

Family Court Comm.

Wednesday, January 27, 1971
Family Division Committee - 7:30 p.m.

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The eighth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room at the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, January 27th, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Ald. J. W. Gilmore
Mrs. Mary Kendall
Mrs. Helene Dunlop
Mrs. Shirley Nichol
Rev. M. Fowler

Also present were the Municipal Solicitor, the Probation Officer and the Deputy Municipal Clerk.

CONSIDERATION OF ALD. GILMORE'S ANNUAL REPORT

Ald. Gilmore placed before the Committee his annual report for 1970 outlining the matters dealt with by the Committee and the accomplishments of the Committee during 1970. Ald. Gilmore stated that his report could serve as a review of last years activities as well as a basis on subjects to be followed up during the ensuing year.

Ald. Gilmore went on to state that the Committee might consider during 1971 how to make the community more aware of the needs in the community.

RECEIVING HOME

Mr. Reed reported to the Committee that the Beta Sigma Phi Sorority had taken on the job of redecorating the interior of the Receiving Home and that Fraser Mills had supplied all the paint necessary for the redecoration.

Mr. Reed stated that in the discussions he had had with Mr. Bombardieri, that a couple had been obtained to serve as house parents for the receiving home and it is hoped that children will be housed in the Home by the end of February.

Mr. Reed also informed the Committee that the first payment for the operation of the Receiving Home has been received from the Provincial Government and that the lease for the Home has been completed with Crown Zellerbach Limited.

It was duly moved and seconded:

That the Receiving Home be named in memory of Mr. John Kincaid and that a suitable ceremony be held to open and dedicate the Receiving Home.

CARRIED.

R.C.M.P. YOUTH WORKER

Mr. Reed informed the Committee that the Youth Worker from the R.C.M.P. Force has been appointed and that he took up his duties on January 1, 1971. Mr. Reed went on to explain that the Youth Worker is currently working with the young people in the District on the breaking and entering problems being experienced by the R.C.M.P.

The Committee expressed a desire to meet the R.C.M.P. Youth Worker at some future meeting and to discuss with him the problems being encountered with youths in the District of Coquitlam.

CRISIS CENTRE

Rev. Fowler gave a short report dealing with the establishment of a Crisis Centre in the District of Coquitlam and went on to state the following points,

1. The Group now have a constitution
2. An Advisory Board has been formed consisting of the following five persons,
 - a) Mr. Davies, a lawyer
 - b) Rev. Fowler
 - c) Mr. Marr, the Assistant Municipal Solicitor
 - d) the President of the Jaycees
 - e) some Doctors who have offered their services to assist the Group.

Rev. Fowler went on to state that the Group have a house available to them which they will be able to rent at approximately \$100 per month and that the Board of Directors are attempting to have the members of the Organization sell associate memberships throughout the schools in the District to raise funds to institute a pilot project in this regard.

ANNUAL REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Family Division Committee were of the opinion that Ald. Gilmore's annual report could be used as a basis for the official report to the Attorney General, provided some minor alterations were made, particularly with regards to a paragraph of commendation in connection with the assistance rendered the Committee by the late Mr. John Kincaid and the initiative taken by him in the establishment of a receiving home in the District of Coquitlam.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the annual report to the Attorney General be based on Ald. Gilmore's annual report which outlined the matters considered by the Family Division Committee and their accomplishments during the year 1970.

CARRIED.

MINUTES - NOVEMBER 25, 1970

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held November 25, 1970 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR 1971

Ald. Gilmore spoke on the matter of the Chairman for the year 1971 and felt that the next Chairman of the Family Division Committee should not be an Alderman and that he had approached Rev. Fowler to see if he would be willing to serve in the position of Chairman were he to be asked by the Committee as a whole and Rev. Fowler had so agreed.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Council of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam in accordance with the provisions of the Provincial Court Act, Part 3, Section 18, be asked to appoint Rev. M. Fowler as Chairman of the Family Division Committee for the year 1971.

CARRIED.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Council of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam in accordance with the provisions of the Provincial Court Act, Part 3, Section 18, appoint Ald. Gilmore as the Deputy Chairman of the Family Division Committee for 1971.

CARRIED.

BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF ANNUAL REPORT

1. Addition of members to the Family Division Committee

The Family Division Committee at this point discussed the possibility of adding further members to the Committee to give it a broader base in the Community and after some discussion several names were put forward to be forwarded to Council for approval and appointment to the Family Division Committee.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the following persons be added to the Family Division Committee.

1. Father O'Grady
2. Mr. Jack deVerteuil
3. Mr. Peter Cooper.

CARRIED.

Family Division Committee
January 27, 1971

- 4 -

It was duly moved and seconded,

That Rev. Fowler and the Probation Officer seek a youth to serve on the Family Division Committee and that his name be forwarded to Council for appointment as well.

CARRIED.

REPORT OF MR. H. GAFFNEY, PROBATION OFFICER

The Family Division Committee received the report of Mr. H. Gaffney, Probation Officer, dated January 14th, 1971 and at this point discussed the possibility of obtaining the Family Court Probation Officer and it was the feeling of the Committee that Rev. Fowler should appear before the Council in the near future to support a Budgetary provision for such a service.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That Rev. Fowler appear before Council in the near future to request a Budgetary provision in order to provide the District of Coquitlam with a Family Court Probation Officer.

CARRIED.

Mr. Hugh Gaffney requested that members of the Committee keep in mind the need for employment opportunities for persons coming under control of his office and should any members of the Committee know of job openings that they be in touch with him.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Reed informed the Committee that planning will shortly be undertaken for a new court building to service the District of Coquitlam and the City of Port Coquitlam and that he was taking the initiative of involving the Family Division Committee in the planning of the new facility especially in the areas of the Family Court and the Juvenile Detention area. He stated that just as soon as the architect for the project has been appointed, he will make arrangements to have the Family Division Committee meet and discuss the project fully with the architect.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 9:15 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

Annual Report - January 1971

The first meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held on Wednesday, March 4th, 1970.

Officially appointed as members of the Family Division Committee were:

Alderman J. Gilmore
Reverend Fowler
Mr. G. H. Nelson
Mrs. M. Kendall
Mrs. S. Nicol
Mrs. H. Dunlop

With the exception of July and August, meetings were subsequently held on the fourth Wednesday of each month.

I. Some of the highlights of these meetings were as follows:

1. Alderman Gilmore was appointed to act as Chairman of the Committee for 1970.
2. Municipal Solicitor, Mr. D. C. Reed, was a guest speaker. He dealt specifically with the terms of reference of the Committee. Members were given copies of the "Provincial Courts Act" and the "Community Care Facilities Act".

