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This middle years teacher resource is designed to provide information about Canada’s youth justice system to youth from Aboriginal communities as well as other youth. Youth from Aboriginal communities may see the justice system as something that is outside of their community. Both Aboriginal youth and non-Aboriginal youth can benefit from an understanding of how traditional Aboriginal concepts are reflected in Canada’s justice system as well as some of the differences between these concepts and Canada’s justice system. This kind of information will assist Aboriginal youth in seeing justice as an integral part of their communities.

Although there is no one concept of Aboriginal justice that is true for all communities of Aboriginal people, it is clear that Aboriginal justice concepts have some common features and that these are different than the commonly held beliefs about justice that have developed in the Western world. Canadian laws about criminal justice now recognize the circumstances of Aboriginal peoples within the criminal justice system and require the courts to take these circumstances into account when sentencing Aboriginal offenders.

Aboriginal concepts about justice are a reflection of Aboriginal worldviews and the deeply held beliefs of Aboriginal peoples. Justice means much more than what happens to a person who is found guilty of committing a crime. What a community believes about justice will determine what they consider right and wrong, what they do to ensure that people live up to society’s standards and what they do with people who have done wrong. This resource explores these questions and looks at both traditional Aboriginal approaches to these questions and the approaches taken in Canadian law, particularly in the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA).

Every society must have ways of dealing with people who break the law. Societies can, however, take different approaches to preventing anti-social acts and dealing with people who break the law. Different societies may take different approaches to who should be involved in the response to a crime, what purpose the consequences for breaking the law should serve and appropriate consequences.

The following lessons look at the approach to youth justice endorsed by the Youth Criminal Justice Act and Aboriginal approaches to justice. It is important for students to understand that there is no single Aboriginal approach to justice. The original Aboriginal nations living in what is now Canada were not a single group of people. There were many different societies of original inhabitants living in the different areas, each with their own customs, political organizations, language and spiritual beliefs. Aboriginal peoples do not have a single philosophy of life or a single culture. Nevertheless many Aboriginal nations share some ideas about justice. It is these broad concepts that many different Aboriginal societies may have in common that are discussed.
Aboriginal justice concepts are compared to Western concepts of justice generally and youth justice concepts in particular. Under Canadian law youth are treated differently than adults who commit crimes. Although there are some similarities between adult justice and youth justice there are significant differences.

Canada’s youth criminal justice system does not set up a separate set of laws for young people. The same things are illegal for both young persons and adults. However, the Youth Criminal Justice Act does establish a separate system to deal with young persons who break the law. Under the YCJA, a “young person” means someone 12 or older up to the age of 17.

The way young people are treated if they commit a crime is different from adults in many ways. Some of the most significant differences concern what happens to a youth who breaks the law. With young people there is an emphasis on preventing trouble before it starts. The purposes of consequences as well as the consequences themselves are different.
Why, in a society where justice is supposed to be blind, are the inmates of our prisons selected so overwhelmingly from a single ethnic group?

[Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba]

The question of over-representation of Aboriginal peoples in the criminal justice system is a complex one, for which there are no easy answers. Understanding the statistics requires an understanding of the legacy of government actions over the years since first contact, some of the differences between Aboriginal and Western justice concepts, and the effects of discrimination and racism.

Aboriginal people are over-represented in the criminal justice system both as victims and offenders. According to 2004 statistics from Statistics Canada, Aboriginal people are three times more likely than non-Aboriginal people to be the victims of a violent crime. Young Aboriginal people, between 15 and 35, were most often the victims of these violent crimes.

As well Statistics Canada reports that between 1997 and 2000 Aboriginal people were 10 times more likely to be accused of murder than non-Aboriginal people and that in 2004 on-reserve crime rates were about three times higher than in the rest of Canada. In 2004 the rate of youth crime on reserves was also three times higher than the rate of youth crime throughout the rest of Canada and young people were accused of committing murder on a reserve at about 11 times the rate of young people elsewhere in Canada.

Both Aboriginal youth and Aboriginal adults are highly represented in admissions to all types of correctional services. According to Statistics Canada, Aboriginal youth make up only about 5% of the population while 21% of admissions to open custody, 20% of admissions to secure custody, 19% of admissions to deferred custody and 12% of admissions to probation are Aboriginal youth. In 2003/2004 Saskatchewan was among the provinces with the highest proportion of Aboriginal youth admitted to custody and community programs.

The overall proportion of Aboriginal youth admitted to custody gradually and consistently declined between 1998/1999 and 2002/2003. In 2003 the federal government passed new legislation to deal with youth crime, the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA). The following year the overall number of youth admitted to custody declined dramatically but the proportion of youth admitted to custody who were Aboriginal increased. The number of non-Aboriginal youth admitted to custody declined by 51%, while Aboriginal youth admitted to custody declined only by 33%. This resulted in an increase in the proportion of Aboriginal youth admitted to custody.
Although it is possible to speculate about the reasons that Aboriginal people are over-represented in the criminal justice system, it is not possible to pinpoint any one reason. Poverty and Aboriginal people’s marginal position in Canadian society may be one of the causes. Statistics Canada reports that Aboriginal people on average have higher rates of unemployment, lower incomes and are more likely to live in crowded conditions than non-Aboriginal people.

The Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba was created in 1988 to look at two incidents in Manitoba involving Aboriginal people and the criminal justice system. One incident was the murder of an Aboriginal girl in 1971. No one was tried for her murder until 1987, although it was alleged that many people in the community knew who had murdered her. The other incident was the shooting of J.J. Harper, Executive Director of the Island Lake Tribal Council, following an encounter with a Winnipeg police officer. Many people, particularly in the Aboriginal community, believed several questions about the incident were left unanswered by the police service’s internal investigation.

In his testimony before the Inquiry, Chief Dennis Shorting of the Little Saskatchewan band stated:

So we find ourselves in the fertile breeding grounds of crime: high unemployment, lack of educational opportunities, substandard housing, inadequate health care, tradition, hunting, fishing and trapping rights being violated, a shortage of recreation facilities and being subject to the law and which many times we don’t understand, laws which do not fit with our culture, values and traditions.

Discrimination against Aboriginal people both within the justice system and within society as a whole is another factor. According to Statistics Canada, Aboriginal people are twice as likely to report having experienced discrimination than non-Aboriginal people. Aboriginal people reported discrimination on the street, in stores and when dealing with the police at much higher rates than non-Aboriginal people. The Supreme Court of Canada has stated that there is widespread bias against Aboriginal people within Canada and that this widespread racism has resulted in discrimination against Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system.

The Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba concluded that racism exists throughout Manitoba and all of Canada and that racism also exists in the administration of Manitoba’s justice system. The Inquiry also concluded that Aboriginal people did not suffer only from overt racism. They found that the more serious problem Aboriginal people face in the justice system is that the justice system is based on the assumption that all Canadians share common values and experiences. The Inquiry found that a system based on those assumptions “cannot help but discriminate against Aboriginal people, who come to the system with cultural values and experiences that differ substantially from those of the dominant society.”

The laws in Canada concerning what happens to people who commit crimes have tried to address the problem of over-representation of Aboriginal people. In Canada the Criminal Code is the main law that sets out what actions are considered crimes, how people accused of a crime will be dealt with by the police and the courts, and the consequences that people who have committed a crime will face. The Criminal Code determines what is considered a crime for adults and young people. However, the Youth Criminal Justice Act determines the procedure for dealing with young people accused of crimes and the consequences young people can face.
Both the Criminal Code and the Youth Criminal Justice Act address the fact that Aboriginal people are highly over-represented in all types of custody facilities from youth facilities to provincial jails and federal prisons. In 1996 a section of the Criminal Code was added which requires courts to consider “all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable in the circumstances…with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.”

Although most of the Criminal Code sections that deal with sentencing do not apply to young people, this section was specifically incorporated into the Youth Criminal Justice Act. The Youth Criminal Justice Act also has a section that provides that those dealing with young people who commit crimes must consider “all available sanctions other than custody that are reasonable in the circumstances…with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.” As well, one of the principles of the YCJA is that young people who commit offences should be treated in a way that respects gender, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic differences and responds to the needs of Aboriginal young persons.

The Supreme Court of Canada has considered why the Criminal Code now requires the particular circumstances of Aboriginal offenders to be considered and what this section requires the courts to do. The Supreme Court found that the purpose of the section was to change the way Aboriginal offenders are sentenced to respond to the sad and pressing problem of the drastic over-representation of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system.

The Supreme Court found that a significant problem that Aboriginal people face in the criminal justice system is that sentencing purposes, like deterring people from committing crimes and separating them from the community, are far removed from Aboriginal understandings about what should happen to those who do not live up to the standards of behaviour expected by society.

The Supreme Court was careful to say that Aboriginal communities in Canada stretch from coast to coast and from the border with the United States to the far north, each with their own customs, traditions and concepts of sentencing. The Court went on to say that it is important to recognize that sentencing in courts has not responded to the needs, experiences and perspectives of Aboriginal people and Aboriginal communities.

