

WINSTON CHURCHILL MEMORIAL TRUST

Volunteers in Criminal Justice

— A Volunteer's View

I would gratefully like to thank the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust for making this Fellowship Tour possible.

I would also like to thank my family, my friends and colleagues for their support and encouragement.

I hope that whatever knowledge with which I have returned to Australia will prove to be of some value to existing and future volunteer programmes in the criminal justice system.

Penelope A.M. Mountain
Churchill Fellow 1977
Melbourne 1979

**Mrs. Penelope A.M. Mountain, Churchill Fellow 1977 is also co-opted Member on the National Executive of the Australian Crime Prevention Council representing Voluntary Agencies in Australia.*

**Fellow Penelope A.M. Mountain*

1. INTRODUCTION

I was awarded a Churchill Fellowship to study the work of Volunteer Probation Officers and their co-operation with the State system in overseas countries.

1.1 Objectives

The reasons behind my application for the fellowship were twofold:—

- (i) I was convinced that there is an urgent need for a new thrust, for greater co-operation between volunteers and our State system. We are at the cross-roads within our system. We can either go forward and expand, to evaluate and alter our position by research into tried models, or we can stagnate and watch our present system disintegrate so that volunteers gradually become redundant.
- (ii) I also felt, as I still do, that there is an imperative need to upgrade the status, recognition and standards of the Honorary Probation Officer in Victoria with the firm belief that further education of the H.P.O. is vital to be certain that our clients are getting the best possible support.

1:2 Plan

My Fellowship was for twelve weeks covering Hawaii, Colorado, Nebraska, Minneapolis and Ontario. The reasons that these places were selected were that they either had excellent progressive research programmes or they had been suggested to be by Dr. Ivan Scheier (Director, National Information Centre on Volunteers, U.S.A.) as outstanding examples of proven voluntary

services within the criminal justice system.

I went away initially only to look at Volunteer Probation Programmes but I soon realised, after looking at two or three such programmes, that I had left, in Victoria, an excellent volunteer probation system, one which would be the envy of most countries. However, I was very impressed by the broader usage of volunteers in the criminal justice system and though I continued to visit volunteer probation services I amended my tour to study this exciting use of volunteers.

In this report I have presented only some of the many programmes that I visited. Some of them because they enable a comparison with the existing Honorary Probation System in Victoria, and some because they illustrate a far broader use of volunteers in the criminal justice system than we have at present in Australia.

I believe that some of the programmes mentioned in this report could easily be adapted and incorporated into the Australian Criminal Justice System.

2. HAWAII

2:1 Brief Outline

I spent a week in Hawaii, under the guidance of Earl Yonehara, Volunteer Co-ordinator of the Volunteer Services Programme of the Judiciary, State of Hawaii. During this week I discussed the Programme's organization management, operating costs, job descriptions of programme staff and volunteers, volunteer selection, training, assignment, supervision process, training tapes and resource library.

I looked at the training manuals and audio/visual aids

used to train volunteers and also discussed with some volunteers their attitudes to selection, recruitment and training. I would have liked more time with volunteers and clients, to ascertain first hand information on their perception of the volunteer system. I met with the State Co-ordinator of Volunteers regarding functions and activities of the State Volunteer Services Center. I spent a day with Family Court Director, Mary Jane Lee and her staff regarding Family Court organization, function and types of services provided. I toured Hale ho 'Omalu' (boys and girls juvenile detention facility).

2:2 Volunteer Court Programmes

In Hawaii volunteers are called 'na po'e malama' — the caring people.

It is interesting that the "Volunteer services to the Judiciary" was instigated by the Chief Justice and the Judiciary calling a citizen's conference on the judiciary so it grew out of the needs of the Judiciary to a three-pronged objective:—

- (i) The need for additional bodies to help get the jobs done in all areas of service, rehabilitation, administration and clerical.
- (ii) The desire to advance citizen and community understanding of the criminal justice system.
- (iii) The need to profit from citizen input of ideas that could vitalize and enrich court services.

The Volunteer Programme began with funding from the State Law Enforcement and Planning Agency in July, 1971. At first services were on the island of Oahu only and in three main areas:—

- 1 — Family Court, Children and Youth Services.
- 2 — Adult Probation.
- 3 — District Court Counselling.

In December, 1975 the programme became an operational part of all the courts in the State.

At present the following Volunteer positions are being used successfully:—

1. Youth Probation Companion (Big Brother — Big Sister, Behaviour Model).
2. District Court Companion (One to One — Relationship with an adult misdemeanant offender).
3. Adult Probation Companion (One to One — Relationship with an adult felony offender).
4. Volunteer Tutor (Academic assistance in English, reading, mathematics on a one to one basis).
5. Case Aids (Extends the services of probation officers to persons under court supervision in such areas as visitations, follow-up on school attendance and/or employment, pre-sentence investigations).
6. Bailiff Aide (Co-ordinates the Judges' calendar of court hearings).
7. Clerical Aide (Typing, filing, message delivery, reception work).
8. Volunteer Newsletter Editor and Staff — (News and feature writing, layout and production).
9. Research and Evaluation Aide (information and statistics gathering).
10. Law Library Volunteer (Filing of reference material, shelving books).
11. Volunteer Judiciary Tour Guide (General overview of Hawaii's court system to all interested groups).

Comments

I believe Victoria could well follow Hawaii's example in some areas:—

- (i) The extension of the H.P.O., into roles other than that of an unpaid probation officer is a natural one, just as an extension of the role of Honorary Parole Officer is long overdue. By the list of jobs mentioned above (all of which seem to be working well in the Courts of Hawaii), it would seem that there are many areas in which Volunteers can help the courts and I am sure that if the Judiciary of Victoria identified these areas the necessary volunteer support could be mobilised. I would prefer the concept of using existing trained, gazetted honorary probation officers, as I do not believe in establishing expensive separate volunteer systems within the justice/welfare/court system without first establishing that it cannot be done by an existing agency.
- (ii) The Protection and Benefits afforded to Volunteers in Hawaii include:—
 - a. Workers' Compensation.
 - b. Liability of Volunteers.
 - c. Insurance Coverage for Health — Death.
 - d. Vehicle Liability Insurance.
 - e. Tax Deduction.

(By comparison the *only* benefit Victorian Honorary Probation Officers can claim is out of pocket expenses of \$15.00, per case in the City, \$30.00, per case in the country).
- (iii) The following aspects and attitudes which are in vogue in Hawaii I believe are *not* needed or required by Honorary Probation Officers in Victoria:—
 - Recognition Awards.
 - Gold Badges.
 - Volunteer of the Month/or Year Awards.
 - Publicity items in the Press.
 - Coloured Balloons.
 - Birthday card signed by the Chief Justice.
 - The Matching Process.

