



Under the Fairness Lens

How Your Provincial Ombudsman's Office Works

Regina Office

150 - 2401 Saskatchewan Drive
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 4H8

Phone: 306-787-6211
1-800-667-7180

Saskatoon Office

315 - 25th Street East
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7K 2H6

Phone: 306-933-5500
1-800-667-9787

www.ombudsman.sk.ca

promoting fairness

W

What is a provincial ombudsman?

What is an Ombudsman?

An ombudsman is someone appointed to look into complaints and disagreements from a specific area.

Each type of ombudsman may have different mandates and authority.

Some types of ombudsman:

- ▶ government
- ▶ military
- ▶ financial Institution
- ▶ telecommunication
- ▶ broadcasting
- ▶ business



What is a Provincial Ombudsman?

- ▶ A provincial ombudsman is a person appointed to look into complaints people have about the provincial government.
- ▶ These complaints are about the agencies and corporations that are a part of the government.
- ▶ In Saskatchewan, the person appointed or asked to be the Ombudsman is chosen by the elected members of the political parties in Saskatchewan. These elected members are called the "Legislative Assembly".
- ▶ The Ombudsman reports to the Legislative Assembly. Each year the ombudsman writes an Annual Report to give to the Legislative Assembly.
- ▶ This report is free to everyone. It gives examples of cases and other work done by the office.

What Does a Provincial Ombudsman Do?

A provincial ombudsman is a resource for fairness. That means people can use the Ombudsman's office to learn more about fairness and to make situations more fair. Here are some of the services the Saskatchewan ombudsman offers as a fairness resource.



1. The Ombudsman offers a range of services. He or she:
 - ▶ Listens to complaints.
 - ▶ Assesses each complaint to determine:
 - what sort of unfairness may have occurred (fairness issue).
 - whether the office can take the complaint (jurisdiction).
 - ▶ Refers complaints to other helping agencies when appropriate.
 - ▶ May attempt to negotiate a resolution to a complaint.
 - ▶ May mediate between parties in conflict over a complaint.
 - ▶ May investigate the fairness of a decision, action or process.
 - ▶ May do a systemic (system-wide) review into the fairness of a program or procedure.

2. The Ombudsman educates the public and the government. He or she:
 - ▶ Holds workshops and presentations for schools and the general public.
 - ▶ Provides fairness training for government bodies.
 - ▶ Provides printed materials and information handouts for conferences and classrooms.

In Saskatchewan, as in other provinces, there are too many complaints for the Ombudsman to deal with alone. There is a team who works with the Ombudsman and often acts in his or her place. Ombudsman Saskatchewan has two offices - one in Regina and one in Saskatoon. In total, about 20 people work in these two offices. They process complaints and educate the public and government.

Is the Provincial Ombudsman in My Corner or the Government's?

Neither. The Ombudsman is impartial.

The Ombudsman:

- ▶ Is independent
- ▶ Is appointed by the Legislative Assembly (not part of any government department)
- ▶ Is not on anyone's side
- ▶ Is on the side of what is fair and reasonable



Who Can Contact the Ombudsman?

Anyone. It is a free service.

How do I contact the provincial ombudsman?

- ▶ By phone
- ▶ By coming into the office
- ▶ By writing us a letter



Regina Office
 150-2401 Saskatchewan Drive
 Regina, Saskatchewan S4P 4H8

 Phone: 787-6211 or 1-800-667-7180
 Email: ombreg@ombudsman.sk.ca

Saskatoon Office
 315-25th Street East
 Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7K 2H6

 Phone: 933-5500 or 1-800-667-9787
 Email: ombsktn@ombudsman.sk.ca

Website: www.ombudsman.sk.ca

What Kinds of Complaints Does the Ombudsman Take?

The ombudsman listens to complaints about provincial government:

- ▶ agencies
- ▶ boards
- ▶ commissions
- ▶ Crown corporations
- ▶ departments

What Kinds of Complaints Does the Ombudsman Not Take?

