enforcement, supposedly on the basis that it's creating some sort of greater good for society, whatever this standard is we have, but it's actually created an enormous amount of harm, and whether or not there's been any perspective within the department around the issue pertaining to human rights.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** I'll just make a general comment.

Minister Cotler did meet with the particular group. I wasn't privy to what they said, but I know Patrice has a clearer understanding of their issues.

Basically, we look at all issues through a lens of human rights and the charter components of them, so that would be something very natural for us to do when we're looking at a particular problem, as well as trying to get an assessment from all the stakeholders involved, including those whose rights might be violated by certain approaches. For us this is key to figuring out what's an appropriate approach to follow or what recommendations to develop.

Patrice, do you want to comment? I know the minister did meet with Pivot.

• (1850)

[Translation]

**Mr. Patrice Corriveau:** I believe that when the minister met with the members of the Groupe Pivot, he received 91 affidavits from prostitutes who were calling for a review of the situation to see if there was a violation of human rights. According to a Supreme Court decision... I cannot find it.

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** The Supreme Court decision dates back to 1990 and it was a reference to section 195.1, which became section 213. I am referring to the Skinner decision and to the Stagnitta decision, where the court stated that, contrary to what the Groupe Pivot is claiming, freedom of expression was not violated by section 213, even though it dealt with communication. It certainly caused a problem in terms of freedom of expression. However, the provision was saved by clause 1, because it was a necessary evil to try and overcome the problems surrounding prostitution. So it is a right. The Groupe Pivot also said that the right to freedom and security, from the perspective of fundamental justice, was also being violated because of the fact that prostitutes have to go farther and farther away to practice an activity that is legal, but that endangers their lives. That is the submission that the group made to the minister.

[English]

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I don't know whether we can go into it more, but I know it's an area of interest for a lot of people. Maybe this something, again, we'll have to review further when we hear from witnesses.

**The Chair:** Are there any other questions from any of our members?

Go ahead, Paule.

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** There is one subject that we have not yet discussed, and that is everything having to do with the Internet. We can simplify things by saying that in terms of everything that is going on—and we see all the ingenuity... How can the law control all this abuse that is going on? This is becoming very disturbing. Are there any international agreements on this? Can anything be done?

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** As you say, legislation often lags behind technological developments. The Internet explosion meant that the Criminal Code had to be reviewed so that offences committed on the Internet could be included in the code, like those committed through the mail.

With respect to prostitution and the Internet, the subject is more sensitive. Although we created special offences covering child pornography on the Internet, we did not similarly update the provisions on adult prostitution.

However, the courts interpret legislation in light of technological developments. As it is drafted, section 213 could very likely apply to the Internet. For example, in the case of an Internet chatroom, where two people are communicating, one could say that he or she wanted to have sexual relations with the other person and could state the rate, and could suggest the same thing to anyone at all.

However, the difficulty lies in trying to prove this. The problem is not so much that this would happen in a chatroom, but rather the fact that it would be advertised. For example, let's assume that I am a prostitute and I have a web page where I offer a particular service at a particular price. In such a case, it would appear difficult to use section 213, to adapt it to cover new technologies.

Paragraph 213(1)(c), which prohibits communication with any person in a public place—and the Internet is a public place when people are communicating in a chatroom—would not even apply if I had a web page and were soliciting everyone in general, but no one in particular, even if I were in a public place and I wanted to obtain the sexual services of a person offering them. So it is first and foremost a question of evidence. The communication often takes place when the person, having noted the telephone number, calls to say that he or she would like to meet the individual at a particular time. That is when the communication takes place, and not when—and I'm not here to give legal opinions—the person simply makes a note of the telephone number.

In this context, advertising of this type is not illegal in newspapers, even if sexual services are being offered. We do not see advertising of this type very frequently in ordinary newspapers. In any case it is not an offence that is normally punishable.

• (1855)

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** If the services of a minor are being offered, that is a problem.