I see no valid reason for subjecting clients and volunteers to be matched according to a) Colour Preference Charts, b) Astrological Prediction of Compatibility, c) Psychological Assessments or any other Chart, if this is not the method used to match stipendiary staff to *their* clients.

3. COLORADO

I was based in Boulder, at the National Information Centre on Volunteerism, (N.I.C.O.V.), and was very grateful to have as my "mentor", Dr. Ivan Scheier.

At N.I.C.O.V., I was indeed fortunate to have access to the extensive library and to the N.I.C.O.V., personnel who were most helpful sources of information on voluntary programmes throughout America and Canada.

3:1 N.I.C.O.V.

The National Information Centre on Volunteerism is an independent non-profit organization which has been in existence since 1966. N.I.C.O.V. developed from a local criminal justice volunteer programme in Boulder, Colorado and expanded as requests for assistance in utilizing volunteers grew in number and in scope. Today N.I.C.O.V. provides training, need assessment, evaluation, information and consultation

to the leadership of volunteer programmes in all human service areas throughout the whole of North America and Canada.

(i) N.I.C.O.V. maintains a resource library of over 8,000 unpublished and published documents pertaining to the use of volunteers. The library also includes information on volunteer management, training, programme models and description, issue — orientated documents, newsletters, journals and over two hundred research and evaluative studies.

(ii) Timberline Seminars.

N.I.C.O.V. holds 4 Timberline Seminars a year, one of which I was fortunate enough to be able to attend. These three day seminars are in depth explorations of volunteer issues, problems and challenges. The seminars are limited to seven participants, concerned with volunteer leadership in other States, under the leadership of Dr. Ivan Scheier.

The participants at the seminar which I attended were from Minnesota, Alabama, Montana, Colorado, Maryland, Minneapolis. A great deal of worthwhile discussions of problems, solutions and alternatives took place, though I was astounded by the enormous funding (in comparison to Australia) that these volunteer programmes have at their disposal, and so commented.

Whilst in Colorado I had a discussion with:—

1. Judge Holmes — Boulder Juvenile Court Judge.
2. Boulder Probation, Adult and Juvenile.
3. Juvenile Quarters — Reception Centre.
4. Detention, Correction Centre — otherwise known as the "Model Prison".
5. Attention Homes.
6. Denver Juvenile Bureau.
7. Denver Youth Service Bureau.
8. Partners Inc. Denver.
9. Volunteers from different programmes.

3:2 Judge Holmes

Judge Horace Holmes is one of the pioneers of Juvenile Courts in America. I was extremely grateful for his time, his invitations to sit in his court and to attend his staff meetings. Judge Holmes was among the first to experiment with the use of unpaid local volunteers to work with juvenile offenders, both correctively and preventatively. In 1961, Judge Holmes began to use volunteers in court and has been an enthusiastic supporter of the use of volunteers ever since, because Boulder County has one of the lowest per capita institutionalised rate of the ten most populated counties in Colorado ever since its volunteer programmes began.

3:3 Boulder Justice Center

This modern, fully paid for centre is the most impressive piece of justice system planning. The facility, all under one roof incorporates the:—

- (i) Communications Centre for Police and Sheriff's Department, Colorado State Patrol as well as various Forest Services, Search and Rescues.
- (ii) Sherriff's Department — which includes the detention and correction centre. Forensic Sciences laboratory etc.
- (iii) Police Department.
- (iv) The City Traffic Violations Bureau.

(v) County Courts and Criminal Division of District Court and the Juvenile hearings which are heard in the Judges Chambers.

(vi) District Attorney.

(vii) City Attorney.

(viii) Adult Probation.

(ix) Juvenile Probation.

(x) Juvenile Quarters.

The planned proximity of the Juvenile Probation Department to the Juvenile Quarters allows the probation staff to become involved with the juveniles while they are detained. The Juvenile Quarters contains rooms for 13 boys or girls who can be held for a *maximum* of 48 hours prior to a judicial hearing. These juvenile quarters are separated from the adult detention and correction areas — but are adjacent to Juvenile Probation and a hearing room and office for the Juvenile Judge.

The Detention and Correction Centre occupies about one third of the Justice Centre building and is under the direction of the Boulder County Sheriff's Department. Central control systems operate all doors and the facility is extremely secure.

There are eight sealed security areas with ten rooms each, including maximum, medium and minimum security and a 10 roomed women's section. They are flexible units and can be changed as the need arises. There are also facilities for up to 14 persons on work-release programmes. An outdoor recreation area is also available for family visiting. Both male and female inmates were using this area when I visited. An indoor gymnasium is used by police and sheriff employees, local organizations as inmates. There are classrooms, a beautifully appointed library, cafeteria and laundry. There are male and female attendants looking after the opposite sex inmates. The whole building was brightly coloured, light and had a feeling of warmth and hope, in contrast to most prisons we know. If this is the model for prisons of the future, I'm sure inmates and staff would, at the very least have a higher morale.

Comment

This whole Justice Center was an exciting, practical demonstration of the need for planning when updating facilities. I was impressed by the fact that a juvenile (which is up to 18 in Colorado), could only be held for 48 hours. This is made possible because of the close proximity of the Juvenile Judge. This was the case in all the detention or reception centres I visited throughout North America and Canada, *all* were situated next to the Juvenile Court.

3:4 Attention Homes

These are supervised homes of attention instead of detention. They were the first homes of this type in the United States. They were created in 1966 by the citizens of Boulder to help troubled youth solve their problems and become responsible and productive citizens. A troubled youth, male or female between the ages of 12 - 17 may be referred to the Boulder County Juvenile Court for placement as a consequence of police action, divorce, severe family conflicts or friction resulting from discipline or behaviour problems in school. The Board of Directors are volunteers.

Comment

This attention home is similar to the two homes for girls set up by Honorary Probation Officers in Ball-

arat, Victoria ten years ago – the only pre-requisite for being on the Board of Management in Ballarat is to be an H.P.O. There is one boy in residence at present and it is hoped future planning will be able to assist boys in a similar support service in Ballarat.

3:5 *Youth Service Bureaus*

These are community based treatment programmes based where juveniles are having problems. The philosophy behind this is that youths with behavioural problems have generally been found to be disadvantaged socially, emotionally and economically and it is through intervention in these three problem areas that the Youth Service Bureau concentrates. The Bureau mediates between the youth and the environment. There is a partnership of 4 programmes:

- (i) Community Services
- (ii) The Alternative School Programme
- (iii) The Police Drug Abuse Programme
- (iv) Mi Casita Residential Treatment Facility

which provided a comprehensive network of support and has the capability of developing the neglected areas in a youth's life which may promote delinquent behaviour.

