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This is one of the first studies made, in a rural area of British Columbia, of the co-operation between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch of the Government of British Columbia in the allocation of responsibility for the probation supervision of, and the casework services to, certain male juvenile delinquents. The juvenile delinquents under consideration in this study are those who were known to the Social Welfare Branch or who were in need of a specific service provided by that Branch at the time that they were brought before the Court.

The research material was obtained from the files of one probation office and cover all cases opened over a three year period from 1953 to 1956. This probation office served a territory that was also served by one district supervisor and six welfare workers of the Social Welfare Branch.

The study compares the characteristics of a group of 28 juvenile delinquents who were known to both the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch with those of a group of 99 delinquent juveniles who were referred to the Provincial Probation Branch by the Juvenile Courts but who had no contact with the Social Welfare Branch. The groups are compared on the basis of age, offence, family background, religious affiliation, school record, work record and recreational interests.

The study then presents seven case digests in detail, to show how the decision was reached between the probation officer and the welfare worker as to who would provide probation supervision, casework services to the child and casework services to the parents. These cases present a brief social history of the juvenile delinquent, a tentative social diagnosis of his troubles, an evaluation of his needs and a suggested solution to his problems.

The results of the study indicate that there is no hard and fast rule to be used in allocating responsibilities towards the juvenile delinquents in the group under study between the two Government Branches. Each case must be considered on its own merits so that the agencies can cooperate to function in the best interests of the client. The usual social work practise of dealing with each client as a unique individual must be carried over into the field of corrections if the needs of the child are to be met by the social workers.
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A Study of the Co-operation Between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch of the Government of British Columbia in Allocating Responsibility for Probation Supervision of and Casework Services to a Group of Juvenile Delinquents
Chapter I: Inter-Agency Co-operation in Dealing with Some Juvenile Delinquents in a Rural Area of British Columbia.

At the present time almost every issue of the newspapers contains some reference to "teen-age punks" and young "hoodlums" who are racing about in cars, assaulting persons or engaging in various kinds of thefts. The newspapers and other popular publications suggest many causes for this behaviour and many forms of treatment. Suggested causes vary from "modern education" to the lack of "recreational facilities." The proposed treatments vary from beatings to psychiatric therapy.

Various private and governmental bodies in Canada have been investigating methods of dealing with both juvenile and adult offenders. The recently published Fauteux Report suggests that the present method of dealing with offenders, largely on the basis of letting the punishment fit the crime, is outmoded. The methods used must, logically, be based on a diagnosis of the offender's needs. This diagnosis should, in turn, indicate the form of treatment which will help the offender to become a responsible member of society.

Delinquency and crime are not the only problems of interest to social workers. Various social agencies have been established

---

to deal with different problems that beset individuals, family units and communities. Although a social worker's training is generic, he is frequently employed by an agency that focuses his attention on one particular service. Thus, many social workers from different agencies may have contact with a juvenile delinquent and his family. For example: a family in Vancouver, British Columbia, might consist of a father, John; a mother, Mary; and four children: Alice, 22; Bill, 21; Cliff, 16; and Joan, 12. The father, John, is undergoing treatment at the Vancouver General Hospital for ulcers and has been referred to a medical social worker there. As he is unemployable because of his illness, he is in receipt of Social Assistance from the Vancouver City Social Service Department and is visited by a social worker from that agency. Alice has an arrested case of tuberculosis and is in contact with a social worker from the Tuberculosis and Venereal Disease Control agency. Bill is on probation to a social worker employed by the Provincial Probation Branch. Cliff is on probation to a social worker from the Vancouver Juvenile and Family Court. Joan, who has been a ward of the Children's Aid Society, still has contact with a representative of that Society.

The probation officer who is responsible for supervising Cliff needs to clarify his role with those of five other social workers to prevent the duplication of services. This problem of overlapping services is not limited to one geographical area.
However, the problem tends to become more acute in urban areas where many social agencies offer services to the public. Overlapping services, as Price has pointed out, need not be useless duplication, for social agencies exist to serve people, not categories of problems. It has also been pointed out by Street that no social agency can ignore the presence of other agencies. Such organizations must accommodate their procedures to those of other agencies. Street quotes an experienced executive as saying:

An agency whose responsible officers and workers do not see its work in relation to other work in the community has missed entirely the idea that a social agency is only as successful as it is a successful part of a community plan.

It would appear to be advantageous for the executives of social agencies to evolve some method of resolving the problems that may arise when two or more such agencies have contact with a family at the same time. As mentioned previously, the duplication of services by social agencies need not be considered wasteful, but it may be considered axiomatic that useless duplication should be avoided. Successful casework depends largely upon the relationship which exists between the

---


social worker and the client. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a client to have a casework relationship with more than one social worker at one time without becoming confused. However, where two persons in the same family need casework services, competition for the attention of the caseworker may arise when both are served by one worker. This problem may be solved if they are interviewed by two social workers from the same or different agencies. In such circumstances, there must be a high degree of co-operation between the two workers.

Where such co-operation exists, it is possible for the social workers to manipulate the environment without creating either confusion or distress in the clients. But if two social workers try to manipulate the clients' environment, and if they are working at cross purposes, then more harm than good may be done to the clients.

In the case of social agencies set up within the framework of governmental legislation, there are certain functions that a particular social agency must fulfill, and by law it is prohibited from delegating these responsibilities to any other organization.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to examine some questions that arose when the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch of the Government of British Columbia were jointly in contact with certain male juvenile delinquents and their families.
The vast majority of British Columbia's population has available the services of the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch which are both social agencies employing social workers. Both agencies have responsibilities towards the juveniles in the population.

In the case of juveniles who are brought before the Court and adjudged delinquent, the probation officer is frequently required to prepare a pre-sentence report for the Judge of the Juvenile Court. This report is essentially a diagnostic social history with recommendations as to adjudication. If the child is placed on probation, the probation officer is normally the person who supervises him while the Court order remains in force.

The Social Welfare Branch has many services that are provided for juveniles and their families. This Branch, in many areas, assumes the responsibility for all social work services other than those provided by the Probation Branch. The welfare worker conducts studies of adoption homes prior to placing a child and provides supervision until the adoption is finalized by the Court. The welfare worker represents the Superintendent of Child Welfare in the majority of instances in which a child is made a ward of the Superintendent. The worker provides help and guidance to the ward, his parent (if any) and his foster parents. The welfare worker assumes the responsibility of discussing with parents or guardians the advisability of taking a child into non-ward care. When a child
becomes a non-ward responsibility of the Social Welfare Branch, the same intensive casework help is extended to the child, his parents and his foster parents as is provided in the case where the child is a ward of the Superintendent of Child Welfare. The welfare worker is responsible for providing casework services to any family which requests help in marital counselling or guidance of children. The welfare worker comes into contact with many families requiring financial assistance and having juvenile members. It is obvious that the worker has, therefore, official contact with a great many juveniles.

The Juvenile Delinquents Act states:

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. 1

The probation officer is duty bound to extend "help and guidance" and frequently does so in the form of casework services. The welfare worker also deals with children and provides help and guidance to many. It is apparent that the goals of the probation officer and the welfare worker are the same, although their legal frame of reference may differ. Many probation officers would agree with Trecker when he expressed the view that some probationers need specialized help not only from the probation officer but also from other social agencies. On the other hand, it may be argued that some children who have contact with the

---


Social Welfare Branch might benefit by being placed on probation to a probation officer. There may be some doubt as to the success of casework in the field of probation but this matter was thoroughly examined by Rumney and Murphy who stated:

Administration of correctional case work, although a part of the generic field of social case work, differs in some respects from other branches of this field, particularly in matters of approach and the use of authority conferred by statutory law. Probationers do not voluntarily submit to the jurisdiction of a probation officer. They are placed under his control by a court and remain so within the jurisdiction of the court until finally discharged. Some doubt has been expressed as to whether successful case work could be administered in such an authoritarian setting where the elements of compulsion are always in the background of the treatment.

Happily, in our interviews with former probationers we found ample evidence that this situation was no bar to successful outcome. . . . Support for this view continues to be found in the number of probationers who liked their former probation officer as a friend and were grateful for the help and guidance they received.

In reality, the probation officer and the welfare worker have frequently not only a professional interest but also a legal responsibility towards the same child. In cases where the probation officer and the welfare worker are both active in the same situation, there are certain questions that must be resolved. Who should supervise the child when he is placed on probation? Who should provide casework services to him? Who should provide casework services to the parents and/or the foster parents of the child?

Definitions

Before examining these three basic questions, it would be of advantage to define some terms that will be used.

A Juvenile: In British Columbia, a juvenile is any child apparently or actually under the age of eighteen.

Juvenile Delinquent: This 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 provisions of any Dominion or provincial statute.

Juvenile Court: Means any Court duly established under any provincial statute for the purpose of dealing with juvenile delinquents, or specially authorized by provincial statute, the Governor-in-Council, or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to deal with juvenile delinquents.

Judge: Means the Judge of a Juvenile Court seized of the case, or the justice, specially authorized by Dominion or provincial authority to deal with juvenile delinquents, seized of the case.

---

2. "An Act Respecting Juvenile Delinquents, 1929," c. 46, s. 1, Sec. 2, sub Sec. (1) (h).
Adjudge Delinquent: A juvenile may not be found guilty of an offence but may only be adjudged delinquent. Upon such an adjudication the child becomes a juvenile delinquent in need of help, guidance and supervision.

Transfer or Transfer to Adult Court: Where the act complained of is, under the provisions of the Criminal Code or otherwise, an indictable offence, and the accused child is apparently or actually over the age of fourteen years, the Court may, in its discretion, order the child to be proceeded against by indictment in the ordinary Courts in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Code in that behalf; but such course shall in no case be followed unless the Court is of the opinion that the good of the child and the interests of the community demand it.

Foster Home: Means a private home approved by the Superintendent (of Child Welfare) or a Children's Aid Society for the purpose of placement of a child therein, irrespective of whether payment is made to the home for maintenance of the child or not.

Boys' Industrial School: An institution for male juveniles for: Custody and detention, with a view to their education, industrial training and moral reclamation. . . .

1. "An Act Respecting Juvenile Delinquents, 1929," c. 46, s. 1, Sec. 9, sub Sec. (1).


A Ward: For the purpose of this paper, is a juvenile who (a) has been committed to the care and custody of the Superintendent of Child Welfare under the Protection of Children Act, giving the Superintendent full guardianship or (b) a juvenile delinquent who has been committed to the care and custody of the Superintendent of Child Welfare under the Juvenile Delinquents Act but whose guardianship remains with the parent.

A Non-Ward: For the purpose of this paper, is a child who has not been committed to the care and custody of the Superintendent of Child Welfare but who is living in a foster home and receiving supervision from a representative of the Superintendent.

A Welfare Worker: For the purpose of this paper, is an employee of the Social Welfare Branch of the Department of Health and Welfare, Government of British Columbia, who is actively engaged in casework with clients or who is employed as a casework supervisor.

A Probation Officer: For the purpose of this paper, is an employee of the Provincial Probation Branch, Department of the Attorney-General, Government of British Columbia, who is responsible to procure and report such information as the Court may require relating to antecedents, family history, previous convictions, character of employment of, and other matters respecting that person.

and to:

supervise, under direction of the Court before whom any person is so convicted, the employment and conduct of that person, and the general conditions under which he may be placed during the period of probation imposed by the Court. 1

Probation: Under the Juvenile Delinquents Act, probation is the release of a juvenile delinquent by the Court on such terms as the Court may prescribe. During the period of probation, corrective treatment may be carried out while the delinquent remains in the community. If the terms of probation are broken the probation officer must return the probationer to Court to be further dealt with in accordance with the law.

When a juvenile delinquent is placed on probation to a social worker, be he a probation officer or not, the juvenile delinquent should be helped to accept the limitations of the terms of probation at the same time as he is helped to a better adjustment. The treatment of a juvenile delinquent under probation should be viewed as casework in an authoritarian setting.

The Juvenile Before the Court

Any child who allegedly committed an act or omission that may lead to his being declared a juvenile delinquent, may be

3. Rumney and Murphy, Probation and Social Adjustment, p. 6
brought to Court. Normally, a person known as the informant places a document known as an "information and complaint" before a Judge of the Juvenile Court, which alleges the commission of a delinquency. The information and complaint names, not only the accused juvenile, but also the date, the place and the nature of the alleged offence. The child and his parents are notified of the time and place of the Court hearing. The parents may be notified or summoned to appear at the Juvenile Court hearing. After the Court is formally opened, precautions are taken to assure that the only persons present are the officers of the Court, the child and his parents and those others immediately concerned with the case. The procedure of the Court may be as informal as the Judge deems proper. After the charge is read and explained to the child and his parents, it is customary for the Court to determine the age of the child to establish jurisdiction. At this point the child and his parents are frequently asked if they wish to proceed or if they wish an adjournment for any legitimate purpose such as the calling of witnesses or the consultation of a lawyer. When these formalities are over and before the child is asked to admit or deny the delinquency, the prosecution may make an application for transfer to the regular court if the child is over the age of fourteen and the offence complained of is indictable. If the request is made and granted, the juvenile ceases to be a juvenile and legally he becomes an adult for criminal purposes. If the request is not made or is refused, the child may be asked to admit or deny the delinquency. Before the child is
asked to "plead" the Court must decide if he is old enough to do so. If the child admits the alleged delinquency then he is declared to be a juvenile delinquent. If the child does not admit the delinquency, then it is the duty of the prosecution to present the facts of the case, observing the regular rules of evidence, in an attempt to prove the child a juvenile delinquent. The child, his parents or his lawyer may conduct a defence. After the prosecution and defence have presented their cases, the Court decides whether the child is a delinquent or not. It is very important to note that the above procedure is not primarily therapeutic for this role of the Juvenile Court is a legal one. The first duty of the Court is to find a child delinquent or not delinquent as charged. However, during the legal proceedings the good of the child is kept in view by the Court. The Court is conducted in a manner commensurate with the emotional maturity of the child.

After a juvenile is adjudged to be delinquent the Court may adjudicate at once. If the Court desires further information about the juvenile before adjudication, it may request a "pre-sentence report."

The Pre-Sentence Report

When a pre-sentence report is requested, it is customary to adjourn the Court for a period of a week or more. During this adjournment, the probation officer contacts the child and his family and other interested persons such as teachers, employers, clergyman and welfare workers. The pre-sentence report is essentially a social history that is written for the Court. As the report is prepared for the use of the Court, the material is edited to include only that which is of interest
to the Court. In the course of preparing the report, the probation officer forms a tentative social diagnosis of the child and from this makes a plan for his rehabilitation. The best possible realistic plan is presented in the pre-sentence report in the form of a recommendation. The plan presented by the probation officer is followed in the vast majority of cases.