Mr. Reed also dealt with the operation of the Family Court and Juvenile Court in Coquitlam.

The physical facilities existing both within the community and outside, were then outlined. It was noticed that the present municipal buildings have no method of holding juveniles.

The system of dealing with juveniles was also outlined, particularly the new method of review by probation officers before trial or court action.

3. The Committee decided that the Municipal Prosecutor, Welfare Administrator, and the Probation Officer, be considered resource personnel to be called upon as needed.

4. Since Coquitlam had never had a Family Division Committee before, it was decided to continue to give priority in the first few meetings, to a complete inventory of facilities and resources within Coquitlam.

5. Mr. Hugh Gaffney, a member of the Provincial Probation Service for our area, was a guest speaker.

Mr. Gaffney discussed his case load and his various responsibilities.

There was also a discussion of the resources available, including references to the Marpole Hostel, House of Concord, and the Vancouver Juvenile Detention Home.

The establishment of a Regional Remand-Detention Home was also discussed by the Committee.

6. Members of the Committee reported their impressions of their visit to the local Court facilities and a session of the Family Court. Most members stated that they felt the facilities were shabby and overcrowded and most inadequate, whereas the personnel appeared to be exceptional. *

* Note: A new court area was developed later in the year by the Municipality, by using portable units. This is, of course, only an interim solution.

7. The Committee expressed concern over the proposed establishment of a Remand Centre on Riverview Hospital property.

The Committee was particularly concerned over the strain that such a Remand Centre would have on our local Court facilities, since all prisoners must appear before a Judge every eight days, while in the Remand Centre, awaiting trial.

8. Mr. Kincaid, the Social Welfare Administrator, was a guest speaker, and commented on the activities of his Department.

Mr. Kincaid brought forcefully to the attention of the Committee, the need for a Receiving Home in the District, to house children placed in the care of the Welfare Department. Mr. Kincaid pointed out that at present they had no facilities in which to place emotionally disturbed children or children received on weekends or late at night.

Mr. Kincaid saw a solution to this problem in a home able to handle approximately eight children, supervised by professional personnel and suitable house parents. It was mentioned that Richmond has such a home at present and that Surrey had such homes.

Mr. Kincaid stated that from such a home children could be placed in such facilities as Browndale, Seven Oaks, House of Concorde, Brannan Lake, and homes operated by Central City Mission.

9. Mr. Don Copan, Chairman of the Burnaby Family Division Committee, was a guest speaker.

Burnaby has had a very active Family Division Committee and our Committee was very interested in hearing about their activities.

Mr. Copan felt that the most important function of a Family Division Committee was to make the various sections of the community aware of the needs of the community, both for youths and families.

10. Following the untimely death of Mr. Kincaid, Mr. G. A. Bombardieri, Assistant Administrator, became the Committee's resource person from the Welfare Department and was in regular attendance at all subsequent meetings.

11. Following a visit to Brannan Lake School, a discussion took place at the next regular Family Division Committee Meeting.

Reverend Fowler stated that it was his feeling that quite a few constructive things were being done at Brannan Lake School and that the School was not a negative place to be.

Mrs. Kendall felt that one of the benefits of the School was that there was no waiting list and that due to the change in the applicable provincial legislation, the child could be kept as long as it was felt necessary, and thus treatment of those students at the School could be completed. Also the emphasis was no longer mainly on punishment.

Mrs. Dunlop was impressed by the new units. The individual rooms gave privacy and self respect, she pointed out.

12. Mr. Reed reported that the Municipality had rented the premises to be used as a Receiving Home. Mr. Bombardieri reported on negotiations with the Provincial Government to get financial assistance for running the home.

13. Mr. Reed indicated that after the Receiving Home had been set up, the Committee's involvement might be in the area of updating the home in the future.

14. Mr. Bombardieri stated that the Committee should also consider the possibility of looking for another home in the future as there is no guarantee that the home we presently have on lease, will be available to the Municipality for a great length of time.

15. After the Committee discussed the use of schools as drop in centres, Reverend Fowler was appointed to speak to School Board officials to see if schools could be used for this purpose.

16. The Committee had an extensive discussion of the problem of drinking being encountered at Hillcrest School.

17. Mr. E. Yacub, the Municipal Recreational Youth Worker, was the guest speaker.

In a reference to the Hillcrest problem, Mr. Yacub informed the Committee that this group of youths are not interested in Recreation, but are interested in socializing with liquor, and as they cannot do this legally, they go into the bush to do it. Mr. Yacub stated that there are about one hundred and fifty to two hundred such youths in the District of Coquitlam, who cause this type of problem.

Mr. Yacub stated that he works with various groups, such as the Drama Society and Youth Council, in establishing a Recreation Programme.

Mr. Yacub stated that a recreation programme must be carried on in the area or school from which the children come who join the programme, as they do not like going to someone else's school as that is considered foreign territory.

18. The Committee discussed the possible establishment of a group which could be quickly mobilized to attempt to solve community problems such as that existing at Hillcrest School. Such a group could possibly consist of a social worker, an R. C. M. P. Officer, and someone from the Recreation Department.

19. The Committee discussed their visit to the Vancouver Juvenile Detention Home. Several members of the Committee commented that they felt the decor of the Unit was depressing, and that the building was obsolete. They felt it should be made to look less institutional.

20. Mr. Reed stated that he would be bringing before the Committee, each month, a case which is before the Courts, for discussion, and that possibly they may be able to make recommendations on how the case should be proceeded with.

This practice of presenting "the case of the month" was followed in subsequent meetings.

21. Mr. J. Thomson, Coquitlam's newly appointed Social Welfare Administrator, was the speaker.

22. The Committee discussed the appointment of a Probation Officer to deal directly with Family Court matters.

The general object is to provide a counselling service in marital disputes, to see that those cases that are necessary for Court appearances are appropriately arranged, to take the routine applications through the Court, and to carry out all the follow-up actions in relation to payment and administration of Court Orders.

The functions enumerated above are presently being performed by members of the Welfare Staff, the R. C. M. P. Court Clerk, and the Assistant Municipal Solicitor. Very little is actually done in the field of counselling, although the Welfare Department does try to give some advice.

23. The Committee heard two Coquitlam teenagers present a proposal to establish a local Crisis Centre.

The Committee agreed in principle with the proposal, and suggested a pilot programme first be established.