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** In the case of a minor, section 212, on child prostitution, would apply. This type of behaviour would definitely be covered by the act, because it says “every person who...communicates with anyone for the purpose of obtaining for consideration, the sexual services”. This section was amended in 1997, specifically to take into account the use of informers, but also to take into account things that were happening on the Internet. Such a case would be covered by the Criminal Code, but it seems more difficult in the case of adults.

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** I have a question. I think your testimony here today was that only roughly 2% of the johns are in fact charged with communicating for street prostitution. Is that accurate?

**Ms. Lucie Angers:** Sorry; I said 2% were recidivists in terms of being caught committing the offence more than once. There are many more than that who are charged under the section 213 offence. The numbers are quite high, more like 2,000 to 3,000 convictions. It's certainly not 2% of the people who are charged; it's many more than that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** In the year 2003-2004, under section 213, 1,004 charges were laid against males and 775 were laid against females.

Do you want to know about the convictions and the sentences?

**The Chair:** That would be interesting, the convictions anyway, not the sentences so much.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** This is Suzanne Wallace-Capretta from our research and statistics group at the Department of Justice.

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta (Research Manager, Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice):** I'm a little excited that you've asked this question. There is a very interesting result on communicating, which I can share with you.

These data are from the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. I believe Roy Jones gave you a presentation on some general statistics, and I took a closer look at that. It's an adult criminal court survey. You suggested earlier, Libby, that more males were charged with communicating than females. The statistics over 10 years indicate there is a slightly higher representation of males in relation to communicating offences, but they are very close to 50-50. As Catherine has mentioned, under section 213, the number of male cases in 2003-2004 was 1,004, which represents 56%, with 44% being female.

This is the finding that I thought was quite interesting. When we looked at a gender breakdown of those cases of adults who were convicted and received a sentence of custody under section 213, we found that females were more likely to receive custody for communication offences. It was quite a significant—

• (1900)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** What do you mean by “received custody”?

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta:** If there is a case under section 213 and it goes to court and is disposed of by way of a guilty decision, the most serious sentence is custody. We found that in fact more women were receiving custody—

**Ms. Libby Davies:** What does “custody” mean?

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta:** Prison.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Now I have it.

**Ms. Catherine Latimer:** There are other sentences that could have been applied, such as a fine or probation. But when custody is actually applied, which tends to be the most serious sentence for a particular offence, females were significantly overrepresented.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Do you have the numbers based on gender?

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta:** Based on gender, for an offence under section 213, in the year 2003-2004, of those who received custody, 17 were males and 198 were females. So 92% of them were females.

**The Chair:** Is it because of many repeat offences that they took a tougher position?

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta:** We had this discussion earlier about possible explanations for this result. I think there are several. I think that certainly could be one of them. I think another one, based on one of the conclusions of the FPT report on prostitution, which Lucie mentioned earlier today, is that the women were more likely to fail to appear, and as a result, they would have more contact with the criminal justice system and would be convicted *in absentia*.

I think the other one is in relation to the discussion earlier today about clients or johns. Upon successful completion of john school, they receive a stay or the charge is withdrawn, and I think that could certainly have an impact on that as well.

**The Chair:** Is there any indication as to whether those males could have been johns or male prostitutes?

**Ms. Suzanne Wallace-Capretta:** It's unfortunate, but I can't determine that at this time.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I think I'm correct in saying that during the last decade the number of convictions—whether it's male or female—has gone down.

The point I tried to make at the beginning is that getting the picture of the actual conviction is really only part of it. There's also the threat of conviction. That's much harder to quantify. I don't know how you'd do it. The police do convict in some circumstances, but just their presence and the tools they have create a whole environment whereby a whole bunch of other consequences happen. I think what you're saying is really important, but there is also this other part of it in terms of the threat.

**The Chair:** I thank you for your attendance this evening.

I think I might just alert you to the fact that after we have concluded our consultations here in Ottawa and across the country, we might like you to come back, chat with us about some of our findings and opinions, and comment. The committee would very much appreciate that.

Thank you again.

What I intend to do now is just suspend for about five minutes as the room clears and then go back into session for some housekeeping discussion on where we go from here, the passing of budgets, etc.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

---









**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**