Many juvenile delinquents are placed on probation under authority of Sec. 20 (1) (e) of the Juvenile Delinquents Act. A juvenile on probation is normally seen at regular intervals by his probation officer. The officer attempts to provide all possible help to the child and his family.

It should be pointed out that a juvenile delinquent may be dealt with in many ways by the Court. He may have final disposition suspended, be fined, be committed to the custody of any suitable person, be placed on probation in his own or another home, be made a ward of the Superintendent of Child Welfare or be committed to an Industrial School.

The probation officer prepares pre-sentence reports on many juvenile delinquents. It is perhaps inevitable that some of these juveniles have contact with the Social Welfare Branch.

1. "allow the child to remain in its home, subject to the visitation of a probation officer, such child to report to the court or to the probation officer as often as may be required."

2. "An Act Respecting Juvenile Delinquents, 1929," s. 1, Sec. 20, sub Sec. (1).
The welfare worker does not have the same degree of contact with all the juveniles on his caseload. In the case of a child in ward care, the worker normally has a very close contact. The worker not only has an intimate contact with the ward but also with the foster parents. The welfare worker should be in contact with the ward's natural parents with a view to improving the home situation so that the child may eventually be returned to his own home. If the ward's natural parents do not live in the area served by the welfare worker who is responsible for the ward, then the welfare worker in the area where the parents live should maintain a close contact with them. Unless there is no hope of a child being returned to his parents and adoption is being considered, the natural parents should be given help by the welfare worker to prepare them for the return of their child.

In the case of a child in non-ward care, the welfare worker keeps the same close contact with the child, his foster parents and his natural parents. In such a case, there is frequently more opportunity to work with the natural parents towards returning the child to his own home than there is in the case of a child in ward care.

In most cases of financial assistance, the welfare worker who "opens the case" knows the entire family well. In the course of frequent staff changes, subsequent workers may gain only a superficial relationship with the family. Ideally the welfare worker should know the family as a unit and deal with all the many problems that arise, not only in relation to
financial assistance, but also in ordinary day-to-day living. In reality, the pressure of work limits the welfare worker's time to the extent that he deals only with the most pressing problems. As the welfare worker calls on the family during his working hours, the older children are frequently out of the house and he does not get to know them as individuals unless he makes a special effort to do so.

When the welfare worker provides casework help to one or more members of a family at their own request, the worker gains a close relationship with these members of the family. Similarly, when the worker comes in contact with a family under the Protection of Children Act, the worker normally establishes a close contact with the child or children and the parents.

Thus, in most cases other than those of financial assistance, the welfare worker gains a close contact with the children, their parents and their foster parents (if any). In cases of financial assistance, the worker may know the parents well but probably does not have a very close contact with the children of the family. The welfare worker tends to concentrate his efforts on cases where there is the greatest possibility of rehabilitation. It is thus apparent that the welfare worker has contact with many children and their families but that the contacts vary widely in intensity.

As mentioned previously, any juvenile who commits an offence may be adjudged to be a juvenile delinquent. Also, a probation officer may be requested to prepare a pre-sentence
report on, or to supervise on probation, any juvenile delinquent. Some of the juveniles who are adjudged delinquent already are in receipt of services rendered by the Social Welfare Branch, either directly or indirectly, through their parents. For example: a ward or non-ward who commits an offence may be brought to Court and adjudged delinquent. Some juveniles who are so adjudged, or their families, are in need of services offered by the Social Welfare Branch. For example: a juvenile delinquent may need the protection offered by being made a ward.

At this point, it should be recognized that the probation officer and the welfare worker have certain responsibilities that may not be delegated to any other person. If a child is a ward the welfare worker, as a representative of the Superintendent of Child Welfare, must keep in contact with the child. If the family of a juvenile delinquent is in receipt of financial assistance, the worker must maintain a contact with the family. Similarly, if the Judge of the Juvenile Court orders the probation officer to supervise a child on probation, then the officer cannot delegate that responsibility to anyone but another probation officer without a Court order by the Judge seized of the case.

There is, however, a certain amount of leeway and recommendations may be made to the Court. In cases where the probation officer is preparing a pre-sentence report on a child, certain problems are normally resolved between the probation officer and the welfare worker before the report is presented to the Court. Agreement is usually reached on the questions of who
will provide supervision and casework services as mentioned previously.

Before these questions can be resolved, there must be a conference between the probation officer and the welfare worker. Both parties, in all probability, will be in possession of certain social history information concerning the case under discussion. Before a conference can be held, the point of confidentiality must be clarified.

A social worker cannot ethically promise complete confidentiality for, if he records, the facts are known by the typist; and, if he receives supervision, the facts are known to his supervisor. Perlman points out that:

All a caseworker can truthfully promise is what a client tells him will be used responsibly and will be guarded against misuse.

It is obvious that both the probation officer and the welfare worker should contribute all relevant information on the case under discussion in order that the recommendations made to the Court will be in the best interest of the juvenile delinquent. However, it may be agreed that no information given in the conference by either the probation officer or the welfare worker should be used in the other's subsequent reports without permission. Both parties should recognize the fact that they are social workers acting in the best interests of the client and the community.

Limits of the Study

The subject of all relations between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch are too wide in scope to be examined in this paper. The study will be limited to problems that arose in mutual contacts with male juvenile delinquents. The native Indian juvenile delinquent shall be excluded from the discussion as he presents a unique problem that could be made the subject of another study. This study will deal with all cases of male juvenile delinquents (where data are available) that came to the attention of one probation officer over a three year period from August, 1953 to September, 1956. All cases were dealt with by one probation officer and were discussed with one district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch or his staff. In the area covered by the study, there were one probation officer, one district supervisor and six welfare workers.

Area of the Study

The area from which the cases are drawn is basically rural. It could be described as a rectangle measuring approximately one hundred by two hundred miles. In this 20,000 square miles there are only four centres of 5,000 population or more. The area has a mountainous terrain and the population centres are separated by distances of twenty to seventy miles. The principal occupations in this area are lumbering, mining, farming, ranching and railroading.

1. This probation officer is the writer.
The area has no private casework agencies which offer services to juvenile delinquents or their families. The Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch are the only social agencies in the area offering casework help. The treatment facilities are limited as there are neither detention homes, boarding schools nor psychiatric clinics.

Parts of the Study

In the first part of the study, two groups of juvenile delinquents are described. The first and larger group consists of juvenile delinquents who were in contact with the probation officer but not the welfare worker. The second and smaller group consists of the juvenile delinquents who were in contact with the probation officer and the welfare worker at the same time. A "cross-sectional" group was selected for examination consisting of all the juvenile delinquents referred to one probation officer over a three year period. The information used was derived from pre-sentence report questionnaires that were completed in the majority of cases during intake. The answers to the questions asked during intake were frequently verified in subsequent interviews with the child, his parents and other interested persons.

The two groups will be described on the basis of age, offence, family background, education, religion, employment and recreation. The study shows some similarities and some differences between the two groups.

The study was made to observe whether or not the groups were unique. If the groups are unique, then the decision as to whether the Provincial Probation Branch or the Social Welfare Branch can best serve their needs might possibly be made on the basis of the distinctions. If the two groups are similar, then the conference method appears to be the only practical approach to resolving the areas of responsibility.

The second part of the study consists of the presentation of seven case digests of juvenile delinquents who had contact with both the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch. The cases were chosen to represent the categories of clients known to the welfare worker and the probation officer. These case digests deal with male juvenile delinquents from the time that they came to the attention of the probation officer until the case conference with the welfare worker was concluded. The probation officer and the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch agreed that the problems of the areas of responsibility should be resolved on a local level for senior executives should be consulted only when a question of policy is to be decided. Street holds that this is good administrative practice.

Following each case digest, the steps taken by the probation officer and the welfare worker in the conference are examined to determine the criteria for answering the following three questions.

Who will supervise the child? Who will do casework with him? Who will do casework with the parents and/or the foster parents?

Finally the seven case conferences will be examined to determine the basis of the decisions. The facilities available to the probation officer and the welfare worker in the area under study will be examined to observe their effect on the treatment of juvenile delinquents.
Chapter II: Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study and their Characteristics.

This study was undertaken to inquire into the basis for the allocation of certain services to male juvenile delinquents, between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch of the Government of British Columbia. This investigation will show not only the basis for allocation of these services but also the weaknesses in the services available. Before examining these problems, it is proposed to describe the juvenile delinquents referred by the Courts to the probation officer. They are broken into two groups. The larger group consists of juvenile delinquents who were referred by the Court to the probation officer and who did not have contact with the Social Welfare Branch—this is Group A. The smaller group consists of juvenile delinquents who had contact with the Social Welfare Branch prior to or during the time that they were referred by the Court to the probation officer—this is Group B. The study of Group A and Group B was made in order to observe the similarities and differences that exist between the special group under study—Group B—and the larger group—Group A.

Frame of Reference

The juvenile delinquents in Group A and Group B were all referred to one probation officer over a three year period extending from August, 1953 to September, 1956. These juvenile
delinquents were referred from the Juvenile Courts in a basically rural area which is similar to, but not identical with, much of British Columbia outside the Greater Vancouver area. It may not be assumed that these juvenile delinquents are identical to all juvenile delinquents in British Columbia but they are probably very similar. Further studies may confirm this assumption.

In the three year period covered by this study, 143 male juvenile delinquents were referred by the various Juvenile Courts to the probation officer for investigation. Of this number, 115 were classified as Group A and 28 as Group B. Unfortunately insufficient data were available concerning sixteen members of Group A. The juvenile delinquent boys studied consisted, therefore, of 99 in Group A and 28 in Group B.

Age of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups Under Study

Table 1 shows the age of the children in each Group at the time they committed their offence. The age of the child of concern to the Court is the age at the time of the offence, not the age at the time of the appearance in Court. Thus it is possible for a child, on the day before his eighteenth birthday, to commit an offence and to appear later in Juvenile Court as a juvenile although he is now over eighteen years of age and thus an adult for criminal purposes.

It will be observed from Table 1 that the juvenile delinquents referred by the Court ranged in age from eight to seventeen inclusive. In both Groups the majority were over the age of fourteen.
Table 1: The Age of the Juveniles in the Study Groups at the Time when the Delinquency was Committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offences Committed by the Juvenile Delinquents in the Study Groups

The offences listed in Table 2 are broader in scope than the normal legal definitions. Under the heading "Theft" is included all offences where goods were stolen except where the item taken was a motor vehicle or where the place from which the object was stolen was "Broken and Entered." "Breaking and Entering" is a term used to describe the unlawful entry into a building whether it is locked or unlocked. The important distinction is that some object was moved in order to gain entry. "Car Theft" is used to describe all offences in which a motor vehicle was
taken illegally. "Firearms and Offensive Weapons" include all offences relating to such items as guns, rifles and spring-knives. The offences include illegal possession and use. "Motor Vehicle Offences" include such things as speeding, driving without due care and attention and driving beyond the restrictions of a driver's licence.

Table 2: The Offences Committed by the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups Under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Theft</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms and Offensive Weapons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Damage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Offences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed that the most common offences in both Group A and Group B were theft, breaking and entering and car theft, in that order. It will be noted that Group B is singularly free from malicious damage and motor vehicle offences. No theory is advanced to explain why children in Group B were not involved
in malicious damage. They probably were not involved in motor vehicle offences since the majority of them came from families where the income was too low for the family to own a car. Hence the juvenile had not an opportunity to use the family car and be apprehended committing an offence.

The Juvenile Delinquent and his Family in the Groups Under Study

Tables 3 to 11 describe certain aspects of the families to which the juvenile delinquents in Group A and Group B belong. Table 3 shows the person or persons he was living with at the time that he committed the offence that led to his appearance in Juvenile Court and subsequent referral to the probation officer. It will be observed from this Table that the majority of juvenile delinquents in Group A were living with both parents, while the largest single group in Group B were living with only one parent subsequent to the other's leaving the family. A relatively small number of the children in Group B were in foster homes which suggests that the continuing and close contacts between the welfare worker, the child and his foster parents tends to help the child to avoid delinquencies.

Table 4 shows that, when a delinquent boy is living with one parent after the parents have separated, it is more often his mother than his father. This is true of both Groups. On the one hand, this may result from the more frequent desertion by the father than by the mother. On the other hand, a boy living with his mother and without his father may be more prone to get into trouble than a boy who is living with his father and without his mother.
Table 3: The Persons with whom the Juvenile Delinquents in the Study Groups were Living at the Time when the Delinquency was Committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Living With</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent (separation)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives or in Boarding Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent (one dead)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and Step-parent (legal or common-law)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopting Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Parents (ward or non-ward)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Parent with whom the Juvenile Delinquents in the Study Groups were Living after the Parents had Separated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Living With</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows why the parents mentioned in Table 4 have left home. In Group A, the absent partner in most instances has deserted his spouse. This implies an unsatisfactory relationship that was resolved by one partner deserting. In Group B,
the parent missing from the home was absent most frequently as a result of mental illness. The absent parent was either in a mental hospital or had not returned home after discharge. It appears that more family service might be extended when one parent of a family is committed to a mental hospital to prevent problems in the home leading to delinquency.

Table 5: The Circumstances of One Parent's Absence from the Homes of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Absent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desertion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insanity</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father Absent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desertion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insanity</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Separation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the total number of children in the family of which the delinquent is a member. It is immediately apparent that the one-time supposition that the only child is the one who gets into trouble does not hold true for either Group A or Group B. It will be noted that in both Groups the number of children in the family ranges from one to ten. Table 7 shows the average number of children in the delinquent's family in Group A (4.3 children) and Group B (4.8 children) is very similar.
Table 6: The Total Number of Children in the Families of the Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children in Family Including the Delinquent Child</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The Average Number of Children in the Family of the Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Siblings in Family Groups</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Delinquents in Group</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Children in the Delinquent's Family</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 8 and 9 show where the delinquent child falls chronologically among his brothers and sisters. It is apparent that the supposition that it is the eldest child who gets into
trouble is not valid for the Groups under study. It may be, however, that the elder children tend to get into more trouble than do the younger ones. In these Tables the ordinal position of the child in the family is shown—the eldest children who are delinquents are shown on the extreme left hand column and the delinquents who have older siblings are shown in the appropriate square to the right.

No pronounced difference seems to exist between Group A and Group B in so far as the delinquent's place among his siblings—in fact, the similarities are far more pronounced than the differences.

