4 THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed. 5 MR. VERTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. The first witness 6 is Dr. John Lowman who is in the witness stand.

9 THE REGISTRAR: Would you state your full name, please.
10 THE WITNESS: John Lowman.
11 THE COMMISSIONER: Have a seat.
12 MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner, Dr. Lowman is a criminologist and I would like to have his report marked as an exhibit. This has been exchanged with the participants. We have three copies in the binders Mr. Giles has and if we could have the report marked at this time and then we can start to go through it.

THE REGISTRAR: It will be marked as Exhibit 3.
THE COMMISSIONER: Are there any objections to the report being filed?

MR. DICKSON: None from this side but I want to clarify that all the appendices are being marked along with the report.

MR. VERTLIEB: Yes, that's our understanding. Thank you.

There is an addendum on statistics that the professor prepared which can simply be included in the report if that's convenient. It covers the statistic changes.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
(EXHIBIT 3: Document entitled: Expert Report and Appendices by Dr. John Lowman; including numbered tabs 1,2 and alphabetical tabs A to $N$ inclusive)

## EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY MR. VERTLIEB ON QUALIFICATIONS:

Q Dr. Lowman, I'd like to take you through your background in a brief way. It's extensively set out in your report and we're grateful for the time and energy you put into your report which is thorough. You have a bachelor of arts from Sheffield 1971?

A Yes.
Q Please tell Mr. Commissioner your educational background after that first degree.

A In 1972 I travelled to Toronto where I took a master's degree in geography and then in 1977 I moved to Vancouver where I did a PhD in geography, the subject was the geography of crime.

Q What year was it that you were granted your
doctorate?
A 1983 .
Q From the University of British Columbia?
A Yes.
Q In your report you state you joined the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University in 1982 and were granted tenure in 1987, promoted to the rank of professor in 1991?

A Yes.
Q Tell us how it is as a geographer initially you came to develop the expertise in the field of criminology?

A My PhD thesis was about the geography of social control. Knowing that $I$ was studying crime in general, $I$ did a bunch of courses in law, psychology, sociology, as well as geography. The subject of the thesis was examining the influence of law enforcement and law on crime patterns. Most people up to that point who had examined crime patterns had looked at the characteristics of offenders and offences but not at the characteristics of law and law enforcement. One of my particular emphasis was displacement phenomena and one of the anecdotes or vignettes I was using to describe displacement phenomena was
the displacement of indoor to outdoor prostitution when the Penthouse and Zanzibar clubs were closed in Vancouver in 1975, thereby putting prostitution on the street.

Q Let's have you explain to the commissioner and others here how it was you then started to work in the field of criminology with an emphasis on the studies of prostitution. You say in your report beginning in ' 77 you conducted numerous studies of prostitution, prostitution law and law enforcement. How was it that you came to have this area of academic interest?

A In the early 1980s what you were starting to see was a considerable amount of public and political pressure following as a result of the expansion of street prostitution following the closure of the Zanzibar and Penthouse in Vancouver and in Toronto a similar thing happened when the body rub parlors on Yonge Street were closed after the Emmanuel Jacques murder in 1977, a 14-year-old shoeshine boy.

As a result of that the Fraser Committee, the special committee on pornography and prostitution was created in 1983, at which point the Department of Justice decided to do a series
of studies of prostitution across Canada. I was giving a paper at a conference one time and it mentioned my work on displacement of prostitution. There were very few people doing any research on prostitution at that time. The Department of Justice asked me if I would be interested in doing that research and it was at that point that I did a broad study of prostitution in Vancouver, and then subsequently when the communicating law was introduced in December 1985 part of the legislation introducing it was to do a review of that law within four years of its enactment. The Department of Justice asked again if $I$ would be interested in doing that research because the 1984 research we did formed baseline data. Gradually serendipity introduced me to -- I became a prostitution researcher that way. It sort of evolved as opposed to me saying I think I'll study this particular subject.

Q Just to jump ahead for the benefit of the commissioner and everyone else here, you are teaching in this area of criminology at Simon Fraser even as you're here today?

A Yes. I had a class on prostitution in Canada
yesterday.
Q Tell us about the course that you're teaching at Simon Fraser.

A Once I started to realize that I was now embarked on a program of research in prostitution I drew out a plan for the study which involved looking at both prostitution law, social control and the nature of prostitution itself, so you're looking at the control of commercial sex and the characteristics of commercial sex. The course I do is organized around that program so it looks at all the survey research on the causes of prostitution, however conceptualized; it looks at the development and history of law, law enforcement, so it covers the entire range.

Q I know you don't want to appear to be immodest but I do want to ask you this question: To your knowledge is there anyone in Canada who has spent more time studying in this area than yourself?

A Probably not. Debbie Brock and Fran Shaver in Ontario both have been doing research on prostitution as long as I have but I don't think their research includes all the different facets that mine has.

Q Just before leaving your background, you've
written extensively and we've seen references to writings by Lowman, yourself, and Fraser. Who is Fraser?

A Fraser is Laura Fraser who is my partner.
MR. VERTLIEB: I think I've covered the area of your background sufficient for the purposes of allowing you to set out your expertise and I trust, Mr. Commissioner, that we could accept Mr. Lowman as an expert in the field of criminology and able to discuss the issues raised in his report.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is there any concern about his expertise so that he may give opinion evidence based on the issues and the underlying premise Mr . Vertlieb has put to Dr. Lowman?

Thank you. I'll find that he is an expert witness and may give opinion evidence on the area of prostitution and all of those matters that are related in his report.

## EXAMINATION BY MR. VERTLIEB:

Q Let me ask you about the use of the word "prostitute" or "prostitution". It seems that some people would have a view that this should be referred to as "sex trade work" and we don't wish to offend anyone's sensitivities throughout the
course of the hearings. Can you help us understand the words you use and why you do use the words that you do use please?

A In the report $I$ use the term "prostitute" and "prostitution" in order to distinguish direct sexual contact services from other kinds of sex work, pornography, various kinds of exotic dancing, phone sex, so $I$ do it as a matter of accuracy, not as a matter of disrespect. One of the things that is most important to realize when one is talking about prostitutes is that that word becomes a sort of master status that covers up all of the other things a human being is, so I use this for accuracy in the context -- I use those terms for accuracy in the context of this room, not as a term of disrespect to women who are involved in prostitution, or men.

Q I think you've just explained footnote number 1 to your report at the bottom of page 1?

A Yes.
Q Let's then move to a discussion about the Downtown Eastside and the definition, keeping in mind, Dr. Lowman, that the terms of reference given to the commissioner request that he focus on the Downtown Eastside and Missing Women

Investigations. You cover it in your report at page 2 the definition of Downtown Eastside as you use it and I won't take you through all the words, your report is before us, but behind you is a blow-up area of a portion of Vancouver and we believe that would reflect the Downtown Eastside.

A Yes.
Q I am going to ask that you use this laser and just outline for the commissioner where you define the Downtown Eastside.

A I will reference the map if that's okay. This is on page 2 of the report, you will see a map and I've taken this from the City of Vancouver, 2005/ 2006 document, Downtown Eastside Community Monitoring Report. Alexander and the railway track is the north side, we're coming across to Clark Avenue on the right-hand side, we're tracing up Malkin and coming across to this area just by the station here, we're coming up around Victory Square, and then up Cambie and along to Alexander again.

MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner, if you don't mind having that board which I think might be referred to from time to time marked as an exhibit that would be

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
3 THE REGISTRAR: That will be marked as Exhibit 4.

6 MR. VERTLIEB:

# (EXHIBIT 4: Large display board: Map of Central 

 Vancouver, BC and the lower East Side)Q Thank you, Dr. Lowman. Now, as it relates to the work that we've been asked to do here, is there a particular area of reference to the geography of the Downtown Eastside? Is there a particular area for the sex trade work in the Downtown Eastside?

A Prior to the period of the greater interest, if we're talking about the location of prostitution strolls -- I use the term "stroll," it's taken from the language, the subculture of the street to refer to areas that are known for women to stand or men waiting for clients. Historically after the Second World War that stroll area was located immediately south-east of Main and Hastings.

Q Show us please.
A Basically the area from Hastings, Main, down to Prior Street and Gore Avenue, so it's the immediate several blocks to the south-east.

Q That was post-Second World War II?
A That was Post-Second World War II up to roughly in the middle of the 1980s that stroll began to be displaced to the streets to the east, and it's not exactly clear why that displacement occurred. Several social service workers at the time told me that it may be related to gang activity. Nonetheless, regardless of what the reasons were, it moved into an area that was primarily residential and a couple of schools in that area and in the context of other displacements of prostitution in Vancouver around those years and in response to residents' complaints, various devices and strategies were devised to move the stroll to the north side of Hastings Street into the industrial and commercial area, rather than in the residential area. I trace that in the report, the various strategies that were used, and also identify and include in one of the appendices a media release that the Vancouver Police Department published which basically admitted that they had set up an area to contain prostitution. I referred to it at the time as an "orange light district" and the reason for not calling it a "red light district" is that's
really what it was but nobody was admitting that's what it was.

Q You've mentioned displacement phenomenon and you've mentioned it a couple of times now. Tell us what you mean by that and how does it relate to the work we're doing here?

A Displacement can take two forms -- basically we're mostly talking here about geological displacement. There can be typological displacement, temporal displacement, a change of crime type, a change of time at which crime might occur. We're mostly talking about geographical displacement. There are many, many examples of deliberate and unanticipated displacement.

The nuisance injunctions in 1984 displaced prostitution out of the West End. I've often made the comment that it effectively turned the rest of Vancouver into a red light district. You had a series of task forces in the summers of the late 1980s and on into the 1990 s on prostitution in Mount Pleasant, trying to get out of that area. One of the reasons it moved into that area was the closure of the West End as a prostitution stroll. Then it went to the area around Semlin and Lakewood, another area of residential
housing. It was pushed east from there -- sorry, west from there into the areas around Pandora and Franklin. You saw similar things happening in Mount Pleasant. You got prostitution along Broadway, police set up different kinds of roadblock systems, the prostitution was moved to Ontario and Quebec and then subsequently it was moved to 1st Avenue.

So what you see is a series of displacements, some deliberate, some intended and some which left me wondering whether trying to control prostitution was like to trap a ball of mercury on a glass tabletop with the underside of a spoon.

Q You've mentioned track and in your report -let's go to pages 12 to 14. What I'd like to do is just have you tell us how these definitions of yours are used. High track, mid track, low track.

A High track is the area that is controlled mostly by African American pimps practicing a form of subculture that can be tracked back to the southern US and ghetto urban USA. It has a long history, it has a history that's involved with different aspects of racism and it is a culture
that developed in the US but also flourishes in certain strolls in Canada. In that area that stroll is referred to as high track.

There is a mid track, which is generally a stroll where the prices of services are less, and then the pejorative term to describe areas like the Downtown Eastside is low track but from the subcultural perspective of the street it is a pejorative term. Basically what you've had is those different strolls moving around. The low track, so-called, the Downtown Eastside prostitution has been displaced in the way $I$ already described. High track developed along Georgia Street, actually not far from this building, but was also affected by the nuisance injunctions when the boundary was moved from Burrard to Granville Street. That actually affected the prostitution along Georgia Street which is when you got the Richards/Seymour Street start to develop as the high track area. I don't know whether I've fully answered your question.

Q That is fine. That leads us to the question then, you've just been discussing the way prostitution is practiced --

A Street prostitution.

Q High track, mid track, low track. Let's discuss then how the factor of choice comes into all of this discussion, and what $I$ have in mind is just having you look to your report at the bottom of page 13 where you state as a heading Conceptualizing the degree of choice exercised in prostitution. In terms of the concept of choice, tell us how it is that you relate to that in your studies?

A So when I'm using the term "prostitution" I'm referring to the entire range of prostitution, so we're including escort services, various kinds of massage parlors, body rub parlors, women who work independently, as well as street prostitution. It is estimated that in Canada between five and 20 percent of prostitution occurs on the street, the rest is off-street. So when you're looking across the entire range of prostitution you realize that there is a class and race system within prostitution as well as in society more generally. I distinguish what I would call sexual slavery, the term trafficking is used in modern parlance, but sexual slavery is one human being or human beings forcing others to prostitute. It is itself a form of violence I
would say and should be a criminal offence in any decent society.

Then you have prostitution where a choice is exercised. I put that on a continuum. On one end a choice is made where a human being has very few other choices, addiction-driven prostitution by women who started when they were 12 , 14 or 15 years old, especially aboriginal women with the background of the effects of 200 years of colonization on aboriginal peoples in general. The term that's been used is "survival sex". In other words, a person would tell you they make a choice but it's most certainly not in conditions that they choose. There is a continuum to the opposite end which I would call "bourgeois prostitution" where a person makes the choice because of large amounts of money they can make prostituting but they have many other options or some other options. It is a continuum. In the middle there are women who are not driven to prostitution by desperation but what they're looking at is a variety of different low paid forms of service work and that for them prostitution is a preferable choice. It's better paid, it doesn't take them as long to do it, so
it's a choice in that sense.
I give an example of work done on the east coast by Jeffrey and MacDonald, a book called It's the Money Honey, for discussing that kind of prostitution. There's many examples of different analyses of different prostitution across Canada.

Q To discuss this continuum a bit more, at one end of the continuum is what you call the bourgeois prostitution. Give an example what that would mean.

A You have people who are educated. We have one sample, a student of mine, Tamara O'Doherty, purposely sampled the sort of mid to high-end range of off-street prostitution. She got 39 subjects. You have several women who have PhDs in that particular sample; you have women who are earning quite a bit of money; women who are not addicted to intravenous drug use or crack or any of those other circumstances. One of the things that we haven't studied nearly enough is student involvement in prostitution. Instead of student loans, some students go to escort services and work for short periods of time or on and off. I know several professors around the world who are former prostitutes, former sex workers of one
kind or another. So there's a lot of different styles of prostitution and degrees of choice being exercised.

