

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 12, 1978

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Strikes in Saskatchewan

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. It is apparent from a reading of the newspaper and listening to the radio, that there is some possibility of strikes coming to Saskatchewan this summer, in the construction industry, the hospitals, workers for the city of Regina, workers for the city of Saskatoon. My question to the minister, my first question to the minister is, what initiatives if any, has the government taken at this particular time in connection with the parties involved, to see if there is any way they can alleviate the possibility of a strike occurring in the near future?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — I think I can tell the hon. member for Lakeview that every effort is being made to act as a catalyst between the parties involved in each and every case. I suppose the most immediate one is the construction industry which is threatened with some problems in the almost immediate future. We have been successful at this point in time, with the involvement of our Industrial Relations people, in affecting an agreement with all except I believe, about four of the thirteen trades which are involved in construction bargaining and this leaves outstanding, if my recollection serves me properly, the labourers, the bricklayers (of which the tile setters are part of that particular bargaining unit), the operating engineers, general (not including the structural or crane operators or cat operators) and the insulators. So in large measure the bulk of the construction trades have already consummated an agreement which has yet to be ratified, leaving about four trades that are still outside. Right at this point in time the laborers appear to be the key to a possible settlement. As late as this morning I had some discussion with the director of industrial relations who tells me that he is still working with both of the parties separately in an attempt to perhaps bring them together fairly immediately in order to avert what could considerably cripple the construction industry if a walkout were to take place.

With respect to the other collective agreements, I think it is a shade early to become hysterical at this stage. We are making every effort in the meantime to effect an agreement and doing everything possible to avoid any possible shutdown in the other areas that you draw attention to.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody is becoming hysterical at this point in time. What we are trying to do is avoid hysteria occurring later on. Would the minister not agree with me, that I am sure it is the aim of this government and all members of the Assembly to avoid strikes wherever and whenever possible? You were successful in finally concluding a successful conclusion, if I can put it that way, to the milk producers strike by bringing them into this building, putting them in a room and making sure negotiations were completed. To avoid that particular situation occurring again, would the minister not agree with me that now would be the point in time for the government to issue quite a strong statement to the effect that these labor disputes should not be allowed to continue to the situation

where there is a strike or lockout. This government should now be stating its intention that if something happens that will result in a strike or a lockout, that this government will be doing its utmost, including legislation to avoid the possibility of strikes occurring.

MR. SNYDER: — Well, once again, the member has indicated his willingness to use the big club before the necessity arises. I think, once again, this portrays the approach of the Liberal Party to the whole process of collective bargaining. I want to remind the member again that in this province we conclude something like 300 collective agreements in any 12 month period. There are only a few occasions when these relationships are strained to the point where it involves a strike or a lockout. Obviously in the system of free collective bargaining which, I think, has served us very well, we find ourselves on the odd occasion when these things do occur. But if the approach that the member opposite is suggesting were used, I can forecast that he would be accelerating difficulties and would be amplifying upon the problems that currently exist. I don't believe by threatening legislation at that time that this represents an approach by the use of the big club to whip the parties into place and impose settlements upon them, represents any kind of an approach to civilized collective bargaining. I don't think I can state that more clearly. I think the member opposite is wrong when he says that we should be preparing legislation or doing those things vis-a-vis old Bill 2 in order to create the kind of atmosphere which he says that would produce. I just happen to disagree with him, that it would not produce a set of circumstances that would make the relationships between management and labor more compatible.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will take a new question.

Provincial Government Borrowings in Foreign Markets

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Premier. The Premier undoubtedly is aware that the Prime Minister of Canada announced that there will be no federal election this summer. He is afraid to go to the people because of the polls.

Mr. Speaker, as the Premier is no doubt aware, this indecision will cast doubt in the minds of the people of Canada and will also cast doubt in the minds of investors. The Premier is also aware that the government of Canada has recently second mortgaged the Canadian people with reference to a billion and a half dollars borrowed to prop up the Canadian dollar.

My question is this. In the light of that propping up and that massive borrowing by the federal government to prop up the Canadian dollar, has the Premier or his government been contacted by the federal government to restrict provincial government borrowing in foreign markets?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, Mr. Speaker. I would find that rather remarkable if they did because obviously they wish people to borrow in foreign markets. In this way the value of the Canadian dollar will rise. They have not contacted us. May I say in comment that it may well be that the First Minister in Canada is afraid to go to the people because of the polls but the First Minister of this province would welcome going to the polls because of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, in the light of the Premier's answer, is the Premier therefore, today, announcing the long-awaited provincial election either in June of this year or in the fall of this year? A further supplementary which we would welcome as well, Mr. Speaker, on that question is, since the massive second mortgaging of the future of Canada by the Prime Minister of Canada, what steps are the government of Saskatchewan taking, since the dollar is presently being artificially maintained by those massive borrowings by the Prime Minister of Canada? What steps are the government of Saskatchewan taking to protect the interests of the people of Saskatchewan with reference to the borrowings that have already taken place by the government of Saskatchewan in the United States with reference to the interest payments that have to be made in US dollars?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we will be continuing our policy of seeking funds which, in effect, average one's exchange losses or exchange profits, as the case may be. One makes them both ways. We borrowed some \$125 million in the United States a week or so ago. The exchange rate then was around 87 cents; presumably it is now 89 cents and we have made ourselves some money. I do not think we should spend that money. I think that there will be fluctuations up and down. These are more or less covered up by the sinking fund policy which provides that each year we put into a sinking fund certain bonds or other securities which are payable in the same currency in which we borrowed them and which bear interest payable in the same currency in which we borrowed them. It has the effect of meaning that if one borrows over a 20 or 30 year period, and most of our borrowings now are 30 years, one gains or loses on the exchange rate, depending on the fluctuation over 30 years. By and large, that has proved to be adequate protection in the past. By and large, because of the lower interest rates in the United States we have made money by borrowing in the United States. No one can assert that that is certain for the future but there is no reason to believe that the circumstances will be significantly different in the future than they have been in the past.

MR. COLLVER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I am sure the Premier is aware of the questioning of the Minister of Finance, pertaining to a policy of hedging the Canadian dollar in order that the massive borrowing that has taken place by your government in the United States be maintained. The Minister of Finance refused to do this and refused to establish this kind of policy so that the people of Saskatchewan can be protected from these fluctuations. The Premier suggested that the increase of two points and so on has made money.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is quite simply this, since the federal government has massively borrowed to artificially maintain the value and increase the value of the Canadian dollar and because of the indecision and doubt in the minds of investors and most particularly, foreign investors, created by his indecision to go to the people of Canada which will cause continued doubt and could cause a run on the Canadian dollar again, what steps is the Premier of Saskatchewan taking today to not mortgage the future of the people of Saskatchewan in the same way that the Prime Minister of Canada has mortgaged the future of the people of Canada?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we have taken steps over many years, the government of Saskatchewan, to see that our future was not mortgaged. That is why we have a lower per capita debt than any province in Canada except Prince Edward Island and that is why we have more assets to show for our gross debt in the ownership of a power utility, a telephone utility and a natural gas utility and some other interests in minerals, which have been the subject of adverse comment but which will not be so when they yield

significant dividends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Essentially, therefore, we are continuing the policy which in the past has led this province to have a very sound and very conservative, small ‘c’, fiscal policy. We certainly would not want to pretend to have a conservative, large ‘C’, fiscal policy like they have proceeded with in, let us say, Ontario. So, accordingly, I think there is no danger of us mortgaging our future any more than we have done so in the past. I look forward to a bright future unmortgaged, as it would have been, had we had governments of the stripe of the one in Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct a supplementary question of the member for Nipawin to the Premier. It would appear that the major disappointment in the Dominion of Canada because of no election is the member for Nipawin because now the entire strategy of the session to move from there to here is cancelled out until next spring. I wonder now if the Premier might indicate whether or not we can proceed with the business of the House so the farmers in the House and the rest of Saskatchewan can get on and we can get the House over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Poplar River Plant

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. We understand this morning the workers at the Poplar River Plant are reported to be thinking of walking off the job because they have to drive to work on gravelled municipal roads. Does the minister believe this is a reasonable excuse for allowing the project to be shut down in light of the fact that most rural people have to drive on dirt or gravelled roads to get to and from their farms and their work?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Well, I’m at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the hon. member’s question since it is a kind of a nip question and, therefore, I would have no response to make.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If there is any decision in the area made as far as the changing of the surface of the roads in the Hart Butte municipality, will the minister guarantee that such a decision will be made by the rural municipal council?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member’s question about decisions of roads, the kind of surface on the roads being made by the rural municipal council, that’s in fact the case and always has been the case with municipal roads. Even though there are cost-sharing programs by the provincial government with main farm access roads, super grid roads and, in the past, grid roads, the decisions to construct have always been made by the municipal councils themselves and that will continue to be so.

Sask Housing — Star West

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Housing Corporation. (Inaudible interjection.) Are you finished? May I proceed? Thank you. Mr. Minister, some time ago a matter was brought up in this Assembly referring to Star West, which I am sure you are aware of. The matter was further brought up in Crown corporations, in which case you tabled some documents and I tabled some documents. Mr. Minister, it was about some two weeks ago that you did indicate in Crown corporations, that you would assess the documents that I had presented to you and make a statement to the Assembly, since I said they did tend to completely support the suggestions that have been made on behalf of Star West. Mr. Minister, in light of your comment in this Assembly in the question period on April 20, on page 17 and 18. where the minister replied to me saying, 'I think the very people who are talking to him are trying to mislead him.' In light of that comment, Mr. Minister, I think perhaps it's fair to ask you, are you prepared to make a comment on the Star West matter in the Assembly today or when can we expect it?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Chairman, some of these questions have been asked in Crown corporations, are we prepared to deal with them? I understand the Housing Corporation is coming up in Crown corporations on Tuesday, at which time I will be glad to deal with them.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, in light of the letter from the architect, which was tabled by yourself in the last session of Crown corporations, I think it was Forest, Scott, Bowers, Walls etc. In the light of the letter in which these architects pretty coyly admitted that they had made a blooper that had cost the taxpayers of this province a minimum of \$17,000 as well as a very drastically lowered quality of workmanship and I believe the letter you tabled conclusively indicates this. Might I ask the minister, what are the future relations with this architectural firm on the part of your government when a blooper like this is made? Do you ask them, or is it your intention to take these funds that they have blown for one reason or another, from their architectural fees? Will they be asked to do future work for the government in the light of this? As far as the Housing Corporation, what are your future plans as far as a working relationship with this firm, is concerned?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a hypothetical question. The architects are hired, not only by us but also by Central Housing and Mortgage, Air Corporation, subject to their design and subject to other qualifications that they may have. Certainly, we are not striking them off as the hon. member suggests that be done, but certainly their work will be carefully assessed equally with other architects as to the quality of their work and pricing, etc.

MR. THATCHER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, then can I interpret your comments to mean that in the next session of Crown corporations, we can expect a complete statement of policy and a full response to all the matters that remain that have been raised as far as Star West and the entire Sask Housing Corporation, when Crown corporations meet on Tuesday?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, certainly in the case of Crown corporations, we will be glad to deal with any matters under review for 1977 under the Housing Corporation.

Control of Prison Violence

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. Last week, due to some recent inmate assaults, Judge Bence of the Provincial

May 12, 1978

Magistrates' Court, called for less prison violence and said that in effect, a man is not as safe there as he is on the street.

When is your department going to get control of the situation in corrections and put some discipline into the institutions?

HON. H.H. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, there is a very simple answer. We are in control of the corrections system in this province.

MISS CLIFFORD: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not agree that this jungle atmosphere that Judge Bence describes is not conducive in any way to any kind of rehabilitation, and are you not foisting the hope on the public of Saskatchewan that they do have some security when these people do come back into society?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I think one has to have an overall view of the situation as it exists in Canada and I think if you compare the Saskatchewan situation to any other province — in British Columbia or Ontario or Quebec or anywhere in Canada, you will find that we compare favorably to any of the other situations. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that we have in Canada, and I think the evidence is there in the Maloney Report, is that many of our jails are simply outdated and they need to be rebuilt.