II. VISITS BY FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE - 1970

1. Visit to New Westminster and discussion with Mayor M. Evers, and members of the New Westminster Family Division Committee.
2. Visit to Brannan Lake.
3. Visit to Vancouver Juvenile Detention Home.
4. Visit to Court Session of Coquitlam's Family Court.

III RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL

1. That the Council's Regional Board Representative support the establishment of a Regional Remand and/or Detention Home.
2. Endorsed the establishment of a Receiving Home for Coquitlam.
3. That one R. C. M. P. Officer be appointed as a youth worker, if at all possible.
4. That we favour the establishment of a pilot scheme Crisis Centre.
5. That we favour the establishment of a Family Court Probation Service.

IV SUMMARY

Our first year as a Family Court Committee has been largely one of familiarization with the resources of the community, and an attempt to establish areas where we could operate most effectively. The emphasis, then, was on the guest speakers.

The Committee unfortunately lost the services of Superintendent Nelson, when he left the District, during the summer. Two or three new appointments should be made early in 1971.

I would like to pay particular tribute to the following members of the Committee, who I believe did not miss a single meeting and made a full contribution in every way:

Mrs. Shirly Nicol
Mrs. Helene Dunlop
Mrs. Mary Kendall
Reverend Fowler

The assistance of our Municipal Solicitor, Mr. D. C. Reed, has been invaluable to the Committee. He has been in regular attendance at our meetings as a resource person, given us wise counsel throughout the year and enlivened our meetings with his lighthearted manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Alderman Jack Gilmore
CHAIRMAN

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

January Meeting - 1971

1. Discussion of Alderman Gilmore's Report to Council
2. Discussion of Report to Attorney General
3. Election of Chairman
4. Discussion of Programme for 1971

Wednesday, February 24, 1971
Family Division Committee - 7:30 p.m.

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The ninth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room at the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, February 24th, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Rev. M. Fowler
Mrs. Mary Kendall
Mrs. Helene Dunlop
Mrs. Shirley Nicol
Ald. J. W. Gilmore
Mr. Don Good Jr.

Also present were the Municipal Solicitor, the Probation Officers for the District of Coquitlam Mr. Hugh Gaffney and Mr. E. H. Klassen, the R.C.M.P. Youth Worker Constable Sebastian, Mr. J. Carlberg Architect for the new Public Safety Building and the Deputy Municipal Clerk.

INTRODUCTION OF CST. SEBASTIAN AND DISCUSSION OF R.C.M.P. YOUTH OFFICER'S ROLE IN THE DISTRICT

The Chairman introduced Cst. Sebastian, the newly appointed R.C.M.P. Youth Officer for the District of Coquitlam and asked Cst. Sebastian to give a short resume of the role he sees for the Youth Officer in the District of Coquitlam.

Cst. Sebastian stated that following his appointment, the position of Youth Officer had been investigated in surrounding areas and that he was particularly impressed with the manner in which the system works in North Vancouver District. He went on to state that in North Vancouver one man acts as liaison to schools to arrange and organize meetings with students and that this officer will take a regular uniformed officer to the school to meet with 30 to 40 students for general discussion.

He stated that in North Vancouver the public are very impressed with the programme undertaken and it appears as if the students enjoy the visits of the R.C.M.P. to the schools. These visits have apparently been successful as the general crime rate for youths in North Vancouver has shown a decline, especially in the area of housebreakings.

Cst. Sebastian stated that it is his hope to introduce a similar type of programme in the Secondary classrooms in Coquitlam, however, at the present time they have a manpower problem and until more men are received this will not be possible. It is his hope though that by September such a programme may be instituted.

Cst. Sebastian informed the Committee that he has already started discussions with the teachers in the schools as well as with the Counselling Staff and has spoken to some Grade 12 students.

Thursday, February 24, 1971
Family Division Committee Cont'd.

- 2 -

On a question from the Municipal Solicitor, Cst. Sebastian stated that when a uniformed officer is taken to a school it will be the officer who regularly patrols in that area so that some liaison may be instituted between a particular officer and a particular school.

Cst. Sebastian stated that with regards to a programme for public schools he is hopeful that the traffic detail can do this in the future by way of giving safety lectures to Elementary School pupils.

The Municipal Solicitor inquired as to what response has been received from the students and Cst. Sebastian stated that he has had three discussions with students at Centennial High School and the response in the way of questions has been great and the main subjects talked about dealt with police work, namely riots, pre-recruiting programme harrassment and searches. He stated that very few questions had been forthcoming with regards to drugs and feels that this is probably because students know quite a bit about drugs and their affects already. Cst. Sebastian did state, however, that he would be working with the Vancouver Drug squad for three weeks in the near future, which would lead to a better understanding as far as he was concerned with the drug problems so that he could better answer questions on the subject if they should be discussed in the future.

Mr. Reed inquired as to how youths not attending school could be reached and Cst. Sebastian stated that Mr. Yacub of the Recreation Department has a Teen Drop-In Programme in effect at the present time and that Corporal Proke has attended several of these and that it is his intention to team up with Mr. Yacub to have discussions with this section of the youth in Coquitlam.

The Municipal Solicitor inquired if this Committee could be of any assistance with regards to rallying Community involvement and Cst. Sebastian stated that he could not say at this time as the programme could not really be assessed until it had been in operation for a period of six months to a year.

On a question from the Committee, Cst. Sebastian stated that the youth problem in Coquitlam has improved greatly in the last six months, however, with spring and summer coming more problems could and would, mostly likely, arise. The Chairman thanked Cst. Sebastian for his appearance at the meeting and for the information provided to the Committee.

PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING

The Municipal Solicitor introduced Mr. J. Carlberg, Architect for the proposed Public Safety Building for the District of Coquitlam and the City of Port Coquitlam to the Committee and informed the Committee that the building was proposed to be located at the intersection of Loughheed Highway and Barnet Highway, behind Eastgate Shopping Centre. He went on to state that with the completion of this Building the R.C.M.P. forces of Coquitlam and Port Coquitlam will be amalgamated into one force to serve both Districts. The Architect at this point produced proposed plans of the Public Safety Building and discussed such aspects as the Court Room, Probation Service Quarters and the holding areas for Juvenile offenders and received recommendations from the members of the Committee as to how they would like to see these areas developed.

Thursday, February 24, 1971
Family Division Committee Cont'd.