The ombudsman does not look into complaints about:

- ▶ the federal government
- ▶ courts
- ▶ decisions of Cabinet
- ▶ school boards
- ▶ the police
- ▶ municipal governments
- ▶ private companies
- ▶ individuals

*Department of
Community Resources*

Regional Health Authorities **SGI**

SaskTel

SaskPower

Workers' Compensation Board
Saskatchewan

Human Rights Tribunal Department of
Corrections & Public Safety

SaskEnergy ... & others

Some Examples of Complaints



Agriculture Issues

- ▶ Rebate program denials
- ▶ Crop insurance issues
- ▶ Cash incentive program denials



Education Issues

- ▶ Student financial assistance denials
- ▶ Repayment demands
- ▶ Miscalculations



Health Issues

- ▶ Denial of out of province treatment costs
- ▶ Special needs program coverage denied
- ▶ Coverage eligibility issues



Housing Issues

- ▶ Rent and eviction issues in public housing
- ▶ Rent and/or mortgage calculation in public housing
- ▶ Special program denial
- ▶ Rental hearing issues



Insurance Issues (public / government insurance only)

- ▶ Denial of claim payout
- ▶ Incorrect value of claim payout
- ▶ Denial of coverage



Injury Issues

- ▶ WCB claim and benefit denial
- ▶ Vehicle accident injury claim denial
- ▶ Benefits delayed



Justice Issues

- ▶ Lost property in correctional centres
- ▶ Miscalculation of in-house wages
- ▶ Improper calculation and/or removal of money from trust accounts (Public Trustee and Correctional Centres)
- ▶ Errors in sentencing affecting release date and waiting job income.



Social Assistance Issues

- ▶ Denial of benefits or reduced benefits
- ▶ Denial of allowance for special needs and medical needs
- ▶ Overpayment and repayment issues
- ▶ Demand for sale of houses and vehicles or use of savings



Utility Issues

- ▶ Power, energy (gas), telephone billing and collection issues including disconnects, wrong bills, inability to pay, payment plans, budgeting

H

How Does the Ombudsman Deal with Complaints?

What Should You do if You Have a Complaint About Government?

First, talk to the people at the government agency or department.

Ask :

- ▶ How can I solve this problem?
- ▶ Is there someone who can help me?
- ▶ Why was this decision made?
- ▶ Who can I go to if I am not happy with the decision?
- ▶ How do I appeal this decision?



Keep notes!

Your notes will help you keep track of events in case the problem does not get resolved right away. Make note of the first names of people you talked to and who made the decision. Record the dates and times you talked to them.

What Happens With Your Complaint?

If you take your complaint to the Ombudsman, what will happen? What do you need to do?



1. Call the Ombudsman's office and ask to speak to the person who listens to complaints. That person will listen to your complaint against the government.
 - ▶ You will be asked questions about your complaint and what happened.
 - ▶ You will be asked "what did you do to try and solve it?".
 - ▶ The person who listens to your complaint can call the government department or agency and can sometimes help solve your complaint.
 - ▶ You will be told if your problem or complaint is a problem for the Ombudsman to look into - that is, within our jurisdiction. If it is not, we may suggest some more appropriate organization where you could take it.
 - ▶ If the Ombudsman cannot look into your complaint you will be told where you can get help with your complaint
 - ▶ The Ombudsman's office will also call and find out who can help you.
2. The Ombudsman's office looks at your complaint and determines what approach will be appropriate: coaching, mediation, negotiation, conciliation, investigation or a combination of these.
 - ▶ Sometimes the Ombudsman asks you or the person who listened to your complaint to do something to solve the problem.
 - ▶ The Ombudsman may decide it would not be appropriate to work on your complaint.



3. The Ombudsman sends a letter to you telling you if your complaint will be investigated. The Ombudsman will tell you which Ombudsman Assistant will be assigned to work on your file.
4. The Ombudsman gives your complaint to an Ombudsman Assistant.
5. The Ombudsman sends a letter to the government department or agency to tell them that an investigation is started. The letter tells the department that you have a complaint and what the complaint is.