We, I think, in the two new correctional centres that we will be building, will be able to do the kinds of things that the member is asking us to do. There is no change in the particular direction. The direction of the correctional systems, I think, was established when the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley was the minister.

Mr. Speaker, in Estimates this morning — if the member for Indian Head-Wolseley wants me to remind him of the situation in 1969 when he was the minister, I can do so.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we still believe that the two-fold purpose of the correctional systems is to protect society and to rehabilitate the individual. The first objective is to protect society when the individual is in the institution and when the individual is released from the institution. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you need a program in the institutions and I think we are working along that particular avenue.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: -(Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Minister, first of all I want to tell you the situation is not the same as it was in 1969 or 1970. One of the major causes of discontent and disruption in the correctional centres in the province of Saskatchewan is because of the rising inmate population of native background and until the province of Saskatchewan recognizes this problem and is willing to address itself to the problem, you are going to have a continual disruption in the correctional services in Saskatchewan.

Can the minister tell me whether or not the correctional services of the Department of Social Services is addressing itself to the increasing problem of native inmates and the discontent between the natives and the whites in the correctional centres in the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. ROLFES: — In a recent meeting, Brigadier MacCorquodale of the Salvation Army addressed a group here in Regina and indicated to the people there that you in Saskatchewan, can be proud of being the leaders, and being the leaders, he said, also in corrections. And he said many of the other provinces are stealing our ideas and then taking credit for it. He referred,

Mr. Speaker, to our Fine Option Program; he referred, Mr. Speaker, to the CTR (Community Training Residence) program; he referred, Mr. Speaker, particularly, because he visited the camp, the White Gull Camp, and he said to the people there that we could be proud in Saskatchewan of the leadership that we had taken. I don't say that we don't have problems but don't put your heads in the sand by saying that Saskatchewan is the only one that has problems because our province, when our problems are compared to the problems in the correction systems in the other provinces stands well in the front. We, Mr. Speaker, I think are facing the problem squarely and I can assure the people here and the people of Saskatchewan that the situation is well in hand.

Juvenile Delinquents Act

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A question to the Minister of Social Services. You have indicated in your responses that protection of the public is the main goal. Now, my question is about a tragedy in Saskatoon where a juvenile was found guilty of murdering a store clerk and under our Juvenile Delinquents Act that juvenile will be released at 16. Now I realize that that is a very, very difficult problem. But would the Minister of Social Services be prepared to undertake liaison with the federal government to modify our Juvenile Delinquents Act so that on very, very serious crimes we reinforce and reinstate protection of the public as it applies to juveniles. We go right now to the side of the juvenile being released at 16 and forget at age 16 the protection of the public. I think that there is a serious glaring weakness in our system and I would like to know the minister's thoughts on that.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I think the member makes a good point and I think, if you check the records, Saskatchewan has continually taken the stand in our negotiations with the federal government that the age should be raised. In the new act that will be presented to Parliament by the solicitor general our stand has been that the age should be raised, not lowered. We are experiencing some difficulties in this because not everybody in Canada agrees on that concept but we have made our case and I agree with the member that he is making a good point and we will certainly take that into consideration in future negotiations.

Harassment by Juvenile

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I will address my question to the Attorney General in the light of the minister's response to the question from the member for Qu'Appelle. As the Attorney General is quite aware there has been reported to him and to me a case of a juvenile who is harassing a particular town in the province of Saskatchewan. This particular juvenile has been shunted from the Attorney General's department and from the RCMP over to the Department of Social Services. Both the Attorney General and I have attempted to try to get something done about this particular juvenile. I would like to ask the Attorney General whether or not he has turned this matter over to the Department of Social Services and whether the Department of Social Services has taken action within the last couple of weeks to ensure the safety and protection of this particular town in the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the question of dealing with juveniles in conflict with the law is a very difficult question generally. I think everybody acknowledges that. There is no simple answer short of putting juveniles who are in conflict with the law strictly behind bars. If the aim of society is that, with these young people particularly, there is some hope for rehabilitation and redevelopment, obviously

putting them behind bars, which is the only safe protection, is not an alternative. Now that's the situation that we are in with respect to the particular case that you refer to. The Department of the Attorney General officials together with the RCM Police, I think it is primarily the RCM Police in the area involved, are dealing with the local social services people. I don't think it is at the ministerial level. I am aware of it but not at the ministerial level. It is the RCMP locally dealing with the social services people locally with a view to putting some forms of control and some guidance and some general supervision over the particular incident involved.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the Attorney General has been cautious, so have I been cautious not to mention the town and not to mention the name of the juvenile for the protection of all. But the fact of the matter is, I asked a specific question about a specific case. The point is, has the Attorney General taken action, because the RCMP can take no action in this instance and because the town is being harassed and continued reports of this harassment have arrived on my desk and the Attorney General's desk I know, as late as three days ago, has the Attorney General taken steps to place this particular case before the Department of Social Services for immediate action to protect the people of that town?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I tried to indicate that in the first part of the question, the first question. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I don't have my file here with me, subject to a check of that, my information is, as of several days ago, perhaps even as much as two weeks ago, that indeed the matter was in the hands of the Department of Social Services with the view to protecting the town and giving some guidance and supervision and control over this particular juvenile. The member indicates from his chair that there is no action. I don't know one way or the other whether there is or not, perhaps he is closer to the situation than I am. My information is that that is in fact the position as of today. The law, the way it is structured, does not afford very much other option for either an Attorney General or for a Minister of Social Services.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mackenzie Basin

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Len Marchand, the federal Environment Minister has announced that the assessment of the environmental impact of the developments in the Mackenzie River Basin will be aided by a three-year water resource study. I rise to inform the members of the House that Saskatchewan will participate in this three-year study of the water and related resources in the Mackenzie River Basin. This study links Saskatchewan with the governments of Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon and Northwest Territories and three federal departments, Environment, Indian and Northern Affairs and Transport. The purpose of this study, which will cost \$1.6 million, is to assess the ability of natural systems in the Mackenzie to survive various forms of development. About 20 per cent of Saskatchewan, everything north of the Churchill River Basin and west of Wollaston Lake drains into the Mackenzie system, so the Mackenzie Basin Studies will provide much important data for this province which has a vast potential in the North.

One of the important components of this investigation will be a study of the Athabasca Sand Dunes on the south shore of Lake Athabasca. This part of the study is designed to provide base line data on the ground water hydrology, on the terrestrial ecology, surface geology, the natural and mineral resources and the cultural and economic use

of the area.

Mr. Speaker, the Athabasca Sand Dunes are the largest areas of this kind of environment in their latitude in the world. The active and stabilized dunes, which cover about 600 square miles, contain many species of plants found nowhere else in the world. The Athabasca Sand Dunes are, therefore, unique. The study, which will be organized jointly by the Saskatchewan Environment and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, will try to determine for example whether developments in the area would drastically change the water table and stream flow, and if so, whether the sand dunes would quickly erode and become a desert. At the present time, no development is permitted in the Athabasca sand dunes area and the Saskatchewan government is concerned about this unique fragile area and hopes through this study, to determine whether it can withstand various kinds of development or whether the Athabasca sand dunes should be protected and left as nature made them.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond by saying I am pleased to hear that the province of Saskatchewan is prepared to participate in this overall study of the Mackenzie system. We learned a good lesson I think. At least it has come to our attention in the past two or three years that, had we done studies of this kind of the North and South Saskatchewan river system before we allowed urban and other development to go on along the banks of these river systems, we wouldn't have the serious mercury contamination problem in the North and South Saskatchewan that we do today. I welcome the government's involvement in this study. I would like to ask the minister if he won't caution his environmental officials to keep in mind at all times, the potential contamination dangers from the development of uranium, notwithstanding what Bayda says when he comes in, because I think the government there has already made up its mind and on balance, I think we will need serious, serious environmental studies done by your government to try and prevent any potential problems that might come about, with your narrow minded approach to the development of uranium in Saskatchewan.

POINTS OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Orders of the Day. Point of Order.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to outline to Mr. Speaker, the fact that the last time there was a ministerial statement, the minister ruled specifically, that the Liberals should come up first. Today, the member for Kindersley rose to his feet very quickly and Mr. Speaker recognized him immediately. Accordingly, our spokesman, having noticed this, let him go ahead. It was our turn today to be second on ministerial statements. Mr. Speaker, I suggest again that you allow the Progressive Conservative Party to speak on ministerial statements and since it is obviously so confusing in this Legislature, as to whose turn it is to be first and whose turn it is to be second, I wonder if it would be possible for Mr. Speaker to say today on ministerial statements, because they don't occur everyday. Today on ministerial statements it is the Liberal Party's turn to be first and today on ministerial statements it is the PC party's turn to be first. But today, in watching this, Mr. Speaker, it was . . . (noise and inaudible interjections). Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Assembly to allow the Progressive Conservatives to have their say in this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order, order! There seems to be confusion in this Chamber but it seems to be isolated in a certain area of this Chamber and I want to try to

clear up that confusion, once and for all. Today when the minister for the Department of the Environment rose and made a statement, I sat in my chair and watched the Conservative caucus for sometime and the member for Kindersley was on his feet and I continued to watch the Conservative caucus and no one rose so obviously, the Conservative caucus had passed up its opportunity to comment on the ministerial statement. (Inaudible interjections) I then, as I have done in the past, recognized the member from the other caucus who was to be second today. Now, if there is any doubt about who is to be first and second, then the members from both caucuses should be on their feet immediately the minister ceases his statement and I will pick the right one. Otherwise they will have to trust my judgment. Now, my record shows that on May 5, the Minister of Social Services made a statement in the House on home care. The member for Qu'Appelle apparently wanted to rise and neglected to rise. I gave the Conservative caucus plenty of opportunity to rise at that time. He did not rise, therefore I allowed the member from the Liberal caucus to proceed. Yesterday, on May 11, the Minister of Health rose and made a statement in this House about level IV beds. The Liberal caucus was first; the member for Indian Head-Wolseley rose and made a statement; he was followed by the member for Souris-Cannington who rose and made his statement. Today on ministerial statements the obvious one to respond first was a member from the Conservative caucus. As I stated, I gave the members of the Conservative caucus ample opportunity to rise to their feet today and they neglected that opportunity. That is not my problem; that is not my confusion, therefore, the member's point of order is not well taken.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling on the previous one but I wonder, in light of the fact that yesterday you allowed both the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and myself to respond to the Minister of Health, if this is not a little inconsistent with today's ruling that both critics cannot respond to the Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I do not intend to take up the time of the House repeating the logic that I have just presented to the House and I think it was logic. I invite the member for Souris-Cannington, next time the Debates and Proceedings comes on his table, read what I said today carefully, in light of what happens, and I think he will see the logic of what I said.

The reason for this is that members from one caucus are not allowed to get behind members of another caucus and make a statement afterwards. I am not suggesting at any time that they have a devious thought in their minds, that they might get behind the members of the other caucus and make a statement. But while these two caucuses in this House maintain at the same level, I am going to follow the pattern that I have been following which I think is as fair as can possibly be practised in this Chamber.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES — VOTE 36

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Chairman, I will introduce only a few people at this time and if the others are needed I will introduce them at that particular time. I know I will not need them. The opposition is going to be very tired today. Immediately to my right is the Deputy Minister, Frank Bogdasavich. To the right of him is Richard Fontanie, Assistant Deputy Minister, and to the left of me is Don Cameron, also Assistant Deputy Minister. Behind me is Walter Charabin, Director of Administration and directly behind me is Terry Thompson, Director of Corrections.

ITEM 1

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Chairman, I want to first make a few brief comments about the Department of Social Services. I am going to dwell mainly, to begin with, on the area of corrections, not because it is the only area that I am concerned about in the department but because it is an area of prime concern to the people of Saskatchewan, and I think it is one that most people are interested in and want to find a solution for.