- 3 -

MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held January 27th, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

FAMILY COURT PROBATION OFFICER

The Chairman reported that he would be appearing before Council on March 9th, 1971 to request funds from Council in order that a Family Court Probation Officer could be provided for the District of Coquitlam and requested that as many members as possible of the Family Division Committee attend the Council Meeting that night.

APPOINTMENTS OF FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The Chairman explained that Mr. deVerteuil was not prepared to accept an appointment to the Family Division Committee and that Mr. Peter Cooper had requested time to consider the appointment.

The Municipal Solicitor suggested that some representation should be sought from the School Board and that possibly a letter should go forth to them requesting the appointment of either a member of staff or a member of the Board.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That a letter be written to the School Board expressing the appreciation of the Family Division Committee for past representation from the Board on the Committee and request that the Board appoint either a member of staff or a Trustee so that the point of view of the School District may be incorporated in the discussions of the Committee.

CARRIED.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the names of Father Joseph O'Grady and Mr. Don Good Jr. be recommended to Council for appointment to the Family Division Committee.

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

Wednesday, March 31, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The tenth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room at the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, March 31, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Rev. M. Fowler
Mrs. Helene Dunlop
Mrs. Mary Kendall
Mrs. Shirley Nicol
Mr. Don Good Jr.

Also present were the Municipal Solicitor, Mr. D. C. Reed and the Deputy Municipal Clerk.

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 24, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held February 24, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Reed presented copies of a Statement by the Honourable Jean-Pierre Goyer, Solicitor General of Canada, on the proposed Young Offenders Act and read it to the Committee. Mr. Reed explained sections of the Act and answered questions posed by members of the Committee. A copy of this statement is attached.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER FROM SCHOOL BOARD

A letter was tabled with the Committee from School District #43 stating that the Superintendent would be considering the appointment of someone to sit on the Committee.

FUTURE DELIBERATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

It was suggested to the Committee that they should be considering the resources needed in the Community such as more foster homes and that the Family Division Committee should serve as an idea Committee. It was agreed that at the next meeting the subject of resources needed in the Community would be discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn. 9:30 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

STATEMENT BY THE
HONOURABLE JEAN-PIERRE GOYER
SOLICITOR GENERAL OF CANADA
ON SECOND READING - BILL C-192 -
YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

RECEIVED
781071
PROBATION
OFFICE
BURBANK

(Translation) The Bill which I have the pleasure of submitting for second reading today is a very important one. It concerns young persons, those who need special assistance and protection from society. Our young people represent our future generations, the fate of our country depends on them.

The Juvenile Delinquents Act has been in substantially the same form since 1929 and it may no longer reflect a number of contemporary concerns.

The recommendations for reform of the Act have required a great deal of effort and careful reflection and this explains the length of time it has taken for this Bill to come before the House.

(Spoken in English)

Before I outline the policy of Bill C-192, I wish to pay tribute to the work of my predecessor, the Honourable George J. McIlraith. Many years and much expertise has gone into this Bill, but it was Mr. McIlraith's efforts which resulted in the Bill being put in final form and he introduced it here on November 16th, 1970.

My colleagues, I am sure, will want to join me in applauding Mr. McIlraith's decision to carry on as a Member of Parliament. In this way, Canadians will be able to continue to take advantage of his parliamentary experience, and they are not likely to forget the services

he has rendered to his country throughout the years, not only as a conscientious Member of Parliament, but also as a Minister holding different portfolios.

(Translation)

In outlining the research and work in preparation for this Bill, I will mention only a few of the stages through which it has passed.

On November 6, 1961, a Department of Justice Committee was set up to study the problem of juvenile delinquency in Canada; the Committee's report was tabled in Parliament on February 6, 1966. The implementation of its recommendations required consultation with the provinces and a Federal-Provincial Conference was held in Ottawa in January, 1968.

It became clear from the beginning that provincial delegates would have to examine the proposed Bill in light of their existing social legislation and administrative structures. Cooperation was required to arrive at acceptable compromises.

One of the main problems was that of the maximum age limit for jurisdiction; another was the kind of offence to be dealt with under the proposed legislation.

As stated in the brief submitted to the Justice Department Committee by the Canadian Corrections Association (now known as the Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association) the existing Act created a new kind of all-encompassing offence, that of "delinquency." This is an offence unknown at common law. No matter how a child is before a juvenile court, he can be tried and found to be in a state of delinquency. No legal distinction is made, the Society points out, between the young person who has committed a serious crime like armed robbery, and one guilty of an offence under a municipal by-law, such as riding a bicycle without a licence.

I wanted to bring the Society's comments to your attention because they are representative of the attitude of a number of public bodies to the Juvenile Delinquents Act, and emphasize the need for the reforms proposed in this Bill. On this point, I should also point out that delegates from all provinces agreed that offences under provincial or municipal legislation should no longer be dealt with under federal law. The Juvenile Delinquents Act, which is in effect criminal legislation, should be applied only to clearly defined offences. Nevertheless, unanimity could not be achieved on all the proposed

reforms, and some compromise solutions had to be adopted in order to win approval by a majority of the delegates. Consequently, and I wish to make this clear right from the beginning, the Bill which I am submitting to you today for second reading is certainly not perfect.

It does however ensure greater homogeneity in the treatment of young people appearing before courts across the country, and it does uphold certain provisions which attempt to eliminate, as far as is possible, arbitrary treatment.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

As I have already said, the Juvenile Delinquents Act has not been changed significantly since 1929. However, during this long period of forty-two years, provincial and municipal legislation has evolved in varying degrees in the general direction of greater precision, and often of greater severity in the matter of penalties. More precisely, what was in the past considered only a form of nuisance, to be controlled through the informal means existing within the framework of a given community, is now treated as an infraction or an offence.

This phenomenon is all the more serious since minors are not tried in the area in which they live, but before a court having jurisdiction in the district where the offence was committed. Furthermore, since the definition of a juvenile is not uniform in all the provinces of Canada, a delinquent who is considered a juvenile according to law in one province may be tried as an adult in the neighbouring province, where the Juvenile Delinquents Act applies only to those under sixteen years of age.

It is obvious that such inconsistencies are unacceptable and contrary to the concept of justice.

Allow me to quote here Jean Chazal, a juvenile court judge who by his writings as well as his social action was successful in humanizing justice.

