THUNDER BAY LAW ASSOCIATION

2024 Fall Conference – Criminal Law Program

18 October 2024, 1:30 – 4:30

(LSO CPD credit: 1.5 hours EDI Professionalism (log as session title Nokiiwin Tribal Council's New Restorative Justice Programming), and 1 hour substantive (log as Top 10 Criminal Cases 2024)

Nokiiwin Tribal Council's New Programs; and Review of Kairos Operations

---

Lost causes are the only ones worth fighting for.

-Ethel Lina White

1:30 – 3:00 Nokiiwin Tribal Council's Restorative Justice Programs

Joseph Duncan, new restorative justice co-ordinator for Nokiiwin Tribal Council, fills us in on new restorative justice programs they are offering (Nokiiwin is a federated Chiefs' organization of five Thunder Bay area First Nations: Fort William, Lake Nipigon, Sand Point, Rocky Bay, Gull Bay, Pic Mobert).

He is joined by Travis Godick and Serena Jacobsen from the Kairos facility, to answer your questions about what they do (both as an open custody facility, and a provider of programming out of custody -- that may complement programming like Nokiiwin's).

3:15 – 4:15 The Roundup: Top 10 Cases in Criminal Law, for the past year – prepared and presented by our bar's newest members (students, even), Joshua Platanitis and friends (as of this going to print, he has not secured the commitment of any friends for this panel)

4:15 – 4:30 Informal wrap-up with your colleagues at the bar (at the bar).

GUEST PRESENTERS

Joseph Duncan, an Indigenous member of Muskrat Dam First Nation in Treaty 9 Territory, currently serves as the Restorative Justice Coordinator for Nokiiwin's Justice Department. He began his career at 20 years old, with the Ontario Provincial Police First Nation Policing Program and the Nishnawbe Aski Police Service. Joe was promoted as a Detective Constable in the Major Crime Unit for five years before an injury concluded his 14-year career in law enforcement.
Joe returned to School and completed an undergraduate degree in Outdoor Recreation, Parks, and Tourism, a Master's degree in Social Justice, and multiple certifications conducting major investigations from the Ontario Police College, along with awards recognizing his dedication and commitment. He also completed his first year of law school at the Bora Laskin Faculty of Law at Lakehead University. He is also a father and husband. Joe actively engages in traditional land teachings and Indigenous spirituality, aligning with natural laws to advance Indigenous rehabilitation

Travis Godick – is the Facility Supervisor of Kairos, where has worked for over 16 years. After a few years of casual employment on the frontline, he moved into a full-time Prime Worker role (case management). He was a Prime Worker for about 10 years before accepting the Facility Supervisor role 3 plus years ago. His passion is working frontline, engaging with the youth and building positive relationships. As Facility Supervisor, he still has those opportunities to connect with the youth.

Serena Jacobsen – is a Program Coordinator/Prime Worker with Kairos, which she first joined as a student in 2018. She progressed from that placement, to a casual front-line role that quickly turned into the position of Prime Worker (Case Management). About 2 years later, she took on the Program Coordinator Role for the facility. Working front line with the youth in various different areas has provided an insight to various struggles that our youth face daily. Serena's roles have allowed her to focus on her passions with building relationships, advocating for the youth, and assisting youth in meeting their individual needs.

Joshua Platanitis, from Oshawa, is a 3L [I think that means 3rd year – Ed.] student at the Bora Lakin Faculty of Law, currently placed at Atwood Labine LLP. He spent this past summer at the Northumberland Community Legal Centre, working on employment, housing, human rights, and disability issues (ODSP and WSIB). Spare time goes to guitar and fantasy football league (and complaining about the upcoming NFL season).

Jessica Dykes is a second-year law student in the Bora Laskin Faculty of Law at Lakehead University. She is a retired flight paramedic with extensive experience in the delivery of prehospital care in remote northern communities. Before pursuing legal studies, Jessica worked as a college professor in Thunder Bay.Loves gardening, cycling, swimming, and fishkeeping, and playing chess [Intellectually impressive – Ed.]

Program Chair: Neil McCartney. You all know him. Just celebrated 20th anniversary at the bar. Likes to fit everything on one page.

