



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 6th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, June 12th at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Stan Persky was in the chair. He briefly reviewed the proceedings of the last two meetings for the benefit of new and absent members. The Minutes of the last meeting were accepted as circulated.

A reply from Mr. Gorby to the Committee's letter of enquiry regarding the vacant position of day care consultant was read. A copy of the advertisement for this position had been enclosed with his letter. No mention was made of client participation. Leonard Minsky had called Mr. Gorby on behalf of the Committee and had received the impression that any consumer representation should be at the Board level, not at this position.

A letter had been received from Alderman Harry Rankin of Vancouver expressing his interest in the Social Services Policy Committee and his willingness to see "if something could be worked out so that I can work with them". It was suggested that the Committee hold its next meeting on a Wednesday in the hope that Alderman Rankin could attend.

In response to a letter from the Finance Sub-committee, George Carlisle, GVRD Director of Administration, and Drew Thorburn were present to explain their position regarding the Committee's request for \$2200. It was explained that while this sum had been set aside for each Committee, there was no way it could be handed over except upon presentation of a budget. It was suggested that the Committee set up a petty cash fund of \$250 and that this be replenished as needed in the same way that the staff maintains a petty cash fund, i.e. by producing cash or vouchers totalling \$250. The remainder could be obtained as needed by requisition after presentation of a budget. Mr. Carlisle stressed that this was not a question of lack of trust, but merely of procedure. A cheque for \$250 was presented to the Finance sub-committee.

Merrilyn Payne reported on her conversation with Alderman Harry Rankin regarding attendance by a delegation from the Committee at a meeting of the Vancouver Standing Committee on Health and Welfare in order to obtain further information regarding the function of the various

health facilities in Vancouver. Because this Standing Committee is concerned only with hearing briefs requesting funds and making recommendations for the provision of these funds, it was decided that the delegation should not appear before the Committee at this stage.

Merrilyn Payne also reported on her visit with Dr. Bonham and other members added information concerning other areas of the region. Some of the points which emerged were:

- Regulations and standards have no legal validity and can be invoked by anyone. New regulations are now being drawn up, although it was not certain by whom.
- The process varies from municipality to municipality, from day to day, and even from case to case. For a person to "beat the system" it was necessary to know the functions of the various staff members and their personal inter-relationships.
- All areas of licensing in Vancouver -- physical regulations and qualifications regarding personnel and programmes -- are under the complete control of the Vancouver Health Department. Actual responsibility for licensing has been delegated within the Department. It was difficult to determine precisely what responsibilities interest, knowledge and concern the various health officers have in this process. It was stressed that administrative officers must be held responsible for provision of services regardless of where the actual decisions are made. It was questioned why Dr. Bonham had not been approached directly by members who had had difficulty re licensing.
- There is no client participation. The only advisory committee which Dr. Bonham cited was one of volunteers for senior citizens who were advisory to him. Citizen participation did not seem to be regarded as desirable.

A suggestion was made that in view of excessive obstacles and confusion re licensing, the GVRD should hire one or more persons who understood the system and could provide help to those who sought it.

The sub-committee on structure was instructed to prepare its report on the basis of the material which had been presented at the last two meetings.

Sub-committee 2 began its report of the frustrations experienced by three groups -- Grandview Terrace Day Care Centre, the South Hill Day Care Centre and the Mental Patients' Association. Discussion of this report will be continued at the next meeting.

The Committee dealt with several administrative matters:

IT WAS AGREED that the Committee would continue to meet throughout the summer.

Some concern was expressed over the fact that some members of the Committee, notably those from social service agencies, had not been to recent meetings, and a Membership sub-committee of Anne MacAulay and Carolyn Jerome was set up to try to contact these members.

IT WAS AGREED that Shelley Dillon would act as chairperson at the next meeting.

IT WAS AGREED that the Secretariat would try to arrange for Alderman Harry Rankin to attend a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday, June 27th. If he were not able to attend on that date, the meeting would revert to Tuesday, June 26th.

NOTE: The next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee will be held on Tuesday, June 26th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

/ng
June 18, 1973



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 5th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, May 29th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Stan Persky acted as chairman. The Minutes of the last meeting were accepted as circulated.

Dan Tobin, chairman of the Finance Sub-committee, voiced a strong complaint that the \$2200 promised to the Social Services Policy Committee had not been provided upon request. It was explained by staff that although each Policy Committee had been given \$2200 for its needs, the GVRD Administration was prepared to provide the money only on presentation of a budget. In this case, a cheque for \$250 had been issued and the remainder would be forthcoming upon presentation of a budget. There was much discussion on the point, with some members feeling that the whole principle of community control and the value of other GVRD promises was at stake, while others felt that it was not an important enough issue to disrupt the Committee's work. IT WAS AGREED that Dan Tobin would send a letter to Mr. George Carlisle, GVRD Director of Administration, and Drew Thorburn, expressing the Committee's dissatisfaction over this incident as a poor basis for an exercise of mutual trust and asking them to appear at the next meeting to explain their position.