Much has been said about law and order in the province of Saskatchewan and in Canada and when you are looking at either one of them you have to interrelate the problems.

We have to look first; I think, at what a prisoner correctional system is expected to do. Most people, I think, expect prisons to give appropriate punishment and suffering to those who have violated society's rules. Prison must also, they believe, serve two types of deterrent: (1) to threaten and deter potential criminals from further crime, to dissuade them from doing that and (2) to make sure that those who have once suffered its pains refrain from other criminality.

Society also asks that penitentiaries ensure that those convicted, when they come out, will be better people in society. The prison experience is expected to inspire self-improvement and, when they leave, the prisoners will be able to take their places in society as law-abiding citizens. Now whether or not this is realistic, I rather doubt because we have to live with what we have in the correctional institutes.

The government has done some things in this area which I would like to admit, and one of the biggest promotions is that of the Judge Moore Inquiry which I would like to commend the government for. I feel that the report was basically a good one and that it has offered some alternatives.

I would briefly like to comment on a number of the recommendations and our opinion towards that and our suggestions and possible solutions. The report mentioned complaints, that the inmates had too much idle time and attributed this to overcrowding and lack of meaningful work programs. They mentioned the White Gull Camp. As well, they would like some other community organizations to take on this type of work program.

I have previously indicated my support for community programs as well as such things as wilderness camps. I was interested in the proposal, as I mentioned previously in one of the speeches to the Legislature about the American Bar Association that indicated how they set up work programs. As well, other places like Japan and Sweden have set them up as well.

Now in my questioning, I would like the minister and his department to comment on what programs they see ensuing in the next number of months, if they do at all; how they feel that this type of meaningful work can be instilled in the penitentiary so that we can get some productive work and meaningful work in the prisons going.

You can't expect a prisoner to sit around in the correctional centre doing meaningless tasks and idle work and then come back out in society and have the pressures of society put upon him to do something meaningful. I dwell upon this because I think this is one of the positive alternatives that we can do to make this a better rehabilitative system and I even stress the use of the word 'rehabilitation' because it is sort of an area that possibly

May 12, 1978

is an idealistic situation, but we have to make the best of what we have to work with.

I also realize that in the corrections proposal you have stated previously that you are doing some of this in the camps you are going to be setting up in the North and that is one of the things, but I would like to know what other future programs you have planned.

As well, in the reports, they mentioned that there are problems with the large number of native inmates. The idea to have staff training encompass Indian history, values and traditions will likely be beneficial and I would wholeheartedly support that. I would like to know as well, if the minister has looked at the situation in Alberta where the Peigan Society is attacking such problems. With the support and advice given by the Native Counselling Services of Alberta, Peigan is trying a new approach to incarceration and rehabilitation for the native person who ends up in jail. The program centres around a work program in which the prisoner is given an opportunity to work and acquire job related skills so that when they do get out they will have something meaningful to do.

The success in the Peigan program in Alberta is very good and they are considering expanding it so that on the job site they will also have a trailer in which they counsel as well as give alcoholism programming. They employ a life skills program for men and their families and as well, counselling.

Now, one of the things that I think should be stressed in the correctional centre is an additional program for alcoholism counselling. A total as high as 70 per cent of the offences in Saskatchewan are on alcohol-related offences and it is even more so when we include the native population. I believe a more extensive and intensive alcoholism program should be set up in all of the institutions and should include one-on-one counselling. Now I realize that the number of staff has to be increased but you have got to realize in society today, and I'm sure you do, that this is one of the main concerns of the public of Saskatchewan.

Let us look for a moment at staff training. Again, I preface my comments by saying that there are many jobs that each one of us are not suited for and I give the example that perhaps I would not be suited to be a primary teacher or a nurse. In the same way I think, many people are not suited to work in corrections.

I would like to first of all, commend those who work within the penal system. At the same time I feel that, due to no fault of their own, in many cases their training is inadequate. I commend all those concerned, to the report that Parliament made on the sub committee on penitentiary systems in Canada. I would like to get the minister to respond as to whether or not he has looked at the recommendations on staff training that the subcommittee recommended for the penitentiary system in Canada. Besides, I would like to review a couple of those recommendations and one of the main ones that they mentioned, besides having a minimum education standard, was that the selections committee must carefully consider the psychological attributes of prospective recruits, to ensure their aptitude, maturity, stability and self-discipline for penitentiary work. That, I think, as in any job, you have to not only be qualified for it with education but you have to be mentally ready to take on the job. I think such suggestions that they have made, recommendations in the penitentiary system, would be well for us to look at when we are looking at our new training programs. Now I understand it will take many years to revamp the system but I think, it is essential that we tackle this problem and get on with it now.

During the course of the inquiry, suggestions were made that the Corrections Division of this province has lost sight of the custodial and security nature of our provincial institutions. The terms of reference did not go into detail of many of them because it only looked at the provincial system, but as you have stated you did have a corrections proposal for Saskatchewan a couple of years ago. I have previously stated in the House as well that I didn't find too much to argue with about the corrections proposal.

Other than that, I was concerned about the probation system. I have mentioned, on a number of occasions, that the probation system is not working because the load is too heavy, that there is lack of structure, that it is cumbersome and, in effect, it hasn't got any effect. That is due to the size of the caseload and not being able to report back to the courts for pre-sentence reports. As far as I can see very little has been done in that matter. I realize it is going to take additional spending and hiring of staff but, as I say, this should be one of your top priorities. I think, as well, we should put more teeth in the probation order so that we are not just saying that when the person on probation comes out, we are not really checking up on him and he usually ends back in the parole system.

The jail situation basically is the end result of a failure to adjust to society. Our focus should not be primarily on the problems of or in the institution but development of programs for initial sentences so that they don't return to the jail situation. As I have said previously, I fully support the Wilderness Challenge program as an alternative to incarceration. I feel that such programs as Outward Bound in the States and the province's Wilderness Challenge are beneficial and should be promoted. I am also going to ask you what you are doing about seeing that such programs are being reinstated and where you are going to put the money on the line or put your money where your mouth is, or so to speak, if you do believe in this type of program.

I have mentioned previously that there is a void in the area of juvenile corrections and services — juvenile offenders between the ages of 16 and 18. A problem was brought up today by the member for Nipawin that there is no other alternative but a jail situation when you are a juvenile. I believe that we should make an effort to offer services to continue assistance to emotionally disturbed juveniles and provide alternatives to the jail situation. I proposed to the government previously that a new division be created to keep all the juvenile offences in one area and to look after all these areas so that we have some coherence.

Mr. Chairman, the last area I will mention today is the use of community services and volunteers. I know that the John Howard Society and a number of others are contributing much of their time to volunteering and assisting in the corrections area. I noticed last night in the news as well, that they are having some financial problems in that they do not have enough support, whether it be government or public and they are having to cut back on some of their services. I think it would be well to try to support such volunteer organizations. As the offender has to come back into the community, it would be well to support community organizations that will try to help them in their effort to adjust to society when they are let out of the system; they in that way will get more community empathy to the problems that they must face.

We must always keep in mind, especially in minimum security institutions, that our objective is first to protect society while the offender is in our chair, but, second to realize that these offenders must come out in society at some point in time and we must not be closed-minded to any program that may enable these one time offenders to understand what they have to cope with in society to become law abiding citizens.

May 12, 1978

Mr. Chairman, the attitudes of the public still tend to fluctuate from one extreme to another in regard to punishment and the treatment of the offender. There is a growing recognition in the community of its responsibility to the offender on his return.

The citizens' greatly increased interest in law enforcement and the correctional process is significant, since it is back in the community, that the ex-inmate will either return once more to crime or find himself a new role in society.

Governments and Crown corporations should show greater sensitivity to this problem than they do now by paying more attention to the possibilities of employing ex-inmates, who are probably qualified and suited for positions open to competition and appointment.

We have a big challenge ahead of us, but by communicating with all groups associated and concerning ourselves with the problem, we have a better chance of succeeding than by confronting all the groups.

What has our record been to date, Mr. Chairman? I think without too much bias I can say that we have suggested some positive alternatives that possibly will work and we are willing to work toward that end.

What have the possibilities and the contributions been of the members to my left? They continue to tear down the whole system. Granted, there are many areas that need immediate attention, but you don't throw away the baby with the bath water.

Unfortunately, this has been their method of attack all along — sensationalism and publicity at the expense of people. They are perpetuating their long-standing policy of instilling fear and hate and playing on people's emotions and fears for their selfish political gain. This has been shown on numerous occasions — and the member may laugh, but I challenge him to state any time in which they have put the people in these programs ahead of their political gain. I notice that they are a little sensitive to that matter.

But the government is not off the hook in this crucial issue, either. You have been slow to react; you haven't considered probation as a top priority. It is still understaffed, as I mentioned, has lack of structure and is ineffective and it would do well for you to look at Canada's parole system and take some advice from them. I mentioned this years and years ago, but still very little has been done.

When you have an area of rehabilitation that has some hope of working, that of recreation, you let the PCs bully you and you run with your tail between your legs. You are too worried about your electoral skin. It is time that you stand up for programs that are working and not be paranoid about whether or not you are going to get elected and wonder whether you are coming or going.

There are many studies proving that the physiological and the psycho-social implications of physical activity are important to the well-being of individuals. Each person must find a way to relieve his pent-up energy without creating conflicts with his fellowman. Such an approach not only fosters a better state of mind but also earns respect, goodwill and adds to the self worth of each individual. It is a positive outlet for frustration, hostility and anxiety.

For anyone to condemn a well-studied therapeutic program just for the sake of publicity is irresponsible and not to defend it is at the outset equally absurd.

As elected representatives it is our responsibility to work together to tackle this problem that is a major area of concern in Saskatchewan and offer constructive alternatives. The Liberal caucus is ready to do our part in achieving this goal.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, say that I am somewhat taken aback by the presentation made by the member for Wilkie because I think it was a very good presentation. There is very little in what she says that I could disagree with. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you for the position that you have taken this morning, I think a very realistic one.

You could have taken the position, I suppose, in being aware of what the political atmosphere is out there and the swing towards the right could have, I suppose, taken advantage of that position in condemning what I think is probably a similar attitude to dealing with prisoners as you and I may have. If you go back to my first speech in the House in 1971, coming out of the high school situation, I emphasized in my speech at that time in the House that more must be done on prevention. That we are simply not successful in dealing with young people once they reach the age of 14, 15 or 16, our success rate is very low and the dollars involved, the financial implications, are very significant. I said that at that time and I believe it even today.

The member said, and I repeated that in question period this morning, again I firmly believe that the two main objectives of a correctional system or on a penitentiary system must be first of all the protection of society. Now when you say that you want to protect society, what do you mean by that? I know what I mean by it. I mean that you must protect society while the inmate is in prison and also when the inmate is released. Now, how do you do that? Well you can certainly protect society while he is incarcerated by making absolutely certain that there is no escape, that there is absolutely no opportunity at all for an inmate to harass staff and I suppose you could take all those precautions but that doesn't meet the objective that you indicated and that I have indicated that you must protect society after the individual is released.

Now, if you also want to protect society after the inmate is released, then you must expect and I noticed you were somewhat hesitant using the word rehabilitation. I'm not, I'm not hesitant in using that because it means exactly what you said — self improvement. That's what it means. There is no one but the individual himself or herself who can decide whether he or she will improve. You can make conditions such that it would be easier for them to improve but the inmate himself must determine that he or she wants to improve. And then you have to do the counselling, that is necessary and you have to make conditions such that the desired result can take place.

One of the problems that we had in the correctional system is that the term of the individual, the length of stay, is relatively short. Intensive personal counselling, those of us who have had any experience with it, know that you cannot accomplish very much, generally speaking, in any two or three or four or five months' time. This may well take two, three, four or five years to get any significant change in the individual. You know, it doesn't make any difference which professional person or expert you quote from, they will tell you that once a person gets to that particular stage it is very difficult.

