

Adjournment Debate

fore request that the Canadian government take the necessary steps to convey this feeling to the United States government at the earliest possible opportunity.

I hope that the parliamentary secretary has seen today's lead editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, which sums up the situation very well. Under the heading "Six Years of Dithering" the article reads:

Surely some time ago it must have occurred to our leaders in Ottawa that the ambling stroll down diplomacy lane which the Canadian government has been taking for the past six years over the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota has been a dismal failure as an exercise in international negotiation.

The Garrison project is a \$500 million irrigation scheme that by all accounts of environmentalists on this side of the border and the other will deleteriously affect the quality of water in the Red and Souris Rivers flowing north across the international boundary into Manitoba.

Mr. Herb Breau (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the hon. member has not brought out very much that is new on this subject. Aside from referring to what the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) has said, he quoted Ambassador Cadieux, our former ambassador to Washington. I have not seen the quotation ascribed to Ambassador Cadieux on this subject, but I guess this shows that the government, from quite early on in this matter, was on top of it and showing its concern.

From the point of view of the United States, this might be an environmentally good or bad project, but we can only be concerned with what happens in Canada. We cannot tell the United States how to make its decisions. However, we can, of course, insist on its following the treaty that was signed between our two countries in 1909, the Boundary Waters Treaty, and we have done that. We have talked to it about the potential effect on Canada of this project and about, to use technical terms of the treaty, possible injury to health or property in Canada.

The United States has assured us that it will abide by that treaty, and also that no decision on construction involving the diversion of water into the Souris Basin would be undertaken prior to 1978. United States officials have further stated that, under the present timetable, construction on the Velva Canal is not expected to be scheduled until 1988, and construction on the Souris River is not to begin until 1981. In this regard we are confident that the United States will honour its long-standing pledge and that no project construction, and I repeat, no project construction potentially affecting waters flowing into Canada will be undertaken unless it was clear that the United States would meet its obligation under the treaty.

There is nothing I can add, but to say that we are following the situation very closely and following its schedules very carefully. If we had any evidence, or if the hon. member has any, which would show that the United States is not living up to its obligation, then I would undertake to look into it. As long as I do not have that kind of evidence I am sure the hon. member will understand that we have to accept the United States' assurance.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

PENITENTIARIES—ALLEGED HIGH RATE OF TURNOVER OF SECURITY STAFF—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, how many more tragedies and morale shattering incidents in our streets and penitentiaries must we have to convince the government that its experience in permissiveness and its failure to enforce laws, rules, and regulations uniformly and fairly are neutering the characteristics and quality which made this country envied by all throughout the world?

If a free democratic society is to survive there has to be order. The incident in New Westminster last week, in addition to earlier bizarre incidents in other penitentiaries, surely has to impress the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) and the government that something is seriously wrong in our correctional institutions and with our correctional policies.

If our penitentiaries were administered with correct and logical priorities we could perhaps see progress in our attempts to rehabilitate people with serious behavioural problems. The priorities and objectives are well known. They are: first, secure custody until the sentence of the court is ratified; second, to make every endeavour to return the prisoners to the community with a determination to live the lives of law-abiding citizens; and third, to use our tax resources to achieve the best result with wisdom and economy.

The correctional services budget in 1960 was \$19 million to \$20 million, with a headquarter's staff of 50 people supervising a total penitentiaries' staff of 3,000 in Canada, overseeing over 6,000 inmates. The correctional services budget for 1975, according to the Blue Book, is over \$230 million, with a headquarters' staff and regional headquarters' staff of 620 people supervising a total penitentiaries' staff in Canada of 7,000 people looking after 8,800 inmates.

The measure of success in penal reform is the recidivism rate. In spite of the prolific growth in staff from 3,050 to 7,620 in 15 years, and in spite of the 1,100 per cent increase in expenditures in this service, the recidivism rate is still constant. Of all persons admitted to the penitentiaries in one year about 80 per cent have had previous penal institutional experience, and 42 per cent to 45 per cent have had previous penitentiary experience. Before we are told in reply that there was a decrease in the penitentiary population last year, may I say that these decreases occur in cycles which usually reflect a policy change in law enforcement or parole.

I understand that the turnover of guards in our penitentiary service is very high. In the British Columbia Penitentiary it approximates 80 per cent. To resolve this serious problem a special task force was appointed by the service to see what could be done to recruit guards. An investigation should report on the reasons for this high turnover, which represents a serious situation. Then perhaps we could do something positive about the very shallow and thin security conditions which exist in our institutions.

Penitentiary service policy does not differentiate between types of institutions in its programs. This allows for far too much freedom of movement of inmates in maximum security institutions in the name of rehabilitation.