Q At that range of the spectrum, the bourgeois range, you mentioned there could be a lot of money meaning what? Give us an example.

A The more exclusive prostitution becomes, the fewer clients a person is likely to have and the longer they're likely to spend with them. If a person spends a night with a client they may be earning thousands of dollars. Some women will charge 500 or a thousand dollars an hour depending on the style of prostitution. Often those liaisons are made through contacts on the Internet or through madams who specialize in high-end prostitution.

Q Let's then provide a bit more detail for the mid point of the spectrum, and obviously we'll then come to the other end, the survival end, but let's deal with the mid point. You mentioned this would be lower paying jobs. Give us an example of the choice that might be made of a job in prostitution versus what other types of jobs.

A Again, I'd refer to this work done in the Maritimes by Geoffrey and McDonald. You're
looking at various kinds of service work for women who don't have a great deal of education, don't have various kinds of work skills or haven't developed them so they're going to be relatively young. Some of them may have started prostitution before the age of 18 , some may have started it after the age of 18. They could work for largely minimum wage jobs. Restaurants, various kinds of service work, whatever it may be, shop assistant, sales clerk. One way or the other they overcome the psychological hurdles that are created by the stigmatization of prostitution. They may go to an escort service or a massage parlour, they may decide it's not for them or they may decide they prefer this kind of work because of the relative freedom it gives them, depending upon the circumstances of the location in which they work. Off-street locations can be quite exploitive. There are various ways that they are able to exploit people who work for them.

Q That then leaves the far end of the spectrum, the survival end. What is that characterized by?

A If you look at studies of samples of mostly street-involved women, about 60 to 70 percent of
them begin prostitution prior to the age of 18 , so regardless of what kind of background they come from, they find themselves in what $I$ would call situational poverty. They're not eligible for welfare. If you're 16 or 17 you may be eligible for something called independent living. If you're younger than that you find yourself out on the street. When you look at the profiles of the people involved there's a lot of state-raised youth, 30 to 50 percent depending on the survey. You'll find people raised in foster homes for at least part of their lives or group homes. Then you have the very particular plight of aboriginal peoples and the effect of 200 years of colonization. When you compare some of their circumstances you often find that there's intergenerational involvement and that can be with people non-aboriginal as well, but you often find they start earlier, often reasons that they've run away from their own home or group or foster home. Many of these people, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, have backgrounds of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. Then we find those people living on the street. One of the things that you often hear people say is it's the
first time it felt like home because what they encounter is other people with similar kinds of problems. Survival sex work enters at that point, it's one of the ways of surviving. If those elicit sort of subcultures also include various kinds of drug use, drug use develops into patterns of addiction, addiction can then drive the need for prostitution. There's various forms of exploitation that can occur, boyfriends needing drugs, all sorts of other things. So there you have a situation where you have got a set of vicious cycles, especially as people become entrenched, don't get the education they need, they can't write resumes so they find themselves entrenched in a kind of vicious cycle.

Q I think that then leads to a discussion that starts at page 9 of your report about A Two-Tier System of Law Enforcement. Why do you use that as a title in your report, $A$ Two-Tier System of Law Enforcement?

A Since 1985, December 20, 1985, was when the soliciting law was repealed and the communicating law enacted in its place. The soliciting law, there were hardly any charges after the Hutt decision in 1978 for a variety of reasons related
at the time to jurisprudence more than anything else. The communicating law was designed to fix those problems. It's estimated that only five to 20 percent of prostitution is on the street, and yet since 198595 percent -- I should be more accurate -- between 93 and 95 percent of all charges have been for communicating, not for the kinds of offences that would be involved in offstreet prostitution, i.e. bawdy houses, procuring, living on the avails. So I call this a two-tier of prostitution law enforcement in Canada.

Essentially off-street prostitution, apart from a handful of investigations here and there, off-street prostitution is effectively legal. Street prostitution is very different. Police have always told me over the years that law enforcement is largely complaint-driven. Most of the complaints they receive about prostitution come from residential areas when there's street prostitution. What we learn from that is prostitution occurs in our midst on a massive scale on a daily basis, often in corner malls without us even knowing it's there. No attention is paid to that. I once asked a regional crown
counsel when $I$ saw in the VPD vice squad pictures of various escort owners, why they weren't prosecuted and there was effectively what I would call a policy at the time: We don't prosecute those because we know what will happen if we stop what's happening off-street, it will put it on the street. The memory of what happened when the Penthouse and Zanzibar was closed was fresh in their minds at the time, so it's almost like you had a deliberate policy.

When you look at the statistics the situation is clear, there's de facto legal prostitution off-street as compared to illegal prostitution on the street which is where the law enforcement is focused.

Q What happened with the Penthouse? Many of us were too young to follow that case, but tell us the result of the Penthouse issue.

A I wish I was too young to follow that. In 1975, for reasons unknown -- the soliciting law was enacted in 1972 and the report goes through these laws as well. The original law before that was a vagrancy law. For reasons unknown in 1975 -- let me backtrack. In 1974 a woman by the name of Monique Layton published a report for the BC

Police Commission in which she analyzed prostitution. That report mentioned indoor prostitution. It was quite prophetic. She said in that report the people involved in Penthouse prostitution -- essentially it was a place where customers and sex workers met, they would leave for the conduct of the sexual activity and then return later. It's not known why a decision was made to mount an investigation against the club. There was an undercover operation in the fall of 1975 which ended up with the police laying charges against the owners and several employees for living on the avails, there may have been procuring charges, I don't know. Layton's report said that they dance around the law and any effort to try and prosecute them would likely be doomed to failure, it was prescient. The lower courts found the parties guilty but on appeal all of the convictions were overturned. The Penthouse was closed in 1975, it did not reopen until I think it was 1982, so you had that meeting venue closed. There was a police investigation of the Zanzibar as well. Charges were never laid and mysteriously the club burnt to the ground. My recollection is the owner was
charged with arson but not convicted.
Q You've described the two-tier system of law enforcement as you view it. You then set out a table of charges at the middle of page 9. What $I$ want to ask you about is to look at this and keep in mind our time period for terms of reference which is 1997 to 2002. This is the timeframe when it appears that Pickton was most active. By looking at the chart it seems that there is a drop in charges during that timeframe. Can you help us understand from your expertise if that drop in charges had any impact on the serial killer such as Pickton?

A What those charge rates say to me is that once you had an equilibrium established where prostitution was confined to certain industrial and commercial areas and largely out of residential areas, then there was much less concern on behalf of the police department for prosecuting communicating offences. I don't think that that is an offence that in the subculture of policing is high on a police officer's list of things to be doing. I think police often -- they often express to me the idea that this was a revolving door, sentences tend to
be relatively light. What you're seeing there is once you've got prostitution contained there's much less of an interest in enforcing the communicating law, and when you look at that press release and the information sheet that was put out at the same time, police are reflecting on the difficulties of this particular population and the sort of -- sort of the almost waste of resources sometimes in these kinds of charges. So once it's out of sight it's out of mind. That's what I'm seeing in those statistics. Once it's out of mind police don't need to enforce the communicating law to create that equilibrium. Once it's there the charges fall off.

Q So once there's less enforcement did that mean less police presence?

A It may well have meant less police presence. There were other things that were happening in the area north of Hastings Street. One of them was the use of bail and probation order area restrictions which had the effect of -- basically what that is if a woman is convicted of a communicating offence part of her conditions may include not being in the prostitution stroll areas. So what a woman would do is move to the
streets immediately adjacent to those areas and hang out there hoping to catch a date as a man was driving into the stroll area. The effect of that was that particular stroll tended to get larger and larger. The women got more and more spread out. There's no eyes on the street as there would be in a residential area. When women are spread out in an area like that in back alleys and pushed off the main streets, they're much easier targets for a misogynistic predator pretending to be a client.

Q You've said something that's important, a predator pretending to be a client. I will come back to that because $I$ think that's an important discussion. Just to clear up your comments about the press release and what was being told to the public, I think you've referenced words at page 10 of your report, you reference a notice and it's indented and single-spaced; do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Tell us about that notice. Who put that out?
A We came across this when we were doing our evaluation of the communicating law for the Department of Justice Canada. The notice reads: The many families with kids in Strathcona
are very worried by the presence of street prostitutes in our neighbourhood. We are asking you, as fellow parents and members of the community, to avoid certain areas where families live, and children play and go to school. The police have agreed to enforce all laws most stringently in residential areas and in particular around the schools and playgrounds. Please keep your business to non-residential areas.

As an observer at the time $I$ thought this is a rather interesting strategy to the extent that instead of treating these women as outsiders it treated them also as members of the community, as part of us, not part of them, and it was a very successful strategy because women moved. You
don't have to use an iron fist in order to displace women. But if what you say is, "We will not arrest you here but we will arrest you here," then you've basically given them a choice. You've told them that there's somewhere they can operate, and when you do that they try to be as helpful as they can. Unfortunately in this case, the area that they were moved to and the way that things developed meant that those same women in
their spirit of co-operation had unwittingly put themselves at greater risk in my opinion.

Q I want to reference the press release you spoke about, it's tab $H$ to your report, Exhibit H. It's a media release, February 25, 1997, under the signature of Rich Rawlins, Deputy Chief Constable, and Terry Blythe, Deputy Chief Constable, and of course Constable Blythe became Chief of Police later on. That's the media release you were speaking of?

A Yes.
Q To move to the discussion flowing from your comment that there were no eyes on the street and the women became much easier targets, less safe, I'd like to discuss the issue of vulnerability of violence as it relates to these people. You've covered this starting at page 22 of your report. I think this is an important discussion for us to hear about from your knowledge base. Tell us about the violence as it relates to the Downtown Eastside women who are involved in prostitution or sex trade.

A When we look at different kinds of sex work and the susceptibility of the men and women involved, mostly women, and look at the rates of
victimization in different venues, whether we look at homicides that have occurred or whether we look at self-report studies in social survey research, the people who seem most susceptible to violence are those who work on the street. Even when you look at street prostitution, there appears to be considerable differentiation of the risk of violence. Part of that is a reflection of the income of both clients and sex workers. For example, if we look at the people who are prosecuted under the communicating law in the 1990s, the large majority, 80 to 90 percent depending upon which period we look at, come from East Vancouver, they are low socio-economic men. When we look at the women involved on the Downtown Eastside, when we look at the level of prices of different forms of sex work those are the lowest. When a trick is maybe $\$ 40$-- and I will give you an example of the desperate situation of some women -- I was going to a meeting of social service agencies on the Downtown Eastside. Back in the '90s I sat on a variety of committees. A woman approached me and offered me a date for $\$ 5$. I was amazed. Basically that was going to be the price of the
next hit of crack or whatever it was going to be. People operating at that level of commercial sex don't have room -- don't have the money to pay $\$ 20$ for a hotel room. Whereas if you were to go to high track where it might be between $\$ 100$ and $\$ 200$, paying $\$ 20$ for a hotel room is not a stretch. Right there you're much more likely to see those women having to turn tricks in remote locations, a parking lot near by Trout Lake, down by the docks, wherever it may be. She is alone with somebody who might be a predator, she's at much, much greater risk. You have another factor that if a woman is feeling dope sick, the need for -- I'll let that siren pass by -- the symbolism of the siren and what I'm talking about, I can't help but notice it. So you add in the issues of substance use and addiction and the desperation that those produce and then you've got a person who is going to take greater risks, is exercising a much less degree of choice about who she's going to go with and so on, and so you see this continuum of violence. The women who are the most disadvantaged are the most abused.

Q Is there a relationship between the price for a sex service and the price of a drug?

A Yes.
Q How so?
A Well, often the price of the sex service will be the price that's required for the next amount of whatever drug it is, crack cocaine, heroin, Ts and Rs, whatever the case may be.

Q You mentioned dope sickness. What is it and what are the symptoms?

A Basically a person who is on a heavily addictive substance, if they're not getting that substance are going to go through various kinds of withdrawal symptoms. The easiest way to deal with those withdrawal symptoms is to take the drug again. So if you're in that situation, you're more likely to take a greater risk in order to alleviate the pain you're feeling.
Q You mention the word "trick" and you mentioned the word "date". They're actually different words used in different segments. I think it's interesting for you to give us your knowledge on that.

A The term "trick" is really -- in my understanding emanates from the African American pimp subculture. That particular subculture has an attitude whereby a man who buys sex is not really
a man, in the sense that he has to buy sex. If you think about the way the psychological game of the classic pimp operates is that he withholds love, he withholds sex from a woman he's managed to make psychologically dependent on him, so he is being paid for sex in a sense so he is the highest form of man. That kind of thinking does not necessarily translate to other kinds of prostitution, indoor or out. I would say on the Downtown Eastside the much more likely word to be used for a client would be a "date". When you're seeing women passing around information -- once we started to realize the enormous amount of violence these women were being subjected to, different organizations start collecting information that were called bad date sheets. They were called bad date sheets and not bad trick sheets when it came to the Downtown Eastside in order to respect the language of the local women -- or at least that was my interpretation of it.

Q That's interesting. I wanted to ask you about that for that reason. We'll hear more about bad date sheets later. On this important discussion about the violence these women are exposed to, in
your report you talk about two forms, you talk about situational and predatory. Before we discuss the predatory, which is an important concept for the commissioner to hear about, let's discuss situational violence. What does that mean?