I would again ask every individual to acquaint themselves with the McGuigan Report. I have read the McGuigan Report and I just want to refer you to section 78. It's 'The

Public's Role' and it states the public's role and we will go on to the corrections role:

Therefore it is apparent that the community is safer if the person who shares their freedom is not more dangerous when he rejoins them in life on the outside. Prisons as they now exist protect society only during the two, three, ten or twenty years the inmate is in there. If the institutions are boring, oppressive and lack programs preparing the inmate for release they come out angry, vindictive, frustrated, snarling like animals released upon long confinement in a cage. Many are released on the streets directly from maximum security institutions, unadjusted, unprepared with fear, tension and paranoia that spell danger to the community.

And one could go on. What I am simply saying is that what has happened in the penitentiary system and many people say that you can't apply this to the correctional systems, I say you can. It is to a lesser degree because we don't have as many hard core criminals as they have in the penitentiary system but let us not kid ourselves there are some hard core criminals in our correctional system. We must either accept those two objectives that I have said and then provide the conditions so that we can accomplish those or we simply say, no, those people have committed a crime, they have lost all their rights, they have no more rights and we will do with them as we please. Mr. Chairman, that is the position that I seem to be getting from some members in this House. I am pleased that I did not get that from the member for Wilkie this morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to continue just for a few seconds on some of the other things she has said.

I agree with her on alcohol counselling. I think that you will find, for example, that we will very shortly announce a program, as I have done before, at St. Louis (I think that is the place where it probably will take place). We also, in the new correctional centres that we have on stream for Saskatoon and Prince Albert, will be able to adapt ourselves much more readily to that kind of program that you are suggesting. I can't disagree with you. Many of our people are in the correctional centres because of alcohol related problems.

I do want to take just one exception to the member opposite. She indicated that we should increase staff. I don't oppose that. We have indicated that we are intending to increase the staff at the Prince Albert Correctional Centre. We have, Mr. Chairman, increased significantly the probation officers since 1971. We increased them from 17 to 60, a significant increase. Is that sufficient? No, it is not sufficient. But, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. If we added up all the suggestions, that have been made by the members opposite, for increases in staff (each one of the critics has his pet project) if we added them all up there would be a significant increase in the civil service, a significant increase. I am not saying that that is wrong but I don't think that you can, on the one hand, individually criticize each individual department for not having sufficient staff and then go out in the public and say that the government has hired too many civil servants. We can't have it both ways. Either you fully believe that there should be more civil servants (and we need to have more people to work in some of these projects) or else you have to accept some of the shortcomings. Don't think that we can have it both ways.

Mr. Speaker, she also asked us about some of the work programs, the new work programs that will come on stream. I think I mentioned them when we released the Moore Report and I made my statement. But just some of them — for example, we will

be establishing the North Battleford community training centre. I shouldn't call it a community training centre because it is a low security work centre for about 25 inmates. We will be establishing a camp in Meadow Lake which I think will take in about 25; the Yorkton Community Training Centre will take in about 12. We have many others, Mr. Speaker. A program on stream, outside the walls for example, we will need if we are going to have this, we will need increased security.

Mr. Speaker, my staff has just given me a list here. In addition to all the others, Mr. Speaker, we have for example, (I am told) established a prison industries committee which is composed of senior staff of the Corrections Branch and Industry and Commerce staff. This was as a result of discussions between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and myself. The committee has been requested to recommend possible models for development of prison industries or productive inmate work camps or programs for consideration by government. So, we are looking at it: we do believe that we must provide more productive work. I can't disagree with the member on that.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Chairman, I think some of the responses of the minister deserve some comment. I notice atypical reaction of the philosophy of the minister opposite when he says there is a swing to the right. I don't think there is any swing to the right. I think what has happened, Mr. Minister, and I think you should recognize the public hasn't changed, what has changed is the administrators of the programming or the philosophy behind programming, which has taken it beyond the beliefs and what I feel is the inherent common sense of the average citizen. I am convinced that there is no swing to the right when we talk about welfare abuses. I think that the average citizen and the average taxpayer is just as compassionate and just as concerned today as he was 5, 10, 20 years ago. He is just as concerned about the aged and he is just as concerned with the handicapped as he was years ago. But what he is tired of is seeing people abusing the system and governments refusing to do anything. We agree that the abuses are a small minority, no question of the abuses. The taxpayer and the average citizen is entitled to be assured that those abuses in fact don't take place. The average taxpayer of this province is prepared today to go to the law in support and help to the handicapped, to those who can't support themselves and to the aged and those who are less fortunate. He will not tolerate today any more blanket programs that create abuses that in fact don't work in many cases; that there is a philosophy developed which has forgotten an inherent common sense of the average citizen. There is no swing to the right. I say that the average citizen hasn't changed one bit.

You talk about rehabilitation and our attempts in the correctional system, that we are going to rehabilitate. The average citizen believes in rehabilitation; he wants to see these people change their ways and become contributing members of society. He hasn't changed a bit. There is no swing to the right. But what he won't tolerate is irresponsibility or a lack of respect for authority, or a lack of respect for persons, or a lack of respect for property. He hasn't changed one bit, he hasn't changed one bit in his beliefs. But what we have given him is, we have given him a system that allows juveniles and allows individuals to walk free after crimes against persons or property. We have so gone overboard to the rights of the prisoner that we forgot, as I say, that basic common sense of the average person out there. He wants your system to work. He hasn't changed a bit, but when we see, daily, senior citizens attacked on the streets, in Regina. You have seen it. You try and deny that. The fact is that is what bothers us. If a juvenile or an adult or anyone persists in breaking the law, or has not respect for the law then why aren't we doing something with it? That is what the average citizen is trying to tell you. There is no swing to the right. There is a demand from the public for a restoration and a

return to the beliefs of the average citizen. That is what he wants and sure, some of his abuses may be perceived as opposed to actual, but you have to answer them and you have a duty to answer them. I say that you have failed in that duty.

When you say that there are political whims out there and they are all blowing against you, they are not blowing against you. They are demanding from you that you answer them and respond to them. And you say it is wrong for us to attack? I say, in fact, to you that we would be negligent in our duty if we didn't attack and bring your errors to the attention of this Assembly and to the attention of the public.

I say to you that there is no swing to the right, but I say that the average citizen has a belief that his concerns, and they are real and legitimate, are not being heeded. I say that you failed in your duty to take into account the concerns of the average citizen and that is the reason for the attack on your program and that is the reason for the attacks on your philosophy.

As I say, I don't think he has changed. I say, as well, that you deliver programs that deal with those concerns, you will have the overwhelming support and endorsement of every person in this province. I say to you that they want to. You can't hide behind a statement such as a swing to the right. I don't think it is accurate and I say if you persist in that belief, Mr. Minister, you are going to continue to hide behind programming and attitudes that don't take into account the legitimate concerns, because I think you had better start to listen. There is no swing to the right; there is just a vocal statement by the average citizen that his concerns are not being listened to. I say that you should start listening.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to spend very much time on those remarks. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. I do hope that the press will give the headlines to the member for Wilkie because I think she deserves it. She made, I think, a very constructive speech this morning. I think what the member for Qu'Appelle is attempting to do, and has been doing, is trying to — I was going to say be a head hunter, but I think a headline hunter, but maybe both are apropos, I am not sure.

I want Appelle to agree with the member for Qu' that most of the people out there want to use a common sense approach. The only problem is that the member for Qu'Appelle doesn't use a common sense approach and very often he gets the headlines and the people out in the public, I think, are affected by it. Mr. Speaker, there is a good example in a statement that he used this morning when he said that senior citizens are being daily attacked on our streets. I ask every member in this House, when is the last time that you heard that a senior citizen was attacked on the streets in Regina? When was the last time that you heard of a senior citizen being attacked on the streets in Saskatoon? That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that people aren't abused and assaulted in Saskatchewan. We all recognize that but a statement like that, I think, over-exaggerates the situation. That is I think, the difference that we have. You over-exaggerate and you blow it way out of proportion and then you get the headlines — senior citizens being daily attacked on the streets, says Lane, which simply isn't true. Are some attacked? Yes they are. Why are they? Because this world is inhabited by human beings who are imperfect. That's why they are. It doesn't make any difference what kind of a system you have. Those things will continue. We must, Mr. Chairman, do whatever we can to minimize that and I don't disagree with that.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further comments for the member for Qu'Appelle.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Mr. Chairman, I have some specific questions to deal with in my remarks now. First of all, while I am asking the question, I was wondering if you could get your officials to work out the number in the caseload for each probation officer.

MR. ROLFES: — About 47.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Well I'm sure that you mentioned my pet peeve or my pet project or whatever. In 1976, it was 48 and you have come down one now. You know all the reasons why I think this is an important function and how we can, to use your word, rehabilitate, in the best way possible. I think it should be a top priority.

The way in which you can work out the system is that you — it depends where other departments are putting their civil servants or spending money on hiring people. I think that the public would agree that one of the most important areas is in the area of corrections, so it is priorities of government and where you put the numbers of staff. I think that this is something you should seriously be looking at.

The second question I have is, have you discussed with the Attorney General at all — I think one of the best methods of correcting some of the juvenile offenders and other offenders is that we have alternatives to sentencing. In other words, if you have a crime that is not a serious crime, perhaps vandalism or something like that as compared to assault or death, there should be alternatives to sentencing in that they can work it off in the community to pay for the damage they have done. Is there any way that you could discuss with the Attorney General, possibly any alternatives to work in this way so that the only alternative is not a jail situation or a penal situation?

MR. ROLFES: — I think again, that the member asked some very good questions. First of all, on the probation officers. I indicated ours was one to forty-seven which is true, but again, in comparison to what we have in Canada, the average in Canada is one to sixty. Ours may not be good but it is better than what we have in other parts of Canada.

With regard to alternatives to jail for juvenile offenders, I am told that a youth study was under consideration by the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Committee. They have completed their study and their suggestions now are before government on alternatives to incarceration. So we are looking at that; we are making some suggestions to the government. Hopefully we will be successful in having some of these accepted and we can incorporate them in future budgets.

Secondly, as you know, the new Youth Offender Act is going to be introduced hopefully in the very near future in the federal Parliament. All provinces have had an input in that. That again stresses, considerably, diversionary programs as alternatives to incarceration. So we have those two that we are working on and hopefully future budgets will indicate that we have taken some action.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I do not want to belabor the point. I cannot give you the figures about the Canadian system across Canada but I know that in Saskatchewan there are no more than 25 per worker. I do not know what the statistics are for Canada but I know that for a fact as far as the Canadian system goes.

MR. ROLFES: — You are talking about parole.

MISS CLIFFORD: — That is right.

MR. ROLFES: — You asked about probation.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Yes I know, but I am just comparing the two and I thought that you were telling me that for Canadian penitentiaries there was 60 per — Oh all right. I misunderstood you.

The next thing that I would like to ask you as far as sentencing goes and juvenile offenders, have you considered at all — and I know that last time I asked this question you said yes I will consider it. I suggested that all juvenile areas be put under one division a year or two ago. Have you considered that to any great degree and are you planning on implementing anything to co-ordinate juvenile programs?

MR. ROLFES: — The member will be pleased to know that we have made the change in the department. We have set up, I am told, a youth and family services area in the department. I think this has just recently been done. There will be a chief of youth services for institutions and field services.

MISS CLIFFORD: — As well, I know that you have paid Ranch Ehrlo about \$19,000 for their court costs (85 or 90 per cent of them). I would like to first know what your plans are for assisting Ranch Ehrlo if they wish to open their wilderness camps. Their costs will be about \$100,000 I would think at the minimum. If you believe in such programs and you feel that they are an effort to help juveniles, you should at least take 75 per cent of the costs as a round figure. I want to know what your plans are in the event that Ranch Ehrlo will want to open these camps. I hope you will not say it is a hypothetical question.