"We are convinced", he wrote, "that judges can only hand down judgements in cases where an offence has actually been committed. This is the most important guarantee against arbitrary prosecution..... It is essential to understand in depth the personality of the child appearing before a juvenile court. This knowledge determines what action should be taken. But the offence does not lose its importance thereby. It is only

possible to decide whether a juvenile delinquent should be punished or retrained if the offence of which he is accused has been established in fact and defined in law. A juvenile court judge has no right to transform into a delinquent, a minor whose material guilt has not been established, for the purpose of retraining him. We earnestly hope that juvenile court judges will have power to order educative measures for children in danger of becoming delinquents, but if he tries to teach a child by burdening him with even a minor offence, without having gathered sufficient proof, the judge is taking arbitrary action which in our opinion cannot in any way be justified. Moreover, for the juvenile court judge, the offence has not only legal, but also undeniable psychological importance. It often reveals tendencies in the child's character and can only indicate his intellectual level." X

Judge Chazal's text, particularly the paragraph which I just read to you, is all the more important in that it conforms with my view that juvenile laws should not limit the power of judges dealing with children, but rather help them better accomplish an extremely difficult

...7

X Etude de Crimonologie Juvénile", par Jean Chazal, Ed: Presses Universitaire de France, 1952.

task. This is achieved in the Bill before you.

In fact, applying the same law to both the case of an alleged juvenile delinquent because of an offence against municipal laws, for example remaining too long in a car parked under a particularly romantic moon in a park, and that of a young person who has just committed a burglary, is placing a difficult burden on the judge and more important it imposes a federal record on the young person in both instances.

The same philosophy also underlies the second major reform in the proposed legislation, that which deals with the definitions of offences proposed in the bill.

According to Section 2, subsection (h) of the present Juvenile Delinquents Act,

"juvenile delinquent" means any child who violates any provision of the Criminal Code or of any Dominion or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory under the provisions of any Dominion or provincial statute"

In other words, the Act authorizes proceedings for delinquencies as poorly defined as "sexual immorality or any similar form of vice" and "any other act".

In contrast, in Clause 2, sub-clause (m), the proposed new legislation clearly defines the meaning of the term "offence" as follows:

"offence" means an offence created by an Act of the Parliament of Canada or by an ordinance, rule, order, regulation or by-law made thereunder or a criminal contempt of court other than in the face of the court.

This indicates clearly that the bill is exclusively concerned with federal offences.

The third element in the proposed legislation which I consider basic in comparison with that now in effect, and which also reflects its philosophy, is that of the age limit. As we have just seen, the present definition of juvenile delinquent is to be replaced by the definition in the Act of the "offence". A "child" is defined as a person apparently or actually under the age of eighteen years to whom a proclamation under Section 3 applies, as the case may be (Clause 2, sub-clause (c)).

The following would be the definition of "young person," that is the one against whom an offence is alleged:

"Young person" means a child apparently or actually ten years of age or more and, where the context requires, includes a person who is found, under Section 29, to have committed an offence, until he reaches the age of twenty-one years. (Clause 2, sub-clause (s)).

The combined effect would be to limit the court's

jurisdiction to those over ten and under seventeen or eighteen as the case may be.

In short, those definitions which describe the young person as a juvenile delinquent have been removed. This shows the intention on the part of the Legislature to remove the stigma of delinquency and deal with incidents instead.

Fourthly, I should like to emphasize that the proposed legislation is intended to encourage the development of social rehabilitation rather than exclusively legal procedures for the treatment of young people who have been found to have committed offences.

Since the protection of children and young persons, or in other words social legislation, is a matter of provincial rather than federal jurisdiction, it is obvious that the federal government does not legislate in that area. Nevertheless, it is of paramount importance that we should draw attention to the following passage from Clause 30:

Where a judge makes a finding that a young person committed an offence, he shall consider the pre-disposition report, if any, made under Section 35 and any other relevant and material information, and he may then make any one of the following dispositions, or any number thereof that are consistent with each other (Clause 30 (1)-).

In the same clause we also find:

Where he is of the opinion that the evidence shows that it would be in the best interest of the young person to proceed under a provincial act intended for the protection or benefit of children or young persons, he may discharge the young person

- (i) in order that the case may proceed instead under that Act, or
- (ii) in order to proceed himself under that Act if he has jurisdiction thereunder (Clause 30(1)(c)-).

In my opinion, these Sections are very important tools, so that court judges in juvenile court are able to choose the Act under which they consider it desirable to proceed, even in cases where an offence has been established. This clause clearly shows the desire on the part of the government that young persons should have available social and educational measures for their rehabilitation. This is a far cry from the strict application of punitive justice.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF YOUNG PERSONS IN THE COURTS

Unlike the Juvenile Delinquents Act, the proposed legislation offers a procedural framework with clearly defined limits. It is a question of protecting the interests of the young person and at the same time of

providing him with all necessary legal safeguards.

In the traditional scheme of things, the juvenile was considered incapable of understanding his real interest, and for this reason the Act did not confer upon him the formal protection enjoyed by offenders tried in other courts. The new Act, therefore, is more in line with the present change in the attitude of the authorities towards young people. Paternalistic and authoritarian theories are being abandoned and an attempt is being made to develop a greater sense of individual responsibility among young people and even children.

This sense of responsibility, however, cannot be developed unless the individual is brought to a full awareness of his duties and responsibilities towards society and of the protection in the form of certain basic guarantees which society owes him in return.

Since at this stage I cannot possibly provide a detailed review of the procedural framework proposed, I shall simply comment on it in broad outline, placing particular emphasis upon the more obvious effects of the innovations.

The proposed legislation authorizes the

young person, if he indicates his intention to admit the offence, to have the disposition imposed in the jurisdiction where he resides. This right likewise applies to the choice of judicial district within a given province.

It is in fact laid down in sub-clause (1) and (2) of Clause 22 that the young person may claim this right in the case of all offences with the exception of those mentioned in subsection (2) of Section 413 of the Criminal Code relating to treason, inciting to mutiny, sedition, piracy or murder. This is one of a group of rights all aimed at ensuring assistance from his community for a young person appearing before a judge.

The new legislation includes the stipulation that the judge, justice or clerk of the court shall not issue a warrant unless he has reasonable and probable ground to believe that it is necessary in the public interest to issue a warrant rather than a summons. This measure is obviously aimed at limiting the number of arrests ordered by the court.

The warrant as well as the summons is to include a statement of the alleged offence and a notice that the young person to whom it is directed is entitled to

representation by counsel of his own choosing. Furthermore, the court must not accept an admission of an offence alleged in an information laid against a young person unless he is assisted by counsel or a parent or some adult who in the opinion of the judge is capable of advising the young person (Section 26, subsection (2)-).