3:6 *Partners Inc. – Denver*

Partners Inc. is a non-profit organization which provides services to the police, the juvenile courts and some schools, in the areas of volunteers intervention with juvenile offenders working on a one to one basis. The volunteers are *not* probation officers, they are companions based on a Big-Brother – Little-Brother philosophy. Partners Inc. does some marvellous work with wonderful recreational activities including river rafting, hiking, skiing, field trips, mini-bike clubs. Various community activities are provided free or are nominally charged, e.g., bowling, movie theatres. All I'm sure are enjoyed by staff, volunteers and clients. I'm not so sure that there isn't a strong incentive to get into trouble, so that one can join in the activities of Partners!

However, they are serving 21 full-time staff members, 400 clients, served annually at a cost of \$700,000.00 per year.

Comment

In my opinion, this amount of money spent on 400 clients is "volunteerism gone mad". I had long discussions with the acting Executive of "Partners", who was concerned with what had happened to Partners. He suggested that in Australia we should fight hard not to let voluntary agencies build themselves up, so that they end up as yet more bureaucracies. However, I am in agreement with the philosophy behind "Partners" and a similar but less costly and less elaborate programme would be a great acquisition to any State in Australia.

4. LINCOLN – NEBRASKA

4:1 *The Volunteer Probation Counsellor Programme*

During the time I was in Lincoln, I was the guest of the Municipal Court of Lincoln – Lancaster. The Volunteer Probation Counsellors Programme is one of the National Institutes of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice "exemplary" projects, one of only seventeen criminal justice projects selected to date.

The programme reads magnificently and would be, I'm sure, a computer psychologist's delight. It is heavily psychologically managed with precise matching of volunteer and probationer programme and

because of this heavy psychological bias, I did not find this relevant to the Victorian programme.

However, I was very grateful to Dr. Richard Moore and his staff for their friendship and their time spent in discussions of mutual interest. I was also deeply indebted to all the Judges for their time and allowing me open access to their courts and chambers, plea bargaining sessions, prosecuting and defence attorneys' offices, State Parole hearings and overview of the prisons. Also the meetings with volunteers and probation staff I found very useful and allowed me to understand more of the legal system of the United States.

4:2 *CONtact of Lincoln*

This is an organization which impressed me as a resource centre in touch with the criminal justice area and volunteerism.

This National Offender Services CONtact Center was created about fourteen years ago by Mr. Gary Hill. Mr. Hill began his work as a volunteer prison visitor who organised a Jaycee penal chapter in the Lincoln prison – there are now over 365 chapters throughout the United States. As Mr. Hill became aware of the problems of the offender he began travelling nationwide visiting other prisons. He has visited every prison in the United States at least once. Today he and his wife and family plus a staff of 13 provide the following:–

(i) *Human Services*

The Human Services Division handles individual problems, primarily for offenders throughout the States ranging from prisoners rights to employment, crisis support and lodgings etc. for parolees or for families of prisoners.

(ii) *Information*

CONtact maintains an updated library and reference system. A special "Corrections Compendium" is published monthly and sent free of charge to people involved in the corrections field. Requests are accepted from anyone, anywhere free of charge. Questions range from wanting to know the number of prisoners on death row on a given day to a request for information on penal reform for a high school debate.

(iii) *Communication*

CONtact sends a monthly newsletter to over 25,000 persons both in and out of prison. The newsletter describes new programmes in the justice area (usually volunteer). The library is most extensive and up to date for the criminal justice volunteers.

Comment

Considering that in Australia we have not been able to, as yet, identify all voluntary agencies, the above programme is a source of great information and support both to existing agencies and to anyone contemplating the setting up of a new agency.

4:3 *Lancaster County – Separate Juvenile Court*

Judge W. Nuerinberger, who is the Judge of the Separate Juvenile Court was another judge who worked hard for juvenile legislation and courts. I was delighted to meet him and discuss with him his programme of Volunteers in Probation. This programme began in 1971 and now volunteers are used in many areas. They are used in the companion-friend model not as surrogate probation officer.

(i) *Community Resource Volunteer*

The community resource volunteers assist the Director, court staff, counsellor and counsellee. The C.R.V. helps establish communication between professionals, schools, churches, recreation organization, business and vocational people. At present they are also responsible for handling restitution money.

4:4 *Lancaster Juvenile Court Tutoring Programme*

This programme is designed to tutor young people on probation who are having both academic and social school problems and have been referred to the programme by their Probation Officers or the Juvenile Court Judge. The two co-ordinators are volunteers with teaching experience and advanced degrees in counselling. The volunteer teachers are mostly senior students at the University of Nebraska or certified teachers.

The goals are to improve school attitude, attendance and grade average.

Comment

With unemployment as it is in Australia and children leaving school so early, this programme attached to our Children's Court would, in my opinion, be a very positive step in helping our clients within the court system. In fact there is probably as great a need to have this programme available at our adult court as well. With teachers accounting for 19.6% of H.P.O.'s in Victoria we may already have the basis for implementing this.

4:5 *Extended Use of Volunteers*

The other areas covered by volunteers attached to the juvenile separate court are:—

1. Employment.
2. Foster placement.
3. Children in placement.
4. Transportation.
5. Publication and training.
6. Professional component, (e.g. doctors, dentists, psychologists).
7. Custody case workers.
8. Scouting groups.
9. Mechanics.
10. Fund Raising.

4:6 *The Youth Aid Bureau - run by Police*

Deals with youngsters fifteen years of age and younger who come to the attention of police.

The Youth Aid Bureau interviews all youth and parents referred, it determines which of the following dispositions is appropriate:—

- (a) Referral to the County Juvenile Court Office.
- (b) Youth Service Systems.
- (c) Child Guidance.
- (d) Lincoln — Lancaster County Mental Health Clinic.
- (e) Other Counselling Agencies in Community.

Following are the alternatives available to the police in dealing with youngsters within the Youth Aid Bureau:—

1. Discussing alternative ways to have handled his situation — legal ways or alternatives to breaking the law.
2. Discussing and writing papers on subjects such as self-discipline, self respect, respecting the rights and property of others.
3. Returning to business firms to apologise and

attempt to arrange restitution.

The Bureau works closely with the Juvenile Court and its Probation Department and with the Office of the Lancaster County Attorney. It also monitors the missing person cases to ensure follow-up when needed and to detect unusual circumstances.

4:7 *The Youth Service System of Lincoln and Lancaster County*

This is a private, non-profit corporation established to work with youth in resolving personal and family problems by:—

1. Serving as an advocate for youth in the community.
2. Recognising the family as the most important primary group in our society.
3. Utilizing available community resources.
4. Avoiding deeper penetration by youth into the Juvenile Justice System.
5. Developing comprehensive, co-ordinated, integrated, community based programmes to meet the needs of all youth, regardless of who they are or what their problems are.
6. Mobilising community resources to resolve youth problems.
7. Strengthening existing youth resources and creating new ones.
8. Promoting positive programmes to have an impact on delinquency — breeding conditions.