MR. ROLFES: — In response to the member opposite. A committee has been set up and composed of members from DNS, Social Services, Ranch Ehrlo and other government agencies. Oh, pardon me, non-government agencies, to study this whole area. Not only in increasing the camps and other camps in the future but also in regard to the inquiry that took place. So I can't answer at this particular time that they have held a meeting, a preliminary meeting and I am awaiting, as DNS is and I suppose, the Attorney General. We will have to await the outcome of that particular committee.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Well, surely there is not, after the inquiry, any doubt in your mind that wilderness camps do serve as a rehabilitative measure for delinquent juveniles. Is that the question? Surely, it is not.

MR. ROLFES: — No. I think if you would look at the Maher Report, he recommended that such a committee be set up and that is what we have done. It wasn't set up because we were questioning the value of the camps. That's not the function of the committee. The committee was set up because the Maher Report has indicated that we should set up the committee and study that whole area.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Then generally, we can assume that your department would give all out support to helping such a project, if they were to be started again.

MR. ROLFES: — They will be supported.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Financially and many ways as possible?

MR. ROLFES: — We will certainly have to await the outcome of the committee but I can tell the member that I myself and I think my department, will certainly support it. Now

the degree of support, I think, will have to await the outcome of the committee.

MISS CLIFFORD: — I mentioned as well, that the Neegan Society of Alberta are doing a lot of work and . . .

MR. ROLFES:— O.K. I have a terrible time hearing the member. O.K.? Maybe I am losing my hearing, I don't know.

AN. HON. MEMBER: — That is not all you are losing.

MISS CLIFFORD: — I mentioned as well the Neegan Society in Alberta were doing a lot of work with native people in the correctional centres. Have you looked into that report and as well, I would like to know what you are doing to assist native people that have been put into the correctional centres? You were asked a question today by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley to that problem. The question that I asked was about the report of Judge Bence or his comments on the institutions in the news article. One of the people that was in the assault charge was a native person which is fine, but his comment was that, when questioned by Bence, Bruce said, 'Indians get the raw deal in confrontations with the whites on the street. Therefore in jail, where Indians outnumber whites, the situation is reversed.' Now, that is only one person's opinion and I will grant you that but I am sure that there is a conflict that needs to be looked into and dealt with in the correctional centres. I want to know what positive alternatives you are suggesting to alleviate any problems and help these offenders.

MR. ROLFES: — We are finding it very difficult to carry on our debate here with the other members speaking at the same time. So, I want to indicate to the member that we have had consultations with the FSI and they have been invited to attend the CJCC (Criminal Justice Co-ordinating' Committee) meeting in June, to look at that particular aspect.

I think the other thing that also needs to be mentioned — again, I want to emphasize that, yes, there is a native problem in Saskatchewan. That, again, is not unique to Saskatchewan.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Keep records . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Well, I don't think you need to keep records to know that there is a native problem in Saskatchewan but there is a native problem across Canada. At our last Social Services Ministers' Conference, we had on the agenda native problems and it wasn't headed up by Saskatchewan. I was pleasantly surprised to see that other ministers were also trying to come to grips with the problem that exists, for example, in Quebec. Ontario and B.C. and in Alberta. I think that we will have to pursue this in the future and see just how we can come to grips with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That was five years . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Well, I've only been the Minister of Social Services for almost three years now so your mathematics is somewhat wrong there. But this has been a problem for a long, long time in Canada and we aren't going to solve it overnight. Basically, it is a social-economic problem and we have got to attack it from that point of view. We are going to be getting together, three or four ministers, as soon as this session prorogues to have a look at the whole native problem to see what solutions we can come to. I can't give you any immediate solutions because I don't think there are any immediate solutions.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Well, I would first like to say that, of course, I'm concerned with what is going on in Canada as well but my main concern is Saskatchewan so I don't think it is easy to beg off the question and say that, you know, Canada is worse and the problem is all over. I am concerned about what is happening here. Now, have you studied, and I am not saying that this society has all the answers and is the be-all and end-all to everything, but have you studied what the Neegan Society in Alberta is doing in its correction centres?

MR. ROLFES: — Not really.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Oh, well, then, I would suggest that that might be a start to look at the problem. Now, as well I would like to ask you — you mentioned you were starting some alcoholism programs. Now, you can go to the Alcoholism Commission; you can go to the AA Society. Have you tried any independent — there are many, not many, but there are a number of independent people that do set up alcoholism committees to give instruction in business or whatever — are you also going to the private people who do set up committees to try to help people with problems like this?

MR. ROLFES: — No, that has not received any significant emphasis at this particular time. We are looking at the possibility of using, I think it is the high school that is vacant at St. Louis, to set up an alcohol rehabilitation program at St. Louis. We are looking at that right now but the decisions have not been finalized. I do hope that within the next month or two that we will be able to have a program on stream there.

MISS CLIFFORD: — The main reason why I'm asking you this is that, I think, private agencies that do do this type of counselling in industry and business do have some, perhaps, valuable information. We sometimes are close-minded enough that we just look inside our own house, so to speak, and don't look out and I think that this might possibly be an alternative.

What are you doing about programs for drug offenders in institutions? As far as I can tell there is very little support for those who are working in drug counselling or rehabilitation other than when they get out they can go to the hospital and get some methadone or whatever and they are sort of left on their own. I think that there is a need to have an extensive drug program.

MR. ROLFES: — Again, on the advice of the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Committee, I recently, a week or two ago sent a memorandum to the Minister of Health, that our department would like to have an early opportunity — the Department of Social Services in conjunction with, I believe, the Attorney General's Department and the police — we would like to have an early opportunity to discuss with them the drug related offences and the offender. I think this would have to be viewed from the point of view of being a health/legal problem. It has to be looked at from that point of view. I would just simply want to emphasize at this time, yes, it is a serious problem. We are looking at it and hopefully within the next little while we will be able to take some steps to have corrective measures taken.

MISS CLIFFORD: — In saying that, I would hope that you would consider this one of your major concerns as far as a problem that is in the correctional centres. It is not, I would say, not as serious at this moment as alcohol problems but it is growing and I think perhaps there are fewer places to go for assistance than there would be with alcohol problems.

You mentioned as well, that one of the problems with rehabilitation with people in correctional centres is that you only have them there for a short term and that personal counselling is difficult. I mentioned that I would hope that the department would give support to community organizations and groups that would be willing to work with the offender after he comes back from the correctional institution. I mentioned as well the John Howard Society are finding themselves in financial trouble. Have you been approached by them to assist them in any way? If so, would you be willing, even if they haven't asked, are you going to put this as one of your main priorities to get community organizations to give their support to these people who are coming out of the institutions?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, I think the member again makes a good point. I do want to indicate to the member, because I have a lot of sympathy for that particular area. When I became Minister of Social Services the grant, for example, to the John Howard Society was \$64,000, \$64,130 to be exact and their grant this year will be \$127,000, almost 100 per cent increase. I do think we must do more in that that particular area. I will certainly take your suggestion again under advisement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I wonder, I think the member for Yorkton wants to introduce some students. Does he have leave to do that?

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Norman Lusney, the MLA for Pelly, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House, 28 Grades Four, Five and Six students from Calder, Saskatchewan, east of Yorkton. They are accompanied by Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, their teacher and four parents, Mrs. Marie Rohatensky, Mildred Donelko, Mrs. Marlene Balabuk, Mrs. Judy Pryslak and also by their bus driver, Mr. Bill Rohatensky. We would like to welcome you to the house and I hope that you have an interesting stay in the House, watching the proceedings here for a few minutes. These students have visited the Leader Post Building, and are planning to visit the RCMP Academy, the Museum of Natural History and a couple of other places in town during their visit here. I would like all of you to welcome them here and to wish them an interesting stay and a safe return home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Committee of Finance continued.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister., you have given conflicting reasons for the demotion of Walter Chester. I would like the minister to give today a definitive statement as to the reason of Walter Chester. I will ask you secondly, will you undertake that that is the reason that you intend to maintain, so that there will be no change?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, the reasons for the suspension of Walter Chester and his subsequent demotion, I think have been stated in this House very clearly. The letter is in the hands of the member for Qu'Appelle. I think he knows what they are. We can spend a lot of time on this particular area. I am quite prepared to do so. We suggest again that the reasons are stated in the letter. The action taken by the department was one that we felt was in the area of management rather than in the area of conflict of philosophy as the member for Qu'Appelle wants to put it. He can make his

statement and I will make mine. We will walk away differing and the problem will not be resolved. I am quite prepared to carry on as long as you want to. I think there is a basic difference of how you see the problem. We do not see it the way you see it. We have not taken the action from the point of view that you want people to believe and that is where it stands. If we want to get into the details of it, we can do so but it is not — All I will do is simply read the letter which is before you and if you wish to pursue that I will let the member speak now but I think I have made very clear the reasons why Walter Chester was demoted. I have indicated to you the options that are open to an employee. If he disagrees with his employer he can attempt to have the policy changed by going to his superiors, he can either ask for a transfer or he can quit the job. One of the things he cannot do is to ignore the policy and simply not carry out policy. That is simply unacceptable. On too many occasions in the past it was felt that Mr. Chester simply disregarded policy, not under my ministry, but also under other

MR. LANE: — Well, you are trying to soft-pedal this, which is a back-down and a pretty dramatic one from your earlier statements. I will preface by saying that Mr. Chester said that we could pursue this and he is not at all concerned about any statements. He is, in fact, proud of his records and he is proud of the rating forms that in fact have been supplied to him.

Now, there was an implied threat on previous questioning, that you d new evidence and new material that you were going to drop in this House, which was going to be embarrassing to Mr. Chester. That is certainly what you indicated before.

First of all, I will ask you specifically, was Mr. Chester demoted because of activities prior to the assault or was the assault one of the causes of the demotion or was the assault the sole cause of the demotion?

MR. ROLFES: — No.

MR. LANE: — What do you mean, no?

MR. ROLFES: — Both.

MR. LANE: — O.K., so it is both the assault and previous actions. Now, would you delineate for this Assembly the previous actions, the dates of those previous actions that led to the demotion of Walter Chester?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated before if the member wishes me to do so, I will read the letter that was tabled at the Moore Inquiry. A summary of the . . . I don't know . . . we do have the letter somewhere here, that was tabled at the Moore Inquiry but it basically contains the reasons and the incidents that occurred in the correction centre related to Mr. Chester. We took those into consideration when the assault charge was laid. I suppose one has to simply judge as to which, I suppose carried the most weight. All I said in the House the other day, I suppose the assault charge was the straw that broke the camel's back and we had to make a decision and taking into consideration many of the incidents in which Mr. Chester was involved. I did not, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the records, say that there would be new evidence come forth.

The member, during question period, some time ago said that we had not, had not made available to the Moore Inquiry the letter that I then brought forth in the House and he said no evidence was brought forward. I am simply saying, that I said at that time that I would make the letter then available and I must admit that I was in slight error in saying

that the letter would be made available because I wasn't sure just where it had been made available. But checking later on with my officials they said, yes, it had been made available to the Moore Inquiry, which I thought we had done and the evidence in that letter simply relates what I have before me now. This is available to anybody and has been since the Moore Inquiry.

So, what we have here, Mr. Chairman, then is the evidence of things that happened in the past, and his letter of demotion. Here is a pattern of action, I suppose, by Mr. Chester, Which covers about a four or five year period.

It says here, the fifth month evaluation of Mr. Chester completed and signed by you — meaning by Mr. Chester, I assume — on July 31, 1973, with respect to your promotion to your present position, indicates, and I quote:

1. A conflict of philosophy with the superior that tends to limit Mr. Chester's overall effectiveness. The eleventh month evaluation signed by yourself, Mr. Chester, on February 14, 1973, indicates, Mr. Chester has a fundamental conflict with general philosophy of his superiors.

2. In April of 1973 you received an official reprimand for having issued guns to staff contrary to the policy of the centre. The reprimand reads in part:

You indicated that you were aware of the policy that guns were not to be issued without the director's authority and that you did not contact the director because you felt he would not give you this authorization.