How are Complaints Addressed?

The Saskatchewan Ombudsman and his or her team address complaints in whatever way is most appropriate for them. This includes:



Coaching – used to help people solve issues on their own

Negotiation – used when a person and the government agency reach an impasse

Facilitated Communication – used to facilitate an informal face-to-face meeting with the parties to discuss the issue

Mediation – a formal process where the parties meet to outline their interests and expectations and come to a signed agreement

Investigation (informal) – process of inquiring as to what happened and why and discuss what can resolve it

Investigation (formal) – process of opening files with notice letter, reviewing all documents and carrying out interviews to determine reasons for decisions

What Happens if Your Complaint is Investigated?




1. An Ombudsman Assistant will talk to you and the government department or agency involved in your complaint. The Ombudsman Assistant will ask to meet with you to ask you questions about the complaint. He or she will also ask the government department or agency to see the files about your complaint.
2. The Ombudsman Assistant will talk to all the people involved. He or she will also talk to anyone who can help find out what happened and why it happened.
3. The Ombudsman Assistant will look at the legislation and policies that are related to your complaint.
4. The Ombudsman Assistant will try and solve the problem. He or she may suggest ways to solve the problem to you or the government .
5. The Ombudsman Assistant will write a report to tell the Ombudsman about your complaint and explains what was found in the investigation. He or she will also tell you what they found and you can say if you agree or disagree.

When is Mediation Useful?



- ▶ The issues are complicated by a strong emotional element.
- ▶ The parties involved know each other.
- ▶ Maintaining a relationship with the other party is important because they will continue to interact in the future.
- ▶ One party feels uncomfortable talking to or confronting the other party unless someone else is present.
- ▶ The parties work or live together, or for some reason cannot avoid conflict.
- ▶ A decision must be reached within a specific and short time frame.
- ▶ The parties doubt their own ability to work out the problem.
- ▶ Many people are involved or indirectly affected.
- ▶ One or both parties want to avoid formal proceedings.
- ▶ Both parties are willing to meet or talk.

Complaint Flowchart



W

What is fairness?



When you were younger, did you ever say something like this? "Hey! That's not fair! He got a bigger cookie than me."

Does fairness mean that each person gets exactly the same thing? Not always. If two people are in the same situation, they may have different ideas about what is fair. What is fair for one person might not be fair for another.

Here is an example:

SaskTel has a policy that they give a customer up to one month free Internet if the service is poor. Seems fair, doesn't it?

What if the service is poor for a whole year? SaskTel reasons that anyone who has poor service should call about it so SaskTel can fix it. Why should SaskTel give the customer more than one month free if the customer doesn't complain about the poor service? For most of us, this policy would be fair.



On the other hand, SaskTel had some customers - we'll call them Jon and Andrea - who lived in a very remote community. Jon and Andrea didn't know anyone else who had the Internet, so they don't know what the service was supposed to be like. It took a whole year before they realized the service was poor. When they complained, SaskTel checked into the problem. SaskTel had not put in the line properly. SaskTel fixed the problem and gave Jon and Andrea only one month's free service. Jon and Andrea didn't think that was fair and called the Ombudsman. Do you think it was fair? What should SaskTel do?

We all Need Government to be Fair

Each year, virtually every person in Saskatchewan deals in some way with the provincial government. Paying taxes, obtaining a driver's license or simply switching on a light - these are just a few of the many instances when members of the public deal with provincial government agencies.

Given the frequent interaction between government and the public, it is inevitable that there will be occasions when people are not satisfied with the services they receive or the way they are provided. It is also inevitable that there will be occasions when that dissatisfaction cannot be resolved. In those cases, the Ombudsman may be able to help.


How Does the Ombudsman Decide What is Fair?

A government ombudsman gets his or her authority from legislation - a law that says what the ombudsman is allowed to do. In Saskatchewan this legislation is called *The Ombudsman and Children's Advocate Act*. The Act says the Ombudsman can investigate complaints from people who think they have been unfairly treated by provincial government departments, agencies, boards, commissions and crown corporations.