Dave Mossop made a brief report on his May 24th trip to Victoria to appear before the Community Care Facilities Licensing Board on behalf of the South Hill Day Care Centre. His conclusion was that although nothing concrete had been achieved, it was not a wasted effort and indeed in order to overcome the basic problem of lack of communication, it is important that such groups go regularly to Victoria to keep them aware of local problems.

Merrilyn Payne reported on behalf of the sub-committee investigating the structure of the machinery responsible for the administration of the Community Care Facilities Licensing Act. A copy of the information she obtained through a phone call to the Director of Day Care in Victoria is attached to these Minutes. Several inferences were made on the basis of this information:

- This information was given freely because it was asked for by a member of the GVRD staff; it would probably not be so readily available to an ordinary citizen who might enquire.
- The situation is in a state of flux with changes being made day by day. Instead of concerning itself with these details, the Committee should try to examine the basic policies behind the changes.
- The situation is different in Vancouver from other municipalities in the region and indeed from other regions.
- At the moment there is increased centralization in Victoria prior to decentralization, at least in principle. But there is not likely to be any significant local control in terms of authority, administration, funding, licensing, qualifications etc.
- The whole picture of structure is a muddle. This exercise has probably given this Committee more information than is held by any one individual within the structure. People inside as well as outside are probably dissatisfied with the bureaucratic confusion.
- There is no provision anywhere for citizen participation.

A motion of thanks was made to Merrilyn Payne and Cathie Goldney for obtaining this information.

In the course of this report, it was stated that the position of Consultant on Day Care had recently become vacant. Because of the Committee's concern for client participation in decision-making, IT WAS MOVED by Jim Tyhurst, seconded by Dan Tobin and agreed that the Secretariat would send a letter to Mr. C. Gorby, Executive Officer of the Community Care Facilities Licensing Board Office, with copies to the Ministers of Human Resources, Health and Education, stating that it was the Committee's understanding that the position was vacant, asking for a copy of the qualifications required, and expressing the Committee's belief that there is need for the consumer viewpoint to be represented at this level. (A copy of this letter is enclosed with these Minutes.) Len Minsky of the GVRD was to further underline this concern by a telephone call to Mr. Gorby.

IT WAS FURTHER MOVED by Jim Tyhurst, seconded and agreed that a letter be written by Jim Tyhurst to the Ministers of Human Resources, Health and Education expressing the Committee's general concern about client participation in the process of licensing and administration and asking them to give consideration to this.

Since it was apparent that local structures and practices varied from municipality to municipality, IT WAS MOVED by Merrilyn Payne, seconded

by Carolyn Jerome and agreed that a delegation from this Committee, to consist of Merrilyn Payne, Dan Tobin and Lanny Beckman, should go to see Dr. Bonham of the Metropolitan Board of Health to obtain information regarding health and social services in Vancouver, and in particular information on accountability, authority, regulations and licensing. An amendment to this motion was made by Effie Keays that this delegation should also meet with the Vancouver Health and Welfare Committee or its chairman, Alderman Harry Rankin, regarding their policy on day care.

IT WAS FURTHER AGREED that Thekkie Cuff and Murray Stark should form a delegation to obtain similar information in New Westminster.

A letter from Hon. Norman Levi was read to the Committee. It stated in part: "I notice from your letter [letter of April 11th from Mr. A.C. Kelly, GVRD Board Chairman, inviting political participation on the Policy Committees] that there is a Committee dealing with Social Services, and certainly I would be interested in participating at some of the proceedings as time permits. I would appreciate it if you could ask the Chairman of the Committee if we could receive the minutes of the previous meeting, and I will certainly endeavour to schedule my attendance."

IT WAS MOVED by Jim Tyhurst, seconded by Thekkie Cuff and agreed that the Secretariat should reply to Mr. Levi on behalf of the Committee, stating the Committee's appreciation for his interest, enclosing the minutes and asking when he might be available to meet with the Committee, together, it is hoped, with his colleagues the Ministers of Health and Education. (A copy of this letter is enclosed with these Minutes.)

IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, June 12th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver. At this meeting the Committee would proceed with the development of the first section (structure) and begin consideration of the second section (documentation of experiences) of its brief. IT WAS FURTHER AGREED that Stan Persky should continue as chairman for the next meeting.

/ng
June 5, 1973



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 4th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, May 15th at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Jim Tyhurst was in the chair. After some discussion IT WAS AGREED that until further notice the Committee would have a rotating chairman, with the choice for the next meeting being made at the end of each meeting. IT WAS FURTHER AGREED that Stan Persky should be chairman for the next meeting.

Stan Persky outlined the terms of reference for the Finance sub-committee. The \$2,200 allocated to the Committee by the GVRD would be given to Dan Tobin for deposit in the bank. Dan would act as accountant and present a weekly financial statement to the Committee. Any cheques would have to be signed by two of the three members of the Finance sub-committee, (ie. Stan Persky, Dan Tobin, Carolyn Jerome). Petty cash would be on hand at the end of every meeting for members' out-of-pocket expenses as agreed by the Committee at an earlier meeting. Other expenses would have to be approved by the Committee. IT WAS AGREED that these terms of reference be accepted.