Some of the more outstanding efforts achieved by the Youth Service System are:—

1. The production of a handbook of Juvenile Laws and Rights written in simplified language called "Dealing with the System" so that juveniles may better know their rights.
2. The setting up of the Lancaster Freeway Station. This provides temporary housing for youths 12 to 18 years of age, who have run away from, or have been expelled from their home, an institution, other living arrangements, or who are awaiting future placement by other agencies. The youths come themselves to the Freeway Stations or are referred by family or other agencies. This house provides an atmosphere that allows youth to analyse their present situation and make decisions about the future. Staff provide seven day 24 hour service. They provide crisis and family counselling.
3. A Boys Group Home and a Girls Group Home have been established as an alternative living situation.
4. Intake and Referral. This provides assistance to youths and their families. Case Managers do home visits during the day or evening, problem classification, discussion of alternatives or referral to a service agency. In some cases they will provide payment for services needed.

Volunteers are used extensively in these programmes. N.B. It is important to realise that in Nebraska the legal age of leaving home and being self-supporting is 19 years unless parental consent is obtained.

4:8 *Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex State Prisons*

The State Prison (which is an antiquated, overcrowded, tiered-cage type prison) started to use volunteers in 1975. The first volunteers were trained and matched with offenders who resided at the

Lincoln Work Release Centre. The use of Volunteers then spread to include the Trust Dormitory and the Medium Security Unity and is now, I believe, in the Maximum Security Unit. The main service provided by the volunteer is working on a one to one basis with an offender based on the fact that many offenders have few, if any relatives or friends in the area. Volunteers can befriend these men, and provide community resources before and after his release. This programme when I visited it was only at the befriending, visiting stage even though there was a paid, full-time, volunteer services co-ordinator with an office in the complex. Because it was a male prison, volunteers were male, except in the odd case of a husband and wife team. I didn't visit the female prisons, but I was informed that at that stage there wasn't as much being done for female offenders. I was disappointed in the fact that having created a position, with staff and an office, that greater penetration into the prison by male and female volunteers hadn't been achieved by the volunteer co-ordinator. I was very grateful to the Governor for allowing me access to the prison, and to the Parole Board for inviting me to sit in on their parole hearings.

Comments

An obvious difference between Nebraska and Victoria is that in Nebraska each court has its own probation service which is entirely separate from the others. The probation service is paid for and supported (or not) by the Judges of each court. Volunteer training programmes and managements are managed completely separately. In one programme I spent a lot of time introducing volunteers to each other. Many of them were critical of their programme and questioned their involvement in it. Many also disagreed with the highly psychological matching with clients which, in some cases, were so obviously mis-matched that they wondered if it might not be deliberate. I was disappointed that the Programme Managers had not been able to introduce that esprit de corps which is so helpful to volunteers and which I personally enjoy so much in Victoria.

5. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

I visited Minneapolis to look at the Hennepin County Court Services, at the invitation of Mr. Richard Hodgkins (Jnr.) who is Director of Volunteer Services for Hennepin County Court Services. During my stay I was a house guest at the home of Laura Lee Gerahty who is Director of the Governor's Office of Volunteer Services, Minnesota.

5:1 Juvenile Code – Relevant Facts

- (i) *Minor*. Means an individual under 18 years of age.
- (ii) *Termination of Jurisdiction*
Unless terminated by the court, the jurisdiction of the court shall continue until 21 years of age if the court determines it is in the best interest of the individual to do so.
- (iii) *Release or Detention*
A child may be detained in a place of detention, for not longer than 24 hours, excluding Saturday or Sunday or holidays unless an order for detention is signed by Judge or Referee. Except in emergencies, a detention hearing will be held within six (6) court hours after the child is first detained or if the child is already under court jurisdiction, within twelve (12) court

hours. A detained child may not be held longer than sixty (60) court hours without a further detention hearing. Each child is reviewed every eight days.

- (iv) *Restitution*
The court may order the juvenile to pay restitution, up to the maximum amount which is \$600.
- (v) *Legal Representation*
Approximately 90% of children appearing in court are represented by a lawyer.
- (vi) *Expungement of Records*
When a child has been so rehabilitated as to merit judicial recognition of the fact, the Probation Officer or other appropriate person may petition the Juvenile Court for an expungement of any adjudication of delinquency unless there was a commitment to the Commissioner of Corrections.
- (vii) *Arraignment to Disposition*
The average time is three weeks.

5:2 Hennepin County Court Services

History

In 1969, Hennepin County started a volunteer programme. It began by using volunteer probation officers and has since expanded to be recognised as one of the finest in North America. I shall list some job descriptions as the easiest way to illustrate a very effective use of volunteers.

- (i) *Volunteer Probation Officer*
Volunteers establish a one-to-one helping relationship with either juvenile or adult probationers. Through this effort, volunteers work with clients to accomplish specific goals.
Commitments – Three orientation sessions, at least one contact each week when assigned to a probationer, one year enrolment.
- (ii) *Visitation Counsellor*
Working in the Domestic Relations Division (Family Court) volunteers supervise child visits and counsel divorced or separated parents who are unable to agree upon visitation arrangements.
Commitments – Four orientation sessions, at least one contact each week when assigned to a case, one year enrolment.
- (iii) *Chemical Dependency Counsellor*
Volunteers participate in all aspects of the "chemistry dependent" (drug dependent) person's situation. During treatment, volunteers work with the dependent person on a one to one basis, while encouraging family therapy and involvement. Follow-up tasks include employment help, half-way house arrangements and further family counselling.
Commitments – Some chemical dependency education, attendance at orientation sessions of selected division (child, adult or family); average of three hours service each week; one year enrolment.
- (iv) *Court Investigator*
Volunteer Court Investigators are technically trained to conduct social assessments of clients and to present them in Court. Volunteer court investigators may choose to do:—
(a) Pre-Disposition Reports for Juvenile Court.
(a) Pre-Sentence Investigations for Adult Court.

(c) Custody Studies for Domestic Relations (Family) Court.

Commitments – Fifteen to twenty orientation/training sessions, approximately twelve hours of ongoing service each week including in-service training; two years enrolment.

(v) *Volunteer Teacher*

Volunteers offer one-to-one tutoring and additional educational opportunities at two juvenile correctional facilities – The County Home School or the Juvenile Detention Center.

Commitments – Orientation with the teaching staff, approximately 6 - 10 daytime hours of teaching each week of the academic year; one year enrolment.

(vi) *Juvenile Court Interviewer/Guardian Ad-Litem*

Volunteers conduct family interviews after arraignment hearings, gather statistics, and answer procedural questions. When necessary, these volunteers act as Guardian Ad-Litem at the same arraignment hearing. A person acting in this capacity is appointed by the Court to serve in the best interests of the child, in lieu of the parent or guardian.

Commitment – An initial orientation session; four hours of service (normally the same morning) each week; eighteen months enrolment.