The Court noted that although there are many differences between Aboriginal communities, many Aboriginal communities share a common understanding about the importance of community-based sanctions. The Court stated that traditional Aboriginal ideas about sentencing emphasize “restorative justice” and that this tradition is very important when considering what the Criminal Code means when it requires sentencing judges to pay particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.

The Court went on to describe restorative justice as an approach to remedying crime in which it is understood that everything is connected and that crime disturbs the harmony of these connections. What should happen is determined by the needs of the victims, the community and the offender. The Court then stated that although traditional Aboriginal justice concepts emphasize restorative justice, Aboriginal peoples also see the importance of things like separating an offender from the community, in the case of some serious offences and some offenders.
Objective: Students will learn about the importance of laws.

Method: Class Discussion, Creative Writing

Materials: Background Information, Scenarios

Teacher Background Information

Helping young people to understand the reasons societies have laws can help young people see justice as something that is a fundamental part of their lives, rather than simply an abstract concept. Societies have laws for important reasons. Laws help people live together peacefully. Laws prohibit people from doing things that harm others. Laws give people ways to peacefully settle disagreements. Laws also provide ways to deal with people who break the law.

Stopping people from hurting each other is the reason for many of the laws of many different societies. However, there can be differences between the importance societies place on the harm done and the kinds of harm that are dealt with by the laws of different societies.

In the Western tradition, laws tend to deal with actions that are wrong. For example, there are laws against physically hurting other people (assault, murder etc.) or doing things that could hurt people (speeding, drinking and driving etc.). The harm caused may be considered but the action in and of itself is considered the wrong.

On the other hand, Aboriginal traditions consider the harm to be the wrong as opposed to the action itself. For this reason, in traditional Aboriginal societies, there was often no concept of "victimless" crimes. For example, in the past many European societies made it a crime to express different views on religion, while traditional Aboriginal societies did not have these kinds of laws.
Procedure

1. Share the information on why societies have laws with the students.

2. Ask the students to identify laws that they think are important. Once students have identified particular laws expand the discussion to include the need for laws in a society generally. Help the students identify some of the ways laws help society run smoothly and benefit all members of a society.

3. Have students consider if we need laws and rules by writing a story based on what if…

   • You get a new backpack for your birthday. The first day you bring it to school another kid takes it out of your locker, dumps your stuff and starts using it. You complain to the principal and he just shrugs and says “guess it’s not yours anymore.”

   • A bunch of kids want to play floor hockey at lunch. There are not enough sticks for everyone to play. Everyone goes for the sticks all at once. The bigger, stronger kids get the sticks because they push the other kids out of the way. If a smaller kid gets a stick a bigger kid quickly takes it away. The lunch time supervisor says “well now that’s sorted out we can start playing.”

   • You are walking to school. To get to school you need to cross several busy streets. As you come to the crosswalk you notice the cars are not slowing down. In fact cars are whizzing by at high speeds. You see a crossing guard but she is in a coffee shop having a donut. When you ask her how you are supposed to get across the street she suggests you “wait for a break in the traffic and then run for it.”
Aboriginal cultures share a belief that people must live in respectful harmonious relationships with Nature, with one another and with themselves. The relationships are governed by what are understood as laws, which are gifts from the Creator. The laws are fundamentally spiritual, imbuing all aspects of life. As fundamental as this perspective may be, each Aboriginal culture expresses it in its unique ways, with its own practices, products and knowledge.

[Voices of the Elders, June 2000, Western Canadian Protocol Framework for Aboriginal Language and Culture Programs]

Objective: Students will explore different sources of laws in both Aboriginal and Western traditions.

Method: Discussion, Charting

Materials: Background Information, Chart, Examples

Teacher Background Information

Looking at the sources of laws will help young people understand some of the differences and similarities between Aboriginal and Western concepts about justice. In Canada laws are made by governments. Governments have the right to make laws because they are chosen by the people of Canada. Governments do not just have the right to make any laws; they must use laws to govern people. This is what makes the government different than a dictator or a king or queen. The government cannot just require people to do things on a whim. The government must go through the steps necessary to pass a law. Once the law is passed, everyone, including the government, must obey the law. Canadian laws then represent the wishes of the people, through their elected representatives.

Different societies and even the people within the same society view laws as coming from different sources. What a society considers the source or sources of laws is influenced by that
society's worldview. A society may view laws as coming from a higher power, such as God or the Creator. A society may view laws as reflecting the laws of nature. A society may view laws as coming from customs or practices that over time have come to be considered laws.

The idea that laws are made by people is in keeping with the Western view of people's place in the world. Western societies often view people as ruling over other things in the world such as nature, plants and animals. An example of this is the belief that the world was created by God for humans. In contrast, from an Aboriginal worldview humans are the least powerful and least important factor in creation. There is a hierarchy based on dependencies. Mother Earth is first since everything and everyone depends on the earth for survival. The plant order is next since the animal world needs the plant world to survive. After that comes the animal order. Humans are the last order. The animal order has taught humans how to hunt, what is good to eat and how to survive the cold.

The idea that laws are made by people can also be found in an Aboriginal view of law, although the people that traditionally created Aboriginal law were not people in power, such as governments. Aboriginal laws developed and evolved to meet the needs of the communities and their members. They reflect the principles and values of the particular peoples they govern. Sometimes these laws are called customary laws. Custom is what people do. Customary law is not made by people in power. It is made by people as a whole and is a reflection of commonly-held ideas of right and wrong, values and moral principles.

Both Aboriginal and Western traditions also see laws as coming from nature and from a higher power. In the Aboriginal tradition law comes from the Creator and is observable in nature. The Western view of law also sees laws as coming from both nature and God. For example the Ten Commandments can be seen as the source of laws against murder, theft and perjury (lying in court under oath). The idea of natural law also exists in the Western tradition. According to natural law the fundamental principles of all laws come from nature or from a supreme being, not from creation of human societies. The idea that there are natural rights of all humans can be seen in the United States Declaration of Independence. This declaration states that “all men are created equal” and that they are “endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights.”

Procedure

1. Share the information on where laws come from with the students.
2. Distribute the Sources of Law Chart to students or create an overhead from it.
3. Go over the examples provided.
4. Once students understand the concept distribute Sources of Law Activity. Have students identify the possible sources for the laws or rules listed. Encourage students to consider as many different sources for the rules or laws as they can think of but let them know that some rules or laws will have more possible sources than others.
### Sources of Law Chart

**Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law or Rule</th>
<th>Supreme Being</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Custom</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No hitting or pushing allowed in school.</td>
<td>golden rule – treat others as you would like to be treated</td>
<td>ants working co-operatively for the good of the colony</td>
<td>settling disagreements peacefully for the good of all</td>
<td>laws against assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to be home by 10 pm.</td>
<td>honour thy mother and father - one of the Ten Commandments</td>
<td>young dependent on parents to learn how to survive</td>
<td>parents being responsible for looking after their children</td>
<td>curfew laws, laws giving parents rights and responsibilities towards their children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Law Activity

For the following laws, identify at least TWO possible sources of that law from the four options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law or Rule</th>
<th>Supreme Being</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Custom</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No stealing allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids are not allowed to smoke cigarettes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids have to go to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot be married to more than one person at a time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: Students will learn about universal concepts of right and wrong, how ideas about right and wrong have lead to the creation of laws and the relationship between doing what is right and doing what is required by law.

Method: Reading, Questions, Writing Assignment, Class Discussion

Materials: Background Information, Handout, Questions, Traffic Lights Example

Teacher Background Information

Understanding the relationship between right and wrong and the law will help young people see that justice is not based on arbitrary ideas about right and wrong. Laws reflect a society’s most deeply held beliefs. Laws let people know what their society considers acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. What is forbidden in one society may be allowed in another society but almost all societies share some common beliefs about what is right and wrong.

Professor James Youngblood Henderson (Director of the Native Law Centre at the University of Saskatchewan) pointed this out in a 1999 address to a convention of Canadian judges. He spoke about Aboriginal concepts of justice and Western concepts of justice and noted that there is “no real cultural conflict as to the definition of [many] criminal behaviours” as “theft, assault causing injury, sexual abuse [and] domestic violence” all “violate contemporary and traditional Aboriginal norms just as surely as they violate non-Aboriginal norms.”

An example of a commonly held belief about what is right and wrong is what is sometimes called the “golden rule.” This rule requires that we treat others as we would like to be treated. This rule can be found in the teachings of many cultures and religions of the world. One of the Ten Commandments (believed to have been given by God to Moses) is “love thy neighbour as yourself.” The Bible reports Jesus as saying “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” Muhammad requires followers to “Hurt no one so that no one may hurt you.” The teaching of Confucius states “What you do not wish upon yourself, extend not to others.”
Societies use the idea of right and wrong to prevent people from doing things that harm or could harm others or themselves. How ideas about right and wrong developed in an Aboriginal society by considering the consequences of actions can be seen in the following passage:

Some happening came to the people. The result was good and fortunate. “This is right,” said the Wise Men. “This shall be embodied in a new law so that good fortune may be still more assured to our People.” And when misfortune came these Wise Men delved deeply to find its cause.