3. During an Ombudsman investigation, in August, 1973, into alleged threats to an inmate by yourself, Mr. Strimel's report, (he is a former director) to the Ombudsman reads:

Mr. Chester is acutely aware of our standards that you do not verbally or physically abuse inmates. After talking to Mr. Chester, I confirmed that the language used was abusive. At that time the director again reviewed with you the Centre's standards and how your approach is open to misinterpretation by both staff and inmates.

4. The matter of use of force, as a discipline measure was again reviewed with you in December 1975, when a staff under your supervision was suspended for assault. You were informed at that point that such action constituted common assault. In your recommendation for suspension of the staff in question you stated that the action was clearly, 'a breach of ethics.'

5. In May 1976 you contravened the standing orders as they related to the discipline panel by holding an improperly constituted discipline panel and personally sentencing an inmate to 10 days in segregation and loss of dining room privileges for 60 days. You later acknowledged that you had no authority to conduct such a discipline panel.

The above incidents are examples of the type of performance which further substantiates the department's decision that you may not remain employed with a correctional centre because of a demonstrated unwillingness, or inability, to operate within the philosophical context, standards and

standing orders of the correctional centre.

Mr. Chairman, that basically, was the record that we had of incidents that occurred in the Correctional Centre involving Mr. Chester. Now, taking each one separately as individuals will be prone to do, you may say, well that is not justification. But taking them altogether and then the assault charge that was laid against Mr. Chester — and by the way, the Ombudsman indicated, I think, at the inquiry, that had the inmate not requested that a charge be laid, that the Ombudsman would probably have — I think I am correct in saying — would have had to suggest, or that he would have to investigate the particular charge.

I want to say, again, Mr. Chairman, that this is a management problem and it must be seen as a management problem. If this had been, let's say the Department of Government Services, then an individual would simply have not abided by the policy and simply contravene policy, and the Minister of Government Services would have taken action, it would have been seen as a management problem. That we is what we saw it as, and we, then, took action.

In the Collective Bargaining Agreement, if an individual feels that he has been aggrieved, he then can take the action that is available to him and it is arbitration procedures. That is open to Mr. Chester.

I am not really concerned about the outcome of the assault charge. That has nothing to do with our decision. The outcome of that assault charge has nothing to do with it. I am not concerned about it. I am concerned about Mr. Chester not abiding by the policy as laid down by the Department of Social Services.

MR. LANE: — Well, I think that those taking notes should note some very salient facts.

1. The minister has no new evidence that was not tabled before the Moore Inquiry so that the evidence tabled before the Moore Inquiry is the evidence that he has and nothing else.

2. He says it is a management decision, the demotion of an employee and the statements made at the time that had dealt with the assault and that was the reason for it and I am going through some of the evidence of the Moore inquiry in a minute, but it was in fact, the assault that was so recent. They said no to the management and the fact that it was a factor in the Prince Albert riot takes it out of the management decision. In fact, what we have is the totally unconscionable harassment of a long-term government employee who is being made a scapegoat for your officials' actions that resulted in his demotion, a price that he is being made to pay for your mistakes. And I am going to go through some of the evidence at the Moore inquiry so that the minister may need his memory refreshed. Let me say what your officials were saying about Mr. Chester at the Moore inquiry.

First of all, Mr. Ron Schrevel, who had been the director of the correctional centre; he is being asked for some assessment of Mr. Chester's abilities. 'Can you give us your assessment of Mr. Chester's abilities or capabilities during the period of time that you worked with him?'

I guess the most impressive characteristic I felt about Walter was his dedication to his job. Now, there were times when, his job was defined differently by him than it was by myself or other people, but he was motivated

by what he believed ought to be done and that is a quality you can't underestimate in an institution, because of the fact that people have to operate independently there. If you get the feeling that you can't depend on people, that you have to watch over their shoulders, you can become extremely paranoid in an institution and you know, you just can't function. It's impossible. Now, you don't trust people that you feel aren't dedicated to their jobs. If they are there simply for the pay check or for you know, to put in that eight hours, they will bail out on you when you need them. That you know, that was a quality that a lot of the senior staff had. It wasn't only Walter's quality, but you know certainly all the V's that were in the institution at that time were that way.

I think the other thing that I appreciated about him was that he became for me, in management of the institution, a bit of a test. Because, if I could convince Walter that a program was worthwhile, then I knew I wasn't sort of going to catch myself out with my backside in the wind. There were people who I suppose, in deference to my position or whatever, wouldn't be honest about what they felt about things and I could count on him to do that.

That is the kind of person you fired and demoted. Let me go to some others. James Wells being examined at the Moore inquiry. 'What is your assessment of Walter with respect to your many years at the centre,' was the question.

Well, I would have to say that in most ways, Walter was an excellent employee. I think I used the term with him many times, that he was a company man; that he had the interest of the institution at heart. He was particularly adept at managing the duty roster, the holiday roster, things of that nature that are extremely difficult tasks. He did an excellent job. I think I have commented to him on that on a number of occasions.

That is the type of statement. I could go on, and I know if the minister remains, I could read pages of accolades. But to put your statement in its proper perspective and to show how, in fact, untrue it is, let me state questioning of your deputy minister by the commission.

Mr. Bogdasavich: If the court had found Chester not guilty of the charge of common assault that, I presume in the absence of an appeal by the complainant or the Crown, would have been an end to the matter and Chester would still be in his job I presume.

Answer: The whole thing is based on the last decision, Yes. (Most emphatically, yes.)

Let me go to what Judge Moore, if I can get my notes, said in his report, which again puts the lie to your statement. At page 65 of his report.

I am satisfied that had Chester not been found guilty of the charge, he would still be in the employ of the centre.

He would still be in the employ of the centre! Judge Moore. After assessing your letter, the evidence; the verbatim transcript, said that if it hadn't been for the assault charge that Walter Chester would still be employed by the centre. He has now been found not guilty on appeal. I think what we have today is not a management decision but we have a

human tragedy because you in fact destroyed a man, as a scapegoat for your management decisions and your errors which led to the cause of the Prince Albert riot. I think the evidence is irrefutable that Walter Chester was destroyed by you, deliberately and maliciously to try to get the heat off your errors as the cause of the PA riot. I think you have got no choice but to resign.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather shameful that the minister hasn't responded to the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle. If he wants to do so, I would be glad to take my seat.

Let me say that while this Walter Chester incident has been taking place, I think everybody in this Assembly and perhaps many people in Prince Albert have been questioning the decision of the minister and his department. I have been listening to what the member for Qu'Appelle has been saying the last few months; I have been listening to what the minister has been saying the last few months; the only conclusion that I can come to is Walter Chester has not been reinstated, simply because you are trying to cover up for the poor judgment and the unwarranted zeal of your departmental officials in dealing with Mr. Chester. Those aren't my words, Mr. Minister, they are the words of Judge Moore, 'poor judgment and unwarranted zeal.' Now the member for Qu'Appelle has quite properly pointed out in the Moore Report that in his opinion, if Mr. Chester had not been found guilty of the offence that he was convicted of, he would still be employed. There has been an appeal; that matter has been disposed of in Mr. Chester's favor. There is no reason whatsoever in my view that he should not be reinstated. If you have other reasons, let's hear them. But I think to bring the matter to a head, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move a motion which I will read, and perhaps the member for Qu'Appelle would second it after he has heard it. Yes, seconded by Mr. Lane.

That this Committee directs the Minister of Social Services to immediately reinstate Walter Chester to his former position of correction officer V.

The only way that justice is going to be done in this case with Chester is by something like that happening. It may not be possible to re-assign Mr. Chester to the former jail in Prince Albert, but I believe that justice will only be done if he is reinstated with all back pay, all perquisites of office that he has lost since he was demoted. I think that the manner in which your department handled this was tragic to say the least. I'm just following what Judge Moore has said. He was severely critical of your officials. I think the minister will, in all honesty, acknowledge that what Judge Moore said is correct. I think it was proper for you not to do anything further with the report. I am not suggesting that the two officials involved should be fired or anything else, but justice will only be done in this case if Mr. Chester is reinstated.

I think members opposite will acknowledge that what I say is correct. I invite the minister to respond to the motion and I invite all members to support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Could we just have a second on the motion? We have a problem with the motion in that it relates to the word 'direct'.

MR. MALONE: — I move, seconded by Mr. Lane, the member for Qu'Appelle:

that this committee recommend to the Minister of Social Services that he immediately reinstate Walter Chester to his former position as a Corrections Officer V

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, first of all let me again make a few statements in this regard. I think the member from — where is he from? The Leader of the Opposition anyway. O.K., Leader of the Liberal Party. Mr. Chairman, I don't know why the Leader of the Liberal Party wants to completely ignore a procedure that has been negotiated through the free collective bargaining, and that is the right of every individual who works for this government. If an individual feels that he has been aggrieved, the procedure that they have to follow is simply to go through the arbitration procedure. I am not sure but I'm just checking with my officials — my understanding is that this department has done absolutely nothing to prevent the establishment of arbitration procedures. Why Mr. Chester or why the union has not proceeded with it, I don't know and it is not for me to determine why they have not proceeded with the matter. (interjection) That's a stupid comment. It just shows your ignorance about the collective bargaining procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the members here to defeat the motion for the simple reason that I wonder whether the Leader of the Liberal Party would have made the same motion if it had happened, say to a member of the Department of Government Services, or if it had happened to a member from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: — In the same way, yes.

MR. ROLFES: — The same way if an employee has the right to ask for arbitration procedures if he feels that he has been aggrieved. That is part of the free collective bargaining agreement. Why wouldn't Mr. Chester or why wouldn't the union proceed or why have they not proceeded earlier to have this action put in motion and let's then have a look at the results of the grievance procedure. If they recommend at that time that Mr. Chester should be reinstated to the level V position we will take that under consideration and I would think that the government would be hard pressed and I would be hard pressed not to abide by the decision of the arbitration board. Why don't we await the decision of that board rather than to prejudge and to say to the employee and the employer, what you have agreed to in free collective bargaining we will ignore and we will determine for you here as to what the outcome will be, when an employee feels aggrieved. Let me make it very clear to the member that in my conversations with Judge Moore he indicated to me he wanted to make it very clear that he was not judging, he was not judging the decision of the department to demote Mr. Chester. He did not question our right to demote Mr. Chester. That is a management decision. What he did question was the steps taken . . . (interjection) . . . That's right, but he did not question and there is a real difference, he did not question our right to fire or demote or to suspend an individual. He simply questioned the zealotry of one of my officials or two of my officials in doing it. Not that we didn't have the right and I think if you asked Judge Moore he would simply say, let it go to arbitration, that is the right of the employee. I just for the life of me can't understand why the Leader of the Liberal Party would move this motion — it's beyond me as to why he would not let the arbitration procedures go forth and then wait the outcome of those procedures. I simply ask the members of the House to defeat it, let the arbitration board decide what the outcome will be and the government then, I think, has to base its decision on the outcome of that procedure.

MR. MALONE: — I would just like to say a couple of things. First, I am not in the slightest bit interested in private conversations you had with Judge

Moore. This is the second or third time you have come into this House and talked about conversations with Judge Moore. That doesn't interest me at all, it doesn't interest Mr. Chester. What does interest me is the finding of Judge Moore. What does interest me is the appeal court dealing with the matter and having the conviction quashed. Now you keep talking about let it go through arbitration, that he has those rights open to him, but I remind the minister that the reason he is now before arbitration or has rights to arbitration is because you fired him or demoted him because of the conviction. Now when the conviction is set aside, that's what the report says, when the conviction is set aside why is it necessary to then go through a grievance procedure and arbitration? There is nothing to be aggrieved about any more. The main reason you fired or demoted Chester — I'm sorry I know you demoted him, not fired him — the main reason you demoted him was because of the conviction. That conviction is no longer there. Why should he have to be put through the procedure of going through grievance procedures through committees and so on? The reason for your actions has disappeared. Surely any government that is trying to do justice to their employees, whether they are in the Department of Municipal Affairs or Government Services or whatever, would immediately act to reinstate them. I say to you, Mr. Minister, that that is the only course of action open to you. You know it is the only course of action open to you. You should be supporting this motion, I hope you will do so.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I would like to add a comment or two as well. The minister flies in the face of the stated philosophy of his own party. His own party practically monthly stands up in this House and argues for the employee against the employer, wanting fairness and equity for the employee. You've heard the speeches from the Minister of Labour. Now you turn around say it's a policy and a stated policy of your department and your ministry to be able to act capriciously whenever you decide you want a scapegoat, then you force that individual when he has been exonerated, to try to defend himself, to then prove to himself that he is in fact a good employee, notwithstanding the evidence under oath that is given. What you have done is you have thrown this man to the wind saying, you are a bad guy because you assaulted. He then is found not guilty. Now you are putting the reverse onus on him to prove that he is worthwhile to appear back before you as an employee. What kind of management is that? I do not think you have any choice but to reinstate Walter Chester, with his back pay.