A These concepts were developed in research that we did in the early 1990s for the Department of Justice. I'll give you a little bit of background about that research. In 1985 the Fraser Committee, special committee on pornography and prostitution had argued that there needed to be a wholesale revision of Canadian prostitution law. Is prostitution legal or isn't it? If it's legal we need to decide where and under what circumstances it can occur, so they recommended wholesale law reform. Instead what the government of the day did was simply reform the street prostitution law. What some of the commentators said at the time was that was going to increase the marginalization of street involved women. One of the things as we started to evaluate that law that we wanted to look at was the hypothesis: Will this new law make women more susceptible to violence? So we
started to track violence.
In 1991 for the first time the homicide statistics put out by Statistics Canada including a category that recorded the occupation of the murder victim and what became immediately obvious was there was a very large number of women involved in sex work, street sex work in those statistics. A woman in the Department of Justice by the name of Lori Biesenthal was looking at the statistics and going, "My god, we have to do something about this." On the outside I was looking at similar statistics but $I$ was putting them together from newspaper reports and VPD files and so on. I approached the Department of Justice in 1991, probably 1991 or '92, '92 I think, and asked them to do some exploratory research on violence and they did fund that research and it was during that that we started to look at different incidents of violence. We came to the conclusion that you could classify two very broad types of violence, we called one situational and one predatory. Situational violence occurs when there is some kind of conflict during the date. It could be all sorts of things, a conflict about the nature of the
service, the price, a man might be high on cocaine or drunk so he might not be functioning properly -- it doesn't matter what the reason is but there is a conflict. The man resorts to violence to resolve that conflict. For him to do that in the first place suggests to me that he has a particular attitude to women, just that he will use violence to resolve a conflict like that. That's situational. If you had for example a massage parlour where third parties are present or if you're in a hotel where there was a bellhop downstairs that's much less likely to occur because there's third party involvement. Predatory violence is quite different --

Q Before we discuss that let me ask you, the situation you've just now been helping us understand, would there be any element of premeditation involved in situational violence?

A No, not premeditated. That's the distinctive difference, that's the distinctive difference.

Q That leads us to this important discussion about predatory violence. Please help us understand from your expertise about this.

A Predatory violence is that kind of violence perpetrated usually by a misogynistic man. It
might involve a person who decides that a woman is likely to have money on her working on the street so he pretends to be a client in order to get a secluded location in order to rip her off, or it might be something like Gary Ridgway, the Green River Killer, who posed as a client in order to get women under this control in order to be able to murder them. So what you have is the man posing as a client in order to carry out some other intention.

Q You discuss this in your report at page 27. I'm going to read from your report starting at the top:

Predatory violence is premeditated. Sometimes it is financially motivated, such as a planned robbery. On other occasions it is designed to hurt -- or kill -- a prostitute. The offender poses as a client in order to get the intended victim to a secluded location where he can carry out an attack.

Predators target the unregulated and mostly unmonitored prostitution strolls where they can pick up a street worker without being seen. They know that they
will be able to find women who enter their cars -- and thus come under their control -relatively easily. They apparently believe that if these women go missing there is little likelihood of anyone noticing, and even if they do notice, police will be reluctant to mount an investigation. Serial killer Gary Ridgway exemplified this attitude.

The area I wanted you to reflect on is how does this discussion about predatory violence as you define it and discuss it relate to Willie Pickton?

A I think that from what I've been able to put together about Mr. Pickton's modus operandi and his behaviour is that he is a classic example of this predatory behaviour. Some of the evidence I would use is a reading of the description of the history of the missing women and the circumstances surrounding those women reported by Jamie Cameron (sic) in the book On the Farm. What it shows, she discusses a variety of situations as she traces back and finds information about the various women who went missing. It's clear that Willie Pickton's
primary area for picking up women was in the Downtown Eastside. There was certain hotels he hung out at, testimony from witnesses that talked about travelling with him on one occasion first to New Westminster to pick up drugs and then later to the Downtown Eastside where he picked up a woman. It may be that on occasions people like Ridgway and Pickton were clients -- a client being a person who makes a contract, lives up to the contract and then leaves afterwards without harming the woman in any way. He does what they agreed. But if his intention is to do something other than that, in my opinion he's no longer a client. He's a person now who is posing as a client in order to carry out a different agenda.

Q That agenda being?
A To murder the woman.
THE COMMISSIONER: If I have this right, Dr. Lowman, you're saying that based on what you know and the information you've been given about Pickton that he was a predatory person who premeditated his acts, planned his acts ahead of time?

A Yes, and the further evidence I'd use in that particular respect is the reports about the entry of gun shots to three of the victims. It appears
that -- and also his description to one of the other persons who testified in the trial about how he would have a woman in front of him and mount her from the rear, bring her hands behind her back, use a device to tie her up. It seems that his intention, if he did indeed shoot those women in the back of the head, he had to have that all prepared in a way that would not be obvious to her in order to be able to carry out that murder.

THE COMMISSIONER: So your opinion, what you're telling us is that Pickton would have planned ahead of time in a premeditated manner and formed that intent at the time he was picking up the women or even before that?

A Yes, and if you think about the likelihood that he may have done that five times or 10 times or 49 times, the idea that he didn't premeditate it sounds rather unlikely to me.

THE COMMISSIONER: And you say that because situational violence takes place when a particular transaction or situation goes awry?

A Yes. When he is deliberately setting up a person to be able to execute them from behind, I don't see it as something happening in the situation
that would provoke that attack.
2 THE COMMISSIONER: You say that he had the intent to kill.

6 MR. VERTLIEB: This might be a good time for the morning

8 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
9 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing will now adjourn for 15 minutes. Your opinion is that he had the intent to kill at the time he apprehended and picked up the women?

A Correct.

$$
-2
$$ break.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 11:07 A.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 11:23 A.M.)

THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed. MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Commissioner, I would just like to do something $I$ was remiss in not doing earlier and that is to introduce to you my colleague, Andrew Majawa, Mr. Brongers is back in the office today. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

## MR. VERTLIEB:

Q Dr. Lowman, let's discuss the relationship with the police and the women working in the sex trade. You cover this in your report starting at page 28. I would like you to focus on the low track sex work and the police relationship. Tell us about that from your professional knowledge.
A I think that one thing one doesn't want to do is
make a sweeping generalization about police attitudes. They're varied. When we would talk to women on the Downtown Eastside in the mid-1990s one particular VPD officer's name would come up constantly as being somebody who cared and somebody who helped. However, you also found women expressing great concern about the mentality of other officers who they perceived as not really caring about them. One reads in accounts by these women of having police officers take condoms from their purses; starlight tours, being picked up in one place, dropped off in another.

So it's like most things in life, they're gray, they're not black and white, but one of the things that the research indicates is that there is a very high level of distrust by the women, street-involved women, of most police officers and especially uniformed officers who often don't have a specific sort of mandate. They're involved in general patrol work, et cetera, et cetera. It's a little bit different when it comes to certain specialized teams. I often heard women in the early 1990 s saying positive things about a sexual assault squad. But, in
general, a great degree of mistrust.
Q Is there an inherent tension, as it were, between the conflicting functions the police have in law enforcement and protection?

A It's something of an oversimplified description to say that through the police eye there are really two kinds of people: citizens and criminals. I mean, that's an oversimplification case. But nonetheless, these women are involved in a variety of different kinds of criminal behaviour, one of them is possession of drugs, the other one is communicating in a public place for the purpose of selling sex. The law itself encourages an adversarial relationship between street-involved women and the police. Simply because often in order to be able to report a bad date they have to admit committing a crime. It's a structure that tends to discourage the reporting of serious incidences of assault and other problems.

Q So with the best of police intentions, an officer in uniform faces a difficult environment with conflict on the law and the application?

A Regardless of his own attitudes.
Q I want to then in the context of the
relationship, and you've spoken about how the authorities would move these people to industrial areas that were less well-lit and you've spoken about the woman being more at risk and you've covered that earlier, in effect, what's your view of what happened with the approach that was being taken?

A The police solved one problem, it was the problem confronted by residents, and it's not just something that's characterized as police attitudes. If you look back at political attitudes more generally it's the same thing. Public priorities, public propriety and property values are prioritized over the problems these women face. I once watched a member of a residents group tell a parliamentary committee these women are scum, that's the word he used. What happened with the movement of the women to the north side of Hastings Street is one problem got solved -- nuisance. But there was no attempt as far as $I$ could see to do the things you would need to do to that area to protect those women. Various kinds of monitoring, development of systematic relationships with the police, making sure there was eyes on the street, making sure
there was proper lighting, entertaining the idea that if we couldn't get these women out of prostitution we might try and do something to make them safe, by giving them a safe place that they might be able to continue these activities until we could find some way of helping them out. So I don't think it was the intention of anybody to make this a more dangerous area or the situation worse, but $I$ think that's exactly what it did.

Q You mentioned monitoring. What do you mean by that?

A You would have systematic patrolling of the area, you would make sure that you were having a situation where you had a location where dates were being consummated. You might even go to various tactics that have been used in places like The Netherlands where you set up parking stalls. I'm talking about being pragmatic here, trying to fix the immediate problems of violence and murder occurring. Those were the kinds of things one might have tried to do. Just in general, trying to break down that adversarial relationship between the women and the officers who were charged with their safe-keeping.

Q From your study of criminology and you mentioned the relationship between the police and the women at risk, do you have thoughts about what could have been done in that regard?

A At one point in the report $I$ talk about, again, this problem of the adversarial relationship between street-involved women and the police. What one has to do is break down that adversarial relationship, promote the development of community ties, promote relationships. I was involved in the organization PACE for the period 1994 to 2004, I was on the board of directors, and one of the things we were systematically trying to do was encourage the use of former sex trade workers to help educate police, a variety of different tactics could be used. But, again, the police themselves find themselves -- it's a difficult situation to the extent that they have a set of hypocritical and unprofessional prostitution laws. As long as those laws are the way they are, in a sense police are left in the position of having to make those laws by making decisions about what laws they enforce, what laws they don't enforce. There are so many layers of problems.

Dr. Lowman, I have covered the areas that I wanted to cover with your oral evidence. We have your report.

Mr. Commissioner, I'm told by my colleagues that amongst them they've discussed Mr. Ward going next which won't be the normal approach and then Mr. Baynham and then I think Mr. Gratl, just so you know, so I believe it's Mr. Ward up next. Thank you, doctor.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARD:
Q Cameron Ward, counsel for the families.
Sir, what I propose to do is I'm going to cover at least the following four general areas with you. First I want to ask you some questions following on the exchange that you had with my friend Mr. Vertlieb and Mr. Commissioner concerning the circumstances of Pickton's formulation of his intent to take street workers from Vancouver and later murder them. The second area I want to address with you will be something you just spoke to which is the attitude of police towards sex trade workers, especially those who work on the street. The third area will be the concept of displacement that came up early on in
your testimony. And finally, I have some questions for you about the issue of the set of sex trade workers and, again, especially those that carry on their activities on the street as opposed to off the street. Being a lawyer I may come up with some other things as I go along and I reserve the right to question you about other things as well.

As I understand it, during the exchange back and forth that I mentioned between the commissioner and yourself and in response to some of Mr. Vertlieb's questions, I understood you to express your professional opinion that Pickton probably planned to kill sex trade workers from the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, that pursuant to that plan he posed as a client or potential client in order to pick them up in Vancouver with the intent to later kill them and dispose of their bodies elsewhere. We know now that the elsewhere was in Port Coquitlam on his pig farm. Did I get that right?

A Yes.
Q So it would follow, I take it, in your opinion as an experienced criminologist, that the police in the City of Vancouver would have had a
responsibility to investigate the disappearances of the women when those disappearances were reported to them?

A That would make sense, yes.
MR. DICKSON: I'm sorry, commissioner, just before we pursue this line of inquiry -- sorry, it's Tim Dickson for the VPD -- I've not seen in Dr. Lowman's expertise a basis for that line of questioning, leaving aside the legal conclusion --

THE COMMISSIONER: You're going to tell me that's an ultimate decision for the commission to make?

```
MR. DICKSON: Certainly that's part of it.
```

    THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Ward?
    MR. WARD: I accept that and I was going to move to my next subject area.
    MR. GRATL: I just rise -- Jason Gratl -- I just rise to note that although Mr. Ward accepts that proposition I certainly do not accept the proposition that Professor Lowman is unqualified to give and it's not of the ultimate legal issue in terms of jurisdiction of the police department but certainly of the practices of the Vancouver Police Department and other police departments in taking jurisdiction over investigations.

MR. DICKSON: Mr. Commissioner, I don't see any basis at the

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Why don't we deal with it when you're

8 MR. GRATL: I'm quite content to lay the foundation for that
moment in Dr. Lowman's qualifications going to jurisdiction. There's been no foundation of that so far. Perhaps we'll leave this for Mr. Gratl's examination and we can discuss it at that point, but I don't see any qualifications --cross-examining him. expertise.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Ward.
MR. WARD:
Q Thank you. I actually have perhaps a question or two more on this point and I anticipate that, again, being a lawyer and thinking of things as they come up, I anticipate that my friend Mr. Dickson or Mr. Hern representing the Vancouver Police Department may wish to rise and offer their objections.

The first question, sir, have you read the Missing Women Investigation and Review authored by Deputy Chief LePard?

A Yes.
Q In that document he wrote this -- this is Exhibit 1, Mr. Commissioner, at page 18 -- as one of the four key findings of his review, he said at page

4 :
The VPD passed on ALL INFORMATION about Pickton to the RCMP when it received it because the RCMP had jurisdiction over the investigation of information pertaining to crimes occurring in Coquitlam.

Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q If the opinion you just expressed is correct, then that statement would from your perspective as an experienced criminologist with all of the qualifications that are set out in your CV as referred to by my friend Mr. Vertlieb when you were tendered as an expert, that statement would simply be wrong. It's not the jurisdiction of Coquitlam but the jurisdiction of the Vancouver Police over these issues, the issue being disappearance of the missing women?

THE COMMISSIONER: Don't answer that.
MR. DICKSON: Tim Dickson for VPD, and I rise again. Mr. Ward referred to the answer that Dr. Lowman previously gave and that answer was the subject of an objection that I imagine hasn't yet been resolved, but we do object -- as I heard you, Mr. Commissioner, Dr. Lowman was accepted as an
expert in prostitution and the matters covered in his report. This is not a matter covered in his report. There's been no foundation set out about any expertise in jurisdictional elements of policing. Dr. Lowman is not a police officer, he's a criminologist who started off in geography and moved into looking at prostitution, and I respectfully submit there's no foundation for him to offer that opinion on this matter.