At last, satisfied they had learned that which they had sought for, they said, “The action that lies at the root of this difficulty is wrong. Our peoples must be protected in the future that the same error may not be committed again. We make a new law forbidding that action.”

So grew the Code. So were the children instructed in the ways of Right and Wrong. So generation followed generation, each one more vigorous, more prosperous.


Procedure

1. Distribute *What You Do When No One Is Around*.
2. Use the following questions to guide a class discussion or as topics for a writing assignment…
   - What would you do or not do if you could get away with it? Why would you do it or not do it?
   - Can you think of situations where it would be right to break the law? (idea of civil disobedience for example Gandhi, Martin Luther King or others)
   - What are some of the benefits of relying on the law to tell you how to act? (provides consistency, gives people protection from others who may not think some kinds of harming others is wrong)
   - What are some of the drawbacks of relying on the law to tell you how to act? (possibility that lawmakers might use laws in ways that harm people, such as Hitler’s laws or laws about Apartheid in South Africa, people only obeying the law when someone is around to enforce it)
3. Students may be interested in a traffic lights and road safety experiment that is taking place in the northern Dutch town of Drachten. They removed many of the traffic lights. Before the traffic lights were removed there was a road accident death every three years but there have been none since the removal started seven years ago. The traffic planner explains how having no lights actually makes it safer by noting that “it shifts the emphasis away from the Government taking the risk, to the driver being responsible for his or her own risk.”
What You Do When No One Is Around

Laws let us know what is considered right and wrong by society, but should we rely on laws and the consequences for breaking them to guide our behaviour? Aboriginal societies did not traditionally rely on laws imposed by authority and punishments for breaking those laws to guide people’s behaviour.

There is great diversity among Aboriginal peoples but there are some common elements. Customary Aboriginal laws are not something that people are forced to obey or face punishment. Customary laws are made to help people know and live by their community’s ideas about duty and responsibility. The “good life” or a “good mind” often has the same meaning as law. Customary Aboriginal law is all the social mechanisms that teach people from birth to death how to live a good life. This idea was expressed by a Cree Elder when he compared Canadian laws to Aboriginal law and asked “Why do your laws…speak only about what people should do? Why don’t your laws speak to people about what they should be?” The Cree concept of Miyo-wicetowin requires Cree peoples to conduct themselves in a way that creates good in all relationships.

Every person must find for themselves the “good mind” that allows them to know Aboriginal law and comply with it. Reaching the “good mind” requires an understanding of the wisdom that the community has gained through the ages. Because this wisdom is not written down anywhere, this knowledge is often gained from Elders. The role of Elders sometimes varies but generally consists of helping people, individually and collectively, to gain knowledge of the history, traditions, customs, values and beliefs of the community. They are respected for their wisdom and experience and being able to advise people about what to do in difficult situations.

In Aboriginal law there is a respect for individual independence. People are encouraged to make their own decisions and accept responsibility for them even at an early age. Stories are used because the listener is free to understand them in their own way and act on them or not.
Notes
Communities, families, parents and others concerned with the development of young persons should take reasonable steps to prevent youth crime by addressing its underlying cause, to respond to the needs of young persons and to provide guidance and support to those at risk of committing crimes.

[Preamble to the Youth Criminal Justice Act]

Children learned from birth the proper attitudes and behaviours that promoted appropriate dispute prevention and resolution: to respect their Elders and teachers, to refrain from boastfulness, and to value qualities of self-discipline, self-control, generosity, peacefulness and hospitality....This training prepared children for their role in a society that was structured to minimize open disputing.

[Salish Elders speaking about traditional justice]

Objective: Students will learn about the importance of early childhood teachings and the role they play in Aboriginal and Western societies.

Method: Reading, Role-Play, Discussion

Materials: Background Information, Handout, Questions

Teacher Background Information

Looking at crime prevention in traditional Aboriginal societies and Western societies will help students see how prevention is part of youth justice from both perspectives. The focus in traditional Aboriginal societies was on preventing problems by teaching people how to live well together. This was done through examples, stories, legends and the wisdom of the Elders. Customary law was based on the self-control of individuals rather than discipline or authority exercised by powerful people. Traditional Aboriginal understandings emphasize teaching individuals from birth how to live well together to avoid problems rather than dealing with problems once things go wrong.
On the other hand, criminal laws only come into play once someone has broken the law. This does not mean that ways to stop problems before they happen do not exist. Things like providing schooling, health care and basic necessities for everyone can be seen as helping to prevent young people from turning to crime. There are also many early intervention programs designed to help young people turn their lives around.

The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) determines how youth (12 -17 years old) are dealt with when they commit a crime. Like traditional Aboriginal teachings this Act recognizes the importance of supporting and guiding youth before they get into trouble.

Procedure

1. Share the teacher background information with the students.
2. Read Robert Fulghum’s Credo (All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten) to the class. It can be found in Poetry Alive: Perspectives by Dom Saliani (published by Copp Clark Pitman, 1991).
3. Distribute Everything I Need To Know I Learned in Kindergarten to the students.
4. Divide students into groups of three. Assign groups one of the two scenarios. Have two of the students role-play the situation and the third student play the part of a teacher, parent or recreation supervisor who has to deal with the incident. If time allows have the students switch roles so that each has a chance to play each role.
5. As a follow-up have a class discussion using the following questions to guide the discussion…
   • Do you think the kids in the examples have committed any crimes?
   • Would they be crimes if the kids were older?
   • Fast forward ten years from the time of these incidents. Consider what kind of things these kids might be doing if they have not learned the values you tried to teach them.
   • Could they now be doing things that would be considered crimes?
Everything I Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten

Most of you will have heard of Robert Fulghum’s famous essay “All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten.” It was part of a book that was first published in 1986. It became a best seller and the title essay was read on the floor of the United States Senate. The essay reminds people that many of the things we are taught as small children, like sharing, playing fair, not hitting and cleaning up after yourself, are valuable lessons that everyone in society could benefit from.

The following two scenarios are for role-playing. Students will play the parts of the characters in the scenarios and one student will also play the part of the person who has to deal with the situation (teacher, parent, or recreation supervisor). Students who are role-playing dealing with the situations should consider what values they think are at the heart of the problem. They might, for example want to talk about sharing, about not taking what is not yours or about settling disagreements peacefully.

THE TEA PARTY

Every Thursday the Smallville Preschool holds a tea party for their five-year-old students. Chelsea and Sally, both five, always sit beside each other and like to have their favourite stuffed animals join them for “tea.” Today, the girls are fighting over one of the stuffed toys and Chelsea is determined to take it away from Sally, even though it belongs to Sally. When Sally won’t give the toy to Chelsea, Chelsea pushes Sally out of her chair and pulls her hair until Sally gives up the toy. By the time the teacher gets over to their table, Sally is crying because Chelsea has hurt her and taken away her favorite stuffed animal.

THE SKATEBOARD

John and Adam, both 13, usually hang out at the local skate park in their free time. The boys don’t really know each other, but recognize each other from their time at the park. In particular, John has noticed Adam’s skateboard before because it is the kind he really wanted but couldn’t afford. One day John asks Adam if he can try out the skateboard he has always wished for, but Adam says he’s not allowed to let anyone else use it. John isn’t satisfied with Adam’s response and grabs the skateboard from him and goes off a ramp with it. He lands badly, damaging Adam’s board.
Notes
The criminal justice system for young persons must be separate from that of adults and emphasize enhanced procedural protection to ensure that young persons are treated fairly and that their rights, including their right to privacy, are protected.

[Youth Criminal Justice Act]

Objective: Students will explore some of the rights youth have in the criminal justice system and the rationale for these rights.

Method: Case Studies, Quiz

Materials: Handouts, Quiz, Answer Key

Teacher Background Information

The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) treats youth differently than adults in a number of ways. One of these is by providing special procedural protections for young people who are being dealt with in the criminal justice system. This lesson deals with some, but not all, of the rights a youth has under the criminal justice system.

Young people who are in trouble with the law have the right to talk to a lawyer without delay at every stage of any proceeding. Young people don’t just have this right if they go to court. Young people also have the right to consult with a lawyer when they are…

- detained by the police
- arrested
- charged with an offence
- making a statement to the police

Young people who are in trouble with the law do not have to say anything to the police. The YCJA outlines in detail the steps that must be taken before a youth makes a statement to the
police or other person in authority. Before a young person makes a statement they have the right to…

- make a reasonable number of phone calls to contact a lawyer and their parents
- talk to both a lawyer and their parents in private before deciding to talk to the police
- have their lawyer and parents with them if they decide to talk to the police
- be told in words that they understand that…
  - they do not have to say anything (make a statement)
  - they should not make a statement because they have been promised something in return
  - they should not make a statement because they are afraid that someone will hurt them or someone else
  - if they do make a statement it can be used as evidence against them
  - they can contact a lawyer, talk to the lawyer in private and have the lawyer with them if they choose to talk to the police
  - they can also contact a parent, adult relative or other adult, talk to that person in private and have that person with them if they choose to talk to the police
  - they do not have to choose between a lawyer and a parent or adult – they can talk with both and have both with them

If a young person has said they want to talk to a lawyer or other adult or have the lawyer or other adult with them, the police must stop questioning the young person until that person has arrived and talked with the young person. If these steps are not followed any statement made by a young person can be excluded from being considered as evidence.