TBLA "The Roundup" – Top 10 Cases of Criminal Law, 2024

(1)

***R. v. Bykovets*, 2024 SCC 6 – Prepared by Jessica Dykes**

Facts: The original matter was an investigation into fraudulent online purchases. During the investigation police engaged third-parties who managed the online sales and requested/obtained associated IP addresses. Bykovets filed a s.8 Charter challenge against that request, alleging that it violated his right against unreasonable search and seizure. At trial the judge held that there was no reasonable expectation of privacy in an IP address and thus, no s.8 violation had occurred. Bykovets was convicted of fourteen offences related to fraudulent online purchases. He appealed the conviction and the Court of Appeal agreed with the trial judge. However, the SCC subsequently allowed his appeal and ordered a new trial.

Analysis: The SCC determined that an IP address does in fact attract a reasonable expectation of privacy, emphasizing that a broad and purposive interpretation of the right against unreasonable search and seizure is required in order to properly capture the spirit of the Charter. The SCC applied a normative standard, as defined in *R v Marakah*, 2017 SCC which required a broad and functional approach that considered the potential to reveal core personal information. While the Court of Appeal viewed IP addresses as being mere sequences of numbers, the SCC recognized that they are a link to deeply personal information about the internet user.

Ratio: Bykovets expanded upon the court's prior decision in *R v Spencer* which established a reasonable expectation of privacy in subscriber information held by an internet provider. Bykovets established that the IP address itself attracts such status and requires judicial pre-authorization.

***R. v. Lindsay*, 2023 SCC 33 – Prepared by Jessica Dykes**

Facts: The original matter was an assault committed by a police officer during the course of an arrest. Video footage showed Cst. Lindsay punching an individual who was being arrested for theft. The individual was also thrown onto the ground by the constable. The person sustained a skull fracture and a brain injury as a result. He also required ambulance transportation to the hospital. The constable was charged with aggravated assault under s 268 of the Criminal Code. In his defense he relied on s. 25 the protection of persons enforcing the law and s. 34 the defence of self and others. At trial the judge found that although reasonable grounds existed (prevention of spitting) the officer's use of force was excessive. The trial judge held that neither s. 25 nor s. 34 applied. Constable Lindsay was convicted of aggravated assault on the basis that all elements were present. This conviction was subsequently upheld by the Alberta Court of Appeal. The SCC later dismissed the appeal and upheld the constable's conviction under s. 268 of *the Criminal Code.*

Analysis: Cst. Lindsay submitted that the trial judge had misinterpreted his counsel's concessions. The SCC noted that the trial judge assessed the actions of the officer and did not rely solely on defence council's concessions to determine that an aggravated assault had occurred. A determination was made that the pathway to conviction was based on appropriate legal principles. The court recognized that officers must act quickly and that the courts must be flexible in approach when assessing their conduct. However, the SCC agreed with the trial judge that there were other options available to the constable to reduce the threat of spit, such as moving the detainee toward the rear of the vehicle. The SCC noted that the conduct of the officer was excessive on a proper standard, that there were no reasonable grounds to strike him initially, nor to throw him to the ground.

Ratio: The courts may be less likely to find that use of force is reasonable when the threat arises from bodily fluids. There must be evidence that the fear is objectively reasonable to rely on s.25 and/or s. 34 defenses. In addition, the officer's response must be reasonable and measured.

***R. v. Bertrand Marchand*, 2023 SCC 26 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: The accused pled guilty to sexual interference and child luring. The mandatory minimum for child luring is 12 months for indictable offences and 6 months for summary convictions, per s.172(1) of the *Criminal Code*. At sentencing, the accused argued the 1-year mandatory minimum was unconstitutional per s. 12 of the *Charter*. The sentencing judge agreed that the mandatory minimum was grossly disproportionate and imposed a 5 month sentence, instead. The lesser sentence was upheld by the Court of Appeal and taken to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Crown asked the Supreme Court to find the 12 month mandatory minimum to be constitutional and to substitute a 12-month sentence.

RATIO: Mandatory minimum sentences for child luring are unconstitutional under s.12 of the *Charter* due to their potential to impose grossly disproportionate punishments.