MS. TOBIAS:
to what Mr. Dickson has said that I don't think that my learned friend Mr . Ward made the concern -- of course there are going to be witnesses from both RCMP and Vancouver Police Department talking about structural issues including this one, so I think that you can look forward to being fully informed and my friend Mr. Ward can get the information from the people who are best able to give that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Ward, anything more?
MR. WARD: Thank you. In response to both of my friends, firstly, my friend Mr. Dickson is quite correct, the subject of this question is not contained in Professor Lowman's report but arose from the exchange that $I$ referred to between commission
counsel, himself and yourself, Mr. Commissioner, and I was just embarking with a few more questions further to that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Can we not solve this by -- isn't that really a matter ultimately for argument? What Dr. Lowman said that it was his expert opinion based on his knowledge of predators and situational offenders that probably Pickton had the intent to kill, formulated it sometime ago, came to Vancouver with that intent still intact and then committed the murders somewhere else. I think that's what he's saying but that's ultimately for argument as to whether or not which jurisdiction it took place in. I'm going to have to decide that at the end of the day. Ms. Tobias.

Thank you, commissioner. Cheryl Tobias. I was going to remark as well what my friend is straying into as well is something that is a question of fact that is something that was a matter of very detailed evidence at the trial and it's not really evidence as a question of fact that with respect Mr . Lowman is in a position to give. I fully accept that Mr. Lowman has demonstrated a basis on which to talk about
predatory so-called clients and what their behaviour is. But as to whether Mr. Pickton actually did less or so, to be fair I don't think he can be asked those questions.

MR. VERTLIEB: If I may, not to take a position on it, but it is covered in his report at page 27 and I believe I read that out, just so my colleagues are aware of that coverage in the report.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Surely at the end of the day that's a matter for argument. He is entitled to give that opinion based on his expertise as to where he thought Pickton would have formed the specific intent, and whether that argument is sustainable is something that counsel will have liberty to argue.

MR. GRATL: I wonder, Mr. Commissioner, whether it could simply be asked of Professor Lowman if he has any expertise in the area of where police departments, jurisdictions --

THE COMMISSIONER: We're not talking about police officers or jurisdictions. What we are talking about here and the expert evidence he gave was that there are two types of situations: a situational crime and a predatory crime. His view, his opinion is that based on what he knows about the Pickton
case -- and I assume he means by that the numbers -- that the intent to kill probably was formulated much sooner than later. That's my summary of what he's saying.

One last follow-up point on this -- Tim Dickson -- the basis of what Dr. Lowman knows about Pickton's practices as I heard it was Stevie Cameron's book called The Farm and some unidentified other sources, and I think that ought to be kept in mind as well in combination with Ms. Tobias' point that there's going to be a number of witnesses here who are in a much better position to explain that.

THE COMMISSIONER: What you're telling me, Mr. Dickson, is that the evidentiary basis of his opinion may be suspect and surely that's something you can ask in cross-examination.

MR. DICKSON: That's exactly right.
THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Mr. Ward.
MR. WARD: Thank you. Having heard all of this I am indeed prepared to move on but I want to make, if I may have the liberty, to make two observations in respect of this. The first is with respect to Dr. Lowman's expertise, he has studied and written a series of papers on subjects related to
the geography of crimes and that's evident from his CV which is in the record. The second observation is simply I note that -- I think that was my first or second substantive question and the result of it leads me to the observation that this is an indication why anyone trying to participate in this proceeding should have lawyers and, secondly, why it's very clear in my view that we will need to extend the time period for this inquiry past the 31st of December.

Q The next area I propose to review with you, sir, is the issue of police officers' attitudes. Could I take you firstly to page 32 of your report which I think you have in front of you. In my copy it's tab 1. You were asked by the commission as part of the parameters for your report to provide -- to tell us whether you had information that would have helped the police in conducting the Missing Womens Investigation during the time period between ' 97 and 2002, the time period set out in these terms of reference, and if so, whether you had contact with them about those matters; right?

A Yes.
Q If I can summarize your response, it was that
during the course of your research on violence against sex trade workers you had analyzed some bad date sheets that had been compiled about two community organizations with respect to violence against street workers in the Downtown Eastside for the period between '85 and '92?

A Correct.
Q The gist of that was that those two nongovernmental organizations were compiling lists of bad dates on a weekly basis which included in some instances the licence plate numbers of the alleged offenders' vehicles; right?

A Correct.
Q Two members of the North Vancouver Police approached you once it was clear that you had access to that information and asked if indeed you did have the car licence plate numbers?

A Correct.
Q You learned that they themselves didn't have the licence plate numbers of the cars that were reported to have contained people who were abusing downtown Vancouver prostitutes because although those weekly sheets had been offered to them, the RCMP declined to accept them because they would not pay for the postage stamps; is
that right?
A That's what they told me.
Q If they were being truthful when they told you that they didn't gather the licence plate numbers of the bad dates that the Downtown Eastside community workers had compiled because of the cost of postage, would you agree with me that that suggests that the North Vancouver RCMP members who said that had an attitude of indifference to the fact that sex trade workers on the Downtown Eastside were being abused?

A In some ways yes and in some ways no.
Q Would you characterize it then as partly an attitude of indifference and partly an attitude about concern with respect to the resources to be spent?

A It indicates both of those problems. Also it indicates that they had at least come to my door to try and find out. Clearly I was surprised that they would need to come to my door to find out.

Q If I understand you correctly, they had enough concern to come to your door and ask you about the information compiled in the bad date sheets but not enough concern or money to ensure that
they received them when they were compiled and sent out; is that fair?

A That would be a reasonable inference.
Q You actually went through your records, listed the licence plate numbers that kept recurring with respect to reports of bad dates and you gave those to the police?

A Correct.
Q Do you still have those today?
A The chances are if $I$ were to dive deep into my many, many filing cabinets that $I$ probably do have those records today.

Q I may confer with you later about that.
A I can't be sure, by the way, but I keep information.

Q Would it be fair to say that as a result of your work in your area of professional expertise that you have acquired a great deal of experience and personal knowledge of the relationship between the police generally and sex trade workers?

A Yes.
Q And by "police" I'm referring to both members of the Vancouver Police Department and the RCMP; would that still be true?

A I have a much better understanding of the

Vancouver Police Department than the RCMP. I've had much more contact with the police department. Over the years they've co-operated on projects I've done. They've always had what I call an open drawer policy when it came to the various projects that $I$ worked, they were very helpful

Q Sorry, that's the --
A I call it open drawer policy.
Q I missed it. Which department?
A VPD.
Q You testified in your testimony in chief when canvassing the women themselves the name of one particularly considerate or helpful police officer in the department kept recurring?

A Yes.
Q Who was that?
A Dave Dickson.
Q Have you found -- I'll focus on the Vancouver Police Department attitudes for the moment -have you found in your own considerable experience whether there's a difference in the attitude manifested by male members of the department towards sex trade workers compared to the attitudes manifested by female members?

A I don't think $I$ have a basis on which to properly
answer that question.
Q
terms concerning the attitude of members of the Vancouver Police Department, male or female, towards street level, low track sex trade workers in Vancouver in the 1990s, or if you can't express a general view, could you provide your perspective on what that attitude might have been using examples if appropriate?

A I can express both general and specific opinions and observations, both through my own experience and through the experience of my research teams. Again, it's not a story that's just one-sided or black and white. I've met some police officers who clearly care a great deal about women involved in the sex trade, that was obvious to me. I've also met officers who I gained the impression thought that the women brought upon themselves the circumstances that they find themselves in. We've had -- just after the period of the nuisance injunctions we had researchers on the street, we had them before and after the injunctions and were monitoring that whole situation. One of my researchers overheard a police officer, a VPD officer, tell a woman on
the stroll that if anything happened to her she deserved what she got. I've heard police officers who were involved in the various Mount Pleasant task forces which ran from the late 1980s into the mid 1990s, and let me just describe some of the tactics that the task force used to successfully displace prostitution out of Mount Pleasant. Police would take a team, they would take a police cruiser and if a woman was on a corner they'd park the police cruiser by the corner and if she moved to another corner they would park another cruiser there. There would be starlight tours where a woman might be picked up in that area and left at UBC. Those kind of tactics. Taking condoms from women, dumping their purses out on the street. I heard one officer say: "If we treated any other people like this we wouldn't get away with it." I also heard residents asking police officers to take the women out into back alleys and beat them up, wouldn't that be a good way of clearing Mount Pleasant of the scourge? So you see those kinds of attitudes reinforcing some of the things that police officers think. So it's not all of a piece; it's like most things.

Q I want to make sure I understood a portion of that correctly. You personally heard a member of the Vancouver Police Department say in your presence, "If we treated any other person the way we are treating the street workers we would not get away with it"?

A Correct.
Q Did you get the identity of that person?
A I would not be able to disclose it. It was in the context of research and we have a guarantee of confidentiality.

Q But you know who it was?
A Yes.
Q Male or female?
A Male.
Q A male member of the Vancouver Police Department?
A Yes.
Q What time period?
A This would have been early 1990 s.
Q The starlight tour activity you mentioned, just so I have that right, that involves police officers picking up these sex trade workers in their chosen location of activity on the street and driving them across town to some other place far from their home territory and leaving them
there to fend for themselves, does it?
A Correct. It's women that are reporting that to us.

Q What sort of frequency would that activity recur on?

A That I don't know. I can't give you a number for that. I can tell you certainly more than one woman informed us that was the case. If you look at the compendium of research carried out in Vancouver by different people -- I know Kate Shannon will be a witness in this hearing and if you look at some of her research, I believe I saw in one of her tables mention of similar kinds of practices.

Q Just to be clear, you mentioned twice receiving reports that police officers had taken condoms from sex trade workers' purses. I inferred that these were unused packaged condoms?

A Yes.
Q So by doing that it would follow that the police officers taking those condoms away from these sex trade workers would be jeopardizing the womens' safety if in fact they did that?

A If they did not have condoms with them when they went on a date, then the risk of unprotected sex
would be enhanced.
Q Quite bluntly, the women could contract a lifethreatening illness if they didn't have those condoms anymore?

A Correct.
Q Your research goes right up to present day I take it?

A Different aspects of the research continue, yes.
Q Have you seen or experienced any improvements in any negative attitudes that members of the police department and the City of Vancouver have displayed towards the sex trade workers from time to time?

A I don't have a research basis to make a comment in that regard.

Q I want to ask you a few questions about one of the appendices to your report, if I may. It's the paper by your former student Tamara O'Doherty?

A Yes.
Q It's called Violence Against Women. I'm not sure where it is in the exhibit, but it's appendix $E$ to your report.
A Yes.
Q If I could take you to page 16 of that document.

She's compiled some evidence in table form -- and you're familiar with this I take it?

A Yes. I was her supervisor.
Q It would appear that based on her study which you supervised -- and this is a study just to be clear, looking at the first page, she focused on the question whether female off-street sex workers faced the same degree of victimization as female street-based workers in the City of Vancouver?

A Correct.
Q So she's looking at samples in the City of Vancouver and, in effect, comparing the victimization of two categories -- three categories actually, those who work in massage parlors, those who work as escorts -- and I'll stop there. Those two categories of sex trade workers are those that anybody can easily identify if, for example, they pick up today's Georgia Straight newspaper and flip to the back number of pages; is that fair?

A That's true, but more likely the Internet would be the source these days.

Q Internet is displacing print media it seems?
A Yes.

Q After masseuses and escorts there are the independents?

A Yes.
Q The independents would be sex trade workers who ply their trades on the streets of Vancouver?

A No.
Q Who are they?
A They are women who advertise primarily on the Internet, who would provide both in-call or outcall services but would not meet customers on the street. Her purpose example was designed
deliberately to catch people who were not meeting their clients on the street. That was its primary purpose. Only five of her 39 respondents had street experience.

Q Let me ask you about the survey of the independents as a foundation for my next series of questions. In this study you supervised, Ms. O'Doherty found, if I'm reading this information correctly, that with respect to acts of violence experienced by sex trade workers in the City of Vancouver, the survey reveals that police officers are almost as likely and in some cases more likely to victimize sex trade workers with threats, threats with weapons, physical
assault, sexual assault, kidnapping and theft as the women's clients would be; correct? I'm
looking on --
A Yes, yes.
Q That's right, isn't it?
A That is correct.
Q Would you consider from your study and experience street level, low track sex trade workers to be more or less safe than the independents referred to in Ms. O'Doherty's report?

A Yes, the evidence to that effect is overwhelming.
Q And it is?
A It is overwhelming. It comes from Lowman and Fraser, 1995, Currie -- sorry, '96, Currie's work 1996, Cler-Cunningham and Christiansen's work in 2001, the Farley study. I didn't go as far forward in my report as some of Kate Shannon's work but that shows similar kinds of finding. One of the things about O'Doherty's samples is it was 63 -- either 63 or 67 percent of indoor workers had never experienced any kind of victimization. When it did come to victimization, the large majority of those who had been victimized had been victimized just once and the most likely form of victimization was
theft from a co-worker. If you compare those findings to any group of women involved in street prostitution and you focus on the subgroup of women involved in the Downtown Eastside, the surveys show repeated victimization of a large proportion of the women involved over the last six-month period. It's overwhelmingly different.

Q And it's overwhelmingly worse and overwhelmingly more serious?

A Yes.
Q The evidence is overwhelming that sex trade workers on the streets of Vancouver are infinitely more likely -- pardon me -- are much more likely to be abused, threatened, assaulted and killed than those who ply their trade indoors in massage parlors, as escorts or as on-call people?

A It is overwhelming to the extent that it comes up time and time again in different surveys and the results are always the same.

Q I want to ask you about one of the surveys you mentioned. That's the work of Cler-Cunningham and Christiansen. It's one of the exhibits to your report, Exhibit J. They have canvassed in this report a number of subjects including
surveys of how the sex trade workers feel about the Vancouver Police Department?

A Yes.
Q Surveys about the level of violence including attempted murder that is directed towards them?