(vii) *Administrative Advisory Advocate*

Volunteers are encouraged to contribute their talents in a multitude of individual administrative-advisory roles, e.g. corrections' policy planning, manpower development, fund raising, public information and community organization. The various involvements are designed to establish Volunteer Programme and corrections visibility and accountability within the community.

Commitments – depends upon type and extent of involvement.

(viii) *Home Detention Counsellor*

Volunteers provide short-term counselling/monitoring to youth (age 13-17) released from detention pending Juvenile Court dispositions. Volunteers make daily contact with the youth in person and by phone for a period of three weeks.

Commitments – Volunteers will be expected to follow through on five cases during a six month period, completion of four orientation sessions, and attendance at periodic in-service training sessions.

(ix) *Case Managers*

Volunteers manage probation cases which need minimal on-going supervision, but require crisis intervention and initial counselling. Volunteers make progress reports on individual clients and bring them back to court for early dismissals. This role is part of a case-load management system in District Court Probation. There are opportunities for involvement and individual responsibility in a variety of settings in court, jail and other community agencies as well as work with paid staff in Court Services.

Commitment – Fifteen to twenty orientation/training sessions, extensive training provided, approximately twelve hours of ongoing service

each week including in-service training; two years enrolment.

At this stage I would like to comment on two fine programmes for prison inmates:—

5:3 *Minnesota Correctional Institution for Women at Shakopee (M.C.I.W.)*

I was very pleased to visit this Institution. I had lengthy discussions with the Prison Superintendent, the volunteer co-ordinator, prison inmates and some of the volunteers. Everyone, in fact, the volunteer co-ordinator used to be a Prison Visitor who is now in a paid position with her office situated within the prison. Approximately 100 volunteers work with inmates doing the important, friendly supporting role task, others run a boutique at the prison, trying to fulfill most of the requested needs and suggestions of inmates or prison staff. However one volunteer role which I found unique eas:—

(i) *The Custody Volunteer.* There are 35 - 40 custody volunteers who have been trained by the Superintendent and Institution Staff and by the Volunteer Co-ordinator. On completion of training all custody volunteers sign responsibility and accountability agreements with the M.C.I.W. and the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections. This programme has been responsible for a great deal of programming in the institution, e.g., the custody volunteers accompany women off-grounds, thus allowing inmates to see their families and children, as well as look for jobs, attend recreation and social activities, shopping and orientation to society. This programme has been designed to provide an additional off-grounds experience for the women at M.C.I.W. that is consistent with their goals and plans and their overall progress and adjustment at the Institution. On returning to the Institution with the inmate, the volunteer *must* provide M.C.I.W. with a written evaluation of the off-grounds activity, the conduct, attitude and demeanour of the resident participants and a report of any conduct by a participating resident, which in her opinion, would warrant disciplinary action.

Another programme which offers support for prisoners whilst in prison and help with re-adjustment back into society is called AMICUS.

5:4 *Amicus Inc.*

History

In 1967, Amicus (Latin for friend) began its one-to-one programme working primarily with misdemeanours in the Hennepin County Workhouse. It was then decided that the need for a long-term relationship prior to release necessitated working with felons rather than misdemeanants. Now Amicus provides volunteers for inmates for the Minnesota State Prison (for men) and Minnesota Correctional Institute for Women. Since 1975 volunteer services have been extended to parolees of the above prisons and their related institutions.

An agreement with the prisons makes it possible for an inmate to request a one-to-one volunteer from Amicus. Information is compiled on both the inmate and the volunteer, this is supplemented by interviews; matches are tentatively made by the staff. The Department of Corrections allows Amicus volunteers to visit an inmate twice a month in addition to his

normal allotment of visits.

In addition to the prison one-to-one programme, Amicus accepts referrals of parolees who want an Amicus volunteer. The volunteer, backed up by Amicus staff, assumes the responsibility for providing service to parolees referred by a metropolitan parole unit. This programme lightens the parole agent's caseload and frees him or her to spend time with parolees requiring more supervision. More importantly, it provides the parolee with a non-threatening source of help, from an individual citizen who has volunteered to help an ex-offender. Except for Amicus' small contract with the Department of Corrections for service to parolees, Amicus is entirely dependent on private contributions.

Comment

I found the programmes described above extremely interesting and I believe that overall there was a great deal of pride in the volunteer programmes by staff, inmates and volunteers. They were highly organized, extremely well trained and appeared to function as a real team. My impressions are that they appeared to have overcome having to justify a volunteer's right to be involved in their own community. Therefore they are proud to be one of the leading States in involving the community in the correctional field.

One point I thought worthy of though is that many of their volunteers are absorbed into paid jobs within the programme. Some people may consider that this is negative, I am not at all sure that this is so. It certainly means that people know what it feels like to be a volunteer and therefore the input at orientation/training sessions are pertinent. However, bearing in mind that so much literature in America is heavily involved in trying to help the professional not feel threatened by volunteers, it would be difficult, in my opinion, for a professional not to feel threatened if a volunteer can apply for his/her job.

6. TORONTO, ONTARIO

During my four weeks in Ontario I was the "guest" of the Ministry of Correctional Services, particularly of Mr. Robert Fox, Co-ordinator of Volunteer Programmes. The itinerary which Mr. Fox and his staff prepared for me was very comprehensive, interesting and educational, it afforded me time to meet many, many people involved in community based programmes directed towards both juvenile and adult offenders.

6:1 Relevant Points of Justice Policy in Ontario

(i) Legislative Changes

Ontario is in the process of making major legislative changes. One of these being that until recently the Ministry of Corrections was responsible for administering programmes related to the juvenile offender. As of July, 1977, all services to juveniles are being concentrated into the Children's Service Division, Ministry of Community and Social Services and a whole "new look" in the treatment of children with problems is being developed. This has meant that all probation officers/aftercare offices and other staff have to choose with which Ministry they will work.

(ii) Juveniles

Age of responsibility 7 - 16 years of age. It is proposed to alter this to 12 - 18 years.

(iii) Ministry of Correctional Services (Ontario)

This Ministry has jurisdiction over all adult offenders 16 years of age and over in the province of Ontario sentenced to terms of less than two years. A person receiving a definite sentence of more than two years will serve that sentence in a Federal Institution.

(iv) Detention (Juvenile)

A child in detention must be heard in court on the next court day — then reviewed every seven days.

(v) Restitution (Juvenile)

Restitution - limitless — fine up to \$25.00.

(vi) Length of Probation Juvenile and Adult.

Six months to three years maximum.

(vii) Curfew

10.00pm — 6.00am. Applies to all juveniles within the Province. If a child breaks the curfew, the parents are charged *not* the child.