ANALYSIS: Justice Martin did not dismiss the seriousness of child luring, but noted that s.172 covers "such an exceptionally wide scope of conduct that the result is grossly disproportionate punishments in reasonably foreseeable scenarios." The Court reaffirmed the importance of individualized sentencing. The Crown's constitutional challenges

were dismissed. However, the Court did raise the sentence from 5 months to 12 months, finding the trial judge did not adequately reflect the severity of the offence.

***R. v. Brunelle*, 2024 SCC 3 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: A large-scale police operation in Quebec began in 2016, resulting in the arrest of around 30 individuals for drug-related offences. At the time of arrest, all accused were informed of their s. 10(b) Charter rights to retain and instruct counsel without delay. Some of the arrestees on the scene said they wanted to exercise their 10(b) rights immediately, but only one of them was given that opportunity before transfer to the police station. Several accused filed for a stay of proceedings due to the alleged Charter violations. The trial judge granted a stay based on the cumulative effect of rights violations, finding a systemic pattern by the police to deny their 10(b) rights, leading to an abuse of process. While not all of the accused were explicitly denied their 10(b) rights, the cumulative effect of those infringements affected the entire group. The Quebec Court of Appeal reversed this decision, finding that not all accused had standing for a stay, and the trial judge should have considered each accused's rights individually. The accused appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

RATIO: The Supreme Court confirmed that a stay of proceedings could only be granted after assessing each accused's individual rights under s.10(b). Remedies must be tailored to the specific rights infringements experienced by each individual rather than applying a blanket remedy because of a cumulative effect.

ANALYSIS: Justice O'Bonsawin acknowledged that while all accused had standing to request a stay, the trial judge's failure to evaluate each case separately was a significant error. Judicial remedies must address the specific circumstances of each accused rather than assume collective harm. The trial judge also erred by issuing a blanket stay, when they should have considered if there were less drastic remedies that could have redressed the prejudice to the integrity of the justice system.

***R. v. D.F.*, 2024 SCC 14 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: The accused faced charges of sexual assault, sexual interference, and making sexually explicit material available to a child, allegedly occurring while he was in the home of the child complainant and her mother. The mother testified she left the house briefly, during which the accused was alone with the complainant. There were inconsistencies in the complainant's testimony regarding when her mother was or was not in the house during the timing of the alleged offence. The trial judge acknowledged these inconsistencies were noteworthy but otherwise minor, and found the complainant credible. The accused was convicted but appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal. The CoA upheld the conviction for making explicit material available to a child but overturned the sexual assault and interference convictions because the trial judge misinterpreted the complainant's evidence about her mother's presence in the home, which was crucial to the case. The trial judge misapprehended the complainant's evidence and this mistake played an essential role in the judge's reasoning to find the accused guilty on all counts. Justice Hourigan on the CoA dissented. The Crown appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, which allowed the appeal based on the reasoning in the dissent.

RATIO: Trial judges should apply a common sense approach to assess evidence of child witnesses to determine credibility and reliability.

ANALYSIS: The trial judge had properly evaluated the evidence. The trial judge recognized that the complainant's evidence regarding the location of her mother at the time of the offence was inconsistent but did not rely on those inconsistencies when convicting the accused. The inconsistencies were a product of the child complainant's youth. The trial judge correctly applied a common sense approach when considering the evidence. The Supreme Court endorsed Justice Hourigan's dissent where they described the appeal as a "troubling invitation that risks turning back the clock to a time when child witnesses were unwelcome participants in our justice system."

***R. v. Hodgson*, 2024 SCC 25 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: The accused attended a house party where he was asked to help remove an unruly guest. A fight broke out and the accused placed the guest in a chokehold, resulting in the guest losing consciousness and subsequently dying. At trial, the accused was found to have caused the victim's death by the chokehold, but was acquitted of second-degree murder due to a lack of subjective *mens rea*. The trial judge recognized the possibility of self-defence. The Crown appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal, arguing the trial judge made an error in law. Per the Crown, a chokehold is an inherently dangerous act and the trial judge should have been obligated to find the accused guilty of second degree murder after determining the chokehold was the cause of death. The CoA allowed the appeal and directed a new trial be held on the basis that the trial judge made an error in law when considering the *mens rea* for

murder. The defence appealed in turn to the Supreme Court of Canada, who allowed the appeal and restored the acquittal.