A Yes.
Q And is it fair to say that -- well, let me take you to the question about the attitude, page 73. 177 sex trade workers were asked whether they thought Vancouver Vice officers cared about their safety and fully a quarter of the respondents -more than a quarter of the respondents replied that none of them, none of the Vancouver Police Department Vice members cared about their safety; right?

A Correct.
Q There's plenty of evidence in this report that one of the prevailing attitudes women encountered when they reported threats of violence and actual violence to the Vancouver Police was an attitude of indifference?

A Correct.
Q Appended to this report is a document that in my respectful submission is significant. I want to take you to it and I'm sure you're familiar with
it. You know, sir, that one of the women that Robert William Pickton was accused of murdering was Sarah de Vries?

A Correct.
Q She was the victim in count 18 of the indictment first degree murder that Pickton faced initially?

A Yes.
Q Pickton was never prosecuted for her murder because the charge against him respecting the murder of Sara de Vries was stayed after Pickton's appeals were exhausted?

A Yes.
Q Sara de Vries was an author?
A Yes.
Q And she's written a poem that appears in the appendix to the Cler-Cunningham report?

A Yes.
Q You've seen that?
A Yes.
Q It's at page 103 in typewritten form and in her handwriting at page 104?

A Correct.
Q She's also written a short story about her experience of being taken from the Downtown Eastside, almost losing her life at the hands of
a john out in Port Moody or somewhere around there and then reporting it to the police; right?

A That is my understanding.
Q I've read this. Her account where she describes being picked up at the corner of Hawkes and Hastings in downtown East Vancouver by someone who appeared nice at first, being driven to a road in the middle of nowhere in Port Moody, and then being assaulted, being struck repeatedly, kicked repeatedly in the head with the man's black Dayton boots, somehow getting out of his grasp, managing to take a few dollars from his wallet which was on the console of the car between them, fleeing into the bushes with this man chasing her, scared out of her wits, and it concludes with her escaping and then describing what happened when she reported the attempted murder to the Vancouver Police Department?

## A Correct.

Q I want to read that bit to you and then ask you a question about it. She describes walking up and down this road in the vicinity of Port Moody for two hours with the man in the car trying to find her until finally a civilian, a good samaritan, comes along and picks her up and drives her to
the Vancouver Police Department. Do you recall reading that?

A Yes.
Q I'm going to read you what Sara de Vries has written from beyond the grave about her experience in reporting the attempted murder by this john to the Vancouver Police Department. It's at page 109. After this two hours, the john in the car has apparently given up, she writes this:

I almost died -- I think it's died and I cried. Feeling sorry for myself. Then I saw the main road. I got that extra lift from hope. The first car to see me stopped. He gave me a blanket. He was in shock. I think maybe more than I was. He drove me to the police station against my will but I had no fight left.

I'm sorry, I might have misspoke, it's hard to tell from this, but it's not clear which police station it is. I'll read it more fully later but the question remains the same and the point remains the same.

He drove me to the police station against my will but I had no fight left. I had one
thing on my mind. A fix. The pain and sickness were killing me. My eyes were almost swollen shut. I didn't want to go see any pigs. Their response was what I expected. I felt like a total cheap junkie whore standing there, sick, naked, beaten to a pulp and that's what they told me. They said I got what I deserved and they gave me nothing, no clothes, no bus fare, no help, no sympathy. Not that I expected it but still it hurt me and deeply. The truth hurts and part of what they said was true. I could feel my face redden and tears started to burn my tear ducts. My throat grew a lump and it burned and I still remember that tone of voice and that look he had on his face as clear as if it were right now.

Is what Ms. De Vries described in her handwritten story, a portion of which I've just read to you, consistent with your experience in studying the Vancouver sex trade with respect to how women involved in that activity reported responses from the police when they complained that they had been assaulted?

A It is characteristic of how some police officers react.

Q In your professional opinion what, if anything, can be done to correct or improve the way some police officers react when sex trade workers report to them that they have been abused or assaulted or nearly killed?

A It's difficult to know where to begin to answer a question like that. Clearly you need very concerted efforts in training, sensitivity training, training about the nature of sex work, training about the nature of the experiences of women on the Downtown Eastside. All of those kinds of things need to happen, but we're still dealing with a context of a country in which not even the judges on the Supreme Court of Canada could agree in 1990 about what Canadian prostitution laws are trying to achieve. When they can't agree about what the laws as a whole are trying to achieve, we're in trouble, and that includes the police. Fundamental changes need to be made at every level. Take the Criminal Compensation Injury Act case where a woman has been seriously injured because of her involvement in prostitution is told that participation in

7 MR. WARD: Thank you, sir. Mr. Commissioner, I note the time.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Do counsel agree or have advice as to the
prostitution is inherently dangerous in which case you get no compensation. Imagine telling that to a firefighter. It's written through so many layers of our reaction to these women that we need to change it all in order to be able to change the parts. I think it's the usual lunch break. caution against cross-examination is applicable in an inquiry as it is in trial?

MR. VERTLIEB: I think that we have some Law Society rules as well that impact on that. I'm comfortable if we follow the rules that once people are in cross they're not to be consulting with lawyers. THE COMMISSIONER: Does anybody have different thoughts? MR. GRATL: I have one caveat, Mr. Commissioner. What I'd like to do is present a package of documents to Professor Lowman by way of e-mail for him to review over the weekend so that I might ask him about some of those documents. Professor Lowman may or may not have seen some of those documents before. They are derived in part from concordance electronic database and he may not have seen those documents. That's a form of

2 THE COMMISSIONER: You would be entitled in the normal course

6 MR. VERTLIEB: I've spoken to Mr. Gratl and I think that's 7 fair.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Does everyone agree on that? Ms. Tobias? 9 MS. TOBIAS: I don't have any objections to my friend sending
contact. of events to put those to him in cross-examination. Does anyone have objection to Mr. Gratl e-mailing those documents? the documents to Professor Lowman. I think that that would facilitate matters, but also to facilitate matters because $I$ know once my friend finishes his cross-examination myself and Mr. Dickson will be expected to get up in the interest of efficiency, I would appreciate those documents as well.

MR. DICKSON: Tim Dickson. That was the comment $I$ was going to make. Speaking with Mr. Gratl it sounded like he wanted to put a number of documents to Dr. Lowman and that then forces us to review them and respond, so if he could circulate them to us as well I think that would be the most efficient course.

THE COMMISSIONER: Dr. Lowman, you've heard the comments I made with respect to cross-examination. You've
done this before.
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 THE COMMISSIONER: You can't talk to anyone when you're under

6 THE WITNESS: Understood.
7 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now adjourned until 2:00 p.m. cross-examination, save and except receiving the documents from Mr. Gratl.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:28 P.M.)
(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 2:00 P.M.)
THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed.
MR. CHANTLER: Commissioner, Mr. Ward will be here any minute. MR. WARD: Mr. Commissioner, I'm sorry I'm late. I'm coming straight from a meeting with counsel concerning document disclosure and some of the others who were in that meeting I don't think are here yet. I'm here, I'm ready I suppose to go but I might faint from lack of food.

Q Sir, the next subject, the third one I wanted to ask you about is what you have referred to is the concept of displacement and particularly geographical displacement.

A Okay.
Q You referred from time to time during your testimony to the nuisance injunctions. I have with me and I'd like to show you a copy of what $I$
understand to be the 1984 injunction that played a role in the commencement of displacement. For the benefit of counsel what I've made available is a copy of the BC Supreme Court, Attorney General v. Couillard a decision of Chief Justice McEachern pronounced July 4th of 1984 and reported at (1984) 59 BC Law Reports 102, CanLII version, which this copy is, 1984 CanLII 374.

Sir, I want to ask you, first of all, whether this document to your recollection is one of the nuisance injunctions of which you spoke?

A It is.
Q I want to seek your opinion on some of the statements -- your professional opinion -- on some of the statements made in the Reasons for Judgment, if I may. In the first paragraph the court said this:

What has happened in the West End is an urban tragedy that should never have occurred.

Speaking of the fact that sex trade workers were in the early '80s walking the streets of that residential Vancouver neighbourhood. Do you agree that that was something in the nature of an urban tragedy?

A Given the explanation that I would have had of the circumstances that led to the development of a prostitution stroll in the West End in the first place, I would say it's unfortunate that you have street prostitution in residential areas. I would say it's unfortunate that you have street prostitution at all. One needs to unpack the history that led to the development of the prostitution in the West End in the first place to sort of comment on that.

Q To the extent that you haven't spoken to that, would you remind us please of a bit of that history? How was it -- perhaps you might point your laser -- how was it that the street sex trade workers ended up in the West End of Vancouver, and if you would please point the laser to show the area we're speaking of here.

A The explanation that has often been given of the development of prostitution in the West End, and I would point as evidence for this a presentation by the group called Concerned Residents of the West End, CROWE, to the Fraser Committee when it had its hearing in Vancouver in 1984. The impression is that prostitution in that area occurred after 1978 after the Supreme Court
decision in $R$ v. Hutt, i.e. soliciting is not the mere offering of a service and a price to an undercover police officer posing as a client, but is pressing and persistent conduct. The explanation is that prostitution spread out of control after that point. I do not believe the historical records supports that view. The first time we found a reference to prostitution in the West End of Vancouver is in a Vancouver Sun article which if my memory serves me correctly was October 10 of 1972, and it talks about -- the article was titled Worried Davie Street Looks For Cure. Sleezy Elements Rooted in Quality Area. What it described is how a prostitution stroll had developed along parts of Davie Street and it was the local rate payers association talking about that prostitution. The explanation at the time was that certain nighttime activities had been displaced from Gastown and one of the reasons was change in bylaws that allowed certain places to stay open overnight. So what you had was a movement of street culture. But prostitution at that point was relatively confined.

However, you fast forward to 1977 and you
have a report from Corporal Forbes of the Vancouver Police Department who identifies 200 prostitutes working in the West End at that time. The explanation for the large expansion of prostitution in the West End is the closure of the Penthouse and the Zanzibar. Indeed, when we were doing ground research and field research in 1994 some of the people who had worked in the Penthouse were still around at that time and talked about how that stroll developed and why it expanded. One of the reasons it spread off Davie Street itself was because police tried to make it less obvious by moving it into the back alleys and the back streets. Of course what it became to the residents of the West End at that point was more obvious.

So is the development of prostitution in that area an urban tragedy or is it a powerful commentary about the self-defeating and contradictory nature of Canadian prostitution law, which on the one hand seems to be trying to keep it off the street and yet on the other hand given the nature of bawdy house laws and so on and so forth puts it back on the street. So you have a situation where prostitution was put on
the street by a certain kind of law enforcement effort and what we've been trying to do ever since is get it off the street or at least get it out of residential areas. I've got that documented in a paper in the Canadian Journal of Criminology 1986 if you want a source for that.

Q Thank you. Sir, is it the case that by the early 1980s, particularly 1983 and the period leading up to the pronouncement of this nuisance injunction, that these prostitution activities were occurring in the West End in the vicinity of Davie and Jervis streets, in that location?

A Through that period from January 1984, in fact we carried this exercise on until 1995, we did systematic head counts and censuses of the prostitution strolls all of them in Vancouver which included the West End. So on any given night -- we would do them systematically, do them every day of the week, we would do them 24 hours around the clock. We chose Thursday night to do a consistent census. All of those maps still exist and it shows the extent of that prostitution stroll. It also shows how prostitution literally relocated overnight with the nuisance injunctions.

As I mentioned before, the first injunction boundary was Burrard, you got the stroll developed now to the east of Burrard and then in the July injunction I believe it was the one that changed that boundary to Granville and that had an unanticipated consequence which was the effect it had on the Georgia stroll which was high track at that time and that developed after the closure of the Penthouse. The reason it had an impact on that stroll was because the women who were working on Georgia Street now needed to relocate. They went to the Richards and Seymour area because that is a pimped stroll, high track, and many of the women there went to Mount Pleasant and it's there you first see residents concerns and residents groups developing around prostitution in Mount Pleasant. The first indication historically we see of prostitution in Mount Pleasant was in 1982. You saw articles in the Vancouver Sun talking about hitch-hooking on Broadway.

Q Could you please with your laser pointer indicate on the map for the benefit of those who may not be familiar with the West End the part of the West End that came before the court in

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Can I ask what the relevance of all of this consideration of whether this injunction should issue? 5 MR. WARD: Yes, certainly. Where this is heading is picking

8 THE COMMISSIONER: From residential areas.
9 MR. WARD: Yes, from residential areas. The outcome was that
 up on the evidence in chief about the efforts made to displace sex trade workers. they ended up, as I understand it, in commercial or industrial areas which by their nature were less safe and these were the areas from which the missing women were taken and -- the '70s and '80s and shouldn't we be confined more to what happened in the '90s? As you know, the terms of reference are confined to 1997 to 2002. I appreciate that in order to get the full narrative in order to have the full background that some flexibility ought to be given, but we're starting to go back to the '70s and '80s and the Penthouse and Zanzibar and all those things and that took place in 1975, the Penthouse case was 1975. I'm just suggesting that maybe we're getting a bit far. We need to have concern
about the parameters of the terms of reference. MR. WARD: I am alive to that and I only note that your counsel, Mr. Vertlieb, elicited in the examination in chief of this witness the history of the closure of the Penthouse and the resulting displacements that occurred after that and I am seeking to ask some questions to provide some greater clarification to how that occurred. If it was relevant to the terms of reference such that it required him to question the witness -THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.

MR. WARD: Anyway, the nuisance injunction I've shown you -by the way, I would like this marked as the next exhibit.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit number 5. (EXHIBIT 5: Nuisance Injunction)

MR. WARD:
Q You can be seated, sir. If you turn to page 31 of the document, the judge who issued this injunction said the following, the last several lines:

Because of the exaggerated and totally indiscreet conduct of the respondents -Meaning the named sex trade workers.
-- and others in the past, I am going to go further than otherwise might be the case, but the respondents have brought this on themselves.

Would you in your professional opinion concur with that statement that the sex trade workers who were in the West End had brought the action of the court on themselves?