6:2 Historical Notes on Use of Volunteers

1966. The first volunteers recruited from Toronto Rotary Club to become involved in direct services to probationers.

1967. The first Volunteer Co-ordinator appointed for the Province.

1968. The Junior League of Toronto began establishing a volunteer probation programme in juvenile court.

1970. The Minister of Corrections appointed a select committee to report and advise on citizen participation.

1972. Re-organization of Ministries:— Probation joined the Ministry of Correctional Services from the Ministry of the Attorney General. Volunteer Programmes became a separate branch of the Ministry. At that time, some 400 volunteers were involved in institutional and probation programmes.

1977. Volunteers are providing key services to the Ministry in both the adult and juvenile divisions. There are now approximately 3,700 volunteers involved with the Ministry both in institutions and in probation/parole and aftercare services. Volunteers are providing one-to-one supportive counselling, teaching life skills, group discussions, preparation of pre-sentence report, job research, assistance with entertainment and recreation.

3,700:— 600 working with Juvenile Division
1200 probation and parole services
1900 working in adult institutions.

6:3 Role of Volunteer Programmes Branch in the Ministry.

This is a special branch of the Ministry of Correctional Services and acts as a facilitator and resource centre. Volunteers wishing to work with the Ministry may do so as members of existing bodies or by a direct approach to the Ministry in one of its existing programmes. Where a branch is aware of a need, or where for example, a prison has requested volunteer services, the volunteer programmes branch will approach an individual or a group within the community who can fill this need. They also help to set up programmes and offer on-going support to volunteers.

6:4 Precise of Places Visited

During my stay in Ontario, I visited juvenile and adult courts, detention homes, probation and aftercare programmes and Male and Female jails in Toronto, Ottawa, Kitchener, Cambridge and Richmond

Hill. I am not going to discuss volunteer probation programmes nor compare them. They are active but fledgling programmes in probation compared to the active long running Honorary Probation Officer role in Victoria. What I will do is select some aspects of programmes which are also doing excellent work, which we in Victoria may not as yet have, or which could be adapted to more efficient use of volunteers in criminal justice in Australia.

6:5 *Youth Staff Services of Metropolitan Toronto Police Department*

Youth Bureau

Though this following programme is not involved with volunteers, I would like to comment upon it because I was very impressed by its work. This is staffed by police officers of Sergeant status and above to work with juveniles, *not* in uniform, and *not* in police cars. There are 4 - 8 officers at eighteen locations throughout the Province working with juveniles. Any police picking up a juvenile takes the child to the local police station and then notifies the youth bureau staff and hand the responsibility over to them. Parents are notified and must come to the station. *No* statements are made unless parents or guardian are present.

Bureau Contact for 1976.

Approx. 33,000 juvenile contacts.

Approx. 27,000 *not* referred to Juvenile Court.

Approx. 5,000 referred to Juvenile Court.

6:6 *Elizabeth Fry Society – Toronto Branch*

I was very privileged to spend the day with Ms. Phyllis Haslam, Executive Director (who is one of the better known personalities in Canadian Corrections), also with her staff, volunteers and the girls in the Toronto residence. Mrs. Haslam is a member of the National Advisory Committee on the Female Offender and I was very grateful to her for sharing some of her knowledge and ideas with me.

The Toronto Branch of the Elizabeth Fry Society was started in 1952, by a group of people who saw needs in the community of girls and women which were not being met by existing services. They now have the following programmes:—

(i) *Counselling Services*

(a) to girls and women in custody

(b) to girls and women in the community

(ii) *Residence Accommodation*

There is a modern, attractive house which offers accommodation for 14 in a homely setting in which to re-adjust. It helps some residents to follow through on programmes of education, employment, medical treatment etc.

(iii) *Clothing Room*

This provides clothing for clients of the Society.

(iv) *Haslam House*

This is a small residence for juvenile girls coming out of training school. This residence is financed on a purchase of service basis from the Ministry of Correctional Services.

(v) *Court Programme*

Volunteers are in Court to interpret and offer resources of the Agency to the Court and to the girls appearing before the Court.

(vi) *Metropolitan Toronto Jail Programme*

Each Wednesday evening a group of volunteers from Elizabeth Fry spend the evening with the women residents in the Toronto Jail. This is a

recreational programme the content of which is decided by the needs of the residents.

These programmes use mainly volunteers. Other areas in which the Elizabeth Fry Society are active are in education, evaluation (not the least) public action and an advocacy role.

OTTAWA

6:7 *Ottawa Probation and Parole Service*

Abridged Pre-Disposition Reporting by Assistant Probation Officers

To visit this service given to the Ottawa Provincial Court (Criminal Division) was a fascinating experience. I spent the day in court and observed and discussed with all parties involved the real team approach built up by five dedicated women volunteers who cover this court on a daily roster basis. In fact, the court was so busy on the day I was there that I was told to get to work — which I did.

The volunteers start by picking up the pre-sentence reports at the probation office, on arrival these are delivered to the clerk of courts' office (and/or Crown Attorney). They also pick up the probation orders of the previous day for returning to the probation office at the end of the court day.

The assistant probation officer (A.P.O.) on court day has an office conveniently located near the court room next to the Judge's chambers.

Before passing sentence, the Judge may request a pre-disposition report from the A.P.O. on duty.

These abridged reports are for those offenders on whom the court would like some additional data before sentencing, but not so much as would be needed in a pre-sentence report, which would necessitate the offender being remanded, usually for two or three weeks whilst a report is being done.

The A.P.O. on duty writes a pre-disposition report of which there are four copies — one each for the Judge, the Crown Attorney, The Defence Attorney, and one for the A.P.O. file. Whilst the A.P.O. was moving in and out of court with the offenders, it became obvious, on occasions, that some of the testimony had been missed. Here I was so pleased to see the police handing over their police evidence to the A.P.O. often with a helpful remark, e.g. "read the letter which we found in his possession".

In the report the A.P.O. may mention the possibility of:-

- 1) Absolute or conditional discharge.
- 2) Request a full pre-sentence.
- 3) Request psychiatric evaluation.
- 4) Determine the kind of fine or restitution the offender can afford.
- 5) Indicate whether or not probation would be successful.

The A.P.O. may also be asked to interview an offender who is in police custody in the cells which are four floors away.

The co-operation and communication between the A.P.O. the police and the attorneys was a pleasure to see.

An important support to this probation service is the attendance at the court of a Salvation Army Officer who looks after the general welfare of the client. This is an interesting "working together" of two voluntary agencies each with their own expertise. This does not compromise the probation office, nor does it affect the welfare orientation and resources which the

Salvation Army can offer to the client.

I am enthusiastic about this programme as I believe it could easily be incorporated into our criminal justice system and should be. I believe offenders and magistrates are entitled to this service. It is simple, inexpensive and there is no need to build another bureaucracy into our system. The only requirements needed are conscientious, trained, reliable volunteers, (as few as possible to each court so that they may build rapport and credibility with the court staff), an area for them to work in, some abridged pre-disposition papers and a pen.