Copies of the Community Care Facilities Licensing Act and its 1973 amendments had been mailed to the members and the evening's discussion centred around the problems arising from this Act. Dave Mossop from Community Lawyers Programme was on hand to provide legal expertise.

Some of the points emerging from the discussion were:

- The legislation aims to control community care facilities through licensing under a Community Care Facilities Licensing Act Board. The new amendments further strengthen the government's authority by giving power to the Cabinet to pass regulations which are printed in the B.C. Gazette. The difference between "legislation" and "regulations" is a fine legal distinction which the ordinary layman wouldn't understand.
- Regulations are selectively enforced. Many things can be overcome if you know the right people to talk to or if you have the necessary capital to meet the physical requirements. Businessmen can cope with these problems much more easily than community groups who have no power and no money.
- The Board relies on advice from its civil servants whose intention may be good but who are often afraid to act because of their superiors. Perhaps the difficulties encountered over the administration of the Act can be attributed to differences at this level.

- Much discussion took place concerning the exact procedure involved in administering the Act, i.e. how licenses are in fact obtained and who is considered qualified. It was felt that the current situation in regard to this Act is in a state of flux, with infighting over control at the top by the three government departments involved, and with legislation being passed without any idea of the consequences of it. There are also differences from municipality to municipality in the way this legislation is interpreted and administered. In short, it seems most unlikely that anyone knows the structure of who has power and what the process is. As this was considered essential information for the Committee to have, IT WAS AGREED that Cathie Goldney would work with Merrilyn Payne of the GVRD to attempt to obtain clarification from Victoria concerning Board members and civil servants involved in administering this Act, the departments they represent, and their exact functions.
- One way to overcome this administrative tangle is to by-pass the bureaucrats and appear directly before the Board. One of the Committee's recommendations might be an amendment to the Act stating this explicitly.
- At present there is no provision for any public participation in the administration of the Act at any level. IT WAS AGREED that Jim Tyhurst and Murray Stark would form a sub-committee to consider this aspect.
- There was some discussion about the philosophy of licensing (ie. is it needed at all) and it was suggested that the Committee might like to consider this at a future meeting.

The Committee spent much of the evening discussing specific difficulties and frustrations which had been experienced by various members in different organizations, but particularly those connected with day care. IT WAS AGREED that a brief should be prepared which would be presented to the three ministers responsible for administering the Community Care Facilities Licensing Act (i.e. Human Resources, Health, and Education) by a delegation in the name of the GVRD Social Services Policy Committee. The brief should be made up of three parts:

1. what the Committee believes to be the structure and the process, including an outline of the difficulties involved in obtaining this information.
2. a thorough, chronological documentation of the difficulties and frustrations, including legal problems, experienced by Committee members in trying to deal with government.
3. a statement on client participation with recommendations for user control at the level of services.

It is hoped that this brief would be ready for the next meeting, at which time it would be discussed by the Committee, further recommendations made and details worked out concerning the trip to Victoria.

The question of publicity to be given to this exercise would also be discussed.

Some members, including those who had experienced futility in trying to deal with ministers and civil servants, expressed concern over the possibility of another failure and the blow this would cause, and again the question of the power of the Committee arose. Len Minsky of the GVRD felt the Committee should recognize the difference between short-term and long-term gains, pointing out that there was some indication that the provincial government was planning to give more power to regional governments. The Capital Area Regional District has already been given some responsibility for social services and it was conceivable that this Committee could be in a very good position to define a possible social service function for the GVRD.

In a gesture of support for Dave Mossop's efforts to appear before the Community Care Facilities Licensing Board on behalf of the South Hill Day Care Centre, IT WAS MOVED, seconded and agreed unanimously that the GVRD Social Services Policy Committee urge the Community Care Facilities Licensing Board to grant an oral hearing to the South Hill Day Care Centre representatives concerning their permit at the earliest opportunity.

Lanny Beckman told the Committee of a meeting being held to discuss a community health team in Kitsilano and as a gesture of support IT WAS MOVED, seconded and agreed that the GVRD Social Services Policy Committee endorse the principle of citizen participation in establishing a community health team in Kitsilano.

IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, May 29th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

NG/dt

May 23/73



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 3rd meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, May 8th in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215, W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

It was agreed that the Minutes of the last meeting be accepted as circulated.

Acting Chairman Alderman Norman Wild opened the meeting by asking for nominations for chairman, as suggested at the last meeting. After some discussion, it was agreed that Jim Tyhurst should become acting chairman for the immediate future, with the position to be reviewed at a later date. It was also agreed that Carolyn Jerome, Dan Tobin and Stan Persky should form a sub-committee to manage the Committee's funds. They agreed to decide on their own terms of reference and present them to the Committee.