RATIO: The *mens rea* for murder only focuses on the accused's subjective intent and is not an objective assessment of what a reasonable person would have known about the dangers of the offending act (in this case, the chokehold). The Crown has limited rights of appeal when they seek to appeal an acquittal on the basis of questions of law alone. Appellate courts must precisely identify what the errors of law were, or how the trial judge made those errors.

ANALYSIS: The Supreme Court disagreed with the proposition that a chokehold is *always* an inherently dangerous act, because this line of thinking could apply an inappropriate objective element to the (subjective) *mens rea* analysis for murder. The trial judge considered the accused's state of mind and found doubt as to whether he intended to kill the victim. The Court of Appeal could not just overturn the acquittal because they had a different interpretation of the evidence.

A legal error worthy of appeal must come from a question of law, not a question about how to weigh the evidence. Even when the Crown can identify an error of law, the courts will not automatically overturn an acquittal. The Crown must convince the court that the acquittal would not have been ordered had the error not occurred. If an appellate court fails to precisely and expressly identify the offending errors of law in a Crown appeal of an acquittal, there is great risk of expanding the scope of the Crown's ability to appeal that could be highly dangerous for accused individuals and would extend beyond the limit set by section 676 of the *Criminal Code.*

R. v. B.E.M., 2023 SCC 32 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis

FACTS: The accused faced a jury trial for historical sexual assault and sexual interference against his former stepdaughter, occurring between 1995 and 1997. There were two main witnesses: the complainant and the accused. The defence focused on the complainant's credibility, highlighting her vague recollections of the events. The Crown conceded some vagueness but maintained the complainant's overall believability. In closing submissions, the Crown shared a personal anecdote about his own memory issues due to a head injury to support the complainant's reliability. The trial judge instructed the jury to use their common sense regarding memory but did not instruct them to ignore the Crown's personal remarks. The defence did not object to these comments but raised objections on other points. The jury convicted the accused, leading to an appeal based on claims of an unfair trial due to the Crown's comments. The Court of Appeal of Alberta denied the appeal and it was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada.

RATIO: The Crown's personal anecdote belonged to a range of common sense understanding and did not impact trial fairness.

ANALYSIS: The CoA considered four factors to assess the impact of the Crown's anecdote on trial fairness: the seriousness of the remarks, their context, whether the defence objected, and any efforts by the trial judge to address the comments. Although the Crown's remarks were deemed inappropriate, the appellate court found no miscarriage of justice as they did not prejudice the accused. The Supreme Court agreed the remarks were inappropriate but concluded that they did not lead to a miscarriage of justice. While the credibility of the complainant was central to the trial and inappropriate comments could be serious, the anecdote was only a form of common sense and it was not a primary emphasis at trial. The lack of any defence objection was a noteworthy factor in concluding there was no unfair trial.

R. v. O'Brien, 2023 ONCA 197 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis

FACTS: Police obtained a warrant to search the accused's home for electronic devices suspected of containing child pornography. The search was intrusive, with officers demanding passwords for all electronic devices. Testimony revealed that officers routinely requested passwords without informing suspects they were not obligated to provide them. The search resulted in the seizure of the accused's iPhone, a Dell computer, a USB thumb drive, and photographs. The trial judge found the search unreasonable under s.8 of the *Charter* due to the password demands but deemed the breach minimal for the computer since its contents could be accessed without a password. The iPhone's evidence was excluded as it required the password for effective search. The accused was convicted but appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal, which allowed the appeal.

RATIO: Police officers who assume control over occupants to secure a search must pay closer attention to whether there are objectively reasonable indications that the occupants may consider themselves detained. Asking for passwords to electronic devices without giving the opportunity for those individuals to obtain informed consent, is effectively a form of conscription, where the police conscript the accused into participating in the investigation against them.

ANALYSIS: The CoA emphasized that the police conduct during the search was egregious, leading to serious s.8 and s.10(b) violations. It conducted a fresh s.24(2) analysis and excluded the computer evidence, arguing that the

police's systemic breaches were significant enough to undermine the administration of justice. The trial judge's reasoning that the breach was minimal due to the computer not requiring a password to access its contents ignored the seriousness of police conduct.