Whilst I was in Ottawa, I spent a great deal of time with Mr. Jerry Keissling who is Chief Probation Officer and also Consultant to the Department of the Solicitor General of Canada and Professor Andrews of the University of Ottawa. Together they have produced some of the best research into their volunteer programme, its operational mode, philosophies underlying volunteerism and mechanical know-how. This research is, I'm sure, of great interest to academics and behavioural researchers, but the volunteers in court (described above) have dis-associated themselves from the probation and parole department and prefer to work independently. They and other volunteers felt that though the programme may be in existence, it was not covering the areas of need it should, and that the research was negative as it did not relate to their practical work.

KITCHENER

6:8 *Victim-Offender Reconciliation Programme (V.O.R.P.)*

This is a programme based in Kitchener which is an area with a large Mennonite population and where one of the most interesting volunteer programmes has been developed. The V.O.R.P. is a joint effort of the Probation and Parole Service (Ministry of Corrections) and the Mennonite Churches using citizen volunteers. The V.O.R.P. has so far brought about 200 offenders, (focusing on offenders in crimes such as breaking and entering, theft, mischief, wilful damage and assault) face to face with their victims.

These offenders have paid several thousand dollars in restitution for the loss or damage cause by their offences. The effect of these confrontations is often deeply satisfying to the victim psychologically as well as financially. The effect on the offender often appears to be strongly rehabilitative and it is expected that the reconviction rate of people who have gone through this programme will be low. Sometimes the restitution is made in the form of a number of hours of work agreed to between victim and offender.

Offenders also deal with "secondary" victims such as insurance companies. Victims and offenders involved in this programme do so voluntarily. Usually the offender has been placed on probation, and the mutual agreement process is recognised as part of the probation order. The specific terms of the probation order is generally worded as:—

"...Come to agreement with the victim regarding restitution with the assistance of the probation officer or person designated by the probation officer. If agreement is not reached or carried out, the matter will be referred back to this court."

This programme *really does* have volunteer components — victim — offender — probation officer. It seems to have much to offer to both the victim and the offender.

TORONTO

6:9 *John Howard Society of Ontario — Founded 1929*

This is a non-governmental organization of citizens who acknowledge their responsibility for understanding and dealing with the problems of crime and the Criminal Justice System. "This Society's" concern is similar to the Elizabeth Fry Society. Specifically however, these activities can be categorised into four basic areas of involvement:—

(i) *Services to offenders who have been identified but have been committed to institutions*

Examples:

- (a) diversion programmes
- (b) attendance centres
- (c) life skills and work preparation programmes
- (d) extension of the use of probation, Community Service Orders and restitution as valid alternatives to prison.

The society through its staff and volunteers work directly with the courts and the Ministry of Correctional Services in helping these offenders.

(ii) *Services to those offenders who are or who have been in prison*

- (a) Volunteer programmes within the prison.
- (b) Acts as a liaison between the prisoner and his family and friends at home.
- (c) Strives to provide newly released ex-inmates with necessary assistance to become re-established in the community.

(iii) *Reform and Criminal Justice Development*

Plays a very strong advocacy role maintaining a strong and continuing emphasis on reform of the Criminal Justice System.

(iv) *Crime and the Community*

Informs citizens about crime in their community and enables them to become involved in seeking solutions.

6:10 *Volunteers in Institutions*

I was very impressed by the access volunteers had to institutions, whether through established groups like John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society or by individuals. Former inmates are used, and "Family and Friends Centre" is just that, a group of inmates wives, and friends and other volunteers who provide a full day service, Monday until Friday and a half day on Saturday and Sunday at the Toronto Jail. At all the jails I visited, the use of volunteers was encouraged. In some jails the visits of volunteers are times to coincide with what would normally be a busy time, such as staff changeover time. To illustrate government thinking on citizen participation in institutions, I would like to quote part of Recommendation 49 of the Report to Parliament on the Penitentiary System in Canada.

"*Citizen Advisory Committees* must be established in all maximum, medium and minimal penal institutions. Members should be recruited from a cross-section of society representing a wide variety of interests as well as ethnic and cultural characteristics of the local and institutional communities. . . The principle function of these Committees should be to assist the Director with the overall development of the Institution and its programmes. They should assist in determining the types of programmes that are needed for inmates in the Institution in response to the views of staff and inmates. . ."

I support this thinking very strongly as volunteer

opportunities in institutions are unlimited. Within the institution there is a broad spectrum of staff, ranging through chaplaincy, recreation, to education and psychology and within each of the Departments active volunteer programmes should play an important and integral part.

6:11 *Preventive Intervention with Juveniles*

I visited this pilot project at Nepean in Ottawa. This project started in October, 1975 after agreement was reached between Probation After Care Services and the Youth Liaison Branch of the Neapean Police Force. The rationale behind this project was that a large percentage of juveniles were receiving only a warning from the police and subsequent sanctions by the parents. Concern was expressed by the police, as well as by other interested individuals, that this total approach was simply inadequate, i.e., no counselling for parents, although their anxiety, fears and concern were evident in view of their child's conflict with the law. At the same time, no overview was offered to the child as to the seriousness and possible consequences of further breaches of the law.

Adopted Procedures

The police and the Probation Service agreed that referral to the project should adhere to the following criteria:—

- (a) Juveniles referred would have had no previous contact with the Juvenile Court.
- (b) Candidates for the programme would be those who have voluntarily admitted to guilt.
- (c) That, prior to referral, parents or guardian would voluntarily consent to participation in the Preventive Intervention Programme, thereby permitting workers access to their homes.

Process

Withing 48 hours of a parental consent form being signed, a team would contact the family. A team approach was utilized in the intervention process. One officer would initiate discussion about the presenting difficulties whilst the second worker (Volunteer Probation Officer) would act as an observer.

In adopting this method a great deal of information could be obtained through the initial home contact. Intervention with the family was limited to a maximum of eight home visits with each officer dividing responsibility for follow-up services.

Home visits were usually undertaken during the evening — this has proved most beneficial as the entire family was present to participate.

Comment

This project has been received with a great deal of enthusiasm by other police forces, The Judiciary and the Board of Education with a view to expanding this project.

In view of the fact the police warning system in Victoria is being, or is about to be evaluated, I believe, as do many honorary probation officers that this extra arm to the law could help in channelling juveniles away from the court system.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATION

The experience of this tour was exciting, stimulating and extremely educational. I found that the people involved in the programmes that I visited were extraordinarily helpful and friendly, my only regret was that I was not able to spend more time with the volunteers and the recipients of the various programmes.

I must again comment on the enormous funding of many programmes in North America, the comparison being most striking with the money spent in Australia; not that I believe this makes a programme more effective, it just appeared to me that many people believed that this was a prerequisite for a successful programme. I must say, however, that in the majority of cases volunteers are well supported and the approach seems to be that volunteer programmes are designed to give corrections visibility and accountability within the community.