One of the legislation's most important innovations is undoubtedly its intention to relieve certain young offenders from a court appearance or from any formal proceedings. Clause 23 in fact authorizes the judge to designate a person to confer with the person who laid the information with a view to disposal of the case without a hearing. However, this procedure may be adopted only on condition that the attorney general of the province has no objection. The Clause provides that the person designated must draw up and present written recommendations before the expiration of two months; such an informal adjustment prevents the institution of new proceedings for the particular offence, once the judge has ordered acceptance of a recommendation for informal adjustment.

This is indisputably a course which would enable social welfare and child protection agencies centralized at regional level, as advocated by a number of people

including Judge Marcel Trahan of the Montreal Social Welfare Court, to co-operate with the magistrates in seeking adjustment of all cases where the formal appearance of the young person is not necessary or desirable. In other words, officers of the regional social services could cooperate with the judges and relieve congestion in the courts by eliminating certain appearances.

At this point we should focus on the other aspect of the proposed legislation - that of its flexibility with respect to the legal handling of different types of cases. In each alternative mentioned, the law in addition protects the young person's rights by ensuring mandatory assistance from his family counsel or some other trustworthy person.

When we adopt the precise rules of procedure as for adults and the same right of appeal we clearly demonstrate the important role of juvenile courts and equal status is conferred on the juvenile court judge with that of other judges.

To end this brief description of the protection of the rights of juveniles under the previous Act, I would

like to mention that, under the new Bill, a representative of the information media has the right, except in certain instances, to attend a hearing.

He is chosen by the judge who may also authorize the presence of one or two other representatives chosen by him. Newspapermen will not however have the right to publish any account which might lead to the identification of the child in question and result in future suffering. Their presence at the hearing is an additional guarantee of the young person's rights before the court. I fully realize that this proposition may infringe on the freedom of the press. On the other hand, it would be irresponsible on our part not to take into account another right, that of the adolescent not to carry a stigma for the rest of his life. Is there a better solution? I urge newspapermen who might have suggestions in this regard to pass them along to and discuss them with the members of the parliamentary committee.

JUDICIAL DECISION AND TREATMENT

It is obvious that the measures aimed at protecting the young person's rights before the law are not in themselves sufficient to ensure treatment in accordance with his needs. This treatment will depend on the judge's decision. At this

point the crucial question arises: Is he to decide on the basis of the offence or in terms of the total situation of the young person and his personality? The present Act stipulates that: "Where a child is adjudged to have committed a delinquency he shall be dealt with, not as an offender, but as one in a condition of delinquency and therefore requiring help and guidance and proper supervision." This already shows the concern of the federal government to take account of the conditions under which the child lives. The proposed legislation clearly implies that we must go beyond that basic consideration and it defines the forms of help that the judge should require from parents and probation officers before deciding on the appropriate disposition.

When a summons is issued to a young person or when he is arrested, the parents must be advised of their obligation to appear with him and if they are not present they can be found in contempt of court. Furthermore the clerk must notify a probation officer assigned to the court within a reasonable time so that he may be present in court.

This does not mean that the judge must in all cases have a pre-disposition report, but it does constitute

a formal recognition of the importance of the probation officer's assistance. In all cases where consideration is given to ordering transfer of a young person over fourteen to a criminal court, a probation order is mandatory. The judge must, prior to making an order for transfer "cause an investigation to be conducted under his supervision into the background of the young person and the circumstances of the alleged offence, and for the purposes thereof, he may order any social, medical, psychological or psychiatric examination or inquiry that he thinks desirable." (Clause 24(2)(a)-).

Thus Bill C-192 lays the foundation for applying progressive theories according to which, once the gravity of the offence has been established and evaluated, treatment should not only relate to the seriousness of the offence, but also and above all to the personality and environment of the young person before the court.

The terms of the disposition provided in the Bill aim at forging closer links between criminal justice properly so called and social laws protecting children and young people, as formulated and administered by the provinces. This collaboration is indispensable, as it forms the basis for a concerted action regarding the restructuring of intake, education and treatment services.

In this connection it should be noted that in carrying out the treatment imposed, the same concern is shown for the protection of the young person's rights.

The judge after considering the pre-disposition report, determines the maximum time during which a young person may be removed from his home. However, it is open to the provincial authorities to release him earlier, should they think it advisable. On the other hand if he has not become rehabilitated within the time fixed by the judge, the young person should be detained under provincial law as a social welfare measure.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

This legislation looks to the needs of the young persons while not losing sight of their right to just treatment. Nevertheless the proposals will be carefully considered in Committee and amendments may be made.

Furthermore, it is obvious that the effects of the proposed new legislation can only be judged after it has been in force for some time, and even then, not only in a general way, but also in terms of each province; the effects will vary from province to province because their social and legal services may be at differing stages of development.

In other words, although the aim of Bill C-192 is to offer a young person better protection of his legal rights, it is probable that such protection can be fully assured only insofar as provincial structures are standardized at the same time. This observation also applies to all the reforms relating to concurrent penal and social authorities.

I think the provinces must be deeply concerned - and I would like to offer them assistance - and encouragement to define their thoughts on the role of their probation offices, their institutions and on treatment, from the welfare or legal point of view.

If such dialogue is established progress will be made towards uniformity in distribution and application of funds.

One of the objectives of Bill C-192 is to ensure that all young offenders receive like treatment; to attain this goal, reforms other than just legislative ones must be made.

The philosophy underlying Bill C-192 is that the imposition of penalties for their deterrent effect alone may not work nor should penalties be imposed for pre-delinquent or quasi-delinquent behaviour. By the proposed legislation we are undertaking to cease stigmatizing deviant, but non-criminal behaviour in young persons. The Bill

recognizes only offences for which penalties are imposed when committed by adults.

In short, and it is on this general observation, I wish to conclude, Bill C-192 is only a legal framework for the treatment of a proportion of young persons who are dealt with under the federal jurisdiction and it provides legal safeguards during that process, but this framework must be complemented by the formulation of social measures for which responsibility lies with the provinces.

As mentioned earlier, in the present context the fight against juvenile delinquency remains a top priority in all developed societies and as such it deserves to be studied and dealt with, even if this means substantial investments and expenditures on the part of the authorities at all levels of public administration.

Wednesday, April 28th, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The eleventh meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam, was held in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C. on Wednesday, April 28th, 1971 at 7:30 P.M. with the following members in attendance:

Deputy Chairman Ald. J.W. Gilmore
Mrs. Helene Dunlop
Mrs. Mary Kendall
Mrs. Shirley Nicol
Mr. Don Good Jr.