A I would say it's more complicated than that. Yes, people make choices but not in conditions which they choose. You have a situation where prostitution is legal and yet you have a situation where the Government of Canada refuses to tell persons engaged in sex work where they should conduct their work. You have a situation here where indoor locations were closed. You have a situation where people started to occupy this area because of changes in bylaws. You have people who would probably prefer to work in residential areas where there's more eyes on the street to see what is happening to them. So I would say it is much more complicated than saying people simply bring circumstances upon themselves.

Q I'm going to ask you next about a portion of
paragraph 34 , the judge said this, about three lines down:

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, what kind of people do these prostitutes and their associates think British Columbians are that
they would tolerate such indecency on $a$ continuing basis?

Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Do you have any comment on that statement?
A I suppose I would make the statement about the status of Canadian prostitution law in general and our approach to it rather than targeting it specifically at one group.

Q As we see in paragraph 35 , what the court did -and this is the Supreme Court of British Columbia in '84 -- was issue an order restraining certain activities from occurring within a specified geographic area; right?

A Yes.
Q And of course the effect of that order was to displace sex trade workers from that geographic area and push them further east in the City of Vancouver?

A Correct.

Q
Specifically, to push them further east to places where because of the absence of eyes on the street in commercial and industrial and warehouse zones, they were much less safe?

A I believe the evidence points very strongly to that conclusion about different kinds of areas and safety of street prostitutes, yes.

Q Sir, that leads me to the next and I think final area of my questions and that is this important, at least to my clients, perhaps others, the important issue, safety of those engaged in the sex trade. This is a subject that you have studied extensively; correct?

A Yes.
Q I noticed as I was reviewing your material that Cler-Cunningham and Anderson --

A Christiansen.
Q Christiansen, pardon me. In their survey they reported that fully a third of the sex trade workers, street sex trade workers they consulted, had reported attempts on their lives. Let me just turn that up.

A I don't remember all of the tables in great detail.

Q It's page 67 of the appendix, appendix $J$.

A I have it, under the heading Attempted Murder.
Q Attempted Murder, yes. Table 99. "33.1 percent report that someone has tried to kill them since they've worked on the street." Given that and given all of the other data that you have reviewed, working on the street as a sex trade worker particularly in the Downtown Eastside has been and continues to be an inherently risky activity?

A It's very dangerous, yes.
Q As you've already said, it's much more dangerous than engaging in sex trade services elsewhere, indoors?

A Yes, and also there's variation in different street prostitution strolls as well which reflects upon some of the criteria that create and shape risk that you've already mentioned.

Q What in your opinion were in 1997 through 2002 the most dangerous Vancouver strolls in relation to the risks associated to sex trade workers there?

A Downtown Eastside.
Q Overwhelmingly?
A Yes.
Q With respect to the police response to the safety
issue, what steps to your knowledge did the Vancouver Police take in that time period, 1997 to 2002, to address those safety issues for those workers on the Downtown Eastside?

A I did not do a study of police practices that would enable me to give a thorough answer to that question. One of the things that had happened in 1995 is that we had published a report for the Department of Justice that tried to raise a red flag over all of the murders that were occurring in British Columbia of street-based sex workers. We released that report roughly at the time that it seems Mr. Pickton's serial killing of women was beginning or gaining momentum, I'm not sure when the first victim would have been. I would have to go back through my notes to look at the various statements that were made about when a task -- I recall there being a task set up to look at a number of missing women. In 1995 there were three women whose bodies were found in the Fraser Valley, the murders of those three woman, Tracey Olajide, Victoria Younker and Tammy Lee Pipe, those murders were linked by the police. Were there any -- of course $I$ was also a board member of PACE at this point -- were there any
comprehensive efforts to try and change the nature of policing of these strolls, more monitoring, more systematic observation? Not to my knowledge. Individual officers were clearly taking some of these issues very seriously. I've met many police officers that do not believe a woman deserves to die because she's involved in sex. But was there a general attempt to do something about what the research was suggesting was a very, very serious problem? It didn't look like it.

Q Let me ask you a follow-up specific question on that point. Could you please turn to tab -- I'm sorry, this may be in a different place -- it's appendix $H$ of your report, my tab 9, maybe not anybody else. These are several pages, the first of which is a copy of a media release from the Vancouver Police Department dated February 25, 1997 headed Behind Street Prostitution Enforcement. Do you have it?

A I do.
Q It appears to have been signed by two deputy chief constables from the Vancouver Police Department, Deputy Chief Rawlins and Deputy Chief Blythe. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q If I could read you a passage at the beginning of this media release it states this: Since August of 1996 our focus on the street sex trade has been on, first, sexual exploitation of youth through prostitution and pornography; second, violence in prostitution; third, community safety and nuisance issues resulting from prostitution related activities; fourthly, targeting pimps and johns.
A Correct.
Q With respect to the safety issue that I'm focused on now, the phrase that $I$ just mentioned to you "violence in prostitution" may be ambiguous.
A Yes.
Q It may refer to violence against prostitutes or violence involving prostitutes?

A But one of the most common scripts around the world today is the prohibition script which says prostitution itself is violent, and you see parts of that script picked up in this report when it's suggesting in other parts that it's the client who is the "cause" of prostitution. So there's a lot of things going on in this script.

Q You subscribe to that script?
A Which one?
Q That prostitution itself is violent.
A No, I do not.
Q I'm sorry, I misunderstood. On the safety issue, further down in the memo, third paragraph, the authors say this:

Street prostitution is a controversial issue with legal, social, health and economic implications.

You would agree with that?
A Yes.
Q
The life of a street sex trade worker is frequently characterized by exploitation, violence, substance abuse and disease.

Agreed?
A Yes.
Q I want to draw your attention to the last sentence:

The Vancouver Police are developing and implementing innovative strategies at prevention as well as enforcement tactics to deal with the problems associated with street prostitution.

Do you see that?

A I do.
Q That phrase "innovative strategies" also appears at the end of the memorandum from Inspector Ken Dorn apparently prepared the following day which was directed to the chair and members of the Vancouver Police Board. If you flip over that page he has repeated that same sentiment at the bottom of the page?

A Yes.
Q Just focusing on that for a moment, are you aware from your extensive work in this area what the nature of the "innovative strategies" of the Vancouver Police Department said they were developing were?

A One of them I think is a commentary on the development of a sort of containment area, so we've managed at this point to displace prostitution out of the residential areas in Strathcona to the industrial areas. I don't know when the Oscar Ramos DISC program began which was an attempt to start to creating a database that related to some of these issues in terms of clients. I'm trying to remember what the acronym DISC stood for but my memory fails me on that one. I also worked quite extensively with

Inspector Dorn through this period and also Sergeant Bob Taylor prior to this period and it struck me -- both of them were heads of the vice squad when $I$ was doing research -- and it struck me that both of them were very much concerned about violence against prostitute women. But how much that carried through into actual policy at the line level is not clear to me. Was there any kind of program for sort of effective monitoring of the orange light district? Not that I was aware of. There clearly was an agreement that simply repeatedly prosecuting these women under the communicating charge was revictimizing them. When you read this text it's clear there is an understanding of the situation these women were finding themselves in. So there was a recognition that we were revictimizing them. There was a recognition that when a woman gets a fine what is the first thing she does? She goes back down on the street. So the solution is to create this containment area. In the early 1990s as Yaletown was being developed $I$ was called to a meeting of city planners. Where can we move this to? And by the way, this is confidential because we don't want a headline in the Province tomorrow
saying "Vancouver Sets Up Red Light District". So all this was going on in the background to understand this media release. So it was in a sense the best of a bunch of bad alternatives with the current law the way it is. There's a decision to stop this kind of enforcement, it's not been successful. The irony of it is that in many ways, although it wasn't the intention of Inspector Dorn, it created a situation that in some ways created even more problems. Yes, it solved the nuisance problems. But did it solve any problems for these women? Their real problems are addiction, poverty. We can talk about the law all we like but we need to deal with those fundamental issues and all of that stuff is going on. These are difficult issues.

Q Just so that I understand your testimony about the containment issue or policy, is it fair to characterize it this way, that the Vancouver Police facilitated the displacement of street trade workers from one or another area to another contained area because of expressions of concern from the public that they were causing a nuisance where they first were?

A Yes.

Q The response to the community, members of the public's concerns that these people were creating a nuisance manifested itself -- well, in the nuisance injunctions as well as police policy and action?

A Yes, it did and I've placed as an appendix to my report an article talking about newspaper articles on prostitution and what $I$ call a discourse of disposal. In 1983 Staff Sergeant Bob Taylor wrote a report when somebody went around the Downtown Eastside pinning notices on lamp-posts basically saying if you don't move out of this area some serious stuff is going to happen, and you'll see it mentioned in that appendix. I can't remember the exact wording but it was fairly sinister. Bob Taylor went and saw the individual, found out who had done that and intervened. There had been another situation in Mount Pleasant. You got different residents groups setting up there and, by the way, there was another containment area set up in Mount Pleasant to get prostitution out of residential areas which was 1st Avenue. A woman from one of the resident groups wrote a sort of mock letter which was published in the Sun to Clint Eastwood
who was the mayor of Carmel, "We have problems here in Vancouver, looks like we need you. p.s. bring your gun."

Q Sir, what you've referred to sounds like nimbyism in the extreme: Prostitution is going to exist but not in my backyard.

A That term "nimbyism" describes the attitude of many people to prostitution when it gets in their neighbourhood. In many ways, people's concerns who live in neighbourhoods where street prostitution occurs, their concerns are easy to understand. Difficulties with this, difficulties with that. They don't see it as their problem. Nimbyism takes over, just get it out of my area. There was demonstrations when Mike Harcourt was mayor, people occupied his office. We can't sleep in our neighbourhood so we're sleeping in your office. It's failure to deal with fundamental problems that leaves it to people in residential neighbourhoods and police departments to figure out these problems which are much bigger than they are. They still play a part in the problem, don't get me wrong. When you write a mock letter saying, "Bring your gun" I get very concerned about vigilantism which is what this
encourages. I mentioned before we would go to a meeting where residents would ask police officers to take a woman on a street corner, "Why can't you take her into a back alley and beat her up? That will work." Those things happened all the time. I witnessed them all the time.

Q Given the unfortunate circumstances that low track sex trade workers found themselves in, namely they had no real source of income, they were poorly educated, they had no skills, employment skills, they were drug addicted, may have been of First Nations heritage and they perceived that the only way they could survive was by selling sexual services and given the containment policy of the Vancouver Police Department, what choices or options did these women have in your view?

A You've stumped me. Presumably if they could find whatever the power is inside a human being to manage to change addiction and all of those things, but as we know, those things are incredibly difficult so I don't know what options they would have.
Q To touch for a moment on something you raised earlier about another demographic group of sex
trade workers, what you characterized as
"bourgeois". Could I ask you to turn to please appendix E which is Tamara O'Doherty's report, and in particular to page 12 of that document. She sampled or studied women who appear to have had options; is that fair?

A Yes.
Q If you look under Demographics, second to last paragraph under that heading, her sample of sex workers had high levels of educational attainment. 90 percent had some post-secondary training, 36 percent had completed either a bachelor's or a master's degree or a PhD?

A Yes.
Q She described them as comprising mainly well-educated, financially comfortable, local white women near the age of 30 ?

A Correct.
Q So they could work inside in safety?
A In places licenced by Vancouver municipality.
Q The City of Vancouver would actually knowingly licence places where sex trade workers could ply their trade?

A If you look at the difference between the massage parlour licence and the body rub licence, one of
these cost -- there's an appendix in my report that deals with these -- one of which costs $\$ 200$ which is the massage parlour where only health techniques of touch can be used, as compared to a body rub parlour, a body rub you can't have touch that involves health enhancement. What other kind of -- well, I suppose it depends upon what kind of touch you would count as health enhancing, but if you look at the licence and the nature of the regulations and the fact that $a$ person holding one of those licences has to actually declare who is working there to the police constable and you realize it's the third most expensive licence next to the Pacific National Exhibition and racetrack, at $\$ 6,500$, you realize that the City of Vancouver when it writes that bylaw is well aware it is licencing prostitution, or least it's very difficult to see how you could not come to that conclusion. Escort services also are licenced. Escorts used to have to go to see somebody in the vice squad before they got the licence. Women who have talked to me about the nature of those interviews left with no uncertainty or misapprehension about what it is that they might be getting into,
prostitution.
Q
Let me ask you this, sir. In your professional expert opinion, is this a fair summary of the City of Vancouver, the City of Vancouver and in particular Vancouver Police Department's position on the issue of prostitution, if you're well educated, local, white and you've got some money we'll give you a licence so you can safely provide sex services to the public, but if you're poor, native, from out of town and poorly educated, we want you to go down and contain yourself on the Downtown Eastside and stand on a street corner in an industrial area in the rain and fend for yourself?

A I don't believe that that was the intention of the person involved in creating those various structures but I do believe that your description is precisely the effect.

Q Sir, you've obviously devoted most of your professional life to carefully studying this important social issue; is that fair?

A Yes.
Q At the end of this commission of inquiry I expect that Mr. Commissioner may well wish to make recommendations to those who make policy
concerning a number of issues. One of them might be, and I don't mean to speculate, but one of them might be recommendations directed to political decision makers on how the lives of low track -- pardon me, how the lives of those poor, poorly educated, disadvantaged, marginalized women who are forced to turn to the sex trade might be improved, how they could be safer. With the benefit of your professional experience in this area, do you have any opinions with respect to the nature of recommendations that might be of assistance to any people out there who find themselves in the position that their daughters and sisters and mothers of my clients found themselves in before they were taken by Mr. Pickton and murdered?