The evening discussion centered around community control of social services and the question of accountability, the relationship between existing agencies and the people they serve, and the administrative characteristics of these agencies. The following points emerged:

- How can community-controlled groups be held accountable and to whom? Even governments who must satisfy the taxpayers aren't really accountable since they usually face the electorate only every three or four years. One suggested means was through a board of advisers, similar to a board of directors of a hospital.
- Although the government might appear willing or even eager to have community involvement in the running of certain facilities (the Downtown Community Health Society and the Vancouver Opportunities Programme were cited as examples), it is unwilling to relinquish control when public funds are expended. In the final analysis, the question of control is really a question of power, ie. who has the money.
- Community self-help groups have sprung up which are not officially recognized or funded but which meet needs which are otherwise unmet by existing agencies. Several reasons were suggested: (a) the agency may purport to deliver services but doesn't; (b) there are some services no agency purports to meet; (c) people may be unaware of existing services or facilities; (d) people may be turned off by the impersonality,

the bureaucratic red tape or the inconvenience of hours of operation of agencies; (e) few people fulfill the qualifications or fit the pre-conceived "problems" set by the professionals or the licensing legislation. It was suggested that the Committee might look at (a) existing agencies and what services they purport to provide; (b) existing community-run services, the needs they meet and the way they deal with people.

- Once an organization is set up, however good its intentions, it may develop into an organization where the means become ends and the structure of the institution may become more important than the needs it is meant to serve. Even community-run groups are not immune from this danger. Some members felt that this process was inevitable and that a change in leadership did not in fact change anything. Others felt that it was important to make a distinction between institutions and the people in them; some agencies have very good people who are as much a victim of the system as the people they try to serve.
- People are now accountable to their superiors, rather than to the people they serve. Both purveyors and consumers of social services are stuck by their place in the power structure which determines how they will react. Recipients learn that they can obtain help only by supporting the system. The criteria for assistance are set by the elites in society through legislation.
- Since it is impossible to have accountability to everyone, how can fair representation be ensured? Perhaps the Committee should consider the idea of a social services ombudsman to whom those seeking assistance can turn in faith and confidence.

By the end of the evening the Committee had reached the following conclusions:

[It was moved by Lenney Beckmann, seconded and agreed that the Committee go on record with a statement of its belief that the great majority of existing social service agencies are over-bureaucratized, impersonal and do not meet the needs of their clients.

It was moved by Luis Molina, seconded and agreed that the scope of this Policy Committee be broadened to include educational institutions as social service organizations.

It was further moved by Ray Guttridge, seconded and agreed that the scope of this Policy Committee be broadened to include health institutions as social service organizations.

Throughout the evening's discussion reference had been made to the Community Care Facilities Licensing Act and the recently passed

amendment which many members felt tightened the government's control over social services in ways the Committee might find unacceptable. It was requested that copies of this Act and its amendment be made available for the next meeting and it was agreed that the next meeting would consider the letter and intent and other relevant provincial legislation in the light of this evening's discussion with a view to making recommendations to be presented to the appropriate provincial authorities.

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, May 15th at 7:30 pm in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

May 15/73

NG/dt



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, May 1st at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

A list of those in attendance is attached to these Minutes.

Acting Chairman Alderman Norman Wild presided. The Minutes of the last meeting were accepted as read.

The Committee began by reviewing briefly some of the questions which had occupied it at the first meeting -- adequate representation on the Committee, lack of reference to social services in the policy statements, and the course and scope of the Committee's deliberations. It was felt that the whole question of social services was undergoing a period of change, especially with the change in focus of the provincial Department of Human Resources. In discussing priorities for the Committee, several members expressed urgent concern over the topic of day care. Other members pointed out that the same kinds of problems associated with day care -- costs involved, licensing regulations, boundaries, etc. -- also exist in other areas of social concern, for example in relation to senior citizens. Perhaps a place for the Committee to start working was by first gaining a concept of the broad spectrum of social services, including their administration and how the various services are organized and at what level (i.e. neighbourhood, municipal, provincial).

Following this general discussion, the Committee broke itself into three groups to consider which issues were of most interest. Later the Committee reassembled and spokesmen for each group summarized their discussions.

Two of the three groups stressed the need for more community control over social services. This was a reflection of the frustration experienced by some members in trying to deal with established social agencies or levels of government. It was felt that the professionals in social services generally were problem-oriented and that people seeking assistance were made to fit preconceived notions of "problem". Perhaps a solution to this question was to have community resource centres with community-hired and government-financed personnel, not necessarily professional, to deal with a broad spectrum of problems, including many not currently considered as "social services". This approach might overcome the feeling that under the existing system,

bureaucracies not only fail to provide solutions to problems but tend to waste available funds through their machinery. In this connection it was felt that existing community centres were not being used effectively because people in the community do not have access to decision-making on how these facilities should be used. It was felt that this might be an area where the GVRD could be effective.

This appeal for community control of social services led into a discussion of the definition of "community", both in terms of the spirit of a neighbourhood and in terms of a workable size. The concept obviously varies with different individuals within a given area; for some a community was their immediate block, for others it might be the entire Region.