***R. v. Charles*, 2024 SCC 29 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: The accused was charged with assault, using an imitation firearm, and uttering threats following an incident at school involving the complainant. At trial, the complainant testified about being threatened by the accused with a firearm. A witness (a fellow student, present during the alleged threatening incident) claimed they had no recollection of the incident, but they had previously given a written statement to the police the day after the incident. The Crown sought a *voir dire* to admit the witness's out-of-court statement given to police into evidence. The written statement was not sworn or recorded. In the statement, the witness claimed they owned two pellet pistols resembling actual pistols and said they gave one to the accused, who then threatened the complainant with it. The pellet pistols were later uncovered in a police search. The trial judge found the pellet pistols to corroborate the written statement, supporting an indicia of reliability, and admitted the statement. The accused was convicted in part because of the written statement.

The Court of Appeal upheld the trial judge's decision, and the accused appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court determined that the out-of-court statement lacked the necessary indicia of reliability for admissibility at trial.

RATIO: At the threshold reliability stage of hearsay, corroborative evidence can only be relied upon if it has been considered as a whole, in all of the case's circumstances, finding that the only likely explanation for the hearsay statement is the declarant's truthfulness or accuracy of the material aspects of the statement. Corroborative evidence without a connection to the material aspect of the statement intended to be proved is useless in determining whether that specific aspect is true or accurate.

ANALYSIS: The discovery of the pellet pistols was not corroborative. There was no way of determining whether the witness actually gave the pistol to the defendant; it could have been the witness, not the defendant, who handled the pistols. There was no connection between the discovery of the pistols and the accused's degree of involvement. The Supreme Court quashed the convictions and ordered a new trial, emphasizing the importance of reliability in the admission of evidence.

***R. v. Lawlor*, 2023 SCC 34 – Prepared by Josh Platanitis**

FACTS: The accused participated in a sexual encounter with two other men in a park; the next day, one of those men was found dead in the same park – cause of death: external neck compression. The accused had consumed psychiatric medication and alcohol prior to the encounter. He made statements before and after the time of the victim's death that he wanted to kill gay men. He had also said that he would carry a rope and knife when he would try to act on these impulses. The accused searched the internet for news related to the victim's death in the days after the body was discovered.

At trial, the judge's instructions to the jury did not adequately address the relevance of the accused's mental health. The judge asked the jury to consider all the evidence, but did not instruct the jury to limit what they could infer from the accused's post-offence conduct of searching on the internet. The jury found the accused guilty of first-degree murder. On appeal to the Ontario Court of Appeal, the appellant conceded that he did cause the victim's death and was guilty of manslaughter, at the least. However, he argued the trial judge failed to expressly instruct the jury on the use of evidence related to his mental health, and that the trial judge should have told the jury to limit their use of evidence related to the post-offence conduct. The CoA dismissed the appeal and it was brought to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court set aside the conviction and ordered a new trial.

RATIO: A trial judge must provide clear instructions regarding the significance of evidence related to an accused's mental health and limit the inferences the jury can draw from any post-offence conduct of the accused, to ensure a fair consideration of intent.

ANALYSIS: The trial judge's failure to specifically highlight evidence of the accused's mental health compromised the jury's ability to accurately assess his intent. The judge's general instruction to consider "all evidence" was insufficient, because it did not adequately explain to the jury how to interpret the mental health evidence in the context of intent for murder. No specific guidance re: the jury's interpretation of the accused's internet searches post-offence allowed the jury to draw potentially prejudicial conclusions without considering alternative explanations.

Nokiiwin
TRIBAL COUNCIL

Restorative Justice Supports and Services

"Traditional laws are handed down to us from above, from the Creator".

"They are by the people, for the people."

– Elder Jimmy Mishquart, Biinjitiwaabik Zaaging Anishinaabek

Nokiiwin Tribal Council developed the Restorative Justice Program for its member communities to provide support in practicing the Anishinaabe principle of Mino-Bimaadiziwin – a feeling of spiritual, physical, emotional, and mental balance that is at the heart of Indigenous conceptions of wellness and justice. The goal of Restorative Justice is to empower the whole community in resolving conflict, restoring, and strengthening relationships, and helping individuals on their path to healing and wellness.

Restorative Justice practices allow for:

- A sacred and safe space to talk, and both to receive and share knowledge and wisdom.