A We have to find solutions to poverty, the feminization of poverty, we have to find solutions to addiction, we have to find solutions to the effects of 200 years of colonization on west coast aboriginal peoples, we need to rationalize our law so that we understand what it is that it's trying to do, our prostitution law, because if people are going to be involved in prostitution, until we solve those other issues
we could see very similar things happening in the future. When we wrote a report in 1996 for the Federal Department of Justice we were already describing 50 homicides. Our purpose in doing that was to raise a red flag over what we saw as serious issues. In 1997 I wrote to every Minister of Justice and Attorney General in Canada suggesting that there was a serious problem and that political action needed to be taken. I got responses from about half of them and most of them said they would be thinking about it. In 1985 the Special Committee on Pornography and Prostitution said we had to rationalize our prostitutional law. Is prostitution legal or is it not? If it is legal we have to decide where and under what circumstances it can occur. You have two sets of problems. One is nuisance and the other is the problem faced by women in sex work, particularly women. What we did was prioritize public propriety and property values over human life. That's what we've done. My main advice is that that's what we stop doing, plain and simple, but it's multi-layered efforts that we need.

Q One last thing, sir, before $I$ sit down . You

9 MR. WARD: Thank you, sir, and speaking for myself at least,
lost your composure a moment ago in response to one of my questions and I'm sorry if I triggered that. Can I ask you why?

A I'm frustrated, having watched for so long. We read Sarah's work and I worked with Maggie de Vries on a board. Many of the families I've not met, I've met some today. We're talking about extreme human suffering and it got to me. thank you very much for your work and for coming to testify today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Baynham.
MR. BAYNHAM: Mr. Commissioner, I see it's a little bit early --

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You want the break now? Sure.
THE REGISTRAR: We'll recess for 15 minutes.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:50 P.M.)
(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:11 P.M.)
THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR. BAYNHAM: Mr. Commissioner, it's Brian Baynham. I'm assisting independent counsel representing the aboriginal interest and the aboriginal community.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

## 1 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BAYNHAM:

Q Mr. Lowman, I'm going to have some general questions but the focus of my questioning is going to be on the aboriginal community and how the aboriginal community was impacted by the things that happened in the Downtown Eastside and how they were overrepresented in the number of missing women.

I'd like to start with a little better understanding of how you came to -- the basis for your reports and your various articles and your expert opinion. As I understand it you did some empirical analysis and collected data such as head counts. Can you just tell me what empirical data you worked with and how you came to have the empirical data.

A In the report, $I$ think it's item 4, a description of the various studies, so the first one was looking at the whole issue of displacement around the Penthouse and Zanzibar. In 1984 I did the Vancouver Field Study for the Department of Justice. That was background research for a special committee on pornography and prostitution. During that research, which was to basically describe prostitution in Vancouver,
prostitution law enforcement, what is the nature of it, who is involved, how does it work, one of the things we started doing almost immediately was head counts of women working on the street, any police presence that we would see, men approaching them, to try and get an idea of where the strolls were, how active they were and it just happened that during the process of doing that you had the nuisance injunctions, the displacement which we were able to measure. We kept doing the counts because --

Q If I can stop you there. Who is the "we"?
A I have a research team. Basically I've got a variety of students or research subcontractors who are helping me do interviews, do some of these head counts. I always like to be involved directly in interviewing myself, otherwise I don't feel $I$ can understand the question. Each time you see one of these major Department of Justice studies there will be usually two, three, four, five research assistants depending on the particular study. I will often use the term "we" to have to the extent they have a very important role to play in the production of that research.

Q To be clear you're hands on, you did some of the
counts yourself?
A Yes.
Q You were out on the street, you actually saw what happened?

A I don't think you can do research if you're not part of it.

Q Aside from head counts, what other empirical data did you develop and use?

A For the 1984 study we were interviewing police officers; we were interviewing social service workers; we were analyzing whatever charges were laid; we were looking at newspaper accounts.

Q That's a little bit different in my view. That's research, is it not, where you were going out and looking at other publications and newspapers and other things?

A There's two different kinds of -- if you're creating any kind of primary data I'm calling it research. In other words, if you're going into newspaper archives and doing a content analysis you're producing data, but at the same time you're relating that to secondary research sources which may be other databases, other studies, whatever the case may be. So we're creating a variety of different databases in
those various ways that I talked about. Some involves interviewing, some involves examination of various police sources and records, newspaper articles, whatever the case may be.

Q If I could take you to page 15 of your report, this is question 8, and you were asked the question: "How many women were involved in street level sex trade in the Downtown Eastside during the time period?" And you produce a chart. How did you generate those figures, if you could tell us?

A Those particular figures were reproduced from the report by Staff Sergeant Bob Taylor.

Q So they actually come from --
A Those particular data come from his police report.

Q Did you do any independent data?
A Yes.
Q Was your data consistent with the police data?
A One of the things that -- yes. What we did was -- unbeknownst to us, the police were doing these same counts at the same time we were -- not necessarily exactly the same times of day. Actually, there is a comparison of the two sets of counts in the 1989 report that I did. They
are within one or two of each other in terms of the three main strolls that we were looking at at the time. They're remarkably similar. Basically all you're doing is traversing each one of the streets and back alleys just once and counting who is visible at that time. So you get these figures here will show you how many people were visible at any one time. But in terms of the number of people who are actually involved, it's huge compared to the numbers that are visible at any one time.

Q And then the other thing you did was surveys and you regularly did surveys throughout this period of time, the 80 s and into the 90 s ?

A Meaning interviews and questionnaires?
Q Yes.
A Yes, we did these in a phase of different studies.

Q Can you just assist us with your methodology there? We're going to hear evidence in the course of this inquiry about how reticent people are to sometimes testify, reticent to provide information, very distrustful of anybody in authority and anybody who doesn't belong to their community, as $I$ understand it. I don't want to
talk pejoratively but how does an old, white male university professor get data from young largely aboriginal women who are distrustful of authority?

A Old white guy was young once.
Q I forgot about that.
A Sorry. Basically I was involved in what has come to be called community research. In order to be -- I'm an outsider, no two ways about that.

Q That was my point.
A Yes. I'm trying to respond seriously now. The first thing I realized I needed to do was contact women who were directly involved in prostitution. Luckily one woman came up to me after a class and said, "You want to know about prostitution, I'll tell you about prostitution," and she became an important source for me. In 1983 an organization called the Alliance For the Safety of Prostitutes, it was grassroots organization working on the Downtown Eastside and in other areas, and I went to see them to ask for assistance putting together a questionnaire and interview schedule. If I go in there and I use language that is completely alien to the people that I want to try to understand it's not going
to work. Basically I needed to educate myself about the subject before $I$ went near anybody who might be giving me information. If you gain the trust of an organization like that and they feel that you're doing something that is going to be worthwhile and the word goes out you are trustworthy, then you can make some inroads. Also I would use as well as doing interviews myself, I had two female interviews. I also had a person who interviewed persons underage who was a social worker. We have one other promise that we make and that is strict confidentiality.

Q Confidentiality with respect to what aspects of the interview process?

A We have an ethical code that is the same as journalists and lawyers, i.e. when people give us information we are not allowed to divulge who they are and we take that commitment very, very seriously. I would always ask people to use a pseudonym, not their real name. I would bend over backwards not to find out somebody's name. You do things like ask people not their exact date of birth, what is the month and year -because you don't ask people their age, you ask date of birth, it's generally more accurate --
but you don't want to be asking somebody's full date of birth because they may become suspicious. I had to learn all of that, all of those techniques, and you have to become immersed in the community to some extent and the research that is successful is not where you parachute in, collect your data and then leave and one of the reasons -- there was several reasons I was involved in PACE Society which was another street level organization --

Q Can I stop you there for a moment. You mentioned another organization, the name I hadn't heard before --

A Alliance For the Safety of Prostitutes.
Q How long did that organization function?
A That organization functioned for about three years. A woman by the name of Sally de Quatros who was a former sex worker herself, and it was all about protection of women involved in prostitution and providing non-judgmental services for them. That organization lasted for about three years. One after that called POWER, Prostitutes and Other Women For Equal Rights. Then there was an organization that began in 1994 PACE, Prostitutes Alternatives Counselling and

Education. Their offices were usually in the Downtown Eastside in various places and I would spend quite a bit of time in those offices. Most of the people who worked for PACE were former or current working women. So over a lengthy period people got a pretty good idea of who I was, whether I was trustworthy and what I was about.

Q You felt you established your credibility with the community of --

A It looked like it to the extent that we usually didn't have much problem gathering the kinds of data you see in these reports.

Q Your involvement with PACE was volunteer?
A Yes. It's a charitable organization that provided non-judgmental services for women in prostitution.

Q How did you make use of the data that you developed?

A Nearly all of the research that I did -- the first eight or nine studies were funded by the Department of Justice Canada so those became government reports. They're not the position of the Department of Justice; they're the position of the researcher. We got further funding from the Province of British Columbia to do research
on clients which is an area that we hadn't researched until the late 1990s. So the research is used in government reports, used by policy makers. I use that research to talk to -- I've talked to the Canadian government, various subcommittees of government involved in various task forces, trying to figure out prostitution policy, law reform issues and generally providing information to the general public about what we're dealing with and for the purpose of reporting all of that research it goes into peer reviewed journals and other outlets.

Q One of the questions you asked and looked into in your research was what race the person was; is that correct?

A We would -- depending upon the kind of source. If we were going through police reports you would often see on particular forms, you would see certain characteristics recorded such as race, employment, person's address, so on and so forth. We also asked people to sort of self-classify when we would do interviews because we do believe -- there's a lot of argument in academics about whether race should even be an issue, critical race studies, many, many issues. We believe that
they are important issues and we do record data on the race of many people we are studying.

Q If I could take you to page 15 of your report, question 9 -- actually start at page 3, the first reference, I believe. If I can take you to the second paragraph, second -- fourth line from the bottom of the second it reads:

VPD reported that, in 1992, the Downtown Eastside population included over 500 mentally ill persons, 480 sex workers, over 350 Latino refugees, and many alcoholic and dysfunctional residents living in poverty the large majority of street level sex workers in the community were young, female aboriginal.

A Yes.
Q That is the Vancouver Police records you're quoting from there?

A In that particular case, yes.
Q I believe you said in your testimony that they had an open drawer policy in that they would provide written data to you as part of your research?

A When $I$ was doing these various reports, so the one in 1984 -- these were all for Department of

Justice. One in 1984 for the Fraser Committee; the one published in 1989 was part of the evaluation of the communicating law; one published in 1996 was a specific study of violence against people involved in prostitution.

Q The reference here is to 1992?
A That is a reference to a report by Bob Taylor but there's quite a few other different sources that give you the percentage of aboriginal street involved persons on the Downtown Eastside. So you'll find those in different reports of mine and other research, Kate Shannon will have those figures. They vary between 30 and 70 percent in the various sources.

Q I'm going to come to those in a moment. Do you agree with what you quote here from the Vancouver Police Department that the large majority of street level sex workers in the community were young female aboriginals as of 1992; do you share that opinion?

A Yes.
Q You mentioned Kate Shannon and we're going to hear from her. It doesn't appear that you have worked with her on any projects; is that right, or have you?

A No, I haven't.
Q And what's her approach to the issue of -- how does she approach the issue of prostitution as you understand it?

A She's done a variety of different research projects. She is an HIV/AIDS researcher looking at risk factors for street-involved women. Her main contact has been WISH. WISH is an organization that during its opening hours does not have any men in that particular location for safety reasons and for solidarity and a variety of other different reasons. Dr. Shannon's main vehicle -- I described how I was associated with various organizations and I think Dr. Shannon will tell you that her association with WISH is her equivalent of my association with organizations much earlier. I didn't include her research in this review because I knew she would be providing that evidence and also I was concentrating on the studies that were done as close to or in the particular period that the commission is interested in.

Q Referring to the issue of the percentage of aboriginal women involved in the sex trade in the Downtown Eastside, I'll take you to page 15. You
were asked: "What percentage of women identified in question 8 were aboriginal?" And you quote various reports and studies here. At the bottom of page 15, the top of page 16, these -- am I right in thinking that only one of the reports is your report?

A Yes.
Q What can you say about the validity of the other reports you cite here? Part of the question is directed towards there seems to be a large variation in the percentages of aboriginal women that are identified as being involved in the sex work?

A Yes. Just to speak to our study, the 65 respondents were not only from the Downtown Eastside. We were also interviewing high track, so-called high track women, Richards and Seymour. One of the things we were interested in looking at was the risk of victimization in the two different strolls. We don't have -- that isn't a figure that applies simply to the Downtown Eastside segment --

Q It understates it then?
A Exactly, it understates it. That's why you've got that variation there. Currie's report -- it
was estimated in 1999 by Staff Sergeant Bob Taylor, I think they identified 480 women who at one time or another through that year were street-involved, involved in prostitution, and whether it was on a regular basis or piecemeal that's not known. The thing about Currie's sample is that some of her other researchers were street-involved women themselves and she was able to get -- they had a mixture of questionnaires, I think there was about 80 or 58 of those, we can go back to the research to get the exact number, plus a number of focus groups. In the end there were about 150 persons involved in that study. When you look at that as a proportion of the overall population that's a large sample. One of the issues here is that sampling is difficult. A probabilistic sample is one where you can generalize to the population because you sample from it randomly. These are not probabilistic samples. You cannot generalize because you don't know what population they come from, they are self-chosen. So always sampling is an issue, how representative is this. That's why you see some of the variation. If your contact people in snowball sampling, i.e. it's word of mouth,
people are telling each other on the street that there's this study going on. If you have a number of aboriginal women working they're more likely to have other aboriginal women as contacts, so you're more likely to get more of them in the sample. It's those kind of factors that determine the different proportions that you see here. When I talk about those proportions, when I'm saying anywhere between 30 and 70 percent, what we do know by putting them all together is that there is a large percentage of aboriginal women in that street-involved population. That's how we come to the conclusion.

Q Far above their percentage of the population as a whole in British Columbia?

A Way higher than that. I think the estimate that is in this report of the aboriginal population in the Downtown Eastside is nine percent, I believe it was, and that's a Vancouver municipality figure and in British Columbia as a whole it's three percent.

Q That's what is contained in the report?
A Yes.
Q You also had your -- you were down there, you saw
people. Was what you saw consistent with what these surveys were showing?

A Yes.
Q So it rang true to you what the surveys were showing?

A Yes.
Q If I could take you to page 16, just above the 10th question, $I$ just want you to enlarge upon that paragraph and I'll read that paragraph into the record:

The social and economic marginalization of aboriginal women reflects the multi-generational legacy of colonial oppression in the form of concerted attempts to destroy West Coast aboriginal Culture in the late 19th and much of the 20th Century through a variety of coercive mechanisms, including the residential school system. How did you come to form that opinion?

A Primarily by reading a fair amount of secondary literature about aboriginal populations which was primarily -- my interest was primarily stimulated by doing this research and seeing these kinds of issues being raised. So as I've travelled around British Columbia I've gone to places like the

Campbell River Museum where you see a display where there's 100 people shown and the lights go out which represent the fact 90 percent of the population on that coast died of smallpox. I've read about the issues related to residential school systems in the process of interviewing a variety of people, I've talked to them about what happened to them in residential schools. I've read early accounts of the criminalization of the potlatch. I've read accounts of the attempted, and I quote the word, "de-Indianization" of aboriginal peoples. I've in the process of doing this research talked to people about their family histories and how they unfold, and so it is that tapestry that leads to that compressed paragraph that summarizes the effects of 200 years of colonization on aboriginal peoples. My belief is that one can only understand the situation that faces contemporary individuals by understanding the history because the history is still now.

Q If I could take you back to page 14 under the heading Survival Sex you also deal with poverty and addiction and then go on to say that in the Downtown Eastside poverty and addiction are reflected and are amplified by the effects of
colonization of the aboriginal people and the destruction of their culture, and that's really what you've amplified on in your answer as I understand it?

A Yes.
Q We heard an opening from Ann Livingston. Are you familiar with her?

A Yes.
Q From VANDU?
A Yes.
Q She said words to the effect that women were degraded and words that really rang -- I remembered and wrote down and emphasized, she had a sense that the women, missing and murdered women, had gave up on life or words to that effect. Is that what you're describing?

A In some cases that is an apt description. The other thing that has struck me about coming to know women involved in sex work is what incredible survivors many of them are and how strong they are. I think people when they reach certain kinds of bottoms and when we talk about addiction and bottoming out and that kind of thing people may reach that feeling, but what I've witnessed is an incredible amount of
resilience and strength amidst all these problems.

Q I take it from what you've said today and the way you've responded to questions you still hold out hope that things can get better, there can be a change?

A If I lose hope, I'm out of here.
Q Just dealing with the survival sex worker per se, am I right in thinking that it's your opinion that they really don't have any choice in how to survive?

A Very, very little. If you think about the circumstances of a human being who has had her stepfather coming into her bedroom each night so that she's run away from home and she's now on the street and the only kind of help she can get is what $I$ would call bargain help. In other words, if you will do this for us, we will do this for you. But the problem that particular person is having with that approach is that they're going through something that we all go through and it's the point at which we start making decisions for ourselves in life rather than having our parents making them for us. They're going through that at a much earlier age
than other Canadians. So a lot of ways we try to help them don't help at all. We don't understand that from their point of view prostitution is not a problem, it's a solution, it's a solution to the problems that they have. We want to turn it into a problem and have them see it that way and that may be a relevant thing to do in certain circumstances, but unless we stand in their shoes it's awfully difficult to help them. If you're that old and you have all of these kinds of problems we've been talking about, what do you do? I don't see that you have many choices in that situation.

Q I'd like to just move on to the number of missing women because there are various figures that show up in your report and in the police report and what Mr. Pickton allegedly said to police in jail. I could take you to page 28 in your report, the second paragraph you say: Since 1980 in British Columbia, approaching 150 street prostitutes have gone missing or are confirmed homicide victims.

Then you go on to discuss, and I'm not going to go into that, about what percentage were involved in street prostitution and so on. Where do you
come up with that figure of 150?
A This is the reconstruction. What we did in 1993 was try and reconstruct the history of homicides of sex workers going back as far as we could. We did it through a variety of sources, some of which we were provided by VPD, we looked through various newspaper accounts, went through the RCMP macros database and we also looked at the homicide reports from Statistics Canada that begin in 1991, those are the first ones that tell us the occupation of the victim.

Q If I could stop you there, so we put this in context, as I understand it this was in the course of preparing one of your reports for the Department of Justice?

A It was built up over a variety of those reports and then filling in other research that $I$ would do in between, trying to figure out these various figures to create as complete a record as possible. You've got the ones that we discovered and recorded and then you have the ones that appeared in the homicide survey from 1991 onwards and then you have the number, and there's various numbers that were given for the number of missing women, and when you put all of those together it
comes to at least 150 people.
Q So that's essentially in the last -- that's over a 30-year period?

A Yes. But the thing is, as you go through that period it's getting to be more and more and more and I document that in one of the articles that is in the appendices to the report.

Q We're going to hear from Detective Inspector Rossmo in the course of this inquiry and you make reference to his figures at page 24 , if $I$ could just take you to that. You deal with it in the third paragraph -- the second paragraph, about half-way through he says: We now know that 10 women disappeared from this area in 1997, nine disappeared in 1998, and six in 1999.

And you quote that from Detective Inspector Rossmo's records I gather?

A Yes.
Q How did you come to gain possession of those records?

A I first met Kim Rossmo in 1982. He was a graduate student of ours; I was the supervisor of his MA thesis. I was a member of his PhD committee. He spoke to many of my classes and I
went on many ride-alongs at different points with Kim. I've known him for many, many years and we've talked on a variety of different occasions about some of the issues related to these reports. When he gave a presentation a few years ago, he received a prize, he had these figures and he used them in a demonstration. I e-mailed him afterwards and asked him for a copy of the figures and he sent those to me. One of the things that $I$ did as I was going through the book On the Farm was to look at what that book said about the disappearances and I realized that they don't mesh with the ones that Dr. Rossmo gave me and so I decided that I should report that as well -- I mean, information is everything.

Q Were you in touch with him in 1997, 1998?
A I would have been at various points in contact with Kim, yes.

Q I understand we're going to hear evidence from him that he was of the view in or about August, September of 1998 that there was likely a serial killer responsible for the disappearance of so many women in a short period of time. What view did you hold at that point?

A I held a similar view. In 1999 there's an
article in Elm Street by Daniel Wood where I suggest that there could be one or more serial killers and you'll note there's a point in the report that asks me what the basis for that opinion was. In the year 2000 I published another article which is in the appendices here where I also talk about the possibility of one or more serial killers. I strongly believe that there is -- there has been more than one serial killer of women involved in sex work in Vancouver over the last 25 years. Some of those men may have been convicted of only a single crime. There's still women missing beyond the number that is -- or at least my understanding is it is now 33 DNA traces that have been found on the farm. If we believe the comments about 49 victims to the police officer in the undercover -- undercover police officer in the cell -there's other women missing, so there's a possibility that Ridgway killed women in Vancouver -- who knows? But yes, in 1999 and 2000 I was on published written record as expressing the opinion that a serial killer was preying on women in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside.

Q I'm going to move on in a minute to a couple questions about the attitude of the Vancouver Police Department and I'd like your views on that. I did neglect to ask you one question about earlier in your report and that was a comparative between the Downtown Eastside and the other strolls. If you could just bear with me a moment. If I could take you to page 17 of your report. This is when you were dealing with the question of: "What were the common characteristics of the women involved in the street level sex trade in the Downtown Eastside during the time period?" You referred to O'Doherty's report which is at appendix 1e) and she dealt with the high-end stroll?

A No. She was dealing with indoor prostitution exclusively, not street prostitution.

Q Quite right. I just want to take you down to the fourth paragraph there is a reference that there were no aboriginal women found in her report?

A Correct.
Q None at all?
A None.
Q What can you say about the percentage of aboriginal women involved in the high track
prostitution?
A On the street?
Q Yes.
A There are some aboriginal women but the percent is much, much lower than in the Downtown Eastside. In other words, you see a class and race dimension within prostitution as well as outside it.

Q If I could take you to appendix $H$ of your report, this is the media release. Is it your understanding that this media release was put out to the public?

A Yes.
Q The first thing I notice about it is it says Street Prostitution Enforcement. What does that say to you about the Vancouver Police Department's state of mind at the time?

A That enforcement when it came to prostitution law was mostly about street prostitution, but in this particular case it's a specific reference to the Downtown Eastside and what is happening, or at least that's the way I read it.

Q I'm going to go back between the report that I gather went to the police board and the press release. The first line of the report to the
police board says:
Over the past week there has been a great deal of discussion regarding this topic in the Lower Mainland.

Do you recall what discussion was happening at that point?

A I think the discussion at that point was about prostitution spreading into residential areas in and around Strathcona. You had a number of different organizations who were going to emulate some of the tactics of groups in other areas which involved street presence, organizations called Shame the Johns, other tactics like that. I think part of this was a response to some of those concerns. Basically it's saying: Look, we've got the situation under control, we've got prostitution pretty much contained in certain areas so that stimulates a certain amount of interest, especially amongst those groups who are concerned about street prostitution spreading back into residential areas. That's my recollection of the context.

Q The police were reacting to public pressure and pressure from residents in the Strathcona area?

A Yes. Mostly when police explain their decisions
about which prostitution laws to enforce it is always that it is complaint driven. We only react when there are complaints. Those complaints almost invariably are from persons living on residential streets where prostitutes appear. Sometimes you get them from businesses, perhaps along Hastings Street, somebody is standing in a doorway. That incident we referred to earlier on where somebody started posting signs saying if you don't get out of here something serious will happen, I think that was a business, not a resident, but it's primarily people in residential areas who are making complaints.

Q If we go back to the press release, the first sentence after the four bullets reads:

The root cause of Vancouver's street prostitution is the men who purchase or recruit and control pimp, juvenile or adult sex workers.

I take it from what you've said earlier today you don't agree with that as being the root cause?

A I think that's a highly simplified account of a very complex human issue.

Q The last paragraph reads:

The Vancouver Police are developing and implementing innovative strategies of prevention as well as enforcement tactics.

I suggest to you that the only evidence we have of what the police did was enforcement in or about that time?

A Yes. I also mentioned the creation of the DISC program but $I$ can't remember exactly when that originated. Other things were going on. The primary tactic was enforcement.

Q If we look at the next couple of pages at appendix $H$, this is a report to the police board and it talks about a number of highlights. This is in reference to a report of Doreen Duchesne. What was that in reference to?

A Doreen Duchesne published a juristat which is Statistics Canada publication looking at street prostitution offences, giving basic information about the number of offences in different cities, ratio of clients to prostitutes and so on.

Q There's mention of 63 known prostitutes were murdered between 1991 and 1995?

A Yes.
Q That's across Canada then?
A Yes.

Q It's not a Vancouver figure?
A No. Let me backtrack one minute. You asked about what other strategies VPD --

Q Yes.
A I think one of the other ones -- I can't remember the history of this -- is the creation of the community policing office on the Downtown Eastside. We heard the name Dave Dickson, he was the officer that worked in there. That was another initiative -- community policing, that was another initiative going on at that time. I think it dates back to that period but that's something in my memory -- I don't want to create a one-sided impression.

Q But that would be consistent with what you think has to happen, they have to have people on the site, interacting with people so you can develop a level of trust?

A Yes. I do believe that was happening down there at that particular time.

Q What I don't see in all of the -- there's reports about women being murdered, there's reports about so many charges being laid for communicating and how many were laid against the woman, the sex woman, and how many against the john. What I
don't see in any of these reports was how many of the johns or bad dates were charged. Did anybody keep track of the violence against women and how they -- short of being murdered?

A There was a period -- we have this in our report, this is one of the appendices to my report -there was a period VPD tracked assaults and assault cases. That was a two-year period. So VPD was most certainly looking at that issue. We also -- we tracked reports of court cases through newspapers to see if we could pick up on any other things that were happening and we indeed did find that there were some prosecutions. It's like most other things, they were gray. There was one judge who very conspicuously said when he was sentencing a particular offender because a person is a sex worker they do not deserve to be treated this way. So there's people that are realizing what is happening and trying to do something, flailing away in the wilderness.

Q One last question. Earlier this morning you referred to state-raised youth comprising a high percentage of the women involved in the sex trade. In your experience were the state-raised youth disproportionately aboriginal?

8 MR. BAYNHAM: Mr. Commissioner, those are all the questions I

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Baynham.
A Yes, yes. Those -- it's a comment about streetinvolved women, that there's a high proportion of state-raised youth in street populations. So if you were to look at the Downtown Eastside in particular you would find a high proportion and because there's a high proportion of aboriginal women that would carry over. have.

MR. VERTLIEB: We're on track to start Monday at 10:00 a.m. and we'll continue with the questions of Dr. Lowman.

THE COMMISSIONER: How are we doing for timing?
MR. VERTLIEB: I think we've had a very good week. We planned two days for opening, we thought Dr. Lowman might be a day but we thought he might be a bit longer depending, so I think we have a very good start to the inquiry and the week has gone more or less the way we had hoped it would.

MS. TOBIAS: If I may, Mr. Commissioner, I believe Mr. Vertlieb has some introductions to make.

MR. VERTLIEB: I am sorry?
MS. TOBIAS: The support workers.
MR. VERTLIEB: I think we should leave that until we have some

5 THE WITNESS: I also have a question, commissioner. I take it 6

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you are.
8 THE WITNESS: So the same rule applies to contact with

12 THE COMMISSIONER: No.
13 THE WITNESS: I'm not allowed to talk about it?
14 THE COMMISSIONER: No.
15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. I just wanted to make that clear.
16 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is adjourned until Monday,
more clarity on how that is all unfolding. There is some issues arising so I think we need to just let that sit for a day and we'll deal with it next week. I'm still under cross-examination obviously? lawyers. The one question $I$ did want to ask is what if journalists ask me questions about something I've testified?

October 17 at 10:00 a.m.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:55 P.M)
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