The notion that the community represented the ideal was questioned and the point made that small towns, for example, did not always show charity to all. The very impersonality of agencies, which seemed to be a major criticism, could in fact be an asset in ensuring that objectivity was used when determining what assistance was to be given and to whom. However valid the ideal may be of citizens working together to solve their own problems, it was stressed that the Committee should not lose sight of the practicalities and realities of life in a large metropolitan area.

It was brought to the attention of the Committee that some members and prospective members found it difficult or impossible to attend meetings because of the cost of babysitting and bus fares. IT WAS AGREED unanimously that the Committee make use of some of its budget, to a maximum of \$5.00 per night, to provide assistance in these circumstances.

IT WAS AGREED that at the next meeting the Committee would give consideration to the election of officers.

The next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee will be held on Tuesday, May 8th at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

/ng

May 7, 1973

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE -- Meeting of May 1st

Name	Address	Phone	Representing Organization, if any
Ald. Norman Wild (pro tem chairman)	City Hall, Port Moody	684-6441	
Joyce Searcy	7135 Beechwood, Van	266-8218	Status of Women
Eileen Herridge	7 - 2438 Pt. Grey Rd. Van	738-0303	VCC - SPD
Pat Russell	1626 W. 58th Ave. Van	266-2279	Status of Women
Douglas McConney	1625 W. 8th Ave. Van	731-7781	United Comm. Services
Effie Keays	4776 W. 4th Ave. Van	224-0554	
Luis Molina	26 W. 7th Ave. Van.	879-0661	X-Kalay Foundation
Jack Adams	4925 Canada Way, Bby	291-9611	BC Govt Employees Union
Ray Whitehead	4925 Canada Way, Bby	291-9611	" " "
R.J. Phillips	6555 Cypress St. Van	263-6659	Riverview Hospital
Ray Guttridge	864 Francis Rd. R'md	274-2401	Central City Mission
Eleanor Suckling	923 Glenora Ave. N Van	985-4368	
Brian McCaughey	1807 Collingwood	736-3661	Community Info Centre
Carolyn Jerome	4477 Prince Albert, Van	874-6293	Child Care Occupation Forces
Jean Knaiger	3281 W. 3rd Ave. Van	738-8991	" " "
Marg Sigurgeirson	535 E. 50th Ave. Van	324-4532	Van Area NDP
Marg Redmond	1749 SW Marine Dr. Van	266-7743	
Fred Jones	859 Baker Dr. Coquitlam	936-1866	Douglas College
Toby Snelgrove	333 3rd St. New West.	522-9671	
Russ Duncan	485 Seaforth Cres. Coq.	936-4794	Coq. Social Concern Committee
Murray Stark	1300 Hammond St. Coq	939-2481	SHARE
Cathie Gildney	535 E. 50th Ave. Van	224-4532	
Betsy (Meadley) Wood	31 Glenmore, W. Van	922-3784	
Lanny Beckman	2504 York St Van	738-9429	Mental Patients Assoc
Stan Persky	2504 York St. Van	738-9429	
Ron Cutler	3025 E. 25th Ave. Van	434-9496	
J.S. Tyhurst	2550 SW Marine Dr. Van	228-2375	
Len Minsky		731-1155	GVRD
Drew Thorburn		731-1155	GVRD
Mark Bostwick		731-1155	GVRD
Nancy Grant		731-1155	GVRD



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 1st meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, April 24th at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

A list of those in attendance is attached to these Minutes.

Acting Chairman Alderman Norman Wild opened the meeting by introducing members of the GVRD Planning Department staff who provided background information on the Livable Region Programme. Later in the meeting those present introduced themselves.

In outlining how the Policy Committees had come into existence, the role of the Public Participation Programme of the GVRD was explained. This is an attempt to contact citizens' groups in order to determine what objectives and values **are** held by citizens and how they wished to see these objectives translated into policies and programmes in order that we may build a better place in which to live. Meetings have been held throughout the region with a large variety of these groups and the information obtained has been incorporated by the GVRD Planning Department into their "Report on Livability". This report had been adopted by the GVRD Board which had requested the establishment of nine Policy Committees to discuss the 30 proposed policy statements. The Board has requested that the programmes to implement these policies be ready for formal consideration by October 1973. All governments should be represented on the Policy Committees at both the political and administrative levels and the advice of the academic community should be sought, as well as the views of as many segments of the public as possible. Only in this way would it be possible to agree on policies and programmes to achieve these objectives.

Several questions emerged from the ensuing discussion:

-- How do you delimit "social services"?

Members of the Committee had been provided with a list of 59 policy objectives which were common to all nine Policy Committees. There was little reflection in these policy objectives of an awareness of social planning or social demands. It was up to the Committee itself to define "social services", to determine what policy objectives it will discuss, and to provide the Planning Committee **with** an awareness of social needs. Because the concept of "social services" is so broad, there will no doubt be considerable overlapping with topics being dis-

cussed by other Policy Committees and we must ensure that there is co-ordination with these Committees. IT WAS AGREED that, before the next meeting, those present would consider the objectives which they felt the Committee should examine and that these would be discussed at the next meeting.

- Is the GVRD prepared to accept social services as one of its functions? If not, what good will this Committee serve? What is its power?