- The use of ceremony is a critical way the people find their identity and can seek guidance.
- The community can help to care for a person by offering support, guidance, encouragement.
- Acknowledgement that it is natural for people to make mistakes, this does not make one a bad person.
- Teachings like the Seven Grandfather Teachings are there to help us live in a good way.
- Allows for community to work together to make things better for the next generation.
- A place of understanding of how colonization, including Indian Residential Schools and the Sixties scoop, continue to affect Indigenous people.
- Helps us to reclaim our traditional laws and justice practices.

"Indigenous legal traditions are like a quilt".
"It is us that have threads of knowledge. We have to start to put them together."

– Elder Marlene Pierre, Fort William First Nation

Depicted here is the Access to Justice Quilt. Members of Nokiiwin's five communities beautifully crafted patches that speak to what justice means to them at our Access to Justice Forum 2019 titled: **"Kinawin Momagan" Together We Will Do It All.**

Nokiiwin's Restorative Justice Program will continue to conduct information sessions and training via video-conferencing. Requests for information sessions, training, and referrals for criminal diversion and child welfare matters can be directed to the Restorative Justice Coordinator below.

Nokiiwin Tribal Council Restorative Justice Program is committed to working with communities to provide support as they develop their own restorative justice programs.

For further information please contact:

Our Restorative Justice Coordinator
Telephone: (807) 474-4230 ext.621

Kairos Community Resource Centre

Helping youth to have the best opportunity to succeed and reach their full potential

Kairos Community Resource Centre is a non-profit organization offering open custody, open detention and community based services to youth ages 12-17 years.

The organization is mandated to provide youth justice services under the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) and subject to licensing requirements as set out through the Child Youth and Family Services Act (CYFSA) and the Ministry of Children, Community Social Services (MCCSS).

Services are based on the Principles of community safety, accountability and the reduction of recidivism through the provision of rehabilitative programs and community reintegration.

Programs and services are based on cognitive behavioural principles and interventions, best practices, consultation, and integrated with other service providers within youth justice and the broader community.

PROGRAMS

- Reintegration and Community Services Program
- Gang Prevention and Intervention Program
- Youth Justice Family Worker

OPEN CUSTODY AND DETENTION FACILITY

Kairos operates an 7 bed male facility.

Services are provided to young persons age 12-17 (male) at time of offence who have been sentenced to open custody though the Courts; have had community or conditional supervision suspended by a Ministry Provincial Director and remanded to an open custody facility; who have been

remanded into custody on a detention warrant and assessed for placement in an open custody facility. Kairos is the designated point of entry for level of detention assessments for male youth, Thunder Bay and District.

Programs and Services are youth-centered and delivered in a multi-disciplinary teamwork environment which promotes rehabilitation and reintegration for each youth.

Case Management Reintegration Plans are developed for each youth targeting those areas of assessed need/risk and identify areas of youth, family and community strength.

Interventions strategies are tailored to meet the unique needs and learning styles of each youth and promote youth accountability.

pecialized programs and services may be accessed through the community to meet specific identified needs and to support the reintegration process for youth.

Individual education plans are developed for each youth and supported through on-site section 23 classroom.

We would like to acknowledge the 'Picture Store and Framing Centre' and the 'Painted Turtle' art shop for their contributions to our art program. A special thanks to Thunder Bay artists Linda Dell and John Ferris who mentor the youth and draw out their unique talents and strengths. Contact for visits (807) 623-1690.

Programs and Services:

- Anger Management and Problem Solving
- Assessment and referral
- Crisis Response and Intervention
- Cultural Programming
- Discharge Planning
- Educational support section 23 classroom
- Employment skills training
- Family Support/Intervention Services
- Gender Specific Programming
- Health and Wellness Programming
- Life Skills/Social Skills training
- Mentoring
- Positive Leisure/Recreational Activities
- Reintegration services
- Substance Abuse Education and Counseling.

Office (807) 623-1690 Linda.Dacre@kairoscrc.ca

Youth Justice Family Program: (807) 623-1790 Tammie.Corbett@kairoscrc.ca

Gang Prevention and Intervention Program Phone: (807) 623-1890 Email: Tammie.Corbett@kairoscrc.ca