Table 8: The Delinquent Child's Position Among the Children in his Family: Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Ordinal Position of the Delinquent Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>← Eldest ———————————————————— Youngest →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 2 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 2 - 2 - 1 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 2 4 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 1 1 2 - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>- - - - - 1 2 - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: The Delinquent Child's Position Among the Children in his Family: Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Ordinal Position of the Delinquent Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the parents' or foster parents' view of the child's behaviour prior to his referral by the Juvenile Court to the probation officer. The majority of children in both Groups were thought by the parents to be behaviour problems prior to the child's Court appearance. A larger proportion of children in Group B, however, were felt to be behaviour problems.
Table 10: The Parents' View of the Child's Behaviour 
Prior to His Appearance in Court: Group A 
and Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' View of Behaviour</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Previous Trouble</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Trouble</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the principal difficulty complained of by the parents or foster parents in regard to the delinquent child prior to his appearance in Court. It will be noted that the parents of children in Group A most frequently complained of their children's behaviour at home, while the parents or foster parents of children in Group B most frequently complained of the child's previous delinquency. It is interesting to note that in no known cases did the parents in Group A try to get help in dealing with the family problem from the Family Service facilities offered by the Social Welfare Branch.

In Table 11 the fourth entry of "Others" includes mainly trouble experienced by the child outside the home but not at school. Most of the parents who felt that their child experienced a previous problem stated that the child exhibited trouble in more than one area. Table 11 lists only the difficulty that the parent felt was most pronounced.
### Table 11: The Areas of Difficulty Experienced by the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study Prior to Referral to the Probation Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Previous Difficulty</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Adjudged Delinquent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble at Home</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble at School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Church Affiliation and Attendance of Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study

Tables 12 and 13 list the Church affiliation and attendance of the children in Groups A and B, respectively. The delinquent's parents or foster parents were asked to what Church their child belonged at the time the delinquency was committed. It is interesting to note that only five children out of the 99 in Group A were listed as Protestant which, in itself, is not a Church, whereas eleven out of the 28 children in Group B were listed as Protestant.

A child was classed as a "regular attender" at Church or Sunday School if he attended once a month or more often. Approximately the same proportion of children in Group A and Group B attended Church regularly.
### Table 12: The Church Affiliation and Attendance of the Juvenile Delinquents: Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Regular Attender</th>
<th>Not Regular Attender</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentacostal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: The Church Affiliation and Attendance of the Juvenile Delinquents: Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Regular Attender</th>
<th>Not Regular Attender</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter Day Saints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study Prior to Their Court Appearance

Table 14 shows the number of children in each Group who were attending school. Eighty percent of the children in Group A were attending school or on holidays from school at the time they committed their delinquencies while only 54 percent of the children in Group B were enrolled at school. It will be recalled from previous Tables that the children in both Groups were from the same age range, and thus it appears that Group B members have a greater tendency to leave school.

Table 14: The School Enrollment of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Attendance</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Attending School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows the average age of the juvenile delinquents in Group A and Group B in each grade at school. With the exception of children in grade four in Group A, there is a marked similarity of average ages in all grades. It will be noted that there were no children, who were members of Group B, attending grades ten, eleven or twelve. Thus it appears that the children in Group B are of comparable ages to the children in Group A in each grade but that the children in Group B are
more prone to leave school upon reaching the legal minimum school-leaving age of fifteen.

Table 15: The Average Age of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study in School by Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that just over one half the children in Group A passed all their grades in school while less than half those in Group B passed all their grades. With the present school administration policy of promotion in B. C., a startling number of children in both Group A and Group B have failed grades. It is probable that low ability does not account for all these repeated grades: rather, it is suggested that the personal maladjustment of the child has contributed in many cases to failing grades. Poor health played a small role in causing children to fail grades at school. It will be noted
that very few children "skipped" a grade—that is, by-passed a grade in school.

Table 16: The Number of Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study who Passed all Grades, Skipped Grades or Repeated Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Grades Passed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Grade Repeated</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Grades Repeated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Grades Repeated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Grades Repeated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Grades Repeated</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Grades Repeated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Grade Skipped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Grade Skipped and One Grade Repeated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 lists the attitude of the child towards school prior to the commission of his delinquency and before leaving school if he has done so. The child's response to the question of school attendance was discussed by the probation officer with the parents or school authorities in most cases. It will be noticed that more children in Group A tended to like school than did the children in Group B.
### Table 17: The Attitudes of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study to School Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronounced Like</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronounced Dislike</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment of the Juveniles in the Study Groups

Groups A and B were each sub-divided into two groups to examine their permanency of employment. It will be noted from Table 18 that Group A juvenile delinquents, who were students, were more often employed either full time, part time or during the summer holidays than were the student members of Group B. Similarly, it will be noted that the non-student members of Group A were more likely to be employed than were the non-student members of Group B, although this difference is not as marked as among the student group.
Table 18: The Permanency of Employment of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanency of Employment</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Non-Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady, Full Time Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time or Occasional Work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in Summer Holidays</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Work or Unemployed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interests and Recreation of the Groups under Study

Groups A and B were sub-divided into students and non-students before classifying their interests and recreations. Group A students were primarily interested in sports at school, cars, hobbies and outdoor activities. Group B students were primarily interested in outdoor activities. The non-students of both Groups were primarily interested in outdoor activities and cars.

In the area in which the study was made, there were few facilities for spare time activities for juveniles. The schools provided a sports programme and the local "Fish and Game" clubs encouraged lads to take part in the outdoor life. The child was given little opportunity to follow his interests in sports after he left school unless he was good enough to enter
commercial league sports. There was little chance for a lad to receive helpful guidance to further his interests in hobbies and cars. On the whole, few outlets were open to the lad who wanted to pursue an interest in sports, hobbies or cars.

Table 19: The Interests and Recreation of the Juvenile Delinquents in the Groups under Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Students Group A</th>
<th>Students Group B</th>
<th>Non-Students Group A</th>
<th>Non-Students Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports at School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports not at School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Member</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The typical child in Group A would be a fifteen or sixteen year old youth brought before the Court on a charge of theft. He would live at home with both parents and have three siblings. There would be a good chance of his being a problem to his parents because of misbehaviour at home. He would probably belong to a Church but not attend. He would attend school and be in grades nine, ten or eleven, and would have passed all
grades or at worst repeated only one grade. He would like school and have no employment. He would show an interest in sports at school or in cars.

The typical child in Group B would be a fifteen or sixteen year old youth brought before the Court on a charge of theft. He would probably live with three siblings and his mother, after his father's committal to a mental hospital. He would probably have been in Juvenile Court before and have been found delinquent. He would probably neither belong to any Church nor attend any regularly. The child would probably attend school in grade nine, having repeated one grade. He would dislike school and have no part time employment. His interests would be in outdoor activities or in sports at school.

An examination of the Tables in this Chapter will reveal both similarities and differences between the members of the two Groups. However, none of the differences are such as to make either Group unique, other than the fact that Group A did not and Group B did have contact with the Social Welfare Branch.

The differences which can be noted between the Groups are of interest to social workers. Seventy-four percent of the juveniles in Group A lived with both parents which suggests a certain degree of normal home life. Only 29 percent of the juveniles in Group B lived with both parents. Most social workers believe that a child has a better opportunity to develop a healthy personality if he has both a mother and a father in
the home. Thus most of the children in Group B were deprived of a home where they could receive the love and attention of two parents.

In 54.5 percent of the cases examined, the parents of the children in Group A believed their children to be problems before the Court appearance: whereas in 79.0 percent of the cases examined in Group B the parents considered their children to be problems before the Court appearance. Only thirteen percent of the children in Group A had been previously adjudged delinquent as against 50 percent of the children in Group B. This suggests that more children in Group B had behaviour problems of sufficient seriousness and duration to come to their parents attention than did the children in Group A.

Twenty-seven percent of the children in Group A attended Church at least once a month in comparison to eighteen percent of the children in Group B. This suggests that a greater proportion of the juveniles in Group A received regular religious training than did the juveniles in Group B.

Although the juvenile delinquents in the Groups under study were similar in respect to age, 80.6 percent of the children in Group A attended school while only 54.0 percent of the children in Group B did so. The members of Group A liked school better and had fewer failures than did the members of Group B. No information is available as to the relative intelligence of the members of the two Groups, but it is suggested that the child's attitude towards society was more frequently the cause of his poor school record than was a limited
ability. Thus members of Group B showed a poor attitude towards school that was reflected in frequent failures and an early termination of schooling.

The attitude of the juveniles towards society was also reflected in the field of employment. An examination of Table 18 indicates that the children in Group A more frequently found employment than did the members of Group B.

Although these differences are apparent from an examination of the Tables, the Groups are not unique, since the dissimilarities are in degree rather than in kind. The examination does suggest that the children in Group B tended to come more frequently from broken homes, to display more behaviour problems, to perform more poorly at school and to be more frequently unemployed than were the members of Group A. It is not suggested that all children who have contact with the Social Welfare Branch have the characteristics mentioned above but it is true for the ones in Group B who are only a small portion of the children known to the Social Welfare Branch in the area under study.
Chapter III: The Conference Method of Allocating Responsibility Between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch

Some children referred to the probation officer by the Courts for pre-sentence investigation are clients of the Social Welfare Branch and some are not. When a child, referred to the probation officer, has contact with the Social Welfare Branch, then both agencies have certain responsibilities towards him. Some decision must be reached as to the roles that the probation officer and the welfare worker will fulfill in regard to the individual child if these two social agencies are to work in the best interests of the child. There is no known method of routinely deciding what roles each social worker should follow when both have contact with the same child in order to act in the best interests of that child.

In the region under study, the probation officer and the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch agreed to hold conferences to decide the areas of responsibility when a child, who was the client of the Social Welfare Branch, was referred to the probation officer, or when a child so referred needed a service rendered only by the Social Welfare Branch.

A series of seven cases will be presented to show how the decisions were reached between the probation officer and the welfare worker. These cases were selected to provide a
representative sample of the types of cases that were discussed in various conferences. Each of the seven cases has been assigned a number which corresponds to the "Case No." in Table 20.

Case number two was selected to present the factors involved in a case that was originally referred to the Social Welfare Branch for a social history for the Provincial Mental Hospital and remained active under the category of Family Service. Case number three shows the factors involved in a long-term case of financial assistance with only one parent in the home. Case number fifteen presents the problems of a child and his family who have been intermittently in receipt of financial assistance for years.

Case number eight presents the problems that arose when a child, referred to the probation officer, needed a service given only by the Social Welfare Branch.

Cases eleven, twenty-two and twenty-four deal with wards. Case number eleven deals with a ward living in his own home. Case number twenty-two tells of a ward who was living in a foster home but who had been unable to settle in any foster home. Case number twenty-four presents the story of a ward who was settled happily in a foster home.

Each of these seven cases will be presented chronologically. The pressure of time on the probation officer to make a decision during the time allotted by the Court will be evident. This is a limitation that probation officers must accept.
The following Table shows in detail certain information about all 28 of the juvenile delinquents referred to in Chapter II as Group B. The first column sets forth the numbers of the cases in chronological order of referral by the Courts to the probation officer. The second column shows the initial service rendered by the Social Welfare Branch to the child or his family and the service being given to them at the time of the referral. The third column shows who the child was living with at the time the delinquency was committed. Column four shows the offence committed by the child that led to his Court appearance and referral to the probation officer. Column five shows what action was taken by the Courts. The "Initial Action" describes the adjudication at the time of the Court hearing, finalizing the case that resulted in the child's being referred to the probation officer. The "Final Action" describes any subsequent Court action as a result of another charge or of a breach of probation. Blanks in this column indicate that the child was not returned to Court for either of these reasons.

Definitions

MHS--Mental Health Service--i.e., preparation of reports for a mental hospital, etc.

MA--Mothers' Allowance--i.e., a form of financial assistance.

SA--Social Allowance--i.e., a form of financial assistance.

WARD--a term used to describe a child who is in either ward or non-ward care.

NW--need ward--a term used to describe a situation in which a
Table 20: A Composite Table of Statistical Information about the Juvenile Delinquents of Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>SWB Classification</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Who Child Lives With</th>
<th>Nature of Offence</th>
<th>Court Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>JAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>JAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>B&amp;E</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>B&amp;E</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>B&amp;E</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>REL.</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>JAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>FRM</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>MO &amp; S-FA</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>B&amp;E</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>B&amp;E</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>LIQ</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>PHOB.</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>REL.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
<td>JAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PROB.</td>
<td>BIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

child needs to be taken into the care of the Superintendent of Child Welfare.

PROB. — Probation.

FS — Family Service — i.e., a casework service.

FA — Father.

MO — Mother.

REL. — Relative
S-FA--Step-father.
B--Boarding.
FP--Foster parents.
Both--Both parents.
T--Theft.
CT--Car theft.
B&E--Breaking and entering.
FRM--Firearms.
LIQ--Liquor.
BIS--Boys' Industrial School.

The numbers of the following Case extracts are those referred to in Table 20. Table 20 has the cases arranged in the chronological order in which they were referred by the Courts to the probation officer.

Case # 2

Complaint

Jim Able was seventeen when he appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of attempted car theft. The probation officer was asked to represent the interests of the juvenile in Court as Mr. Able did not wish to appear. Jim and another lad admitted to the attempted car theft.

Circumstances of the Delinquency

The Constable, acting for the Crown, gave the circumstances. Jim and his companion had "hitch-hiked" from their homes in Minetown to Railtown, which is a distance of some twenty miles. After spending the evening in Railtown, they tried to hitch-hike home. As the night was cold and the hitch-hiking poor,

1. Herein after referred to as Circumstances.
the lads decided to steal a car and drive home. They were caught in the act of crossing the wires. They were taken to the police station where they made statements to the police. They were then lodged for the night in the town's lock-up.

**Pre-Sentence Investigation**

The Judge instructed the probation officer to prepare a pre-sentence report and adjourned the case for one week. Jim was released in the probation officer's custody.

Jim was interviewed in the probation officer's office. At first, the lad was fearful, but he soon relaxed and began to talk freely. The night in the local lock-up had been a very upsetting experience. The lad appeared bitter and was encouraged to talk out his feelings on this subject. Jim felt that he was always being pushed around by people, and other juveniles who had stolen cars had been allowed to go home after they had been caught. Jim seemed to expect the probation officer to defend the police for their actions. Instead, the officer inquired about the way Mr. Able treated Jim when he did wrong. The probation officer was not prepared for the hostility that poured forth from the lad. Jim felt that his father was a "no good bum." After the initial tirade, Jim explained that after his mother "left" home, his father sent the three younger girls into a boarding home while he allowed Jim and his fifteen year old brother to live at home. Mr. Able, in Jim's view, gave him nothing but abuse. Jim talked about his eldest brother who was in the Army. It was apparent that this was the only
person Jim respected. The lad constantly led the conversation away from any discussion of his mother.

Jim did not like school and had ceased to attend some two years before. He had not been steadily employed since that time.