(Social services as such are not one of the GVRD's functions. But there are many ways of looking at "social services" in the broad sense within the functions which the GVRD does have, eg. the GVRD has authority over zoning regulations which have a bearing on the location of such facilities as taverns, day care centres or half-way houses. Because it is a federation of 14 municipalities, the GVRD can also take steps to ensure that available social services don't overlap. One of the main tasks of these Policy Committees is to make the councils of the various municipalities aware of the needs and views of the constituent populations. [If the Committee is broadly-based and in touch with the community, it will attain far greater strength than other citizens' groups and it will be very difficult for politicians, at any level of government, to ignore its recommendations.] The GVRD will help the Committee to approach the responsible political or administrative personnel but it is up to the Committee itself to spell out what it wants and ensure that it has broad community backing

- How can the Committee ensure that it is representative of both "purveyors" and "consumers" of social services?

The selection process for all nine Policy Committees has been entirely open. Letters and information have been sent to a large number of agencies and individuals concerned with social services, as well as to citizens' groups. The membership is open until the Committee decides otherwise. The Committee can take whatever steps it wishes to ensure that its membership reflects all areas and all interest groups in the region and the GVRD staff will assist the Committee in this job. For example, the Committee may decide that part of its budget could best be spent in payment to certain individuals who might not otherwise be able to participate and whose involvement the Committee felt was important.

- What budget does the Committee have and what resource people are available to the Committee?

Each of the nine Policy Committees has a budget of \$2200 to spend as it sees fit. When the Committee has decided what work it will undertake and has some idea of the funds required, the Secretariat will attempt to obtain funds from government or private agencies. Although

there are very few people on the GVRD staff who are experts in the social field, this Committee contains a good deal of expertise. Other experts are available, for example from within the academic community. Much statistical or other printed material is available from a variety of sources and the GVRD staff will assist the Committee in acquiring whatever data it needs. There would probably be little need for the Committee itself to undertake any research. The Committee's main task should be to spell out the community's needs and wants and to make recommendations concerning legislation or possible funding to achieve these goals.

Some discussion of suitable meeting places followed and various members offered to investigate possible sites within the region. IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, May 1st at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD Conference Room, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver. IT WAS ALSO AGREED that Alderman Wild would continue as Acting Chairman until the Committee had met often enough to choose a chairman from among its own members.

The meeting adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

/ng

April 26, 1973

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting of April 24, 1973

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Representing Organization, if any</u>
Norman Wild (pro tem chairman)	City Hall, Port Moody	684-6441	
Mary Vertin	19417 Fraser H'wy. Surrey	534-6349	Surrey
Eleanor Suckling	923 Glenora Ave. N. Van	985-4368	
U. de Backeo	14th Ave. Vancouver	732-6351	Helpful Neighbour
Anne MacAulay	502-2045 Nelson, Van	685-6098	
Joyce Searcy	7135 Beechwood, Van	266-8218	Status of Women
A.J. Phillips	6555 Cypress St. Van	263-6659	Riverview Hospital
Ray Whitehead	422 Mundy St.	939-8031	BC Govt Employees Uni
Jack Adams	4925 Canada Way, Bby	291-9611	BC Govt Employees Uni
Ray Guttridge	864 Francis Road, R'md	274-2401	Central City Mission
Ron Cutler	3025 E. 28th Ave. Van	434-9496	Alcoholism Foundation
Carolyn Jerome	4477 Prince Albert, Van	874-6293	
Dan Fenny	1675 W. 10th Ave. Van	733-8111	Children's Aid Soc.
Margaret Redmond	1749 SW Marine Dr. Van	266-7743	
J.S. Tyhurst	2550 SW Marine Dr. Van	228-2375	UBC
Marg Sigurgeirson	535 E. 50th Ave. Van	324-4532	Van. Area NDP Council
Murray Stark	1300 Hammond, Coq.	939-2481	SHARE
Brian McCaughey	1946 W. Broadway, Van	736-3661	Community Info Centre
Fred Jones	859 Baker Drive, Coq.	936-1866	Douglas College
Marg Arthur	6355 Gilpin St. Bby	298-3231	BC Govt Employees Uni
Ron Fromson	Calgary		
Rodger Woods	Calgary		
Len Minsky		731-1155	GVRD
Drew Thorburn		731-1155	GVRD
Mark Bostwick		731-1155	GVRD
Nancy Grant		731-1155	GVRD



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 8th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Wednesday, July 11th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Shelley Dillon acted as chairperson. Guests Alderman Harry Rankin of Vancouver and Gary Letcher, a member of a task force on legislation affecting children in B.C., were introduced.

Letters received from Hon. Norman Levi and Hon. Dennis Cocke in reply to letters sent by the Committee (minutes of the 5th meeting of May 29th) were read. A telegram from Hon. Norman Levi in answer to the Committee's telegram (minutes of the 7th meeting of June 26th) was also read.