Also present were the Mr. D.C. Reed, Mr. H. Gaffney, Mr. A. Bombardieri and Mr. T. Klassen.

MINUTES OF MARCH 31st, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held March 31st, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER FROM THE SCHOOL BOARD

A letter from Mr. G.M. Paton, District Superintendent of Schools was read to the Committee stating that Miss Doreen Kenmuir, a Special Counsellor on the staff of School District #43 had accepted the invitation to represent the School District on the Coquitlam Family Division Committee.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That Miss Doreen Kenmuir be recommended to Council for appointment to the Family Division Committee.

CARRIED.

COMMUNITY AWARENESS PROGRAMME

Mr. Hugh Gaffney, the Probation Officer submitted to the Committee a letter dealing with a project which he would like to see the Family Division Committee undertake. Mr. Gaffney stated that he would see the members of the Committee speaking to Service Clubs and Youth Groups in the District to make them aware of problems prevalent in the District of Coquitlam.

Ald. Gilmore offered to chair a sub-committee to make an inventory of resources in the District and requested that Mr. Gaffney prepare a letter to be sent to all groups in the community outlining the programme which the Family Division Committee wished to institute.

It was agreed that the letter and the list of resources would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee and that the Probation Officer would also provide background material to members of the Committee who would be willing to speak to different groups in the community.

Mr. Good suggested that a project which he would like to see undertaken would be meeting of the Leaders of the Community with the Youth of the Community so that the young people of the District could ask questions and express their views to such people as the Mayor and Aldermen and other prominent persons.

RECEIVING HOME

Mr. Bombardieri also stated that relief houseparents were still being sought and asked the members of the Committee to keep this in mind and possibly inform him of anyone who might be willing to undertake such a role.

GUEST FOR NEXT MEETING

It was agreed by the Community to invite Judge Shaw to the next meeting.

VOLUNTARY PROBATION OFFICER

Mr. Reed stated that with the permission of all parties concerned he would seek to use Mr. Don Good Jr. as a Voluntary Probation Officer on a trial basis to attempt to get the Community Awareness Programme off the ground.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn at 9:45 P.M.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

Wednesday, May 26, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The twelfth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, May 26, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Rev. M. Fowler
Miss D. Kenmuir
Mrs. H. Dunlop
Mrs. M. Kendall
Mrs. Shirley Nicol
Mr. D. Good Jr.
Ald. J. W. Gilmore.

Also present were Judge Shaw, Mr. D. C. Reed, Mr. H. Gaffney, Mr. A. Bombardieri and Mr. T. Klassen.

MINUTES OF APRIL 28, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held April 28, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

DISCUSSION WITH JUDGE SHAW

The Chairman introduced Judge Shaw to the Committee and Ald. Gilmore began the discussion by asking the Judge what the most important work was that he did with youth.

The Judge explained that his function is to decide what is to be done with youths who have been found guilty of an offence and he has a fairly wide scope under the Juvenile Delinquents Act to decide what can be done. The alternatives are:

1. Suspend final disposition and leave the guilty verdict hanging over the youth.
2. Impose a fine of up to \$25.00.
3. Place youth on probation.
4. Commit the youth to the care of the Superintendent of Child Welfare.

The Judge explained that he can no longer commit a youth direct to an institution.

The Judge also explained that if a child is committed to the care of the Superintendent of Child Welfare the Superintendent then decides what happens to the child and some alternatives open to him are:

1. Place the child in a foster home.
2. Place the child in an institution such as Brannan Lake or Willingdon.
3. Place the child in a group home.

Judge Shaw stated that generally when a child is committed to the Superintendent, a Social Worker and a probation officer investigate the child and recommend what should be done as far as placement is concerned.

Miss Kenmiur enquired of the Judge as to whether the character of Brannan Lake and Willingdon had changed since committals to these Institutions had come under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent and both the Judge and the Probation Officer stated that it hadn't.

The Judge then went on to explain what would happen if a youth appeared before him charged with a large number of Breaking and Entering crimes and the programme which would be followed, this being

1. If found guilty in Juvenile Court a pre-sentence report would be sought from a probation officer which would outline the social history of the youth.
2. If youth committed to the Superintendent the Welfare Department arrives at a plan for the youth's future.
3. If crimes of a serious nature, an application may be made to have the youth transferred to Adult Court.

The Judge stated that previously the Court had the big stick and could threaten to send the youth to Brannan Lake or a similar institution should the youth again get into trouble whereas now, the youth knows the Judge does not have this authority.

Ald. Gilmore asked if the big stick threat acted as a deterrent and the Judge stated that in his opinion the court should have the real and final threat as youth presently have no real great fear of the Court.

Rev. Fowler asked the Judge if the reason for the change in procedure had not resulted due to a lack of facilities and the Judge stated that this was true as smaller communities would send a problem youth to Brannan Lake as this was the only facility available to them.

Ald. Gilmore enquired as to how effective rehabilitation programmes are and the Judge stated that he would like to see more probation officers as this is a tremendous aid from Societies point of view and the end result is a saving of money.

On the matter of the use of Voluntary Probation Officers the Judge stated that in principle he supports such a move, however, great care must be taken in the selection of such persons initially and also greater care must be taken to match up the officer with the person being placed in his care.

Family Division Committee
May 26, 1971 cont;d.

- 3 -

Rev. Fowler stated that there are presently two communities using voluntary probation officers, however, they have only been in effect for a short period of time. Mr. Gaffney stated that good reports have been forthcoming up to this point on the programme.

Judge Shaw stated that probation also applies to adults and that more use is being made of probation with the population in prisons declining as a result.

Further discussion took place regarding how Voluntary Probation Officers could be obtained and the training for them.

Also discussed was the Community awareness programme and Ald. Gilmore suggested that possibly a meeting could be called of the C.C.C. Committee to have Mr. Gaffney make a presentation and then open the meeting for discussion and use the same meeting to help with the cataloguing of resources in the community.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That Ald. Gilmore call a meeting of the C.C.C. Committee to have Mr. Gaffney make a presentation on a Community Awareness Programme and that the meeting also be used to aid in the cataloguing of groups and also that this be the first step in recruitment of Voluntary Probation Officers.

CARRIED.

The Judge at this point invited members of the Committee to attend any session of the Family Court in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 9:15 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

Wednesday, June 30, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The thirteenth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B. C. on Wednesday, June 30, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Mrs. H. Dunlop
Mrs. S. Nicol

Also present were Mr. D. C. Reed and Mr. A. Bombardieri.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no quorum the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

The Judge also advised that if a child is committed to the care of the Superintendent of Child Welfare the Superintendent decides what happens to the child and some alternatives open to the child.