Procedure

1. Share the information about youth rights in the criminal justice system with the students.
2. Distribute Being Stopped by the Police and Making a Statement. Have the students answer the discussion questions either individually or in groups.
3. Distribute What the Courts are Saying and have either a class or small group discussion about how what the courts are saying compares with their own thoughts.
4. As a summary activity have the students complete the Know Your Rights quiz and then share the answers with them.
Being Stopped by the Police

FACTS

Three youths dressed in baggy dark clothing and hoodies were walking down the street in a high crime area at around 11 pm on a very cold night in December. The police officers, who were in uniform and riding in a marked squad car, saw the youths. One of the officers was curious as to why the youths were out so late on such a cold night and asked his partner to follow them and stop them. The officers were not investigating any particular crime at the time and they described their actions as “proactive policing in a high crime area.”

The officers overtook the youths, stopped the car and called to the youths to stop because they wanted to talk to them. The youths were told to remove their hoods so the officers could see their faces and to keep their hands where the officers could see them. Although the police later testified that as far as they were concerned the boys were free to go and refuse to answer questions, neither officer advised the youths of this. One of the youths testified that he did not think he was free to leave or that he had any choice about answering the questions.

One of the officers recognized one of the youths and remembered that he had been on bail with the condition that he keep a curfew. The officer asked the youth if he still had a curfew and he said he did not. The officers then asked the other two youths for their names and birth dates and ran criminal record checks on all three. The criminal records check showed that one youth had a bail condition that prohibited him from being in the area. The officers arrested the youth and searched him. They found a replica gun and decided for their own safety to search the other two youths as well. In searching one of the youths they found burglary tools and the butt piece of a handgun. The youths were charged with having burglary tools and a concealed weapon.

LAW

*Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*

Everyone has the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned.
Being Stopped by the Police ... Continued

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT

1. What does arbitrary mean? What does detained mean?

2. Were the youths detained? How would you decide if they were detained or not when the police officers felt the youths could leave and the youths thought they had to stay and answer questions?

3. If they were detained was it arbitrary? Does it make any difference that one of the police officers immediately recognized one of the youths and knew he had been released on bail with certain conditions?

4. Should the police be able to stop people when they have no reason of suspecting them of a particular crime? Why or Why not?
   - Should the fact that the people in this case were youths (14 and 15 years old) make any difference?
   - Should the fact that it was a high crime area and that it was night make any difference?
   - Should the fact that the youths were actually doing something illegal make any difference?

5. Should the police be able to require anyone they see on the street to give them their names and birthdates? Why or Why not?
Making a Statement

FACTS

Cameron was arrested after an incident involving a stolen vehicle and a gun. Cameron was 15 years old at the time. He was a passenger in a stolen car that was chasing a van. At an intersection the van stopped and Cameron left the stolen vehicle and banged on the window of the van with what bystanders thought was a gun. The bystanders called the police. Cameron got back in the stolen vehicle and they drove away. The police chased the vehicle and Cameron and the other youth abandoned the vehicle and ran away on foot. The police officer chasing them reported that a shot had been fired at him. The police brought in dogs and a tactical unit and found Cameron hiding under a tarp. He was arrested at gun point.

At the police station the police had Cameron sign a waiver. The waiver form included the statement that "you do not have to tell me anything about this unless you want to." Cameron had called his foster mother and talked to her. He had asked to talk to his lawyer but he did not know his number and the police could not find a number for him. Cameron then consulted with the lawyer who was on duty that night at the police station.

The forensic team then came to test Cameron’s clothing and hands for gun residue to see if he had handled a gun. They were allowed to do this by law. When the police explained what they were going to do, Cameron said his lawyer told him not to. The police officer in charge of taking the samples then told Cameron that they had the legal authority to do it and that if Cameron did not co-operate they would use force. At one point he said “If you don't [co-operate] we’re going to have put you down on the floor.” He also said “You don’t really want everybody out there to come running in here and jump on top of you do you?” After that Cameron co-operated in the taking of the samples. After, Cameron was left in the holding room with only his underwear and a white paper coverall suit.

Two hours later a detective came and Cameron made a statement to him. The detective who took Cameron’s statement talked to him about his right to have a parent or other adult with him while he was making a statement. He told Cameron “you can have any adult…that you choose to speak to or have here with you...” He then asked Cameron if he understood that and Cameron said “ya” and nodded in agreement. He then asked Cameron what his decision was and Cameron said “What was my decision?.” The detective then said “Ya, like, you’re sitting in front of me with nobody here beside you, an adult beside you. So I’m asking you was that your choice? Was that something you willingly decided that you know, that you wanted to do?” In response Cameron said “Ya, I just called my lawyer and after I called my parents.” Cameron and the detective then went on to discuss the fact that Cameron did not know his lawyer’s number and that the police officer helping him could not find his lawyer. They did not discuss whether Cameron wanted his parents or a lawyer with him while making the statement again.
Making a Statement ... Continued

Law

Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA)

The YCJA states that no statement made by a young person can be used as evidence against the young person unless certain conditions are met. The following are two of the conditions that must be met.

The statement must be voluntary.

The person to whom the statement was made has, before the statement was made, clearly explained to the young person, in language appropriate to his or her age and understanding, that:

- the young person has the right to consult counsel and a parent or other person
- any statement made by the young person is required to be made in the presence of counsel and any other person consulted…unless the young person desires otherwise

QUESTIONS FOR THOUGHT

1. No one who is accused of a crime has to say anything to the police about it. Do you think that young people need extra protections to make sure they know they do not have to say anything and that they do not have to make a statement about a crime unless they freely decide that they want to?

2. Do you think Cameron made his statement freely? Do you think he was influenced by the situation into thinking he had to do what the police wanted?

3. Do you think, based on what he said to the detective, that Cameron understood that he could have his foster mother with him while he made a statement?

4. Does the fact that Cameron had consulted with his foster mother and a lawyer make a difference?

5. Cameron’s foster mother was at the police station. Should the police have told her that Cameron had the right to have her with him when he made his statement?
What the Courts are Saying

BEING STOPPED BY THE POLICE

The court decided that when the police stopped the youths they were “detained.” The court decided that although the youths were not physically prevented from leaving they were “psychologically” detained. The court decided that it would have been unreasonable for the youths to have believed they were free to go given the fact that the police demanded that they remove their hoodies and keep their hands where the police could see them.

The court then decided that the two youths who were not immediately recognized by the police were arbitrarily detained. The court found that the police can detain people only if they have reasonable grounds to suspect in all the circumstances that the individual is connected to a particular crime. In the case of the youth who was recognized by the police, the police did have reason to suspect he might have been breaking his bail conditions.

The court then quoted this from another case.

*It needs repeating once again: stopping and investigating people merely because of some “Spidey sense” being engaged goes far beyond the standards our society demands and expects of our police. Young people have the right to “just hang out” especially in their neighbourhood and to move freely without fear of being detained and searched on a mere whim, and without being advised of their rights, and without their consent. Mere hunches do not give the police the grounds to “surprise” a group of young people or to “get right on them” for investigative purposes without something further that provides a lawful basis for doing so.*

The court concluded that the practice of asking for personal information from people, especially youths, to run a criminal records check, where no crime is being investigated and the people are not told that they can refuse to provide any information, is an abuse of police powers. The Judge found that this is particularly concerning because young people, who are typically the target of these practices, have special protections under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* because of their age and stage of development.
MAKING A STATEMENT

The courts have been particularly concerned about protecting young people who are making statements in which they admit to having committed a crime. The Supreme Court of Canada explained the need for this kind of protection by saying...

A young person is usually far more easily impressed and influenced by authoritarian figures. No matter what the bravado and braggadocio that young people may display, it is unlikely that they will appreciate their legal rights in a general sense or the consequences of oral statements made to persons in authority: certainly they would not appreciate the nature of their rights to the same extent as would most adults. Teenagers may also be more susceptible to subtle threats arising from their surroundings and the presence of persons in authority. A young person may be more inclined to make a statement, even though it is false, in order to please an authoritarian figure.

In Cameron’s case the court decided that the prosecutor had not proved that Cameron’s statement was given freely. The court concluded that Cameron’s dealings with the police, especially when they were taking gunshot residue samples, could have influenced him into making a statement. The court found that the problem was made worse because no one explained Cameron’s rights to him again after the gunshot samples were taken. Cameron could have been left with the impression that he had to co-operate with the police by making a statement, because he was told in no uncertain terms that he had to co-operate with the police by allowing them to take gunshot residue samples.

Another issue in this case was whether the police had violated Cameron’s right to have his foster mother with him when he was making a statement. In Cameron’s case the prosecutors argued that Cameron understood that he could have his foster mother with him because he said “ya” after the detective asked him if it was his choice to be there without an adult. The court decided that although the idea of having an adult with him was raised by the detective the detective did not go far enough. The court found that it was not clear that Cameron understood he could have his foster mother with him. The court also said that if the police had told his foster mother she could be with Cameron she could have helped him make an informed decision about whether she should be there when he made his statement.

The court did not allow Cameron’s statement to be used as evidence against him for a number of reasons including because the court decided it was not a voluntary statement and because Cameron’s right to have his foster mother with him was not properly explained to him.
Know Your Rights!

Do you know which of the following are rights of a young person? Put true or false by each statement.

- A young person does not have to say anything to police about the situation the police are investigating.
- A young person has the right to talk to either a lawyer or his/her parent/guardian but not both.
- Before a young person gives a statement to the police they must tell the young person about their rights in language the young person can understand.
- A young person has the right to only one phone call to try to contact a lawyer.
- A young person only has the right to talk to a lawyer if the police charge the young person.
- A young person has the right to talk to a parent or guardian before talking to the police.
- A young person has a right to have a lawyer with them if they decide to talk to the police.
- A young person must always tell the police his/her name.
- A young person has the right to either consult with a parent/guardian or have the parent/guardian with them if they decide to talk to the police but not both.
- The police can detain a group of youths just to make sure they are not up to no good.
- A young person has the right to talk to a lawyer in private but the police can decide to stay if a young person is talking to their parent/guardian.
Answer Key

A young person does not have to say anything to police about the situation the police are investigating.

True

A young person has the right to talk to either a lawyer or his/her parent/guardian but not both.

False – A young person has the right to consult with both.

Before a young person gives a statement to the police they must tell the young person about their rights in language the young person can understand.

True

A young person has the right to only one phone call to try to contact a lawyer.

False – A young person must be given a “reasonable opportunity” to consult with a lawyer. What this is will depend on the situation.

A young person only has the right to talk to a lawyer if the police charge the young person.

False – A young person has the right to consult with a lawyer at any stage of any proceedings against the young person. This includes when the police are deciding whether to lay a charge.

A young person has the right to talk to a parent or guardian before talking to the police.

True

A young person has a right to have a lawyer with them if they decide to talk to the police.

True

A young person must always tell the police his/her name.

False
A young person has the right to either consult with a parent/guardian or have the parent/guardian with them if they decide to talk to the police but not both.

False – A young person has the right to consult with a parent and have the person with them when they make a statement. If the young person consults with a parent, any statement must be made in the presence of that parent unless the young person does not want them there.

The police can detain a group of youths just to make sure they are not up to no good.

False

A young person has the right to talk to a lawyer in private but the police can decide to stay if a young person is talking to their parent/guardian.

False
The purpose of sentencing...is to hold a young person accountable for an offence through the imposition of just sanctions that have meaningful consequences for the young person and that promote his or her rehabilitation and reintegration into society, thereby contributing to the long-term protection of the public.

[Youth Criminal Justice Act]

The purpose of a justice system in an Aboriginal society is to restore the peace and equilibrium within the community, and to reconcile the accused with his or her own conscience and with the individual or family who has been wronged.

[Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba]

Objective: Students will learn about the purposes of having consequences for breaking the law in Aboriginal societies and under the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

Method: Reading, Graphing, Writing, Discussion

Materials: Background Information, Handouts

Teacher Background Information

Looking at the purposes for consequences will help young people understand some of the differences and similarities between Aboriginal concepts of justice and youth justice concepts. Societies deal with people who break the law for a number of reasons. Consequences can punish the person who broke the law. Consequences can deter people from breaking the law again and deter others from breaking the law, in the first place, when they know what happens. Consequences can involve making things right for those harmed. Consequences can involve helping the person who has done wrong to deal with things that may have led to the misbehaviour.
Aboriginal communities view wrongdoing as a misbehavior which requires teaching or an illness which requires healing, as opposed to seeing the offender as a bad person who requires punishment. Although healing and teaching can be painful, pain is not imposed for the sake of punishment. The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) deals both with holding the youth accountable and helping the individual change so that the misbehaviour is not repeated.

The purposes of consequences under the YCJA are different than those under the *Criminal Code* for adults. The *Criminal Code* states that the purposes for sentencing adults include, among others, deterring the individual and others from committing crimes, expressing society’s disapproval for the actions of the offender and preventing the offender from doing further harm (by having the offender in custody for example). The sections of the *Criminal Code* outlining these sentencing purposes do not apply to young people.

Instead, the YCJA has its own sentencing principles. The purposes of imposing consequences on young people can be found in several different parts of the YCJA. The YCJA talks about consequences for youth being designed to…

- rehabilitate young persons and reintegrate them into society
- reinforce respect for society’s values
- encourage repair of harm done to victims and the community
- make sure the young person is held accountable through meaningful consequences

**Procedure**

1. Share the background information with the students.
2. Distribute *How Important is Making It Right? and You’ve Been Wronged!* Have the students read the handouts and decide what they would do.
3. Write the three choices across the board and have the students stand by their choice. Ask the students in each group to explain why they made their choice. (Human Graphing Activity)
4. Distribute *How Important is Setting an Example? and What Do You Think?* Have the students read the information and answer the questions either as a writing assignment or through a class or small group discussion. As a wind-up activity have a class debate, using the suggested debate question, by assigning groups to argue either for or against including deterrence in the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*. 
Aboriginal Youth Justice

Lesson Six: Purpose of Consequences

How Important Is Making it Right?

Some wrongs can easily be fixed. You are rushing down the crowded school hall and accidentally knock some papers out of another student’s arms. You stop and pick them up, adding a “sorry about that” as you hand over the papers. Some wrongs are not so easy to right. You let your temper get the better of you and break an expensive lamp during an argument with your brother. Your brother is scared and is crying now and you have no idea how you can afford to have the lamp replaced.

Many of us grew up being told to say sorry when we hurt someone. For many people who are wronged, whether the wrong was a crime or not, an apology is important. Apologies can result in disputes being settled more easily and quickly. Apologies can help the person who has been wronged heal and put the incident behind them. Making things better for someone we have hurt is also something many of us are taught.

The need for apologies and repairing the harm done are also recognized in criminal law. For adults the purposes of sentencing an offender include prompting the offender to acknowledge the harm done and providing for the repair of that harm. An offender who expresses sincere remorse may end up with a lighter sentence.

The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA), which deals with young people who have committed a crime, also recognizes the importance of making things right through actions such as apologizing and repairing harm done when possible.

Under the YCJA not all young persons who commit an offence have to go to court. Some are dealt with outside of the court through what are called extrajudicial measures. One of the purposes of these measures is to encourage the young person to acknowledge and repair the harm done.

If a young person is dealt with by the court, the court will also consider these things. Court-imposed consequences for young people are supposed to encourage the repair of harm done to victims and the community. When deciding on a consequence for a young person the court will consider whether the young person has done things to repair the harm.

Aboriginal justice requires those who do wrong to acknowledge their misbehaviour. From an Aboriginal perspective the person who harmed someone is required to do something to make it right. If the wrongdoer is sent to jail or placed on probation and the wrongdoer is relieved of any obligation to make it right, justice is not seen to be done. Aboriginal justice is based on all parties acknowledging the wrong, followed by a process of atonement and restitution or compensation to restore harmony.

The YCJA also recognizes the interests of victims and the importance of restitution. The YCJA provides that victims may be consulted on how to repair harm done by the young person.
Handout

You’ve Been Wronged! (Human Graphing Activity)

You are walking across the school yard one day and a kid you don’t recognize comes out of nowhere and grabs your backpack. Now you get the creeps every time you have to walk across the school yard alone. Also you have to buy some new school supplies, spend time replacing your lost notes by copying from friends, and worst of all you had borrowed your brother’s MP3 player and now it’s gone. You tell the school what happened and they find the guy. Now the principal wants you to come to a meeting with the guy and his parents. The meeting is to discuss the incident and what should happen now. Which of the following do you think is closest to how you would feel and what you would do?

1. Even if he says he is sorry that is not good enough. I think the school should call the police and let them handle it.

2. I just want my stuff back or money to replace it if it’s gone. I never want to see that kid again.

3. I need to hear from him. Why did he pick me? Should I be afraid that he or one of his friends will do it again? Is he sorry? What is he prepared to do to make it right?
How Important Is Setting an Example?

Have you ever been made an example of? Maybe your school wanted to come down hard on kids who were late and you were the unlucky one who had to wait in the principal’s office until after the next break when you only missed the bell by minutes. It wasn’t that what you did was more wrong than the dozens of kids who had been late in the past, but the school wanted to send a message to everyone and you were the messenger.

Sometimes the same idea - making an example of someone - is used in criminal law. This is called deterrence. There are two kinds of deterrence: specific and general. Specific deterrence is when consequences are used in the hope of preventing the person from committing another crime. General deterrence is when consequences are used to convince others not to commit crimes. For adults the *Criminal Code* says that both deterring the offender and others from committing crimes are purposes of sentencing people for crimes.