I believe that the following could be incorporated or changed in the Victorian System.

Victoria, at present, appears to be flying in the face of all trends overseas, trends which in most instances have failed. In Victoria, we now have no Probation-Parole Division of the Social Welfare Department. As well as having no P & P Division, we now have the trend, which is gathering increasing momentum, away from having specialist probation officers. The clients are now being serviced by generalist social workers except for those serviced by volunteers. I believe that the effect on our courts, our police force and our correctional institutions will be at the very least a lack of continuity and a disintegration of the trust which both paid and unpaid staff have built up over the years. On top of this we have regional offices run by regional superintendents whose roles will be to incorporate their own standard of training, work and minimum standards. I would like to illustrate my comments above by stating what is happening in Hennepin County Court Services, and I quote:—

"In Juvenile Field Services, there is a move away from the probation officer functioning as a generalist to the probation officer as a specialist, either in investigations or in the treatment/counselling area. The investigator will specialise in pre-disposition activities up to and including the disposition hearing but will not carry a caseload or get involved in the treatment process after disposition. The officer who is a treatment specialist. Other changes consistent with geographic field units, where there have been five field units (equated regional offices) these will be decreased to three."

1. *Job Description (5:2).*

I like the job descriptions and time commitments required from the volunteer, plus the enrolment time. This must be conducive to better programme planning and higher standard of training as the instructors know that these people have committed themselves for a minimum involvement.

2. *Juvenile Detention (5:1, (iii))*

The provisions for detaining a child for the least time possible is enviable. The case work involvement from the start of detention, with a view to releasing the child to home detention or foster care is an area which is sadly lacking in Victoria. In Victoria our children may be taken to remand and then wait one to two weeks before appearing in court — this is done without any official justification for the child being detained!! The child may then be sent back to remand for a further two weeks awaiting a pre-court investigation. I believe that the geographic location of our juvenile remand sections is one of the reasons that this happens. I would hope that future planners would incorporate a juvenile court with a remand section.

3. *National Information Centre on Volunteerism — Boulder, Colorado (3:1)*

We could well follow this example and start to form a central information bureau on volunteer agencies so that we can pool our resources and knowledge and thus coordinate present and future volunteer programmes and management. At present in Australia we do not have a

directory of voluntary agencies, let alone any description or evaluation of their work.

4. *Contact of Lincoln Nebraska (4:2)*

This programme also is centralising all information on voluntary agencies especially those operating in institutions, and those catering for the welfare and after care of prisoners.

5. *Juvenile Court Tutoring Programme – Lincoln Nebraska (4:4)*

This is an excellent concept, offering something constructive to the juvenile with academic and school related problems. I am sure this service could also be offered to clients of the adult courts.

6. *Hennepin County Court Services (5:2)*

This was one of the most worthwhile and stimulating programmes that I visited, it has a most comprehensive and vital volunteer programme covering many aspects of all courts. Worthy of special consideration in this extensive service were the following:—

(a) *Visitation Counsellor (5:2,(ii))*

This service offered to the Family Court in Hennepin County could well help ease some of the identified problems being experienced by the children and parents involved in Family Court hearings in some areas of Australia.

(b) *Home Detention Counsellor (5:2, (viii))*

I believe this programme which provides short term counselling and support with the juveniles kept in their own homes until the Childrens Court disposition is well worth trying so that we have a chance of keeping some of our children out of institutions.

7. *Custody Volunteer (5:3,(i))*

This is an excellent example of volunteer penetration into the prison providing service to the inmates. I especially like the concept of a volunteer being responsible for the short-term release of the inmate (for either life-skills training or family reasons) with the obligation to provide a written evaluation on the inmates return to the institution.

8. *Abridged Pre-Disposition Reporting – Ottawa (6:7)*

I believe this programme should be implemented immediately. As I have already stated, I believe offenders and magistrates are entitled to this service which greatly facilitates the sentencing process. I also believe that this could be started almost instantly especially if there is an effective probation service to back up the court work already being done. The very simplicity of this programme appeals to me, no extra paid staff are needed therefore the cost is minimal. Also, we have excellent welfare voluntary organizations such as the Salvation Army, who could provide the welfare aspect at no extra cost.

I would like to make a plea for governments not to "professionalise" the voluntary agencies. I believe voluntary agencies in Australia may very soon, if this harrowing trend towards American volunteering as a big business continues, have to rethink their roles and priorities anew. As volunteerism becomes the new avant garde profession, voluntary agencies will have to stand firm. If volunteerism becomes absorbed by government it loses its power to criticise the system effectively. It also wastes energy resolving problems identified or caused by government rather than resolving problems identified by the *community*.

Finally, I think it would be extremely useful if the Government could set up a Task Force looking into the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice similar to the one implemented by the Canadian Government which was completed in 1977. The specific objectives of this Task Force were:—

1. To open communications between the private sector and governments at federal and state levels and to ensure a thorough review of the relationship between the private sector and governments and the various roles fulfilled by both private and governmental sectors in the criminal justice field.
2. To recommend appropriate structures for short and long term planning aimed at co-operation and co-ordination between the government and private sectors.
3. To recommend funding models and to indicate the kinds of commitments that governments need to ensure appropriate sharing of responsibilities and development of meaningful programmes and services.
4. To compile an inventory of programmes and services provided by the private sector and relating these to services provided by governments.
5. To compile a descriptive analysis of gaps between government and private sector services with a view to recommending who should initiate future endeavours.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all the staff, clients, inmates and volunteers within all the programmes I visited, for their time and interest in sharing with me their knowledge of their respective programmes.

I would especially like to thank:—

Earl Yonehara, Volunteer Co-ordinator of the Volunteer Services Programme of the Judiciary, State of Hawaii,
Dr. Richard Moore, Court Psychologist, The Volunteer Probation Counsellors Programme Municipal Court, Lincoln, Nebraska,

Mr. Richard Hodgkins, Director of Volunteer Services, Hennepin County Court Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota,

Mr. Robert Fox, Co-ordinator of Volunteer Programmes, Ministry of Correctional Services, Ontario. Also his assistant (at that time) Ms. Ruth Pitman who is now the new Co-ordinator,

for preparing for me, an exciting and stimulating itinerary of the Volunteer Services in their State or Province.

Finally, a very sincere thank you to one of the world leading authorities on Volunteerism:

Dr. Ivan Scheier, President, National Information Centre on Volunteers, Boulder, Colorado.

Dr. Scheier was the guiding hand behind my whole trip and I will be forever grateful for his time, his friendship and his encouragement. Dr. Scheier has been a long time supporter of and has given great encouragement to, Volunteer Programmes in Australia, for this, all of us involved in these programmes are very grateful.

Resources

I am happy to supply access to resource material with which I have returned, or to provide names and addresses to people who may care to make direct contact with specific programmes.