For the members opposite to defend the action of the government opposite, flies in the face of just about every stated policy of the Minister of Labour — You are going to make your statements to the Minister of Labour and your party policy is shammed, if you persist in your statement that you want this defeated.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 11

Malone
Wiebe
Cameron
McMillan

Clifford
Collver
Lane (Qu'Ap)
Birkbeck

Ham
Berntson
Wipf

Nays — 23

Pepper	MacMurchy	Faris
Thibault	Mostoway	Rolfes
Bowerman	Whelan	Tchorzewski
Smishek	Kwasnica	Shillington
Romanow	Dyck	Skoberg
Byers	McNeill	Nelson (Yktn)
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Thompson
Robbins	Feschuk	

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to congratulate the member for Wilkie for setting a wonderful tone for the meeting this morning. I thought that the speech she made would produce a very constructive meeting all the way through the morning but it was too good for the Conservative Party who had been negative all the way through this session. They would sooner spend their time fighting away at petty little things that would perhaps get them a few votes. I think the matter of corrections is one that goes a lot further. Now listen here, just bring those lips a little closer to your brains and it will help you a great deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Keep your traps shut while I am speaking. Now, you know the question of corrections is one that a lot of people seem to feel is bigger jails and bigger fines. My position is, let's do an immunization job and prevent people from going to jail. Well, that's how stupid you are. You don't understand. What do you mean by immunization? Let us build boys, let us build boys so we won't have men in jail. Let us build girls . . . Now, you have programs that were scuttled. The wilderness camp for instance, that should have kept on and we pulled it off because we depended on honorable people to make decent reporting to this House. This is why we were setback with wilderness camps

Now, you take for instance, Camp Bosco when it burnt down. We had people from the Gull Lake Camp go up and clean up. They heard enough about Camp Bosco that they said, look when we were boys, if we would have had a chance to attend one of these camps, we wouldn't be here today. (Inaudible interjection) Will you keep your mouth shut? That's the rule. You listen to one side but you've got verbal diarrhea and that I have no solution for. (Inaudible interjection).

I have visited many countries in the world. I have visited many countries in the world to study the question of alcoholism. Ninety per cent of the people in Prince Albert jail have a problem with alcohol. We seem to send them there. I go along with the member for Wilkie in the position she takes, which is 15 years ahead of you people and that is why you can't understand it.

I say putting an alcoholic in jail does no good and yet we keep on doing it. All medical science has told us that alcoholics do not recover in jail and I don't know who is crazy butte keep on doing it — just like a scratched record that keeps on saying, 'fine and jail, fine and jail and bigger fines and bigger jails'. So if you treat these young boys, if you create the right atmosphere — in too many of our places all they have got for recreation is the beer parlor and the little ones are waiting for the day that they can get in. I want to congratulate the member, Mr. Shillington, for his program of Culture and Youth.

Now I heard on that side of the House that you bought some canoes so that they could go canoeing. I say, good! They are teaching them to dance — what a bad thing that is.

May 12, 1978

Let us develop quality of life; that is what is needed, quality of life and you will not have as many people in jail. It is so satisfying I suppose when they see somebody in jail for having gotten drunk, but I am glad that St. Louis is opening up and I hope it will open the flood gates of a new kind of thinking.

You know, in Melbourne, where I spent two weeks attending two international conferences, the alcoholic when he is caught with .05, the judge sends him to an evaluation centre; he spends two days there. After that he is sentenced, not for what he has done but for what he needs and he is sent to a rehabilitation centre, no fences and no locks. My God, you know when we are going to start a centre with no fences or no locks, the Conservatives are going to be scared out of their wits! But if a proper evaluation job is done, there is no danger.

Now, I want to say, in Melbourne they refer to lawyers — they don't call these people out there lawyers, they call them barristers and a barrister that gets a drunk off the hook instead of getting him to go to a rehab centre is now not referred to as a barrister but is referred to as a 'bar-stard'. The barristers on that side of the House should study some of the work that I have done and they would use a different approach and speak more like Linda Clifford, Linda Clifford in her approach to the system that she talks about.

We have another place, that is Hazelton, that has made experiments whether committed alcoholics recover better than voluntary alcoholics. We have a group of people in our society who say we've got to wait until this person has the right desire to go and be treated. That's a whole bunch of nonsense. That's 15 to 20 years out of date. They tried that experiment at Hazledon to see which one would recover best, the one that was committed by the court or the ones that came voluntarily — no difference. The alcoholics used to say you've got to have the right desire, the most sincere desire for treatment and you go for treatment and they found out that any old desire will do — your wife's desire, the judge's desire, any old desire works and this is what we need to bring into our society so we can prevent people from being in jail. When we are told that 92 per cent in the Prince Albert Jail have an alcohol problem should we not be working at the other end and do some immunization before they get there. That's what I'm talking about this morning.

I hope that the rest of this meeting will be spent in a constructive approach so that we can really come up with something realistic. The government side does listen to the opposition but I am not happy with the last items that they listened to on Walter Chester. They worry about two people who died in a riot in Prince Albert yet you say very little about the 300 people who get killed on our roads every year and that is violence as well.

Now there are several reports before us, there is the Ontario report, and if we can keep the alcoholics out of jail we don't need that many jails. If we have a jail industry to keep these people working with indoor and outdoor activities. Can you imagine if we locked all those doors and told us here, you're going to live here for one month and expect that there would be no blood shed and yet you put some 200 or 300 people in a jail and lock them up 22 hours a day in a cell and expect that they will not go wacky. I say evaluation before you put a person in jail. How many of you have visited the jail, the feeling that you get when those steel doors are shut behind you — and everyone that's in court is just liable to go there. I say evaluation before putting a person in jail is absolutely necessary. And if treatment is the best thing to do let's give treatment instead. You know this sausage machine justice that we have been operating is so simple, is so narrow, time in jail. You know it's just like a grocery list. We sat in the court rooms and we watched the

court cases going through, one in 40 seconds and you call it justice. That was seriously criticized that we need a better system.

Now, I hope and I'm not going to take much more time because the opposition this morning has spent most of its time in a very constructive approach so I will cut my remarks short and I hope the rest of the meeting will be conducive to a constructive approach to the people who run afoul with the law. So that it will be constructive in such away that putting a person in jail, if you put too many in jail the stigma wears off and with the stigma wearing off the first thing you will know our society will be geared this way, that if you don't go to jail you don't belong to the club. Today, if a person hasn't been in court he doesn't belong in the club. The stigma has worn out because we have all kinds of chicken feed charges going.

Mr. Chairman, I think of a different approach, and I can see that a lot has been done. The only stumbling blocks have come, mainly, from the Conservative Party. I hope that in the next half hour that is left you will come up with some constructive ideas and not be in here with just crazy, petty little things which you have been so well accustomed to. You seem to think that power is more important than the welfare of our society. Let's provide the kind of atmosphere — I, as a farmer, found out at a very early age that you can't herd sheep with hound dogs because the flock will be scattered all over. You need good shepherds out there. A treatment centre is a retreat house, that is what we are calling a place of rest.

Now, psychiatrists made quite a study about what was causing these people to drink and by golly they studied and studied and after a while they were almost becoming schizophrenic themselves. All of a sudden there was one that discovered the universe. He said, you know they drink because they want to be happy. Why, the alcoholic knew that all the time that he wanted to be happy and that is why he drank. You didn't need to spend a bunch of money to find that out.

The first ones that were unplugged with the treatment of AA were the churches. They started to accept AA and direct their people towards AA and the results were better. Then came the psychologists and they started referring their people to AA and they did better. The psychiatrists were a little slower in getting there, but they are there now. We have a lot of row to hoe before we get there in coming up with a realistic program. But if we are going to have a party in this House that is going to pull us back two feet for every foot we go ahead, then we will take much longer to go there. I hope that everybody, in the matter of social welfare . . . I resent it whether I sat on this side of the House or that side of the House, when they try to tear the Minister of Social Welfare and tell him to resign and so on.

If the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) were in here he would tell you how we handled the Minister of Social Welfare. Because it is a big job. I want to say, this morning, that we stand behind the Minister of Social Welfare for what he is trying to do. Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I would like to thank the hon. member for the clearest statement of the government policy on corrections that we have had to date.

I would like, now, to ask the Minister of Social Services — you indicated one area of the

McGuigan Report. There was another section that dealt with the return of discipline and it very carefully defined discipline. And if you have any confusion I would like to quote from the McGuigan Report:

. . . the restoration of discipline is our basic objective in the reform of the Canadian penitentiary system. By discipline we do not mean the last, clubs or tear gas, nor do we mean primarily a system of rules, even ones that are firm and consistent and fairly applied, although discipline does mean that too. Discipline is essentially an order imposed on behavior for a purpose.

MR. ROLFES: — What page is that from?

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I don't know, I got that out of page 30 of the Moore Report for quick reference for quoting the McGuigan Report rather than go through — I think there is a reference there.

I suggest to you that that is one area where you have well fallen short in your correctional system. I say that your pendulum has swung well the other way, that in fact the one who suffers if there is any discipline is the prison guard and I think that has been well documented and well proven today. I don't think that anyone, when we accuse you of acting capriciously, feels that prison guards should be able to act capriciously either. There should be rules, but there has to be a restoration of discipline in our Correctional Centre. That's an area that you have either avoided or neglected. I know that that is contrary to the personal philosophy of the minister but I think it is one that has to be restored.

I am going to give an example where I suggest that the minister should start to direct his attention, and that is to the State of Georgia. The Ontario Correctional System is presently reviewing the work policies in the Correctional System in Georgia. What the Correctional System in Georgia does is require able-bodied prisoners to assist on public service projects, or even with training, to assist in such things as harvest or farm work, if there is a shortage. Now it is very careful as well, that in no way is that work project in competition with the private sector. In other words, they are doing jobs that the private sector is not doing or is unable to do. The interesting thing about that, Mr. Minister, and I know that you will jump to your quick criticism of that approach, as I say we have a very basic difference in philosophy, is the approach of the Canadian Union of Public Employees who also studied that particular program in Georgia; their representative was Mr. Roach, and he is quoted as saying that first of all they will keep a close eye on the progress of the work program, 'We approve the principle; we want to watch how it is implemented.' The same official of the Canadian Union of Public Employees says the idea of prisoners helping with the harvest is a good one, especially if it will give them some money when their sentences were over. However, he had some concerns about the manner of payment. I say that you would be well advised to take the McGuigan statement, that restoration of discipline is a basic objective in the report and apply it to our correctional centre. I say to you that if that had been done, we wouldn't have had the Chester incident and I suspect that we wouldn't have had a lot of the activities that led to the last riot.

I suggest to you that it is time we started a restoration of discipline in the framework of the McGuigan definition. Secondly, I suggest to you that you should immediately study, and immediately implement a make-work or the work projects for the able-bodied individual sentenced to our correctional centres. I would like the minister's views on that suggestion.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, first of all let me just correct some of the misconceptions that the member left. He always does; he is very good at it, quoting partially from the McGuigan report. He quoted just that part of the disciplinary definition that he wanted to suit his purpose. But it also in number four — skipping number three, number four also says:

Discipline is also needed for the staff

But you didn't read that. Just listen!