Wednesday, September 29th, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The fourteenth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C. on Wednesday, September 29th, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Rev. M. Fowler
Miss D. Kenmuir
Mrs. H. Dunlop
Mrs. M. Kendall
Mrs. Shirley Nicol.

Also present were Mr. D.C. Reed, Municipal Solicitor, Mr. E. Klassen, Probation Officer, Mr. J. Thomson, Welfare Administrator and Mr. T. Klassen.

MINUTES OF MAY 26, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held May 26th, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

MINUTES OF JUNE 30, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held June 30th, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

REPORT OF CHAIRMAN ON THE CANADIAN CONGRESS OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CORRECTIONS

The Chairman gave a short report on the conference and stated that as a whole it was rather dry and that even the work shops consisted mostly of listening to a panel of speakers and those in attendance were not involved too greatly in the discussion.

Rev. Fowler went on to state that there were approximately seven hundred people in attendance and showed to the members of the Committee the schedule of the conference. Rev. Fowler also passed around several clippings from newspapers which dealt with the matters discussed at the conference and also had brought back with him submissions made by various groups on the Young Offenders Bill presently before the House of Commons.

Rev. Fowler stated that he had learned, while at the conference, that the City of Toronto was apparently using a large number of volunteer probation officers which is known

there as the Junior League and that approximately 50% of those people who apply for such work do not qualify in the end.

The Chairman stated that a complete copy of all proceedings at the congress was to be made available and the Secretary was instructed to write to the congress and attempt to obtain sufficient copies for all members of the Committee.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN-ALD. GILMORE

It was duly moved and seconded,

That a personal letter be written to Ald. Gilmore on behalf of the Family Division Committee, expressing best wishes for a speedy recovery and an early return to the District.

CARRIED.

It was agreed that Mrs. Dunlop and Mrs. Kendall would draft the letter on behalf of the Committee.

DISCUSSION ON THE SUBJECT OF VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICERS

Mr. Klassen reported to the Committee that Mr. Gaffney is presently working with one volunteer who is to serve as a volunteer probation officer, however, the response to the program, at this point, has been very minimal.

The Committee discussed the subject of volunteer probation officers and felt that a letter should go forward to all organizations in the District of Coquitlam, outlining and explaining the proposal on the subject as put forth by Mr. Gaffney, the Probation Officer for the District.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That a letter explaining the Volunteer Probation Program be prepared and forwarded to all organizations in the District, requesting volunteers.

CARRIED.

Mr. Reed and Mr. Gaffney are to prepare the letter to be circulated to the groups.

DISCUSSION ON THE OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE COQUITLAM RECEIVING HOME

The Chairman informed the Committee that Mr. Bombardieri of the Welfare Office had asked that discussion on this subject be delayed until such time as certain work is completed on the receiving home.

It was decided by the Committee that this subject would be put off until the next meeting, at which time further discussion would take place.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN

10:00 P.M. SEP 29, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. [Name] stated that he had been advised that the City of Toronto was considering using a large number of volunteer probation officers, which is a

Mr. [Name] stated that he had been advised that the City of Toronto was considering using a large number of volunteer probation officers, which is a

Mr. [Name] stated that he had been advised that the City of Toronto was considering using a large number of volunteer probation officers, which is a

Wednesday, October 27th, 1971
Family Division Committee

FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEE

The fifteenth meeting of the Family Division Committee of the Corporation of the District of Coquitlam was held in the Committee Room of the Municipal Hall, 1111 Brunette Avenue, Coquitlam, B.C. on Wednesday, October 27th, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance,

Chairman Rev. M. Fowler
Miss D. Kenmuir
Mrs. H. Dunlop
Mrs. S. Nicol
Mr. D. Good, Jr.

Also present were Mr. H. Gaffney, Mr. A. Bombardieri and Mr. T. Klassen.

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29th, 1971

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the Minutes of the Family Division Committee Meeting held September 29th, 1971 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

VOLUNTEER PROBATION OFFICERS

Mr. Gaffney stated that as of this date a letter outlining the programme has not been distributed to local organizations, however, this would be done in the near future.

Mr. Gaffney informed the Committee that he presently has two volunteers who have completed the orientation programme, a man and a lady, and they are now waiting to find suitable appointments for these two persons. He further stated that he is currently attempting to locate 6 or 8 more volunteers by the end of November, and if this number can be obtained, he will have an instructor come to the District to give the 3 week orientation programme.

RECEIVING HOME

Mr. Bombardieri informed the Committee that the Receiving Home is operating at capacity and has almost since the day it was opened. He stated that up to the present time they have not been able to accommodate any children from out of the District, however, it is hoped that some assistance can be given to other areas in the future.

Mr. Bombardieri stated that up to the present time the stove and fridge have been replaced as well as some of the beds. Also, a request has been lodged with the Provincial Government for \$2,700.00 to help with furnishings and alterations to the Home; \$1,000.00 to be received in 1971 and \$1,700.00 to be received in 1972. It is hoped that an answer on this matter will be forthcoming in the very near future.

Mr. Bombardieri informed the Committee that Mr. Cammozi from the Provincial Welfare Department had visited the Home recently and was pleased with the operation.

October 27th, 1971
Family Division Committee, cont'd.

- 2 -

Mr. Bombardieri suggested that if possible, the official opening of the Home should wait until February 1972 at which time it would have been in operation for one year and also the furnishings should be better by that time.

Rev. Fowler stated that he had been in contact with a representative of the Kinsmen Club and had ascertained that this group were very interested in providing some sort of assistance with the Receiving Home. It was left with Mr. Bombardieri to contact the Kinsmen and arrange a tour of the building and to discuss the type of aid they may be able to supply.

NOVEMBER MEETING

Rev. Fowler informed the Committee that he had made tentative arrangements to visit The Maples on Wednesday, November 24th, 1971 at 1:30 p.m. and that if the Committee agreed, this would replace the meeting for the month of November.

The Committee agreed to this proposal.

CONFERENCE OF FAMILY DIVISION COMMITTEES

Rev. Fowler informed the Committee that he recently has been giving thought to the holding of a Conference of Family Division Committees to possibly co-ordinate the aims of all the groups. This was left with the Committee to consider.

ADJOURNMENT

It was duly moved and seconded,

That the meeting adjourn at 10:00 p.m.

CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN