



Ministry of Attorney General & Treaty Negotiations, and Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

Investigation, Inspection and Standards Office

MEMORANDUM

PO Box 9279 Stn Prov Govt, Victoria BC V8W 9J7 Telephone: (250) 387-5948 Fax: (250) 356-9875

Bert Phipps March 1, 2004

A/Assistant Deputy Minister

Corrections Branch 350-25/CCRR

Re: s.14

Attached please find a recent opinion from our legal counsel.

s.14

s.14

The opinion maintains that

S14

s.14

s.14 That is why I am forwarding the opinion to you both for your reaction as well as allowing you the opportunity to provide direction to

s.14 within this context.

I look forward to your reply.

Vaughan Dowie
Director
Investigation, Inspection
& Standards Office

Attachment (1)

Pc: Wayne Willows

Director

Programs & Strategic Services

Bruce Bannerman Program Analyst Adult Custody Pages 3 through 5 redacted for the following reasons:

s.14



Ministry of Attorney General

Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General

Investigation and Standards Office

MEMORANDUM

PO Box 9279 Stn Prov Govt, Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Telephone: (250) 387-5948 Fax: (250) 356-9875

Mr. P. Coulson

July 4, 2006

Warden North Fraser Pretrial Centre

46020-20

Re: Disciplinary Hearing Process

During a period of 11 weeks at NFPC I conducted disciplinary hearings on a daily basis. The following is a summary of my observations and conclusions.

Not Responsive

Pages 7 through 11 redacted for the following reasons:

Not Responsive

IV. CAR s. 24 - SEPARATE CONFINEMENT

It was evident to me that the use of CAR s. 24 to hold inmates in segregation was effectively automatic. I was only aware of two instances where CAR 24 was not applied and in both cases the inmate was on the ESP program and was locked in his cell for most the day anyway.

Staff have told me that when the CAR first came into force, s. 24 was applied with some discretion. However, staff on the living units apparently reported that charged inmates became unmanageable because they told staff that as they were facing a segregation sentence they had nothing to gain by behaving (or in the vernacular: "what are you going to do to me – send me to seg? I'm going anyway.").

The practice of applying CAR s. 24 in this manner presents a double bind for the centre. Firstly, CAR s. 24 is clearly not intended to be a default process that places all charged inmates into segregation and the centre is clearly open to an accusation of abuse of process. Secondly, by application of CAR s.24 the centre finds itself automatically bound by the requirements of the 72 hour rule under CAR 26.1 and at present it is not clear that the system recognises this. (The 72 hour rule applies in any eventuality in respect of commencing a hearing, but a hearing that is opened and then adjourned to allow officers to attend when an inmate is not being held in separate custody or is otherwise being restricted may not be problematic.)

CAR s.24 also requires a daily review of this decision to place an inmate in separate custody prior to a hearing. It is not clear to me that this requirement is being complied with or, if it is, that it is being recorded anywhere.

Not Responsive

Not Responsive

• The centre must review its compliance with the requirements of CAR 24 (Separate Confinement).

Not Responsive

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the support and cooperation that I received from all staff at NFPC during my weeks there.

Lyall Boswell Inspector Investigation and Standards Office

/dk

c. Brent Merchant, Provincial Director, Adult Custody