. . . who must not only faithfully execute the direction received from above but who must also express the discipline of their own profession. Through their professional standards and conduct, they must make a personal contribution to the inmates by example and through interpersonal relationships.

And then we could go on and say, number five:

Inmates suffer from the discipline of justice as imposed by the court but they must also be guaranteed that discipline of justice inside the penitentiaries . . .

and I'm saying here, inside the correctional system

They need the discipline of behavior rules to ensure the peace but they will also gain from the situational discipline of work and humanizing discipline of social life.

Discipline is simply not a one way street and what I am simply saying is — under the McGuigan report it simply says:

The sentence of imprisonment imposed by the court constitutes the punishment. Those who work in the penitentiary system have no authority, right or duty to impose additional penalties except for proven misconduct during incarceration.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent report but let's not pick out parts of it to suit our purpose or your purpose and misrepresent the report to the public. That is what the member is attempting to do again. All I am saying to him is, be fair with the McGuigan Report. Members of your party were on it, members of my party were on it and members of the Liberal party were on it and for once, all three parties I think, came up with a report that was unanimously accepted, that brings forth some excellent recommendations and I think we should have a real good look at it as to how it pertains to our correctional system. I think there are many suggestions in here that we should adopt, one of them being what you are saying, work programs, worthwhile work programs. No one denies that. But there is a limit as to what you can do.

I think we have an excellent relationship with the Prince Albert City Council in the work that has been done over the years by the inmates and the city of Prince Albert. I can tell you that if the hon. member is going to put limits on the city of Prince Albert as to what they can then give as a reward for the work that they have received and he goes out and criticizes City Council for that . . . He criticizes me, but I didn't make those arrangements. Prince Albert City Council did. Prince Albert City Council did — not my officials We approved it, yes. We. didn't make the agreement and we agreed to it. All I am saying is

that what you are doing is, you are putting pressure on the Prince Albert City Council to further limit the work opportunities that are available for the inmates. I agree with your proposition; let's find worthwhile projects, but you can't speak out of both sides of your mouth. It doesn't work. You lose your credibility. The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake I think, entirely agrees with me on this. We have discussed it often and I want the hon. member to tell the House if he disagreed with me, with the arrangement the Prince Albert City Council has made, over the years, with the Prince Albert Correctional Centre, for the work that the inmates have done and the reward that the Prince Albert City Council then permitted to the inmates.

MR. CAMERON: — Does he favor that?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, I think he does favor that. (Inaudible interjection) Well I don't know if it is. All I am saying is and as Maloney, the Ombudsman for Ontario, said — and we can go through that. He said, look, if you do not have an opportunity for inmates to release tension through work and through recreational activity you can expect further riots. I think the member for Kinistino made that also very clear. You have got to have some release mechanism for these people. What is wrong with providing recreational activity? Absolutely nothing.

What the member seized upon is the area of golfing, for example, because he knows that that may not be acceptable out there. Hockey, he says is fine. Baseball is fine but you cannot allow golf or you cannot allow canoeing and you cannot allow — I suppose there may be some other things.

What I am simply saying is that PA City Council found that acceptable; they did not have any problems with it. I am simply saying let's work together on it. We agree that there should be worthwhile programs but there are some problems with that. You must have security. If you are going to release some of these people outside during their time of incarceration, you also have to provide for security.

I think that in our new jail centres where we are able to segregate the inmates, we can again do more work with individual inmates. We are also able to, I suppose, provide them with more meaningful work programs and educational programs to try to develop some skills for these people so that when they go out of the correctional centre they will be better prepared to take an active role in society.

MR. LANE: — Well, I was not going to get too heavily involved in the golf. I think the people have made it quite clear. The one thing we did find out though, because you kind of alluded to that in the past, is that the request for the golfing came from your officials to allow the prisoners, who did some work on the golf course, to use the golf course for the golfing, not from the city of Prince Albert that that be the payment. Don't try to leave that impression. The request came from your officials as to the golfing.

Now, it is that type of activity that puts your program in disrepute and I know Walter Chester puts your program in disrepute. You know, 90 per cent or 100 per cent of the school children in this province get their exercise in the school yard or in the gymnasium and education says that that is adequate; there is a physical education director. That is good enough for most of the people.

Most of the people have to run around the block or go to the Y on a track. But for the prisoners, they are the athletic elite of this province. They get the golf, they get

canoeing; they get the fishing. And that is why your program is in disrepute, because you completely botched up the priorities. The fact is they could get enough exercise, as can I, as can the Attorney General in any gymnasium. You don't need a golf course for exercise for the prisoners. You can't defend that and you know full well you can't defend it.

That was a bad program, it was a foolish program and you shouldn't have got into it.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say very much except, I think it clearly indicates the screwed up mind of the individual from Qu'Appelle.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, just a few questions here. First I would like the minister to define, in your department's terms, what is rehabilitation? What is your definition of rehabilitation?

MR. ROLFES: — Simply put, self-improvement. It simply means that the individual will be a better individual, as he sees himself, not necessarily as others see him. As he sees himself and he then will be able to better function and adapt into society. Let me give you an example of why I disagree with the member for Qu'Appelle.

An individual may well think that he has really improved himself, but because he is an ex-inmate, others may see him as simply not improved at all. And when he comes to apply for jobs, not because he has improved himself, he has a better education, he has a better outlook, but the label on him is ex-inmate. Therefore, he is perceived differently from society than what he perceives himself as to be. That is why I say, self-improvement, more important than how others perceive him, because others will see him as an ex-inmate, very often.

MR. WIPF: — Well, that is a loose definition, Mr. Minister. What are your programs in the facilities for this self-improvement? I am not being facetious, but let's go to the golfing; let's go to the canoeing. A guy can go out and learn to golf and learn to be a better canoeist and he can look at himself as improved in his own image. True, that the person who is hiring him, or the person who has to work with him after, may not look at this as rehabilitation. I thought you would have a more defined definition of the word 'rehabilitation', other than just self-improvement.

MR. ROLFES: — You pick out, again, part of my definition and you leave the other behind. It is self-improvement and then is behavior patterns after he gets back into society. If he perceives himself as being improved but his actions don't prove that, then there is no improvement. He has deluded himself. What I'm simply saying is that you must make the conditions such that he is a less embittered individual when he comes out than when he went in. I'm not saying it has to be done through golfing or fishing or canoeing or whatever it may be, but that's only part of it, a small part of it maybe. You do it too, the McGuigan Report says that the relationship is of inmates to inmates, staff to staff and staff to inmates and how you treat the individual. Do you have the time to spend a few minutes with the individual? How do you present yourself as a staff to the individual? Do they see them as run-down, no-gooders in society or are they there to help them?

As the member from, I think Wilkie again, I don't know why I am always referring to her, she did her work this morning on research and in her speech she said there has got to be more outside one to one relationship. I am saying to you there has got to be more one to one relationship in the prison. This is exactly what the McGuigan Report has

said. In addition to that we have to employ more professional counsellors. I think we need more professional counsellors but I can tell you that in our present set-up, in our antiquated facilities that we have I think this is nigh on impossible. I think in our new facilities we will be able to do that. We will be able to segregate groups of inmates from each other so that we can deal with groups who may have similar problems and try to improve the individual. Try to get at their particular problems, if you have a group with alcohol problems let's try and have rehabilitation in alcohol. If you have people who have problems as far as sex is concerned and as abuses in that regard, deal with those individuals. If you have people who may have difficulties as far as property is concerned you deal with their problem. All I am saying is that we haven't been very successful with rehabilitation. I know that, but that doesn't mean it can't work. I think it can work with the right conditions and the right philosophies.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, when an inmate is released from a correction centre in our province or any other province, is there any card on him or any record on him that say that he has been rehabilitated in his area of rehabilitation? Your psychiatrists or psychologists or whoever is working with these people will probably try to define an area that they need to be rehabilitated in, some area of living in which they have problems and when they work on that is there any assurance given anywhere that the guy is on his way or anything like that or do they just let him go?

MR. ROLFES: — Not really except in our educational programs that they have taken, a particular skill program or they have upgraded themselves, they will be issued a certificate stating that. No, not on rehabilitation. I think that would be a very difficult thing to measure. I don't think you could really measure that. I think the proof of the pudding would be as to how the individual would react once he is back in society. I don't think we could issue those kinds of certificates.

MR. WIPF: — What amount of emphasis is put on rehabilitation in the Correctional Centre? Is there a great amount of emphasis put on that? We are not just crying in the dark saying that we are rehabilitating people when it is general knowledge we are not rehabilitating very many. Those who want to improve their lot, will improve their lot by their own initiative. They will do that whether they are in there or somewhere else. I would like to know how much emphasis or how much time is spent on an individual in the area of trying to rehabilitate him?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, just very quickly on this. I indicated this morning that the main objective still is security. I think that has to be always kept in mind. We do not have, in my opinion, sufficient opportunities in our Correctional Centres to do the kind of rehabilitation, I think, that needs to be done. We are doing some in work areas. We are doing some in improving the educational skills and trade skills of individuals through the workshops that we have but not sufficient. I think we need to do more. We need to, for example, make sure that more and more of the inmates can, while they are being incarcerated, move into the community to take advantage of the opportunities that there are in rehabilitation — alcohol rehabilitation, personal rehabilitation, family rehabilitation. We have to be very, very careful that we select these people very carefully so that we don't permit people into society while they are supposed to be incarcerated and probably cause further offences against society. Again, I want to say, that I think in our new centres we will be able to do much more of this. We will have more staff and also, I think the facilities will lend itself to that.

MISS CLIFFORD: — I just want to briefly make a couple of statements. The member for Qu'Appelle got up and challenged the minister on his programs and said, there is no

way that you can defend them. If you can't defend them, I can. I don't think that you have even adequately come across as to why you are having such things as recreation. I am sorry but I think the member for Qu'Appelle is picking out a number of instances that are totally insignificant in the matter of the comprehensive program. I tried to point out to the member, and to the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake that this is an example, recreation programs are an example of rehabilitation in that I have been trying to tell you that you need work programs so that they will have some meaningful type of relationship. Now if they have cleaned up the golf course and helped with that work, then I think there is no reason why they can't use that as sort of a goal or a reward, of you like, a sort of work that they have done that has been meaningful to society.

Now those instances of golfing and canoeing and whatever, are just minor compared to other things that they can do in recreation. As the member said you can stick them into a gym or wherever you are going to put them. Now, you have to learn in playing sports or whatever you are doing, that there are rules and there are things in which you have to interact with people. This is a prime example, in which you have to learn that in society in everything you do.

The one thing that the Wilderness Camps have taught us, is that getting out there by themselves, they have to learn the basic fundamentals of getting along with people and having to play with the rules of the game no matter how small it might be. And if that is the first instance that they can do to learn the rules of the game, whether it be in golfing, canoeing and basketball, or work in any kind of project that they have in the institution, then we have to grasp at the main program and the smallest we can get. There is no need to criticize any type of a program that offers rehabilitation like that. And you can't defend it, Mr. Minister, then I can.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the member for Wilkie, again. I think I can defend it, but what is the sense of continually defending them when those people simply won't accept them. I just didn't want to waste the time of the House to defend them again. I have in the past and I will defend, but not to those members, because they have a closed mind and they will not listen. I want to thank you for your comments.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. J. L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to introduce some very special guests that just arrived in the gallery.

The group that you see that have just arrived in their dress, from Camrose, Alberta. In that group includes my sister Joyce Wilcox and the group from Camrose. They are here as Sweet Adelines attending the affair that is going on at the Centre of the Arts. I am sure that all members of the House will join with me in wishing and congratulating them on attending the festivities that are going on in Regina and wish them luck in their contest that they will be engaging in.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:01 o'clock p.m.