Later in the day, the probation officer saw Mr. Able. The father talked and dressed more like a race track follower than a miner. He wore a "loud" black and white jacket, a yellow shirt, a pair of brown trousers and brown and white shoes. This is not the typical dress of a coal miner. His conversation was incoherent. Gradually, it revealed that he did not care what happened to his children and that if the "Welfare" would quit bothering him, he would be much happier. Since Mrs. Able had been committed to the Provincial Mental Hospital some two years previously, he found the family too much to cope with. The welfare, in Mr. Able's point of view, insisted that he support his three young girls who were in various boarding homes. Mr. Able's conversation was erratic and disconnected. He seemed to have trouble staying on one topic.

The probation officer then contacted the local R.C.M.Police who knew the Able family well. Mrs. Able had become violently insane some two years earlier and had been committed to the Provincial Mental Hospital. Mr. Able was considered to be not much more stable than his wife. Jim and his younger brother had been on the border of serious trouble for at least two
years. They had no guidance and were allowed to roam the streets at all hours of the day and night.

The probation officer also contacted the local Junior High School. He was informed that Jim left school in Grade eight upon reaching the age of fifteen. Jim had been an average student in school until his mother was sent to the Mental Hospital. The students teased him about his "crazy mother" and the lad began avoiding his former friends. His school work deteriorated and he soon quit school entirely.

The probation officer contacted the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch at this point and confirmed that a welfare worker was active with the Able family. A conference was arranged.

Conference Between the Provincial Probation Branch and the Social Welfare Branch

The district supervisor informed the probation officer that the Able family had been known to the Social Welfare Branch for approximately two years. Originally a welfare worker had visited Mr. Able in order to prepare a social history about Mrs. Able for the use of the Provincial Mental Hospital. After completing this social history, the worker gave Mr. Able help in the placement of his three youngest children. Mr. Able had been seen occasionally for the past two years. Because of staff changes, Mr. Able had contact with two welfare workers. The records indicated that both agreed that Mr. Able would be difficult, if not impossible, to help. The current worker considered him a very unstable person who needed support

1. Herein after referred to as Conference.
to continue functioning at his present level. The welfare worker had some contact with Mr. Able but did not know Jim.

**Tentative Social Diagnosis**

Jim Able was a seventeen year old lad who had been deprived of a normal home life for at least the two years since his mother was committed to the Provincial Mental Hospital. The family situation may have deteriorated prior to this time but no information was available to support this supposition. Mr. Able's behaviour and dress indicated that he was not a stable person but no information concerning the duration of this behaviour was available other than that he had been acting erratically for the past two years.

There was no indication of when Jim's behaviour problem began. The police and the school authorities agreed that he had been a "problem" for at least two years. Jim's ability to relate to the probation officer indicated that he had had satisfactory relationships with some adults in his life at least until the past two years.

Jim was very sensitive about his mother's mental illness which was a natural reaction to the "kidding" he had received from his friends at school. There was no indication that anyone had tried to interpret the meaning of mental illness to him. Perhaps the lad feared that he, too, might become "crazy" like his mother. Nothing was known of Jim's feelings towards his mother for he avoided the subject.
Jim readily verbalized that his father was a "no good bum" yet the lad undoubtedly had some positive feelings for his father, although he failed to verbalize them. Jim had a favourable view of his older brother who was in the Army. This was the only positive feeling that the lad indicated.

In Jim's discussion with the probation officer, he was able to talk over his problems on a realistic basis with the exception of his mother's mental illness at which point he blocked. Jim did resent authority at least as represented by the police, but was able to relate to the probation officer who is normally viewed as an authoritarian person.

**Ideal Solution**

Jim needed a suitable place to live with warm, accepting, yet firm parent-substitutes. He needed a job with male status to give him a sense of personal worth to help to compensate for his feelings of inadequacy that resulted from the community reaction to his parents.

Jim needed casework help to talk out his feelings about his mother's mental illness and his father's rejection of him. He needed to be given the facts about mental illness so as to remove any fears about his heredity causing him to become mentally ill.

Jim needed controls on his behaviour so that he would not roam the town at all hours of the day and night. He needed help in realizing that further delinquencies would probably result in institutional treatment. At the same time he needed help in resolving his feelings towards persons in authority.
He needed a healthy relationship with an adult.

Mr. Able should be encouraged to attend the local medical clinic with a view to a physical and mental examination to determine if he would benefit by some form of treatment other than that which could be provided by a caseworker. If continued casework help was indicated, he should be given support to maintain his functioning at his present level. It was thought that little progress could be made towards improving his mental condition through casework.

Practical Solution

As there was no relationship existing between Jim and the welfare worker and as she had no legal responsibility for Jim's welfare, it was agreed that the probation officer should give Jim the needed probation supervision and casework help. As there were no funds available to provide Jim with a suitable boarding home, a job would be found for him in a logging camp. This would give him a home in the "bunk-house" and a job with male status. Regular interviews with Jim would be arranged for the weekends so that he could get supervision and casework help.

It was thought that it would be unwise for one social worker to interview both Jim and Mr. Able, or Jim would probably feel that the social worker was trying to impose his father's wishes on him. A competition for attention between father and son might arise that would hinder the casework process with Jim. It was therefore agreed that the welfare worker
would continue to work with Mr. Able although the relationship between the two was strained.

**Recommendations to the Court**

Jim Able should be placed on probation to the Provincial Probation Branch for a period of twelve months. The Court followed this recommendation.

**Results**

During his period on probation, Jim matured rapidly. He saw the probation officer weekly and talked over his problems. At first he enjoyed his talks with the probation officer but resented the controls. In the first few months, Jim had several near brushes with the law but became much more stable towards the end of his probation. Upon termination of probation, Jim left his job and entered the R.C.A.F. and has risen to the rank of Corporal.

**Evaluation of the Conference**

It was agreed that the probation officer should give Jim both probation supervision and casework help for three reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker did not know Jim and therefore had no reason to carry the lad as a probationer. Secondly, the welfare worker was to continue to work with Mr. Able making it unwise for her to deal with Jim. If the same worker tried to work with both father and son, there was an excellent chance of Jim feeling that the welfare worker was trying to force his father's wishes on him. Thirdly, Jim needed very close supervision on an authoritarian level to keep him out of further trouble. This is a basic role of a probation officer.
It was agreed that the welfare worker should work with Mr. Able for two reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker had an existing relationship with him. Secondly, the worker would want to maintain a contact with Mr. Able to insure the welfare of his three younger children.

Case # 3

Complaint

Fred Baker was seventeen when he appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of committing a delinquency in that he broke and entered a dwelling house and stole some fishing gear. Fred was accompanied by his mother to Court. He admitted committing this delinquency.

Circumstances

The NCO of the R.C.M. Police, acting for the Crown, told how Fred and his friend, Bill, had been out fishing. They claimed that they had lost their fishing flies and had broken into an acquaintance's house to replenish their supply. Fred had denied the delinquency on first being questioned but admitted everything once he knew that Bill had been caught.

Pre-Sentence Investigation

The probation officer arranged to see Fred and Mrs. Baker later in the day, at their home. The officer had a talk with the R.C.M. Police prior to this interview and was given certain information about Fred. He had been a problem in the community for about two years. He was a member of a loosely organized group of lads known as the "Little Chicago Gang." This group hung around the pool hall and was a minor but constant source of annoyance to the public and the police. Fred was to be
found up town from about noon until after midnight.

The probation officer visited the Baker family and saw Mrs. Baker and Fred. Both the lad and his mother talked freely.

Fred was the oldest of four children. He left school at the age of fifteen in the hopes of getting a job, but had located only seasonal employment.

The mother at first maintained that her son was no trouble, but upon exploring further she admitted that he had been a problem to her for the past several years. The whole trouble, in Mrs. Baker's view, was the war. Her husband did not return to her after the war and so she had to go on "welfare."

People, she felt, looked down on anyone on welfare. As she talked, it soon became obvious that she was against everything. She seemed to have a chip on her shoulder towards the world and projected her troubles onto everyone but herself. She talked on and on without mentioning her son. The probation officer finally refocused the interview on Fred. The mother described him as being just like her husband. At this point, Fred explained that he had to go uptown and asked the probation officer to drive him there.

In the car, Fred explained that he had to get out of the house before he grew too angry and said things to his mother that were not nice. He said that every time the welfare lady called, his mother "sounded off about me and my old man."

Fred said that his mother kept "bugging him" and so he got out and hung around up town where the "guys keep off my back."
Fred talked freely and told how his mother had lived with Mr. White while his dad was overseas. Fred did not like Mr. White. When Mr. Baker came home, he did not stay long but left his wife and family. Mrs. Baker had lived with a couple of other men and Fred did not like either of them. All Fred wanted in life was a job, a car of his own and maybe to go into the Army like his dad.

The probation officer contacted the school authorities who recalled Fred as a potentially good student who was in constant but minor trouble. He was rebellious and resented authority. He missed a good deal of school as his mother allowed him to stay at home on the slightest pretext. Fred left school upon reaching the age of fifteen.

Conference

The probation officer arranged a conference with the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch. Mrs. Baker had been known to the Branch for almost ten years. Since staff changes were relatively frequent, she had been seen by several different workers. They found her a very demanding and self-centered woman. In the past, attempts had been made to work with her but the results of the casework were negligible. Mrs. Baker kept going over and over the same ground time and time again. Her defence mechanisms were firmly established and it would be too threatening for her to abandon them.

The welfare worker did not know Fred as a person but knew of him through the mother's description. In the mother's view, Fred was a disobedient boy who took after his father.
Mrs. Baker had said on numerous occasions that she had told Fred what to do, but he would not listen.

The Social Welfare Branch records indicated that, after World War II, Mr. Baker had divorced his wife who kept the custody of the children. Mr. Baker had since re-married and had a second family. He wanted nothing to do with his former wife or children.

The probation officer agreed with the welfare worker's view of Mrs. Baker, but had a different view of Fred. He was a lonesome lad who felt that no one outside his gang had any interest in him or his troubles. At the same time, Fred had a considerable insight into his own problem and would probably respond to any interest shown to him by the probation officer.

**Tentative Social Diagnosis**

Fred was a seventeen year old lad who had been a "problem" for several years but no definite information was available as to the time when he first became a problem. Fred did come from a broken home. It was known that Mr. Baker left the home for service overseas in World War II when Fred was five, but it was not known if there was strife in the family prior to that time. Fred "lost" his father at an early age and had never gained a suitable father-substitute since that time. In spite of this handicap, Fred was able to relate easily to the probation officer which indicated that the lad had a relatively healthy relationship with some adult persons in his life during the shaping of his personality. This experience perhaps took place at school.
Fred was not operating at the seventeen year old emotional level for he was the leader of a gang of fourteen and fifteen year old boys. Although this gang gave vent to Fred's natural leadership qualities, it was an immature form of behaviour for a seventeen year old youth.

It was not known how Fred felt about his father, but he may have idealized him for he wanted to join the Army like his father. Fred did not mention that his father rejected him by wanting to have nothing to do with him.

Fred did not respect his mother, yet he avoided open conflict with her. In the community he was looked upon as the son of a woman of easy virtue and was told so on many occasions. At home he was condemned by his mother for being "like his father." He was also condemned in the community for taking after his mother. Fred had a great need to become a person in his own right.

Fred had probably been over-protected by his mother (he was allowed to stay out of school on the slightest pretext) yet he had become a leader in a "tough" teen-age gang. This was probably a form of compensation for the maternal over-protection.

Fred was a handsome and intelligent lad who had considerable insight into his problems at home. Whilst he had love for his mother, he knew that he did not respect her because of her various common-law marital relationships, her prefabrications concerning her personal life and her habit of comparing his poor behaviour to that of his father. Fred had
a good deal of self control for he avoided open conflict with
his mother by "escaping" up town (e.g., he asked the probation
officer to take him up town to escape open conflict with his
mother.)

Mrs. Baker appeared to be a person with many guilty feelings
over deserting her husband while he "was giving his all for
King and Country." She probably felt that she had betrayed
her husband but she could not face these feelings. As a
result, she projected the blame onto the war to explain why
her husband had "deserted" her.

Mrs. Baker tended to over-protect and attack Fred. She
probably saw Fred as a living reminder of her husband. As a
result she attacked him continually and compared him to his
father for every real or imaginary fault. Mrs. Baker probably
developed guilt feelings as a result of this behaviour and,
further, tended to over-protect Fred from the rest of the
community. She did not seem to be aware of the damage that
she was doing to her son. She did not realize that her ration­
alizations were not accepted in the community, for the "true
story" of her "carryings on" was common gossip in the small
town.

Needs of the Delinquent and his Family

Fred needed help on the casework level to resolve his
ambivalent feelings towards his mother. On the one hand, the
lad appeared to love his mother and to wish to avoid hurting
her. On the other hand, Fred disapproved of his mother's
constant nagging and immoral conduct. Fred also needed an
opportunity to talk about his father and possibly to gain a less idealistic view of this man who had rejected him.

Fred needed a chance to relate to an adult male in a healthy manner. He needed to resolve his feelings towards authority. These had been shaped by his mother's attempts to control him through nagging, by her over-protection and by the code of the teen-age gang of which he was a member. The father-figures that Fred met in his home from time to time probably did not help him to respect constituted adult authority. As Fred gradually resolved his feelings towards authority, it was hoped that he would come to understand the community disapproval of himself and his mother.

Fred needed encouragement and support to get him to act on a seventeen year old emotional level and develop a degree of independence as a young man. He needed to grow beyond the level of a member of a fourteen or fifteen year old gang. He needed a job to occupy his day, to get him out of his home as much as possible, to get him away from his younger friends and to give him adult status.

Mrs. Baker needed casework help to enable her to cease projecting all her troubles outside herself and rationalizing her divorced husband's absence. She needed to resolve her guilt feelings and make a fresh start on life with more permanent emotional ties to a man than she had experienced for the past twelve years.
Mrs. Baker needed a sustaining relationship with a social worker for a long period of time. She needed regular interviews in an office, free from the distractions of her home such as neighbours calling, salesmen calling, or cooking and washing to be done.

As Mrs. Baker gained emotional support, it was hoped that her need to attack Fred would lessen and that her over-protection would moderate. She needed help in understanding how her inconsistency in first attacking and then over-protecting Fred was damaging the lad's personality.

**Ideal Solution**

Fred required a degree of supervision to act as a brake on his anti-social activities at the same time as casework help was extended to him. He should be given an opportunity to resolve his ambivalent feelings towards his mother, to gain a more realistic view of his father and to talk over his feelings about authority. At the same time, Fred should be encouraged to get a job with male status and to work steadily at it. As he gained in self-confidence, Fred should also be encouraged to break off relations with his younger friends and create friends in his own age group.

Mrs. Baker also required casework help. Her maladjustment was so deep rooted and her strengths so limited that the casework treatment would probably need to be long term. A probation officer normally maintains contact with a family only as long as one of its members is on probation. This period is frequently from six to twelve months. It was agreed that
Mrs. Baker's treatment would need to extend well beyond this period of time. Further, Mrs. Baker was a demanding person who, in the past, had competed with Fred for the welfare worker's attention. On this basis it was agreed that Fred and Mrs. Baker should each have their own social worker.

Practical Solution

It was agreed that the probation officer would provide Fred with both supervision and casework services. The probation officer would request that the Court make an order that Fred would report weekly as it was agreed that the lad needed regular and frequent casework help. It was further agreed that a Court order should be requested stating that Fred would not change or leave his employment without permission from his probation officer. This would ensure that he would not leave any employment to return to his gang without facing the possibility of further Court action. It was realized that Fred needed to mature before he could hold a job and pressure to find employment would be withheld until the probation officer was of the opinion that the lad was ready to assume the responsibility.

The welfare worker would endeavour to arrange a series of office interviews with Mrs. Baker around the subject of Fred's delinquency so that the client would have a "safe" reason for coming for the appointments. The welfare worker's existing relationship with Mrs. Baker would be intensified and all possible casework help would be offered to her on a long term basis.
It was agreed that periodic conferences should be held between the probation officer and the welfare worker to re-evaluate the situation and co-ordinate casework services to Mrs. Baker and Fred.

Results

Fred and the probation officer got along well from the start. Fred was pleased to talk about his family and himself, and gradually modified his views of his family. He was not so pleased over the limitations placed on his behaviour. He was realistic and did not test his probation officer to see if he would be returned to Court in the event of a breach of probation. After three months, Fred got a job driving a truck for a fuel dealer and broke with his gang. For the remainder of his probation, he continued to improve. A few months after the probation period ended, Fred enlisted in the Army where he is at present studying drafting.

Evaluation of the Conference

It was agreed that the probation officer should assume responsibility for probation supervision of, and casework services to, Fred Baker for four reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker had no relationship with Fred and thus she had no reason to function as the lad's probation officer. Secondly, it was agreed that the welfare worker would continue to work with Mrs. Baker. It was thought to be unwise for one social worker to deal with both mother and son because the mother's desire for attention would cause her to enter into competition with her son for the social worker's time and services. Thirdly, Fred required close authoritative supervision to keep him out of trouble and this is a function of a probation officer.
Fourthly, Fred would probably benefit more from a contact with a man (the probation officer) than with a woman (in this case, the welfare worker.)

It was agreed that the welfare worker should continue to work with Mrs. Baker for two reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker legally must continue contact with the client as she was in receipt of financial assistance. Secondly, there was an existing relationship between Mrs. Baker and the welfare worker that could be developed further in order to help the client best.

Case # 8

Complaint

Roy Charles, who was sixteen appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of attempting to have carnal knowledge of his younger sister. Roy was represented in Court by a lawyer. Roy did not admit to committing the delinquency but after the submission of evidence, he was found by the Court to be delinquent as charged. The probation officer was instructed to prepare a pre-sentence report.

Circumstances

The Crown was able to prove that Mr. and Mrs. Charles were absent from the home a great deal of the time. The parents spent a good deal of time in the beer parlour. Roy, his fifteen year old sister, Betty, and his eighteen year old brother were left at home. These three young people shared the same bedroom. During the parents' absence, Roy and his
brother "played" with their sister in a manner that was
construed, by the Court, as an attempt to have carnal know-
ledge. Roy and his older brother were found to be, respectively,
delinquent and guilty of this offence.

Pre-Sentence Investigation

The R.C.M. Police informed the probation officer that
Betty and her boy friend had come to the police station and
registered a complaint against her two brothers. The police
had known the Charles family for some time. They were of the
opinion that the boys were no trouble, but that Betty was
developing a poor reputation.

The probation officer saw Roy in the lock-up where he
had been remanded by the Court. Roy was very bitter. He said
that he and his sister had been playing together since he
could remember and that he never had made sexual advances
towards her. As the subject was explored further, Roy admit-
ted to "playing around" with other girls but maintained that
"a guy doesn't do that with his own sister."

Roy told the probation officer that he and his older
brother did not like Betty's current boy friend who was twenty
years old. Roy knew his sister's reputation and felt that
her boy friend was taking advantage of her under the promise
of marriage. Roy and his brother "beat up" Betty's boy friend
and he thought that she was getting even with them by bringing
them to Court.
Roy and the probation officer discussed the home. The lad felt that his parents were grand when they were sober but couldn't understand why they went out drinking so often. Roy said that his father was the best sports fisherman in town and that he wanted to be like his dad. Roy said that his mother was sure nice and certainly praised her cooking. He would see no fault in his parents.

Roy had left school upon reaching the age of fifteen as he did not like it. Since then, he had been hanging about home except when he went fishing, attended air cadets or went to a show. Roy had been unable to find steady employment but had done odd jobs in the stores about town.

The probation officer found that Roy related easily and was mature for his age. He had done considerable thinking about his trouble and had projected the blame outside his own family onto his sister's boy friend. He indicated an intense family loyalty.

The probation officer interviewed Mrs. Charles. She was a short, heavy-set woman dressed in an incredibly sloppy manner. Mrs. Charles felt that the whole problem was her fault. She believed that she and her husband should have stayed at home more often and fixed up the house so that "the kids wouldn't have to bunk together." She found that she and her husband got on each other's nerves at home and the problem was solved by getting out of the house and going drinking beer or fishing.
The probation officer interviewed Betty who was living in a private home that was being used as a detention home. Betty told the story of the attack on her with every lurid detail and obviously enjoyed doing so. She painted the blackest possible picture of her brothers and parents. She created a very poor impression and was obviously exaggerating. She was trying to create the impression of the hurt little girl. The woman with whom Betty was staying said that she felt the girl was trying to seduce every male who entered the home.

The probation officer visited the school and was informed that Roy had been an average student until about a year before leaving school. At that time, many of his friends quit school. Roy lost interest and merely marked time until he, too, could leave. Roy had never been a disciplinary problem at school. Betty, on the other hand, was a real behaviour problem. She tried to manipulate everyone for her own ends. She disrupted school routine again and again.

The probation officer was stopped by many acquaintances during this investigation. The questions asked of him indicated that many vicious rumours were circulating in the town. These varied from one stating the Roy and his brother had tied Betty before criminally assaulting her to stories telling how Mr. and Mrs. Charles had stood by and approved of their children's actions. Public feeling was running high.

The R.C.M. Police informed the probation officer that charges were to be laid against the parents of contributing to Roy's delinquency.
Conference

The probation officer arranged for a conference with the district supervisor concerning Roy Charles. The probation officer outlined the situation to the supervisor as presented above. The Social Welfare Branch had no contact with the family, but had heard a great deal about it since the Court hearings.

Tentative Social Diagnosis

The probation officer and the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch agreed that there was only a limited amount of information available concerning Roy Charles and his family. As a one week adjournment had been granted in order that a pre-sentence report could be prepared, time was limited.

It was agreed that Roy was a reasonably intelligent and well-adjusted lad. This impression was confirmed by the police and the school authorities. In spite of the charge laid against Roy, his sexual interests seemed to have been within the normal range. Roy displayed a pronounced loyalty to his parents and sister which perhaps was a denial of a deeper feeling that they had betrayed him.

It was agreed that Betty posed a much more serious problem than did Roy. She had been a behaviour problem at school for more than a year during which time she took part in attention-seeking behaviour. She did not appear to accept the limitations imposed upon her by school regulations. During the same period, Betty had developed a poor reputation
in the community. She reputedly had sexual relations with almost any boy who wished them. Medical examinations indicated that she had frequently experienced sexual intercourse.

Betty was going with a young man five years her senior. She seemed to be looking to him for the love, affection and attention that she did not get at home. Betty resented the attempts of her brothers to "protect" her from her boy friend. In her conversation with the probation officer it was apparent that Betty was fascinated by sex and took great pleasure in relating all the details, real or imaginary, of her experience. She also enjoyed the attention that the Court case had focused on her.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles agreed that they had been drifting apart for some time and placed the blame on their drinking and their different religious beliefs. It was agreed in the conference that the problem was more complex than the parents thought. A series of interviews would perhaps be necessary before a tentative social diagnosis of the underlying trouble could be made. The parents were willing to accept a large measure of responsibility for the behaviour of their children. They suggested that they give up drinking and fix up their home. The parents displayed a good deal of strength in their acceptance of responsibility.
Needs of the Delinquent and his Family

The feeling in the community was running high over Roy Charles. It was agreed that he should be sent out of town for his own physical safety. He would need a good deal of support to be able to accept the move and constant reassurance that he could return home when the storm of public protest had died down. During Roy's absence, he should be given the opportunity to talk over his feelings towards his parents and sister. He should be given the opportunity to express any hostility that he might have or develop towards his parents.

Betty also needed to be removed from the community. She needed to be placed in a home where the parent-substitutes could provide her with the love and attention she craved so that she would not be driven to gain love and attention from her boy friends. At the same time, Betty should be given casework help so that she could gain an understanding of why she had been acting as she had done. She needed a worker who could express warmth and acceptance of her as a person and yet disapprove of her immoral behaviour. Betty should understand that the placement away from her parents would terminate when both she and her parents were ready for re-union.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles should be further interviewed to explore the family relations so that a diagnosis of their problem could be made. After a tentative diagnosis of their problem was made, casework treatment should begin to improve
the emotional climate of the home to the point where Roy and Betty could be returned to it.

**Ideal Solution**

Roy should be removed from his home and placed in another home outside the district in which he lived. A social worker should maintain contact with him to help him accept the temporary placement and to work through any hostility that might develop within Roy towards his parents or sister. He would require a minimum of supervision.

Betty should be removed from her home and placed in a home in a district where her reputation was not known. Her substitute parents should be able to provide her with the love and attention that she required. She should be given intensive casework help to gain a more healthy outlook on life and prepare her for the return to her own home and community.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles needed casework help to rebuild their marriage and family. They required a good deal of help to solve their problems so that the family could be re-united.

**Practical Solution**

As Roy had no relatives with whom he could stay, it was agreed that he should be placed in a foster home. As it was planned to return the lad to his own home in the future, he would enter the foster home on a non-ward basis. The Provincial Probation Branch does not operate foster homes. As Roy needed a minimum of supervision, it was agreed that
the welfare worker would provide Roy with both supervision and casework services. It was agreed that the probation officer would ask the Court to order that Roy should live with such persons as the welfare worker, acting in the capacity of a probation officer, should direct.

As Betty was not a juvenile delinquent, the Social Welfare Branch would assume full responsibility for her and action was contemplated under the Protection of Children Act.

As it was decided that the Social Welfare Branch would assume responsibility for Roy and Betty on a short term basis, it was agreed that this Branch should also extend casework services to Mr. and Mrs. Charles. It was duly recommended to the Court that Roy be placed on probation to the Social Welfare Branch and be directed to live in such places as required by his welfare worker.

Results

The Court committed Roy Charles to the Boys' Industrial School for an indefinite period. Roy spent six months at the School before returning home. His older brother had been sent to jail for his part in the same offence and his sister had been made a ward of the Superintendent of Child Welfare. As Betty was a ward, the welfare worker continued contact with both Betty and her family. The family situation had improved sufficiently during Roy's stay in the School that he was allowed to return home on probation to the probation officer. Roy obtained work in a local store as a clerk and settled back into community life. He has adjusted well and has not re-appeared in Court.
Evaluation of the Conference

It was agreed that the welfare worker should provide Roy Charles with both probation supervision and casework services for two reasons. Firstly, Roy needed a service given only by the Social Welfare Branch—a foster home—so that the welfare worker would have a legal reason for a continuing contact with the lad. Roy would probably become confused if he had to form a new relationship with both a probation officer and a welfare worker. Secondly, Roy did not need intensive, authoritarian supervision—normally provided by a probation officer—to keep him out of further trouble.

It was further agreed that the welfare worker should extend services to Mr. and Mrs. Charles because, if the Social Welfare Branch were to be responsible for the Charles' children, then the worker would properly wish to maintain contact with the parents.

Case # 11

Complaint

Jack Davis was fifteen when he appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of car theft. He, his mother and his welfare worker were present in Court. Jack admitted committing the delinquency.

Circumstances

The R.C.M.Police stated that they had received a complaint that a car had been stolen from a parking lot.
Investigation revealed that Jack Davis and a friend were responsible for the theft. The lad was not co-operative during the investigation. In Court, the police questioned the lad about his previous record and he admitted to three prior delinquencies. These offences were theft, car theft and breaking and entering. The police recommended committal to the Boys' Industrial School.

Pre-Sentence Investigation

The probation officer talked to the R.C.M. Police, who stated that Jack had been in and out of trouble for the past year. In their view, all this moving from one "welfare" home to another was a waste of time, for the lad was just plain no good. They also thought something should be done about Mrs. Davis as she was a constant source of annoyance. She was forever calling on the police for protection against some mysterious stranger or threatening a paper boy with a knife or hearing of a plot to rob the local bank. In short, the police felt that she was "a crack pot."

The probation officer talked to the welfare worker. The latter said that Jack had been made a ward about four years ago under the Protection of Children Act, as a result of his habit of running away from home. The probation officer arranged to hold a conference with the welfare worker and the district supervisor after seeing Mrs. Davis and Jack.
The probation officer interviewed Mrs. Davis in his office. She immediately poured out her troubles. Her husband had tried to kill Jack ten years ago and she had not lived with him since. She had been a good woman and tried to rear her two boys but everything had gone wrong. Her husband sent people to watch her. As she talked, her conversation was clear, but not too closely related to reality. She had a little girl with her who appeared to be about three and who called Mrs. Davis "mother."

Mrs. Davis had nothing constructive to say about Jack except that she could not understand him.

Later, the probation officer interviewed Jack who talked freely. The lad at once pointed out that he was a close friend of numerous boys who were in trouble. He seemed proud of his delinquent friends. He was particularly proud of one friend who had escaped from the Boys' Industrial School six times.

Jack seemed a lonely lad who was trying to impress people by being tough, thereby gaining attention. He did not express any love for his mother and described her as being "crazy as a bed bug." In spite of Jack's big talk, he seemed frightened but resisted every attempt to discuss anything other than surface problems. When the probation officer indicated that the interview was at an end, Jack continued to talk and seemed to be trying to hold the probation officer's attention.
Prior to the conference with the welfare worker, the probation officer saw several probationers who knew Jack. They informed him that Jack was "okay" and "if his crazy mother would leave him alone, Jack would be okay." The probationers held the view that every time Jack got into trouble at home, he got into trouble with the "cops."

Conference

The welfare worker presented a social history and running record summary to the district supervisor of the Social Welfare Branch and the probation officer.

When Jack was five, his father, while under the influence of liquor, had attacked the lad, and Mrs. Davis. Mr. Davis had been taken to Court and sent to jail for this assault. He never returned home. Mrs. Davis applied for, and received, social assistance after her husband's desertion.

The present Davis family consisted of Mrs. Davis, Jack and his three year old, illegitimate sister. Jack had an older brother who had been killed in a hunting accident about a year prior to the conference.

Mrs. Davis was very unstable and appeared to have paranoid tendencies. She could not stand to have Jack under her roof and continually threw the lad out of home. After he had been gone a day or so, she wanted her "dear little Jackie" home again.
Jack could not tolerate his mother. When he was at home he wanted to get away to any place other than his own home. Once he was away, he wanted to return to his mother.

When Jack was eleven, he was made a ward of the Superintendent of Child Welfare. He had gone through one foster home after another, being removed under stress or running away from each. During the past year, Jack had been involved in delinquent behaviour. Six months ago, it had been decided to allow him to return to his own home as he did not seem to benefit from foster home care. The welfare worker had worked intensively with Jack and Mrs. Davis. There had been some improvement in Mrs. Davis' outlook on life and an improvement in Jack's attitude towards his mother. Jack was still having trouble with his feeling towards authority.

The worker found it very difficult to deal with both Mrs. Davis and Jack, as they competed for his attention. He was quite definite about the movement in the casework with both clients.

Jack's school record showed that he had left school on his fifteenth birthday. Although he was of average ability, he had failed two grades due to frequent absences. He had not gained employment since leaving school.
Tentative Social Diagnosis

Four years before the conference, Jack was recognized as a child with an acute problem, at which time he was taken into ward care. He was apprehended because he frequently ran away from home. This suggested that Jack and Mrs. Davis had trouble in forming healthy relationships with each other. Jack's behaviour pattern carried over into foster homes. When he gained a feeling that he was being accepted, he would test the limits set by his foster parents. If he was "thrown out" because of his poor behaviour, he was moved to another foster home. If he was not "thrown out," he would run away. Jack continually expressed a desire to return to his own mother but was dissatisfied as soon as he did so. When he did return to his own home, Jack continued to act in a provocative manner which led his mother to "throw him out of house and home." If this ruse did not succeed, he would run away.

Jack's behaviour problem was becoming more acute. When he was "thrown out" of home or had run away from it, he tended to commit delinquencies. This latter behaviour had brought him to the Juvenile Court.

Jack's underlying difficulties probably began when he was five or younger. His father "rejected" him by trying to kill him. Mr. Davis never returned to the home. Jack probably had other "father-figures" in his life from time to time, as suggested by the fact that he had a half sister aged three. There was no information as to Jack's feelings about his father.
His feelings towards his mother were ambivalent. He had little respect for her and described her in most uncomplimentary terms. He frequently ran away from home as he could not tolerate her. Yet Jack did not feel comfortable away from his mother. He felt compelled to return to her from any foster home.

Jack seemed to gain little satisfaction or security in either his own home or foster homes. He concentrated on gaining the approval of the teen-age delinquent group in town. He tended to brag to increase his status in this regard.

Jack had shown an improvement in his attitudes during the last while as a result of interviews with his welfare worker. This improvement was being hampered, however, because he was in competition with his mother for the worker's attention.

Mrs. Davis was an unstable person. She had rather fantastic ideas about people trying to spy on her or trying to harm her. She occasionally became violent. She seemed to lack affection and attention to the point where she tried to draw attention to herself by odd behaviour and fantastic stories. She used Jack as a source of affection, but could or would give none in return. Mrs. Davis wanted her "Jackie" at home when he was away, but could not tolerate him when he was at home.
Mrs. Davis was showing some improvement in her behaviour and attitude towards Jack as a result of the attention given to her by the welfare worker. Her improvement was being hampered by her competing, with her son, for the worker's attention.

It was agreed that there was very little hope for a marked change in Jack or Mrs. Davis.

**Needs of the Delinquent**

Jack needed immediate controls placed on his anti-social actions or he would be committed to an institution. He needed a home with warm, accepting parent-substitutes who could tolerate his testing and running away. He also needed a sustaining relationship with a social worker who could be firm and helpful. He needed to resolve his feelings towards his mother and father, and then to society as a whole. When Jack gained enough strength, he would need employment and then to move into the world of self-supporting individuals and become a person in his own right.

Mrs. Davis needed a different social worker from Jack so that the element of competition would drop out of the casework situation. She needed a good deal of support, attention and understanding to gain enough strength so that a real attempt could be made to modify her outlook on life.

**Ideal Solution**

Strict controls should be imposed on Jack by the Court. He should be required to report promptly and regularly to his social worker under the compulsion of further Court
action. He should be removed from his own home and placed in a treatment home where he could receive continuing contact with good parent-figures in spite of his acting-out and socially unacceptable behaviour. He should not be expected to relate positively to the parent-figures in the foster home until he was ready to do so. This home should provide him with support and controls. Jack should be seen regularly while in the treatment home where casework would continue with a view to helping the lad to resolve his many feelings towards his family and authority. When Jack had sufficient strength, he should be helped to find regular employment.

Mrs. Davis needed intensive casework help to support her at her present level, to further strengthen her and to work for an improvement in her attitude towards life. She definitely should not be on the caseload of the same social worker who would be caring for Jack.

Practical Solution

There was no treatment home for Jack. There was no foster home that would meet his needs. He could be placed in the Boys' Industrial School or in his own home. Although the prognosis was poor, it was agreed to try to work with Jack in his own home. It was hoped to control his behaviour by very close supervision from the probation officer, who would assume full responsibility for Jack's supervision and casework. He would also try to make Jack feel that he
was a person in his own right while giving him suggestions and directions. It was hoped that the probation officer could help the lad to work through his feelings towards his parents and authority. It was agreed that Jack was not ready for employment until he became more stable.

Since the welfare worker believed that he had a better relationship with Mrs. Davis than with Jack, it was further agreed that the mother would continue to be the responsibility of the worker who had already helped her considerably. The welfare worker would continue to support Mrs. Davis with a view to helping her to gain sufficient strength to modify her behaviour further.

Recommendations

It was recommended to the Court that Jack Davis be placed on probation for an indefinite period. The Court concurred.

Results

Jack Davis showed a steady improvement for about six months at which time he met a delinquent from another area of the province. The two lads began to run around at all hours of the day and night. Jack failed to report to the probation officer as directed. The officer contacted Jack and explained that he must report, but the lad failed to do so. He was returned to Court as an unsatisfactory probationer where his attitude led to a transfer to Police Court and a sentence to New Haven.

Mrs. Davis continued to receive casework help from the welfare worker and slow progress has been made in her case.
Evaluation of the Conference

It was agreed that Jack Davis should receive both probation supervision and casework services from the probation officer for three reasons. Firstly, although Jack was a ward, he could be seen by the probation officer. The district supervisor and the welfare worker agreed that, as the lad was living at home, it would be legally sound if the probation officer supervised him and gave him casework services on the condition that the probation officer kept in frequent contact with the welfare worker. Secondly, Jack needed close and authoritative supervision to control his delinquent tendencies. Thirdly, as it had been decided that the welfare worker would continue to work with Mrs. Davis, the probation officer should deal with Jack to prevent the mother and son competing for one social worker's attention.

It was also agreed that the welfare worker should continue to work with Mrs. Davis for two reasons. Firstly, as she was in receipt of financial assistance, the welfare worker had a legal responsibility to maintain a contact with her. Secondly, the welfare worker had a good casework relationship with Mrs. Davis and was helping her to improve her attitude towards life. It was believed that it was in Mrs. Davis' best interest for the welfare worker to continue this casework process.
Complaint

Henry Ellis was fourteen when he appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of breaking, entering and theft. Henry was represented in Court by his mother and the Roman Catholic priest. Henry admitted the delinquency.

Circumstances

Henry and a friend had gone hiking for a weekend when they came upon a logging camp. The lads smashed in a window of a bunk house and stole cigarettes, a rifle and some money. The rifle had been recovered.

Henry admitted to being found delinquent on two previous charges of theft.

The Court adjourned for one week for a pre-sentence report.

Pre-Sentence Investigation

The probation officer talked to the R.C.M. Police who had a wealth of information about the Ellis family. There were ten children in the family—the five oldest being boys. All the boys had been found delinquent at least once. The Ellis family was at the root of half the trouble in the community. The family was looked down on by almost everyone. The father was away from home logging most of the time, but Mrs. Ellis was the friendly type and entertained her husband's "friends" while he was away. The parents, the ten children and two dogs lived in a two-roomed cabin
located on the side of a mountain. The police did not think that the Ellis' could be helped.

The probation officer then called on the Roman Catholic priest who knew the Ellis' well. The family was not Roman Catholic, but the five boys "scrounged" at least half their meals from the priest. The priest saw Mr. and Mrs. Ellis as hopeless alcoholics who had lost almost all self-respect. The family lived in filth and squalor beyond belief, but in spite of everything, there was an intense family loyalty. Mr. Ellis was unemployed half the time and then the family went on welfare. The priest felt that the family were all of limited ability but that they could be helped.

The probation officer called at the school. The teachers all knew the Ellis family. The children were below normal in intelligence as measured by the tests. They came to school only occasionally. They had many excuses for failing to arrive--the clock quit working, the pump quit working, the fire wouldn't go, the day was too cold, etc. When the children did come to school, they were dirty and occasionally lousy.

The probation officer called on the Ellis home. The police, the priest and the school authorities had not exaggerated. Mrs. Ellis was in an advanced state of intoxication when the probation officer arrived. No liquor was in sight. Mrs. Ellis said she only went up town when her boys were in Court and then thoughtfully added "Shore have been up town a lot of late." The probation officer could not discuss the
situation with her as she was too intoxicated. He told Mrs. Ellis she had better sober up in a hurry or it would be tough on Hank. She went outside, was sick and came back. As she and the probation officer talked, the children kept making comments. It was obvious that they saw nothing wrong with their way of life. It was also obvious that there was an intense family loyalty.

The probation officer asked Mrs. Ellis about the welfare and she said that the family went on welfare every-time her husband was out of work. She thought the welfare sure asked a lot of questions.

The probation officer then got Hank out of the cabin for a talk. Hank said that he had stolen the stuff because he wanted it. He said it as if that was a valid reason. When the probation officer mentioned the possibility of his being taken away from home, Hank became upset and began to sob. He never wanted to leave home. The probation officer asked Hank what he wanted to do and the lad said that he wanted to work in the bush and buy a horse and a guitar.

The probation officer telephoned to the district supervisor and arranged a conference for the following day. Conference

The welfare worker presented the social history to the district supervisor and the probation officer. The Ellis family had been a constant source of complaints from members of the community who thought something should be done to the children. It was frequently suggested by members of the
community that the Ellis' ought to have all their children taken away from them. The Social Welfare Branch had contact with the family for about eight years. Four different workers had visited the home at various times.

The welfare worker was called upon from time to time to provide financial assistance to the family and also tried to render some Family Service. The Ellis' accepted the former but rejected the latter. The worker said that she found it impossible to form a meaningful relationship with Mrs. Ellis and little was ever seen of Mr. Ellis as he was usually away at work or drunk at home. The welfare worker noted that there was a very close bond between all members of the family.

Tentative Social Diagnosis

Henry Ellis, better known as Hank, was an undersized, unwashed, dull fourteen year old. Hank, it was agreed, had adjusted perfectly to his home life. He had learned to accept drinking, fighting, stealing and immorality as the "normal" way of life. He had no desire to change and seemed happy with his present mode of existence. Hank's only regret was that he frequently got caught by the police after "having some fun."

Mrs. Ellis was an alcoholic. She could not face the day without a drink any more than she could go up town without a little "liquid courage." There was no indication that Mrs. Ellis had ever led a better life herself. She, as Hank, accepted life as she found it and showed no desire
to change. Informants and the files of the Social Welfare Branch agreed that the Ellis' had accepted their present mode of life since the parents were first married. Mrs. Ellis either accepted the two-roomed cabin, the limited family income, the filth and the low moral tone of the home as normal or shut her eyes to the whole situation by drinking.

Little was known of Mr. Ellis' reaction to the situation but he was reported to hold similar views to those of his wife.

All of Hank's brothers had been in Juvenile Court on different occasions. They, too, accepted the family's way of living.

The community looked down on the Ellis' as the lowest of the low in the social order. They were blamed for half the trouble in the area and rightly so in about half the instances.

There were two strengths in the whole situation. On the one hand, Hank and all the family respected the parish priest. They would go to him and talk over all the day's happenings and feel perfectly safe for, although the priest would point out the error of their ways, he would never laugh at the family. On the other hand, there was an intense family loyalty that existed between all members of the Ellis family. They would fight viciously among themselves but form a solid front against any outsider. The idea that Hank might be taken away from them was so foreign that they could not accept it.
There was not sufficient information available to make even a tentative diagnosis as to the origin of the troubles of the Ellis family.

**Needs of the Delinquent and his Family**

Hank, and all the Ellis children, needed a complete social re-education. He needed to learn manners, morals and ethics. This re-education was virtually impossible in his own home. If it were not for the strong family ties, Hank might profit from a period in a foster home where the parent-substitutes could help to re-educate the lad.

Mr. and Mrs. Ellis should be "sobered up" and encouraged to rebuild their home physically and morally. This would be, without doubt, a long, slow task.

**Ideal Solution**

A foster home should be found for all ten of the Ellis children that would be willing to accept them and re-educate them in the basic ways of life.

While the children underwent treatment in a foster home, the parents should be offered real help on material and casework levels to rebuild their home physically and emotionally for their children’s return.

**Practical Solution**

It would be useless to consider taking Hank into care, for his family loyalty would have drawn him away from his foster home and back to his own home. If Hank was to be placed in a foster home, all ten of the Ellis children would have to be placed with him to insure any hope of stability. No foster home was prepared to accept ten children.

It was decided to use the strengths in the family
situation. It was agreed that the only way to encourage the Ellis' to change was through the use of authority. As the welfare worker had no effective relationship with the Ellis' and as the probation officer was a direct officer of the Court, it was agreed that the latter would assume this responsibility. The plan agreed upon was to play on the family unity and point out in very clear terms that if the Ellis family did not show a change for what the probation officer considered the better, then they could expect the children to depart one by one to other areas where more effective treatment could be carried out.

This was not a threat but a promise, and the Ellis family must be made to understand it. The improvements the probation officer would insist on would be small but cumulative.

The probation officer would delegate his responsibility for supervising Hank to the priest who had expressed his willingness to undertake this work. It was believed that the priest was in a far better position to supervise Hank than was the probation officer who came to town only once a week.

Recommendations to the Court

The probation officer recommended that Hank Ellis be placed on probation to the probation officer for an indefinite period, with the understanding that the priest would assume much of the responsibility for supervision. This procedure assured a maximum amount of supervision for
the lad, while protecting the priest in the event that a charge of a breach of probation had to be laid. Such a charge would be laid by the probation officer. The Court concurred.

Results

Hank has not appeared in Court since being placed on probation some two years prior to the time of writing. There has been some improvement in the family, brought about by pressure. Hank’s brothers got into trouble, one after the other. All appeared in Court and were placed on probation. The frequency of the Ellis’ boys’ appearances in Court, has, however, decreased.

Evaluation of the Conference

It was agreed that the probation officer should be ultimately responsible for the supervision of Henry Ellis (although the actual responsibility was to be delegated to the priest) for two reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker did not know Henry as a person. Secondly, Henry needed very close supervision such as the priest could give, but the latter needed an authoritarian person in the background to file a breach of probation on Henry if such a step were necessary.

It was agreed that the probation officer should do the authoritarian casework with the family (although the welfare worker would have contact with them when financial assistance was needed) for two reasons. Firstly, the Ellis’ saw the welfare worker only in the role of an inquisitive relief-
giver, but not as a helping person. Secondly, the Ellis family would probably respond only to an authoritative approach and the probation officer, with a close relationship to the Court, was in a better position than the welfare worker to use authority to help the family to improve in spite of itself.

Case # 22

Complaint

A welfare worker phoned the probation officer in order to arrange a conference on Tom Fox, who was a ward of the Superintendent of Child Welfare. The worker said that Tom had been charged by the R.C.M. Police with breaking, entering and theft. The worker suggested that a conference should be held with the probation officer, the district supervisor and himself present.

Pre-Trial Conference

The welfare worker presented the social history on Tom Fox. Tom was a fifteen year old lad who had been a ward for three years. When Tom was two, his father went overseas. During his absence, Mrs. Fox gave birth to an illegitimate child. When Tom was six, the parents were re-united for several months before separating. Tom was seven when his father committed suicide. Three years later, Mrs. Fox re-married. When Tom was twelve, his mother and step-father deserted him and his half sister.
During Tom's three years as a ward, he had been in nine foster homes. He was an unhappy lad who felt that he was not wanted. As soon as he began to get the feeling of being accepted, he began to test his foster parents. His testing was too violent in all but the last home, and his conduct there made it likely that his foster parents would ask for his removal.

The welfare worker had been helping Tom for two and a half years. The lad looked on him as his only friend and fulfilling the role of a good father-figure. The worker felt that Tom had not sufficient inner strengths to accept much in the way of controls from him. The worker felt that he was the only emotional anchor that Tom had in the world, and that if he became authoritarian the lad would be cast adrift on a sea of emotional upheaval. The worker did feel that Tom needed some controls, but that the nature of his relationship prevented him fulfilling this role. The welfare worker suggested that the wisest course of action would be for Tom to be placed on probation to the probation officer. He could act in a friendly but authoritarian manner to encourage Tom to break with his present delinquent associates. The welfare worker would continue his more accepting role and at the same time, try to help Tom to accept authority as represented by the probation officer.

No decision was reached at the time as to recommendations and a further conference was agreed upon.
Court Hearing

Tom appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of breaking, entering and theft. He was represented by his welfare worker. Tom admitted committing the delinquency.

The Constable, acting for the Crown, gave the circumstances. Tom and a friend broke into a house whose owners were on holidays. Tom had used an axe to chop down a door to gain entry. The lads had stolen a watch, a ring, a rifle, some change and some liquor. They drank the liquor, tossed flour about the house, divided the loot and returned to their homes.

Tom had appeared in Juvenile Court previously on a charge of theft.

The Judge of the Juvenile Court adjourned the hearing for one week and requested a pre-sentence report.

Pre-Sentence Investigation

The probation officer had a long talk with Tom Fox. The lad was very upset and felt that no one really cared for him. He talked warmly of his welfare worker but was not too sure about him. Tom hadn't the slightest idea why he got into this trouble. The probation officer asked him if he thought he could do better, and the lad said that he thought he could. The officer explained to Tom that he would like to see the lad on probation so that he could help him to stay out of trouble. The probation officer also explained that it was his duty to have Tom returned to Court if he continued to misbehave. Tom said that he understood for he knew other boys on probation.
A conference was held between the welfare worker, the district supervisor and the probation officer. The welfare worker reviewed the situation again.

Tentative Social Diagnosis

Tom Fox was a fifteen year old lad who tested in the average range of general intelligence but whose performance at school fell below average, thus suggesting that an emotional involvement was hindering his development. He had experienced frequent emotional upsets in his own home prior to being made a ward. Since being made a ward, he had moved from home to home, never finding emotional security.

It was impossible to say when Tom's own home life began to deteriorate. Mr. Fox left the family for military service overseas when Tom was two. Some time after this, Tom gained a common-law father for an unknown length of time. Tom's own father returned home for several months when the lad was six. Mr. Fox again left the family and a few months later committed suicide. When Tom was nine, his mother re-married. Tom's new father could not tolerate any competition for his wife's affection from her children. Finally the parents deserted the children and thereby resolved the problem of competition for attention between children and step-father. As a result of this experience, Tom had learned to fear putting his trust in any man for all his "fathers" had deserted him. It was known that Tom
had very strong feelings against his step-father who was, in Tom's view, a "bad" man for making his mother run away.

Tom could not accept the fact that his mother had deserted him. He had rationalized a story telling how his "wicked" step-father had made his "good" mother run away. Tom had built a dream mother in his mind who was the only good person he knew. Tom loved his mother, or the image he had of her, a great deal. Neither Tom nor the Social Welfare Branch knew the whereabouts of the lad's mother.

Tom had not emotionally been able to accept the desertion by his mother, and believed that one day she would reclaim him. He could not accept life in a foster home. He had a great need to test every situation and did so with such effect that he rarely spent more than four months in any one foster home. Tom's gross misbehaviour in various foster homes led to requests for his withdrawal. Tom viewed this as rejection by his foster parents.

During the last two and a half years, Tom had a close, continuing relation with only one person, his welfare worker. Tom almost trusted this worker in spite of the fact that he was a man. Tom was beginning to relate to his welfare worker as a boy might relate to a good father. He was still wary of his worker and seemed prepared for, if not expecting, the latter to betray him. This relationship seemed to be Tom's only continuing, healthy one with an adult.
Needs of the Delinquent

Tom needed a great deal of help in order to come to the point where he realized that adults did not automatically reject him. He needed help to realize that adults did not dislike him, but only his anti-social acts.

Tom needed to be placed in a foster home where his provocative testing could be accepted, where he would gain controls and where he would be able to stay as long as it was in his best interests. The parent-substitutes in this home should not expect Tom to relate to them until he gained the inner strengths to do so.

Tom needed casework help to resolve his feelings towards his father, to gain a more realistic view of his mother and to resolve his antagonisms towards society. At the same time, he would require considerable support to remain within his foster home.

Tom also needed a check placed on his delinquent behaviour or he would be sent to an institution where he would lose contact with his welfare worker who provided him with the only healthy relationship that the lad had.

Ideal Solution

Tom should be placed in a treatment home where he could act out in a controlled setting until he had proved to himself that he was being accepted. During this period, he should maintain his contact with his welfare worker who could give the lad support and encouragement to settle into the home. His welfare worker should also help Tom to
resolve his feelings towards his father(s), to gain a more realistic view of his mother and to accept the controls of society.

**Practical Solution**

There was no treatment home available. Tom's foster parents agreed to keep him for a little longer, at least. They made it clear, however, that they would stand for little more foolishness. It was agreed that the welfare worker would work with Tom on an accepting basis and carry on his present casework relationship. The probation officer would work with Tom on a friendly but authoritarian basis with a hope of controlling his anti-social behaviour. The probation officer would also give the lad controls and support but leave more intensive casework to the welfare worker who had a good relationship with Tom.

Regular conferences would continue to insure cooperation between the probation officer and the welfare worker.

**Recommendations**

The probation officer recommended that Tom be placed on probation to the Provincial Probation Branch for an indefinite period. The Court concurred.

**Results**

During the six months the probation officer had contact with Tom, the lad was in and out of minor trouble, but did not appear in Court. At first he resented the controls and the minor punishments inflicted. These included a
variable curfew, removal of privileges and disagreeable tasks such as writing an essay. Tom came to accept his probation officer as a "tough" friend. As his behaviour improved, privileges were extended to him.

Tom's mother somehow found her son's whereabouts and wrote to him. He ran away to her new home in Ottawa. A social worker visited this home, felt that Tom was settling in well and recommended that he be allowed to remain there. Although Tom had broken the terms of his probation, the Judge agreed that no action should be taken to return him to Court.

**Evaluation of the Conference**

It was agreed that the probation officer should supervise Tom Fox as a probationer but not extend casework services to the lad. These would be provided by his welfare worker. This decision was reached because of the relationship that existed between Tom and his worker. The only adult in whom Tom placed any real trust was his welfare worker. This relationship was not strong enough for the welfare worker to act as a probation officer for Tom. As a result, it was decided to be in Tom's best interest if the welfare worker continued in his normal role while the probation officer dealt with Tom only in regard to controlling his anti-social behaviour in the community.
Complaint

The welfare worker phoned the probation officer to say that Joe Gibb, a ward, was to appear in Court on a charge of theft. She requested that a conference be held prior to the Court hearing.

Pre-Trial Conference

Joe was a fourteen year old lad who had been a ward for approximately a year.

When Joe was seven, his parents had separated after a stormy married life. As no trace could be found of Mr. Gibb, the mother applied for, and was granted, financial assistance by the Social Welfare Branch. Joe and his younger brother began to be a source of trouble on the coast where they lived with their mother some two years previously.

When Joe first appeared in Court for committing a delinquency, the welfare worker in Coasttown took a great interest in the family. It was suspected that Mrs. Gibb was not much concerned about her two sons and was using her male acquaintances as a source of income. The worker tried to encourage her to mend her ways in the interests of the children. Mrs. Gibb and her sons moved to Bayville to make a fresh start. Joe promptly became involved in a breaking and entering. The Judge of the Juvenile Court in Bayville put Joe on probation to the local welfare worker. A few weeks later Joe broke and entered the Judge's office. At this time, Joe and his brother were made wards.
Joe was moved to Railtown where he had been in the same foster home for almost a year. During this time, he had one welfare worker. Joe had settled down well in the home and seemed to have a good relationship with his welfare worker. She found the lad pleasant and intelligent. His behaviour was improving steadily. Joe also liked his foster parents and their children. In turn, he was accepted as one of the family.

The welfare Worker had talked to Joe who explained the theft as a momentary weakness.

**Court Appearance**

Joe Gibb appeared in Juvenile Court on a charge of theft. He admitted committing the delinquency.

The Constable, acting for the Crown, said that the police had received a complaint that a watch had been shoplifted from a variety store. Investigation led to the questioning of Joe Gibb, who was found in possession of the watch. The lad had been co-operative during the investigation.

The Judge of the Juvenile Court asked the probation officer for a pre-sentence report.

**Pre-Sentence Investigation**

As the welfare worker had detailed information on Joe's background and development, the probation officer decided that it would be sufficient to interview only Joe prior to the conference.
The probation officer interviewed Joe. The lad seemed friendly and relaxed though trying a little over-hard to please. He said that, although he liked his foster home, he certainly missed his mother whom he described in glowing terms. However, Joe said, he was happy where he was and his worker was sure nice.

The lad seemed to be adjusting very well to life in a foster home.

Conference

The probation officer told the welfare worker that he was particularly impressed by the apparently good adjustment of Joe Gibb. He remarked on the excellent relationship existing between the lad and the worker.

Tentative Social Diagnosis

Joe Gibb was a friendly and intelligent lad. The Gibb family had been known to the Social Welfare Branch for seven years. A welfare worker saw that Joe was becoming a problem two years prior to the conference and during this interval an effort was made to rehabilitate the Gibb family through both environmental manipulation and casework services. In spite of the help extended, Joe's behaviour led to his being made a ward.

The files of the Social Welfare Branch suggested that the Gibb family had never been stable. Mr. Gibb had deserted his family when Joe was seven. The boy was reported to have very little love or respect for his father. Joe did love his mother but had little respect for her.
During the past year, Joe had been in a rural foster home. He settled into this home almost from the first. He loved both his foster parents. There had been a marked improvement in his behaviour. Joe also had a close relationship with his welfare worker. Both the foster parents and the worker thought that Joe had taken part in the theft to see if he was really accepted by them. The welfare worker thought Joe might indulge in similar behaviour in the future.

Mrs. Gibb was still living in Baytown where she was being seen by a welfare worker. Work was being done to strengthen the Gibb home to the point where Joe and his brother could return to it.

**Needs of the Delinquent**

Joe Gibb's needs were being met by his foster home placement and his welfare worker.

**Ideal Solution**

Joe Gibb should continue in his foster home under the supervision of his welfare worker.

**Practical Solution**

As Joe had an excellent relationship with his welfare worker, there seemed to be no use in having the probation officer see the lad. It was agreed that the welfare worker should assume full responsibility for both supervision and casework services to the lad. It was agreed that, if Joe Gibb's behaviour deteriorated, then the welfare worker should feel free to apply to the Court to have the
responsibility for probation supervision transferred from the Social Welfare Branch to the Provincial Probation Branch.

Recommendations

The probation officer and the welfare worker recommended that Joe Gibb be placed on probation for an indefinite period to the welfare worker. The Court concurred.

Results

Joe Gibb settled down and did well for several months. Following this period of improvement, he stole a car. When pursued by the police car, he tried to outrun it. Joe was charged with car theft. The Judge of the Juvenile Court was not convinced by the account of Joe's over-all improvement since his move to Railtown. Joe was committed to the Boys' Industrial School.

Evaluation of the Conference

It was agreed that the welfare worker should provide Joe Gibb with both probationary supervision and casework help for three reasons. Firstly, the welfare worker had an excellent relationship with both the lad and his foster parents. Secondly, Joe did not require close or authoritative controls on his behaviour and what control he did need could be provided by his welfare worker. Thirdly, as the worker was doing such a splendid job with Joe, it was useless for the probation officer to enter the situation and perhaps confuse the lad's relationship with his welfare worker.
It will be observed from an examination of the seven cases presented that there is no routine method of deciding the areas of responsibility when the Social Welfare Branch and the Provincial Probation Branch are active on the same case at the same time. There is no prescribed method of deciding what the probation officer and what the welfare worker should do in a particular case.