Different rules apply to young people who commit offences. The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) sets out the principles for deciding what consequences a young person should face. The YCJA does not say that deterrence should be a factor when determining consequences for young people. The YCJA also does not say that deterrence should not be considered.

The Supreme Court has considered whether deterring others is something that can be considered when sentencing a young person. The Court began by explaining that when general deterrence is considered in sentencing “the offender is punished more severely, not because he or she deserves it, but because the court decides to send a message to others who may be inclined to engage in similar criminal activity.” The Court pointed out that, unlike some other factors in sentencing, considering general deterrence will always result in a harsher sentence than the offender would otherwise receive. The Court also noted that there is a lot of debate about whether general deterrence works or not.

The Court considered the argument that general deterrence could apply to sentencing young people because the YCJA talks about protection of the public, meaningful consequences, accountability and reinforcing respect for society’s values. The Court rejected these arguments and decided that general deterrence could not be considered when sentencing a youth.

The Court found that under the YCJA, protection of the public was the long-term effect of a successful youth sentence that helped the young person turn their life around. The Court also found that the consequences had to reinforce the offender’s respect for society’s values, hold the offender accountable and be meaningful for the offender, not society at large.

The Court also considered whether specific deterrence could be considered when sentencing a youth. The Court first noted that the purpose of specific deterrence is
to prevent the offender from committing another crime in the future and that this often involves placing an offender in custody so they cannot do anymore harm. The Court concluded that, under the YCJA, specific deterrence could not be considered when sentencing a youth.

What Do You Think?

Do you think it is fair to use someone as an example to stop other people from doing something wrong?

Can you think of a time you were made an example of? How did you feel? If you cannot think of a time just imagine how you might feel.

Do you think using people as examples helps to stop others from doing the same thing? Why or why not? (Does seeing other people get off easy make people more likely to try the same thing? Do people who are about to commit a crime even think about what will happen to them if they are caught?)

Can you think of three examples of where general deterrence was used at home, in the classroom or in the community? (It could be that time the soccer coach made someone run laps for talking during practice even though lots of people had done it and gotten away with it, or it could be when you were grounded for talking back to your mom because she was fed up with the whole family for doing it and wanted to let them know she wasn’t going to stand for it.)
Do you think harsher consequences stop people from misbehaving in the future? Why or why not? (Does getting off easy make people more likely to misbehave again? Do people who are about to commit a crime even think about what will happen to them if they are caught?)

Can you think of three examples where specific deterrence (a harsher consequence designed to stop the person from doing the same thing again) was used at home, in the classroom or in the community? (Maybe your teacher told you many times to hand your homework in on time and you were still always late until finally one time she would not accept your homework late and gave you a zero or maybe you were late getting out of the house one too many mornings and your dad decided you were not allowed to watch TV in the morning for two months.)

Debate Question

The Government has now announced plans to change the *Youth Criminal Justice Act* so that deterrence can be considered when deciding on consequences for youth. In announcing this, and other planned changes to the YCJA, the Government stated that “Young offenders across Canada continue to commit serious crimes and it is a problem. For this reason, Canada’s New Government is serious about making the changes that are needed to better protect our communities.” Do you think adding deterrence as a purpose of consequences could make Canada a safer place? Why or Why not?
Notes
Objective: Students will learn how and when custody can be used as a consequence for youth who have broken the law and compare it with the traditional Aboriginal concept of banishment.

Method: Reading, Discussion, Comparing and Contrasting

Materials: Background Information, Handout

Teacher Background Information

Looking at custody and banishment will help young people see the differences and similarities between youth justice and Aboriginal concepts of justice. Aboriginal perspectives on justice emphasize bringing the offender back into the community and having the offender repair the harm. Traditional Aboriginal communities depended on all their members contributing in order to survive in the harsh environment. This does not mean that all offenders were accepted back into the community. Community welfare was important and an individual who threatened community welfare and was beyond community efforts to heal could be banished into the wilderness. The Supreme Court of Canada has said that community-based sanctions and restorative justice are an important part of many Aboriginal justice traditions. However, the Supreme Court also decided that it would be unreasonable to conclude that there are not circumstances where separating the offender from society, condemning the actions and deterring others are not important parts of Aboriginal justice as well.

In the Aboriginal tradition banishment was a last resort. Custody can be seen as the modern day equivalent of banishment. Canada has not always considered custody a last resort. The Supreme Court has noted that Canada is a “world leader in putting people in prison.” The Court also noted that sending people to prison was originally considered a more humane option when penalties such as death and flogging existed. One of the purposes of custody has always been to rehabilitate offenders but rehabilitation by removing people from the community is often not effective.

More recently the limited usefulness of custody, particularly for less serious and non-violent offences, has been recognized both by the courts and governments. The Criminal Code now
directs courts to consider all other sanctions that are reasonable for offenders before deciding to send them to jail. The *Youth Criminal Justice Act* (YCJA) also clearly directs courts dealing with youth who have committed crimes to consider custody only as a last resort.

The introduction of the YCJA says that one of the purposes of the Act is to address Canada’s over-reliance on placing youth in custody and to reserve the most serious consequences for the most serious crimes. There are certain conditions which must be met before a court can sentence a youth to custody. Custody can only be used if the young person…

- has committed a violent offence
- has been sentenced to something other than custody on previous occasions and has not complied with the sentence
- has committed a serious offence for which an adult could go to jail for more than two years and has a history of committing offences
- has committed a serious offence and there are aggravating circumstances that make it an exceptional case

Even if one or all of these conditions are met, the court cannot use custody if there is a reasonable alternative. The YCJA also states that custody cannot be used simply because a youth needs help or protection and does not have a suitable home environment.

**Procedure**

1. Share the background information with the students and distribute *Banishment/Custody*.
2. Divide the students into small groups. Assign each group one of these four topics…
   - why banishment is useful for dealing with people who have committed crimes
   - problems with using banishment to deal with people who have committed crimes
   - why custody is useful for dealing with people who have committed crimes
   - problems with using custody for dealing with people who have committed crimes
3. Bring the class back together and record the groups’ conclusions on the board, making a comprehensive list of the pros and cons of banishment and custody for dealing with offenders.
Banishment/Custody

Every society must have ways of protecting its members from dangerous people. One of the purposes of custody is to keep people who are a danger to others away from others. When custody is used for this purpose alone society is only safer while the person is in custody. For this reason custody is also intended to serve other purposes. It is meant to deter the person and others from committing crimes. It is meant to show society’s disapproval of the actions of the offender. It is also meant to help people change so that they are not as likely to go back to a life of crime. This can be done in a number ways including drug or alcohol counselling, anger management or skills training.

The purposes of custody for youth include protecting society and holding youth accountable for their actions, as well as helping youth to turn their lives around. Deterring other people from committing crimes is not a purpose for sentencing a youth under the Youth Criminal Justice Act. That leaves holding youth accountable and rehabilitating youth as purposes for sentencing a youth to custody. How effective custody is in rehabilitating offenders, particularly young ones, is the subject of much debate. Some people argue that when a youth is placed in custody the youth is likely to be negatively influenced by other youths who may be more involved in crime. As well a youth may get a reputation in the community that could lead the youth to continue to associate with others who are involved in crime. Others argue that custody is the only way to properly hold a youth who has committed a serious crime accountable and that a youth can receive rehabilitative programming while in custody.

In traditional Aboriginal communities banishment served some of the same purposes as custody. Society was protected because the individual was removed from the society. Banishment can also provide for rehabilitation and hold the person accountable for their actions. The Saskatchewan Court of Appeal has said that the central features of banishment are things like the self-discipline, self-treatment, introspection and self-examination of one’s goals designed to make the person a better person. The Court also noted that banishment is a form of punishment because of the deprivation involved.
Respect means listening until everyone has been heard and understood, only then is there a possibility of ‘Balance and Harmony’—the goal of Indian Spirituality.

[ Dave Chief, Aboriginal Elders Teachings Archive, October 1998]

Objective: Students will learn how traditional Aboriginal justice concepts have been incorporated into the justice system through Sentencing Circles.

Method: Reading, Role-Play, Simulated Sentencing Circle

Materials: Background Information, Handouts, Chairs, Talking Object (like a stick or a feather)

Teacher Background Information

Looking at Circles will help young people see how traditional Aboriginal values can be used in a modern context. Circles are central to Aboriginal values. Days, years, people’s lives and all creation are made in a circle. Circles remind people about Mother Earth and their journey through life from the earth, to infancy, childhood, adulthood, old age and back to the earth. Circles are sacred and represent bringing people together.

Aboriginal peoples see everything in the universe as part of a single whole. Everything is connected so it is not possible to understand one thing without understanding how it is connected to everything else. The Aboriginal concept that everything is interconnected means that people and their actions are not considered in isolation.

The use of a Circle to deal with people who have committed crimes was developed as a way of bringing some traditional Aboriginal values into the justice system. In the court case that introduced this concept the Judge recognized that the Aboriginal way of dealing with conflict is to emphasize reconciliation, the restoration of harmony and the removal of the underlying causes of the conflict. He also noted that Aboriginal culture places less emphasis on individual
responsibility and dealing with conflict through confrontation. The Judge found that using a Circle to determine consequences for a wrong-doer can allow greater recognition of Aboriginal values in the justice system.

Circles were first used in the early 1990s, by courts struggling to find a way to effectively deal with people who had committed crimes. The Judge of the Yukon Provincial Court that first introduced the idea noted that rising crime rates and the high numbers of repeat offenders, as well as the high cost in monetary and human terms of dealing with crime and criminals, have forced societies to search for alternatives.

Since that decision Circles have been used to decide on sentences numerous times in Saskatchewan courts. These are commonly referred to as Sentencing Circles. There are specially designed Circle courtrooms in some locations in Saskatchewan. The design and furnishings of these courtrooms are based on the traditional circle setting of First Nations in Saskatchewan.

Everyone who sits in the Circle has the same power and everyone in the Circle must come to an agreement about what should be done. This consensus method of making decisions is in keeping with traditional Aboriginal ways of resolving disputes. In keeping with the Aboriginal view that peacekeeping is not entrusted to solitary people but is shared among a wide range of people, everyone has a chance to participate. Because of the belief that people must make their own choices, the responsibility for solving the problems rests with the parties affected, although others in the community can assist them.

In keeping with the Aboriginal view that problems cannot be viewed in isolation, often the Circle will include the victim and others affected by the misbehaviour. Those affected may include the victim’s family and the offender and members of his family and community, as well as Elders and others who will assist the parties. A Sentencing Circle to deal with a matter that is before the court will also include the Judge, Crown Prosecutor and a lawyer for the offender (unless the offender represents himself).

In the case where a Circle was first embraced by the Court as a way of deciding what to do with an offender, the Court noted that in the criminal justice system too much blame and too much responsibility is placed with the offender. The Court stated “within the community lies many answers to what causes crime, what will prevent crime and what can be done to rehabilitate offenders.”

The goal of Aboriginal justice is to bring the person back into harmony with the community. The person’s actions are condemned but the person is still seen as a valuable member of the community. In traditional Aboriginal communities all community members played essential roles in the community. In one of the early Saskatchewan cases dealing with the use of Circles, the Court noted the emphasis in Sentencing Circles is on re-integration and restoration of harmony within the community. The Court went on to say “I understand that this attitude was developed as a survival tool because traditional native North American groups could ill afford the luxury of exacting revenge on individual productive members of the group.”

The offender may agree to things like apologizing, receiving treatment for drug or alcohol problems and compensating the victim. Including these things in a sentence is in keeping with the importance placed on healing and restitution in Aboriginal justice.

The Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) does not specifically mention the use of Sentencing Circles for dealing with youth who have committed crimes, but there are a number of ways
that a Sentencing Circle could be used for a youth, although the term Sentencing Circle will not usually be used. The YCJA provides that measures should, where appropriate, involve the parents, the extended family, the community and social or other agencies in the young person's rehabilitation and reintegration.

The YCJA allows anyone who is trying to make a decision about what should happen with a youth, for example a Judge in a court case or the police when they arrest a young person, to call a Conference. These Conferences can operate much like a Circle, although the final decision still rests with the person who called the Conference, for example in a court case the Judge. As well a youth who is dealt with outside of court under the YCJA may be referred to a Community Justice Committee. The Conferences held by these committees can also operate much like a Sentencing Circle.

WHAT A CIRCLE CAN DO FOR OFFENDERS AND THE COMMUNITY

A Sentencing Circle is a different way of dealing with someone who has committed a crime. Using a Sentencing Circle can benefit the offender, the victim and the community in a number of ways. A Saskatchewan Court noted that it is often said that “one main purpose of the circle process is to keep Aboriginal offenders out of jail.” The Court went on to conclude that keeping people out of jail, although it may be a “welcome side-effect” is not the purpose of using Sentencing Circles. The Court found that if the only goal was keeping people out of jail this could be achieved simply by opening the jails and letting people out.

A Sentencing Circle provides a way for certain things to happen that may not happen when a sentence is decided by a Judge acting alone. One of the most important things that happens is that offenders must face the person they have harmed and their own community. In one case a Judge noted that dealing with an offence in a person’s own community may be harder than being sent away to jail. He noted that an offender who is dealt with in and by the community must “live with the daily humiliation [of having the community know what he or she did] and at the same time seek forgiveness not just from the victims, but from the community as a whole.”

The importance of facing your own community was recognized by the Court when developing the criteria for using a Sentencing Circle. One of these criteria is that the person must have deep roots in the community in which the Circle is being held. This does not necessarily mean that a Sentencing Circle can only work in smaller centers where everybody knows everybody. Even when people live in large cities they have communities made up of their friends, family, employers and other significant people.

Shaming a person who has misbehaved is part of some Aboriginal Justice traditions. Shame is experienced by an offender in a Sentencing Circle because they see and hear first hand from the victim the pain their actions have caused. They also see how their actions have caused pain to the victim’s family and the community. Because offenders are facing their own communities, it is hard for offenders to rationalize what they have done and dismiss the feelings of people who are part of the Circle.

Shaming as a sanction for misbehaviour also has a part in Western justice. Some examples that come to mind are from an earlier time in history. Students may be familiar with the novel *The Scarlet Letter*. In this novel a young woman was required to wear a scarlet “A” on her clothing because she committed adultery. Students might also know that at one time people who committed crimes could be placed in stocks. Shaming was not limited to those who
committed crimes. Children, for example, could be shamed for misbehaving by having to sit on a stool wearing a dunce cap. There are also more current examples, including things like publishing the names and photographs of people convicted of soliciting prostitutes.

In the Aboriginal tradition, shaming of the person’s actions was coupled with the recognition that the offender was still a valued and respected member of the community. Shaming sanctions in the Aboriginal tradition are intended to assist the offender in reintegrating back into the community. Other types of shaming sanctions that shame an offender as a person could serve to further alienate an offender rather than bring an offender back into the community. The purpose of these kinds of sanctions could be viewed as punishing the offender.

Procedure

1. Share the background information with the students.
2. Distribute *The Case and Sentencing Options* to all students. Explain that Cody has pleaded guilty to the charges and that a Sentencing Circle, or Conference, is going to be held to decide what should happen.
3. Have students represent each of the 11 characters. Give students the *Character Description* for the role they will be playing. Teachers may want to have more than one student play each role or have two or more Circles so that every student can participate.
4. Distribute *How a Circle Works* to students and review it with students. Have the students assist with setting up the room and choosing an object to pass around.
5. Conduct the Sentencing Circle according to the outlined procedure and continue until everyone has said what they want to say and a consensus is reached about the sentence. Teachers may need to set a limit on the amount of time the Circle can take and agree to end it before a consensus is reached if the time limit has passed.
6. Provide an opportunity for students to debrief and discuss how they felt when playing their roles.
Character Description

CODY (OFFENDER)

Cody had turned 15 just two months before the offences were committed. Cody is of Aboriginal descent* and recently moved from the reserve to the city. He is an only child. On the reserve he lived with his mother and father. After the family moved to the city, three cousins came to live with them. Previously these cousins had been in the care of Social Services. Shortly after coming to the city Cody had been robbed at gunpoint of his bike, sneakers and video games. He had recently received these things as gifts. At the time of the incident Cody had been drinking. He does not remember some things about that night because he was drunk. This was only the second time he had ever drank alcohol. Cody was arrested shortly after the incident. Cody was initially unco-operative with the police but eventually admitted his part in the offences. He feels very bad about what he did and wants to apologize.

* Cody’s race is relevant because the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) requires courts dealing with young people who have committed crimes to consider “all available sanctions other than custody that are reasonable in the circumstances…with particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.” As well, one of the principles of the YCJA is that young people who commit offences should be treated in a way that respects gender, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic differences and responds to the needs of Aboriginal young persons. The Supreme Court has found that the purpose of considering the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders is to change the way Aboriginal offenders are sentenced to respond to the sad and pressing problem of the drastic over-representation of Aboriginal people in the criminal justice system. The Supreme Court has also stated that traditional Aboriginal ideas about sentencing emphasize “restorative justice” and that this tradition is very important when considering what it means to pay particular attention to the circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.

NOTES
Character Description

JAMES (VICTIM)

James is 22 years old. He had been enjoying a night out with friends at the pool hall. Around midnight he left the pool hall and walked to his car in a nearby parking lot. Cody and two other kids around the same age asked him for a cigarette. They punched him in the face several times and pepper-sprayed him. His face was red and swollen and he had several cuts above the eyebrow. They stole his cigarettes, his lighter and his watch.

NOTES
Character Description

MIKE (VICTIM)

Mike is 43 years old. He was walking down a major city street on his way home from working a late shift. He was attacked by Cody and three other youths. They pepper-sprayed him and punched and kicked him. They took his wallet which had money as well as credit cards and identification. Mike had cuts, lumps and abrasions on his forehead, the side of his head and behind his left ear. Mike was taken to the hospital for stitches and decontamination from the pepper-spray. In the time since the incident Mike has been very worried that the boys know where he lives and might come after him. He has not slept well and this has started to affect his performance at work and his home life.

NOTES
Character Description

CODY'S MOTHER

Cody’s mother is a recovering alcoholic. As a child she had been sent to the United States where she was adopted. She has taken treatment for alcoholism six times in the past twenty years and most recently has been sober for a year. She moved her family to the city so she could go to University. She feels that Cody did what he did because he had consumed alcohol and because he was angry about having been robbed of prized possessions himself. She notes that he also had to adjust to sharing his parents with his cousins. She regrets that she wasn’t there for him because she was busy with the demands of school and her expanded family.

NOTES
Character Description

CODY’S FATHER

Cody’s father has also struggled with alcohol addiction. He now has a job as a carpenter. He feels that in the past he has damaged Cody by being violent and abusive towards Cody when he was drinking. He feels his son has a promising future as a hockey player. He notes that Cody had been a positive influence on his young cousins.
COLIN BROWN (CODY’S LAWYER)

Colin does not know Cody very well but has met with Cody and his parents several times. He knows that Cody and his parents are scared that Cody could be placed in custody. He thinks Cody is a good kid who made a serious mistake. He is concerned that Cody is susceptible to negative peer influences. He wants to see Cody remain at home with his parents. He would like Cody to have the chance for a fresh start so he is going to ask the Court for a conditional discharge. He knows that he needs to make sure that the Court takes Cody’s circumstances as an Aboriginal offender into account. [Students playing the role of the defence lawyer may want to review the material from the introduction on Aboriginal peoples and the justice system.]
Character Description

KAREN THEISSEN (CROWN PROSECUTOR)

Karen knows that Cody has not been in trouble before but she is concerned about the violent and vicious nature of the assaults. She thinks that if Cody is just allowed to go back and live with his parents as if nothing had happened he will think he can do things like that and get off easy by just saying he was sorry or using the excuse that he had been drinking. She would like Cody to spend some time, even a short period of time, in custody so that he can get an idea of what will be in store for him if he ever does something like this again. She does not think his parents alone can stop him from getting into trouble again. She would also like to see Cody get help dealing with alcohol and thinks that he could be assessed for this problem and start treatment while in custody. [Students playing the role of Crown Prosecutor may want to review lesson seven on custody as a last resort.]
Character Description

ELLEN WATTS (JUDGE)

Judge Watts would like to hear what the people in Cody’s life, the victims and the Crown Prosecutor think would be a good sentence. She has decided to have a Sentencing Circle, or Conference, to decide on the consequences for Cody, if they are able to come to an agreement and if the consequences are in keeping with the principles of the Youth Criminal Justice Act. She would like the people involved in the Sentencing Circle to remember that a sentence for a youth should reinforce respect for society’s values, encourage repair of harm and be meaningful for the young person. A sentence should hold a youth accountable through just consequences and help a youth turn their life around. The sentence must also fit the crime; more serious offences require more severe responses. Finally they need to remember that Cody could be sentenced to custody (because of the violent nature of the offence) but that all other consequences that are reasonable in the circumstances must be considered first, particularly in light of Cody being an Aboriginal youth. [Students playing the role of the Judge may want to review the materials from lessons six and seven on the purposes of consequences and custody as a last resort.]
Character Description

TOM JOHNSON (ARRESTING OFFICER)

Tom was called to the scene of the incidents after a passer-by saw Mike being assaulted and robbed and phoned 911. Tom and his partner searched the surrounding area and found the group of boys. The boys looked like they had been in a fight and matched the description given by the bystander. The boys all appeared to be drunk. When Tom approached them they shouted obscenities and refused to answer any questions. Tom and his partner arrested the boys. A search of the boys’ pockets revealed the stolen wallet and other items. Initially after being taken into custody Cody had to be restrained. He repeatedly punched the door and window of his holding cell. After he calmed down he gave Tom a statement admitting his part in the incidents. This statement assisted the police in dealing with the other boys.

NOTES
Character Description

HANNAH LANE (CODY’S TEACHER)

Hannah is Cody’s home room teacher for grade nine at the high school he attends. She teaches him math and science. In the few months that Cody has been her student she has found him to be quiet, polite and hardworking. He has completed all his assignments and he attends school on a regular basis. He has been involved in cultural activities at the school. She is not sure who his friends are and is concerned that he may be somewhat isolated or looking for acceptance from some students who are not good role models.

NOTES
Character Description

FREDA CARDINAL (ELDER)

She has met with Cody and his family several times since the incidents. Cody seems receptive to learning some of the traditional teachings and looking at ways to heal both the damage done to himself and to others through his actions. They have discussed the difficulties that Cody has faced moving from the reserve and adjusting to the new members of his family.

NOTES
The Case and Sentencing Options

THE CASE

Cody has been found guilty of two charges of robbery. Cody was hanging around with two other youths, both of whom had been in trouble with the law before. They were all drinking. They had not planned on mugging anyone, but Cody had pepper-spray with him.

One of the youths said “let’s go get a smoke off that guy,” pointing to the victim who had just left the pool hall and was heading towards his car. The three youths approached the victim and Cody asked for a smoke. When the victim pulled out his cigarettes and lighter, Cody attempted to use the pepper-spray on him. Cody could not get the spray to work and one of the other youths took it from him and sprayed the victim several times in the face. After that Cody grabbed the victim’s cigarettes and lighter. All three youths then started punching and hitting the victim in the face. After the victim fell to the ground one of the other youths took his watch.

The second robbery took place about 20 minutes later. The youths were walking down the street when they saw the victim further ahead. One of the youths said “let’s get him” and the three youths swarmed the victim. One youth pepper-sprayed the victim in the eyes. Cody and the other two youths then began punching and kicking the victim. One of the youths took the victim’s wallet.

SENTENCING OPTIONS

There are a broad range of sentencing options available to the Youth Justice Court. The options can be used alone, or they can be combined with other options. They include...

- reprimand of the young person (A stern warning from the Judge. Used where simply being charged and having to appear in court are considered enough of a consequence.)
- an absolute discharge or conditional discharge (With an absolute discharge there are no further consequences for the young person. With a conditional discharge the youth must do what the court orders for a period of time and if the youth complies with the conditions there are no further consequences.)
- a fine of up to $1,000
- payment to any person of a sum of money, compensating them “in kind”, or performing personal service, as compensation for property loss, personal injuries, or loss of income
The Case and Sentencing Options ... Continued

- community service (This can include a wide variety of things including working at a food bank, or friendship centre or with any other organization that provides volunteer services to the community. It also can involve doing things like providing services or speaking to other youths, about, for example, the harm caused by dangerous driving.)

- probation for up to two years (Being on probation means the youth must comply with a variety of conditions. There are standard conditions like keeping the peace and being of good behaviour, reporting to a youth worker regularly, following the directions of the youth worker and reporting to the court as required. Other probation terms can include not having contact with certain people (for example a co-accused), drug or alcohol counselling, community service, providing an apology to the victim, and attending school regularly.)

- in some cases, a prohibition from owning certain weapons or explosive devices

A Youth Justice Court can also sentence youth to custody in some circumstances. Custody would be an option in this case because it was a violent crime, if there is no reasonable alternative. Because robbery is an offence for which an adult can receive a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, a youth could receive up to three years of custody.
How a Circle Works

There is no one way that a Circle can be used when dealing with someone who has committed a crime. There are some things that all Circles have in common. People are seated in a circle. The simple fact that people form a circle changes how they deal with each other. In a regular courtroom the Judge is usually seated on a podium higher up than the rest of the people and people other than those directly involved (lawyers, witnesses, the person charged with a crime) sit in an area that is often separated with a railing.

Having everyone seated in a circle demonstrates that everyone is equal. It also means that people are closer to each other and can communicate more directly. Everyone who sits in the Circle has the same power.

A Circle may begin with an explanation of the significance of circles in Aboriginal culture and include opening and closing prayers and other rituals such as smudging with sweetgrass. Often an object (such as a talking stick) will be passed around the Circle. Whoever has the object can speak and the others will listen without interrupting. When the person has finished the object is passed on to the next person in the Circle.

Everyone takes turns talking and listening until everyone has a chance to say what they want to say and to respond to what other people have said. The Circle continues until everyone comes to an agreement about what should be done.
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Your opinion matters! Please take a few minutes to complete this form and return it to PLEA by mail or fax, or visit www.plea.org/feedback to submit your opinion electronically.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements…

Learning Outcomes

1. The handouts and activities were at an appropriate reading and interest level for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The lessons in this publication engaged students in learning about law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The questions and activities were an appropriate means of evaluating learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. My students know more about this area of the law than they did before I used this resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Outcomes

1. The background information and lesson procedures were appropriate for my teaching needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This resource was relevant to my class and unit of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For which class(es) and unit(s) of study did you use this resource?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. How would you rate this material compared to other law-related teaching resources?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Poor  Average  Excellent

4. Overall, how satisfied were you with this resource?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Not Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Very Satisfied

Other Comments?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for assisting us today!

Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan
#300 – 201 21st Street East, Saskatoon SK S7K 0B8
Fax: (306) 653-1869