A status report was given on the preparation of the brief. The sub-committees had met since the last meeting and had decided **on** the structure of the brief as follows:

1. Memo of Transmission -- short letter to explain what the brief is and why it is being submitted.
2. Preface -- to explain the existence of the Social Services Policy Committee and how we undertook preparation of this brief.
3. Introduction -- instructions to the reader and general discourse on the conclusions and recommendations contained in the brief.
4. Body of the brief--
 - A. Discursive description of the problem. Chronology as an appendix.
 - B. Attempts to discover and analyze the process which causes the problem, including how we went about it, what we asked, etc. The existing structure as we understand it.
 - C. Conclusion: 1. Comments on the significance of the above.
2. Recommendations.

There was some confusion expressed concerning the overlapping of the Preface and the Introduction but IT WAS MOVED, seconded and carried that this structure for the brief be accepted.

It was suggested that the Committee would probably require someone to tie the various parts of the brief together and draft it into a coherent whole, and it was suggested that anyone interested should submit his name to the Committee. There was also an appeal from a member of one of the sub-committees for greater direction from the whole Committee in the writing of the brief.

The purpose of the brief was outlined for the benefit of the guests. Alderman Rankin questioned whether this was in fact the best way to proceed, suggesting that it would be better for the Committee to draft a set of regulations setting out specifically what was wanted in community facilities. Some of the frustrations and experiences which led to the idea of this brief were outlined. The problem of regulations and the extent to which they are necessary was also rehearsed. One member expressed his hope that the brief would not operate from a suspicion of government but rather with a recognition of the vital role which such authority plays in the community. Where government takes over activities which individuals cannot perform for themselves, certain standards are necessary so people will be assured that certain minimums are met. However, it was important to build into any system some room for innovation to overcome the rigidity of regulations.

Alderman Rankin also questioned the value of citizen participation, which led to a discussion of the value of this exercise. Although the current move in this direction will probably produce chaos and severe growing pains, citizens must have the opportunity to learn by experience. However good existing regulations and agencies are, it was felt that there was a need for regular citizen input, otherwise community groups spring up to meet unfilled needs. It was asked if there was an assumption that citizens' views are always right and their acceptance should be mandatory, the suggested answer being that such participation is a very complicated issue and is not necessarily progressive.

The Committee then went on to look at the third section of the brief, that dealing with recommendations for citizen participation. It was stressed that citizen participation was not the same as community control -- the first implies an advisory role while the latter implies some kind of authority. The concept of community control has not yet been considered by the Committee and it was agreed that this discussion should be held over until the next meeting.

IT WAS MOVED, seconded and carried that the first three parts of the section of the draft brief on citizen participation be accepted as a position statement of the Committee but that the fourth part dealing with community control be further discussed.

IT WAS AGREED that the sub-committees would meet again before the next meeting and that hopefully a draft of the entire brief and a set of recommendations would be ready for discussion by the Committee at the next meeting.

The questionnaire prepared by the GVRD Planning Department on "Evaluation of GVRD Policy Objectives" was brought to the attention of the Committee and prompted several negative comments. IT WAS MOVED, seconded and carried that the department responsible for producing this questionnaire be advised that the Social Services Policy Committee does not consider this a valid document and that its results should be ignored.

A motion of thanks was made to Alderman Rankin for taking time from a busy schedule to participate in the Committee's deliberations.

IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, June 24th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver, and that the chairman would be Fred Jones.

ng
July 17, 1973



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 7th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, June 26th at 7.30 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Shelley Dillion acted as chairperson. The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as circulated.

Correspondence

It was explained that Alderman Harry Rankin was not able to attend a meeting of this Committee on June 27th but would probably be able to be present on Wednesday, July 11th and the Committee agreed to change its meeting date on that one occasion to accommodate him.

There has been no reply to date from Hon. Norman Levi to the Committee's letter of May 30th.

Members were reminded of the meeting on June 28th concerning the proposed integration of social services and it was suggested that some members might want to attend and report back to the Committee.

The Committee was informed of a press release on Premier Barrett's comments to the Canadian Medical Association criticizing professionals for lack of reform in social services. IT WAS AGREED that a letter would be sent to Premier Barrett expressing the Committee's pleasure over his statement and inviting him to attend a meeting of the Committee since his ideas would be useful to the Committee in its deliberations on this subject. IT WAS ALSO AGREED that this letter should be released to the press.

Merrilyn Payne reported on her attendance at the last meeting of the Government and Society Policy Committee where she had outlined the work of the Social Services Committee concerning licensing difficulties and complex bureaucratic structures as part of the Government and Society's examination of the decision-making process.

Finance Sub-committee

A letter from Dan Tobin to Mr. George Carlisle was read concerning his displeasure at receiving only \$250 from the GVRD, as discussed at the last meeting. Since he had not been present at the last meeting, it was decided that Stan Persky should contact him, explain the events of that meeting and determine if he wishes to remain a member of the Finance Sub-committee. Stan Persky will also contact Mr. Carlisle

to explain the circumstances under which Dan's letter had been written.