What is clear is that a conference is necessary so that the probation officer and the welfare worker can pool their knowledge of the individual and his family. The two social workers then form a tentative social diagnosis on which is based the best possible realistic plan for the juvenile delinquent and his family.

All the plans of the probation officer and the welfare worker are useless if the Court does not accept them. The two social workers must propose a plan that is legally sound or it cannot be accepted by the Court. Secondly, the plan, to be of any use, must not be repugnant to the Court. It should be realized by the probation officer and the welfare worker that they are frequently regarded as "starry-eyed dreamers" by the Courts. The plan prepared must be reasonable to a lay person. The Judge of the Juvenile Court is normally a member of the community in which the offense took place and is more liable to public pressure than is a probation officer or a welfare worker. It will be noted that Roy Charles and Joe Gibb were both
sent to the Boys' Industrial School although the probation officer and the welfare worker did not agree that this was necessary.

It may also be observed that the reason why the welfare worker had contact with these juveniles varied, as did the intensity of the contact.

Jim Able's father was in receipt of Family Service but the welfare worker did not know Jim. Fred Baker's mother was in receipt of financial assistance but Fred was not known as an individual. Jack Davis was a ward whose mother was receiving financial assistance. Both mother and son were well known to the welfare worker. Neither Hank Ellis nor his parents were well known to the welfare worker although Mrs. Ellis received financial assistance from time to time. In the cases of the wards, Tom Fox and Joe Gibb, the welfare workers knew their clients well.

It is reasonable to assume that the welfare worker knows all of his wards very well, but that he does not know all of the children of families in receipt of financial assistance or Family Service. It should be pointed out that the probation officer is normally in a similar position in that he knows the delinquent child and his parent(s) but frequently does not know the siblings of the delinquent. Neither the probation officer nor the welfare worker are to blame for this as the size of their respective caseloads makes the ideal impossible.
Chapter IV: The Implications of the Study with some Suggestions for Improving the Over-all Services to Juvenile Delinquents in British Columbia.

In Chapter II, the characteristics of two groups of juvenile delinquents from one rural area were examined. Group A consisted of boys referred to the probation officer who were not known to the Social Welfare Branch. Group B consisted of boys referred to the probation officer who had or needed some contact with the Social Welfare Branch. In many respects, the juveniles in both Groups were similar, but some differences of interest to social caseworkers emerged.

Seventy-four percent of the children in Group A lived with both parents, whereas only 29 percent of the children in Group B did so. Fifty-four percent of the parents of the juvenile delinquents in Group A considered their child to be a problem before his appearance in Court, whereas 79 percent of the parents or foster parents of the children in Group B considered their child a problem prior to his Court appearance. Thirteen percent of the children in Group A, as compared to 50 percent of the children in Group B, had been previously adjudged delinquent, prior to their referral to the probation officer. A greater proportion of the children in Group B, as compared to those in Group A, disliked
school and left school. The employment record of the juveniles in Group B was poorer than that of those in Group A. The differences in the backgrounds of the children in both Groups were not such that each Group was unique. No clear-cut differences in backgrounds existed between the two Groups. However, the study in Chapter II indicated that the children in Group B tended to come from broken homes and to function at a lower level of social adjustment in the community than did the children in Group A. Thus, a greater proportion of the children in Group B appeared to have serious problems of adjustment than those in Group A. It is not suggested that all the children known to the Social Welfare Branch are seriously maladjusted, but it is suggested that many of the children known to both the probation officer and the welfare worker have serious problems of adjustment.

Children become known to the welfare worker for many reasons. The child and his family may need financial assistance because the breadwinner of the home is unemployable. The child and his mother may need financial help after his father has left the home. The child may need protection after being neglected or deserted by his parents. These, and many other reasons leading to a child's becoming known to the welfare worker, are all upsetting experiences that could aggravate or foster maladjustments. The welfare worker helps the child and his family around these troubles but success is not possible in every case. Some of the children known to the Social Welfare Branch and referred to the Provincial
Probation Branch are ones whose needs have not been met by the first agency, and they tend to be rather seriously maladjusted children. Such children pose a unique challenge to the social worker, be he a welfare worker or a probation officer.

In order to best help the seriously maladjusted child known to the Social Welfare Branch and referred to the Provincial Probation Branch, treatment must be based on a thorough evaluation of the child's problems, his needs and the available facilities most capable of meeting his needs. These evaluations are best made in case conferences.

The Probation Officer's View of the Conference Method

The probation officer is in agreement with M. H. Price, that there is a danger in case conferences that definitive formulas or policy may guide thinking to the point where the needs of the client are forgotten. The client should not be pushed into a "category" because of policy. Similarly, it is important to avoid exploring each situation indefinitely. However, "formulas" cannot be forgotten as certain legal requirements must be kept in mind during the conference. The welfare worker must continue his contact with children in foster homes and he must also continue his contact with families in receipt of financial assistance. Similarly,

the probation officer may be ordered by the Court to supervise a child whether he is a ward or not. In spite of these responsibilities, the two social agencies can be of help to each other. H. B. Trecker has pointed out that probationers frequently need help from more than one social agency. It is reasonable that a person should receive help from more than one agency if it is legal for him to do so and in his best interests.

An examination of the seven case studies shows that there is no hard and fast rule to use in deciding what responsibility should be assumed by each social worker. In some instances, it was decided that the probation officer should give the delinquent both probation supervision and casework services. In other cases, it was agreed that the welfare worker should give the child both probation supervision and casework services. In one situation, it was decided that the probation officer should give probation supervision while the welfare worker should provide casework services to the child. Similarly, it was agreed in one instance, that the probation officer should extend casework services to the parents while in other instances the welfare worker should do so.

Factors Involved in the Delegation of Responsibility Between The Probation Officer and the Welfare Worker

It was decided by the probation officer and the welfare workers that probation was essentially casework in an authoritarian setting. The probation officer, because of his frequent contacts with the Court and the police, was normally in a better position to provide close supervision while enforcing the orders of the Court. Probation supervision is a normal function of a probation officer. The following decisions arose logically from this assumption:

1. If the welfare worker has not a strong relationship with the juvenile delinquent, then the child should be supervised by the probation officer. (Jim Able, Fred Baker, Henry Ellis.)

2. If the welfare worker has a strong relationship with the delinquent, then he may supervise the lad. (Joe Gibb.)

3. If the child needs close and authoritative supervision, then the probation officer is normally in the better position to provide that supervision. (Jim Able, Fred Baker, Jack Davis, Henry Ellis and Tom Fox.)

4. If the child does not need close and authoritarian supervision, then the welfare worker may be in the better position to meet the delinquent's needs. (Roy Charles, Joe Gibb.)

It was also agreed that a child and his parent(s) might compete for a social worker's attention (be he a probation officer or a welfare worker) in some situations.
Where this competition was a reality, or a marked possibility, then the child and his parent(s) should be seen by different workers. (Jim Able, Fred Baker, Jack Davis.)

Where a child's needs could best be met by his welfare worker, then that worker should continue to deal with the client whether he is on probation or not. (Roy Charles, Joe Gibb.)

In rare instances, a case can arise when both a welfare worker and a probation officer should work with the same child, one providing casework and the other probation supervision. (Tom Fox.)

If the welfare worker had an existing relationship with the parent(s), then he should continue to work with him (them). (Mr. Able, Mrs. Baker, Mrs. Davis.)

If the welfare worker had no relationship with the parent(s), then the probation officer could work with them. (Mr. and Mrs. Ellis.)

If the parent(s) were in receipt of a service given by the Social Welfare Branch, then the welfare worker must maintain some contact with the family and, where possible, should extend casework services to the family. (Mr. Able, Mrs. Baker, Mr. and Mrs. Charles, Mrs. Davis.)

If the parents needed to be dealt with in an authoritarian manner in order to help the children, this family work could frequently best be handled by the probation officer. (Mr. and Mrs. Ellis.)
Juvenile Courts in Rural British Columbia

In the rural areas of British Columbia, the Judge of the Juvenile Court is frequently a member of the community, with little or no legal training. He is, in the smaller centres, in close touch with the general feeling of the community. For example, in the Roy Charles case, the majority of the persons in the town were discussing the case and exaggerated versions of the story were common. These stories gave rise to public feelings that were known to the Judge of the Juvenile Court. It is difficult, but by no means impossible, for the Judge to remain a truly disinterested party under such conditions.

The Judges of the Juvenile Courts do not all hold the same views on punishment and treatment. Whereas one Judge may, by policy, suspend the drivers' licences of lads who are found guilty of driving without due care and attention, another Judge in the next town may, by policy, impose a small fine for the same offence. The probation officer was talking to Joe Gibb after his release from the Boys' Industrial School and found the lad was quite bitter. He could not see why he had been sent to the School for taking one car and having only four or five previous delinquencies while he knew (or claimed to know) boys from Vancouver, B. C., who had "piled up" ten or more delinquencies before being sent to the Boys' Industrial School.

The Judges of the Juvenile Court are selected with care, but normally they have no training in legal or sociological
fields. The welfare worker and the probation officer must continually interpret the principles of social work. The positions of Judge of the Juvenile Court and Police Magistrate are frequently combined in the same person, and he acts much more often as Police Magistrate. The Magistrate's Court is more punishment-oriented than is the Juvenile Court which should be treatment-oriented. It is difficult for a person to develop the flexibility to change his orientation from one Court to the other.

Common Problems of the Probation Officer and the Welfare Worker in a Rural Area.

British Columbia is a large province, geographically, but the population is sparse in the rural areas. In these outlying areas, one social worker, be he a probation officer or a welfare worker, is frequently called upon to serve a large territory. The probation officer in the rural area mentioned in this study spent approximately one quarter of the working day in travel. The welfare worker had similar problems in relation to travelling time. Both social workers had case loads of more than 100 clients which limited the time that could be spent with each one. The probation officer, on the whole, had more time to devote to each client than had the welfare worker. In many areas, the distances from the office to the client's home were too great for the client to come to the social worker. As a result, the social worker went to the client and interviews took place in homes, coffee shops, cars, police stations or
any other available spots. It is difficult to interview a person satisfactorily in any place subject to frequent interruptions.

The probation officer and the welfare workers in this study were aware of the lack of staff and interviewing space, but continued to do their best in spite of the limitations. The district supervisor and the probation officer agreed that there was a need for more trained social workers to be employed as welfare workers and probation officers in the area under study if an adequate service was to be given to the public.

_Treatment Facilities for Juvenile Delinquents in the Area Under Study_

During the time of this study, any child who was arrested by the police as a suspected delinquent could be dealt with in one of three ways. He could be released in the care and custody of his parents while awaiting trial. He could be placed in a private home temporarily designated as a detention home until his trial. He could be placed in the adult cells of the police lock-up. There was no Juvenile Detention Home in the entire area under study. If a child was considered a poor security risk, he was frequently placed in the local lock-up. The Juvenile Delinquent's Act is quite definite in pointing out that no child shall be held in confinement in any jail in which adults may be imprisoned but shall be detained in a Detention Home used
exclusively for children. There is provision in the Juvenile Delinquent's Act for the detention of a child in jail but it is clearly indicated that this procedure should be considered an exception rather than the rule.

During the preparation of a pre-sentence report on a delinquent, the probation officer frequently wished for the services of the Child Guidance Clinic. This was never possible because the Clinic toured the area only twice a year. There were more children to be seen by the Clinic team than it had time to serve. As a result, appointments for visits were filled months in advance of the arrival of the Child Guidance Clinic.

When a delinquent child's home was not satisfactory, the probation officer could recommend only one of three courses of action to the Court. The child could be allowed to remain in his own home, although this would probably lead to further trouble. The child could be placed with friends, with relatives or in a foster home. He could be committed to the Boys' Industrial School. Many children were sent to the School because they could not stay in their own homes and they were not emotionally ready for foster home placement. There were no treatment homes available for these children.

The same resources could be used when a boy was released from the Boys' Industrial School. Some boys did not have suitable homes to return to and did not wish to live in foster homes. There should have been Hostels available for such lads.

**Suggested Studies for the Future**

This study has shown how two social agencies have co-operated in order to serve their mutual clients. It is not suggested that this method of co-operation is applicable to other areas and to other services. However, it is suggested that when problems arise concerning which one of two or more social agencies should offer casework services to an individual, the solution should be based on a study of the needs of the client. If this basis of reasoning is not used, it is possible for the social workers of various agencies to look on clients as the private property of a particular social agency.

Many more studies could be profitably conducted into the co-operation between social agencies. In the field of probation, inter-agency studies could be conducted concerning female juvenile delinquents and Indian (as defined by the Indian Act) delinquents. These and other groups pose different problems to those of the juvenile delinquents in this study.
The Key to Helping the Juvenile Delinquent

The writer agrees with the 1946 Report of the Saskatchewan Penal Commission when it pointed out that the successful treatment of the offender by means of probation is almost wholly dependent on the calibre of the probation officer. The writer also agrees with the Commission's recommendation that only fully trained social workers should be employed in this field. The recommendations of the Commission could be applied to probation officers in British Columbia. The probation officer and the welfare worker frequently act as a team to help juvenile delinquents and their families. If the social workers accept each other as professional equals and, as such, work together in the best interest of the juvenile and his family, then much can be done to help these clients. The key is professional co-operation in order to help the client.

But good staff and inter-agency co-operation are not enough to solve all the problems that arise. Perhaps this province needs to adapt some programmes in use in the United States and Great Britain.

The "Youth Corrections Authority Act" could be modified to apply to the Juvenile Courts of British Columbia. An agency, whatever its name, could be given full authority

---


over a juvenile delinquent from the time that a child was adjudged delinquent until such time as the authority released him from its charge. The scope of this authority could be expanded to take over some of the duties of the Court, including sentencing. Ideally, a committee should examine the social history of each juvenile delinquent to evaluate the needs of the child and then decide upon the best form of treatment. This committee would be composed of persons with both legal and sociological training. The group would feel free to act in the best interest of a child without fear of public pressure. It would be hoped that this one authority would have control over both the probation services and the correctional institutions for juveniles.

British Columbia could also adopt the British system of having many institutions for juvenile delinquents. The 1952 Directory of Remand Homes and Approved Schools and Probation Hostels and Homes in England and Wales lists approximately 50 remand homes for boys, three classifying schools, 23 senior correctional schools, seventeen intermediate correctional schools, 36 junior correctional schools and six junior, primary correctional schools. There were also 21 approved hostels for boys. Although British Columbia could not hope to support such a diversified programme of juvenile correctional institutions, it is reasonable that a province such as this could afford to provide more than

one correctional institution for boys. It is ridiculous to assume that the one institution in use in British Columbia today can meet the needs of all male juvenile delinquents.

Changes are needed, but until they are made the social workers in British Columbia must continue to use all existing resources co-operatively to help the juvenile delinquents.
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