Membership Sub-committee

Members who had not been attending meetings were contacted to try to determine their reasons. There were two common reasons: the narrow range of the Committee's interests (i.e. primarily day care) and the feeling of a barrier between agency and non-agency members. It was suggested that when the brief on licensing problems had been prepared these members might find the Committee's deliberations of more interest. In any case, there should be provision for "corresponding members" who would receive minutes and interim reports and whose comments would be solicited before a final report was prepared.

Preparation of the Brief

An early draft of the major part of the report on structure has been prepared. In the discussion which took place, the inclusion of the following points was stressed:

- that information was difficult to obtain even by members of the GVRD staff and then only by going to the top.
- that the processes involved in obtaining information and licensing in other municipalities are compared and contrasted with Vancouver, noting that where provincial rather than city officials deal with the public, the service seems better.
- that by this brief we want to go from specific cases to draw general principles of social services as they presently exist and stress citizen participation.

It is hoped that draft reports of sub-committees 1 and 2 will be ready for mailing to members before the next meeting. The draft report of sub-committee 3 will be discussed at the next meeting. Members of the three sub-committees would meet between now and the next meeting to determine the make-up of the entire report. There must also be consideration of what will be done with the brief in terms of publicity and community support.

Following this discussion the Committee gave some thought to what it would discuss following completion of the brief and several suggestions emerged:

- The relationship of social services and a "livable community". If the fact that we need social services reflects a failure in the community, how can we create a community which prevents those problems from arising? Among specific questions to examine would be the effects of population growth.

- The quality of the people who provide social services -- hiring, training programmes.
- Select another topic to investigate in depth, eg. welfare, unemployment, mental health, senior citizens (particularly good since it encompasses a whole spectrum of problems).
- Study experiments, innovations in social services and look for positive programmes and models.

IT WAS AGREED that members would give some thought to this and come to a decision at the next meeting.

It was brought to the Committee's attention that the South Hill Day Care Centre had been ordered to close on June 30th and there was discussion on what if anything could be done by the Committee. It was decided that any financial support was impossible but IT WAS MOVED, seconded and agreed that a telegram should be sent to the Ministers of Health, Human Resources, and Education in Victoria urging that the facility be kept open. The telegram as **drafted** by the Committee and approved by the Centre's lawyer, reads as follows:

- Whereas this Committee is a Policy Committee of the GVRD concerned with social services
- Whereas it has had an opportunity to hear from the people concerned with the South Hill Day Care Centre
- Whereas it has learned with concern that the South Hill Day Care Centre is faced with a closure date of June 30
- Whereas it is our belief that this closure would create hardship for all concerned, including parents, children and staff, and loss of valuable community services
- Resolved that this Committee urge that a 90-day extension be granted on the interim license for the operation of this facility to permit a further exploration of this problem in order to preserve a valuable community facility.

IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Wednesday, July 11th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

/ng
June 28, 1973



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the 9th meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee, held on Tuesday, July 24th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD offices, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

Fred Jones acted as chairman. The Minutes of the last meeting were accepted as circulated.

Len Minsky gave a brief **report on the state** of the brief. Most of the material had been collected but there were several pieces still outstanding:

- Section 4A (see minutes of the 8th meeting of July 11th) -- the discursive description of the problem. IT WAS MOVED, seconded and agreed that the GVRD should be responsible for finding someone, at a salary to be worked out between them, to assist Committee members responsible for producing this portion of the brief.
- Section 4B -- **attempts to discover** and analyze the process:
 1. a written description of the charts which had been produced illustrating the bureaucratic structure.
 2. material regarding New Westminster -- Thekkie Cuff
 3. material regarding Coquitlam -- Mary Brown

IT WAS FURTHER AGREED that Len Minsky would undertake to prepare a rough draft of the brief to be discussed by the Committee at its first meeting in September. His job would be strictly co-ordinating and editing the material produced and it would be up to the Committee themselves to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the facts presented. The question of community control would be left for discussion until the brief had been written. The recommendations would also be left until that time.

There was considerable discussion over the structure of the brief, in particular the parts which should form the Preface and the Introduction. No clear decision was reached. IT WAS AGREED that the Memo of Transmission should be written after the brief had been prepared and should be directed to those persons receiving the brief -- perhaps initially to corresponding members of the Committee or members of the general public as a means of getting feedback.

The Committee then considered briefly what they would address themselves to **after** completion of the brief. It was pointed out that with a deadline of the end of October, there would be little time for detailed discussion beyond the approval of the brief. It was suggested, however, that the Committee might like to make a list of other facets of social services which they would like to consider if time were available. One major issue suggested was the question of the provincial government's policy toward decentralizing social services without increasing client control. IT WAS AGREED that this list of potential topics of discussion should be considered at the Committee's next meeting.

IT WAS AGREED that the next meeting of the Social Services Policy Committee would be held on Tuesday, July 11th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver.

IT WAS ALSO AGREED that there would be no further meetings during August. The next meeting would therefore be held on Tuesday, September 11th at 7.45 p.m. in the GVRD, 2215 W. 10th Avenue, Vancouver, at which time the Committee would return to a discussion of the brief and in particular the question of client control.

/ng
July 25, 1973