This involves reviewing decisions or actions, including the services provided, and determining if they are fair. Ombudsman Saskatchewan looks at three aspects of fairness. We sometimes call these the "fairness triangle". They are:

- ▶ Substantive – the actual decision
- ▶ Procedural – the process in making a decision
- ▶ Relational – how the person was treated in the process

The Fairness Triangle





Tests of Fairness - Looking Through the Fairness Lens

So, how does the Ombudsman determine what is and is not fair? What is the test? The answers are found in *The Ombudsman and Children's Advocate Act* (the Act).

There are basic principles and practices of fairness that are to be considered when we look at decisions. Sometimes generally accepted principles of fairness will apply. Sometimes the law will apply.


Section 24 of the Act directs the Ombudsman to consider a number of criteria when determining whether government acted fairly. The Act requires the Ombudsman to determine whether the decision, action or procedure is:

- ▶ Unreasonable
 - Inconsistent with other decisions made in similar circumstances
 - Inconsistent with the weight of evidence
 - Cannot be rationally explained
 - Effect contrary to what was intended
- ▶ Contrary to law
- ▶ Unjust
- ▶ Oppressive
- ▶ Improperly discriminatory
- ▶ Based on a mistake of law
- ▶ Based on a mistake of fact
- ▶ Wrong

Unreasonable

When the Ombudsman finds that government acted unfairly, it is most often because an action or decision is found to be unreasonable. This is because "unreasonable" is a very broad term that can be applied in a number of ways. We will examine some of the most common.

Unreasonable: Inconsistent With Other Decisions Made in Similar Circumstances



Common sense suggests that people in similar situations should be treated similarly. However, government often treats similarly situated people differently and the Ombudsman does not always consider this unfair.

For example, no one expects that every person who purchases vehicle insurance from SGI will pay the same premium. That cost would depend on the year, make and model of the vehicle insured, as well as the owner's driving record. But one would expect that two people with the same driving record

who purchase insurance for identical vehicles will pay the same premium. Government decisions are not always this simple or straightforward. Programs are offered to people in a variety of different circumstances. Consider social assistance and workers' compensation, for example. No one expects that all participants will be treated the same and receive identical decisions.

Neither does the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman ensures, instead, that practices and policies are consistent and applied consistently. If the Ombudsman finds that government's decision in one case is different than in another similar case and if that difference cannot be explained, the Ombudsman will find that government acted unreasonably and, therefore, unfairly.

Example

Alice was a part-time employee at a government agency. During her time there, her employer thought that part-time employees were not eligible to participate in the pension plan. For this reason, Alice did not contribute. Years later, it was learned that this was incorrect and that part-time employees had been eligible the entire time.

Alice and three other employees at the agency had been affected by the error. The other three, who were still working there, were given the option to purchase the pensionable time they had lost as a result of the error.

By the time the error came to light, Alice was no longer working at the agency. The agency viewed this as a significant difference because it could not offer Alice the resolution it had offered the other three. As a result, the agency offered Alice no resolution at all.

The Ombudsman concluded that this was unreasonable. All four employees' circumstances were the same and all suffered the same loss. The manner of calculating that loss was the same. The fact that Alice was no longer an employee did not mean that some resolution could not be offered to her; it only meant that the same resolution had to be achieved differently.

The Ombudsman observed that the agency could pay Alice directly its share of the pension credits that, had she contributed, would have accrued. Alice could match and invest these as she saw fit. This would put Alice in the same position as the other three employees. The difference in the manner of payment could not justify differential treatment among the affected employees.



Unreasonable: Inconsistent With the Weight of Evidence

Some people would call this logic or just good common sense. Basically, an action or decision will be unreasonable if the available evidence does not support it. This is, of course, easy to judge when the facts are straightforward but is much more difficult when the evidence does not strongly support any position or is contradictory.

When the Ombudsman finds that a decision is inconsistent with the weight of the evidence, it is often because communication has been imperfect and the decision-maker was given incomplete or erroneous information. In some cases, though, speculative information has been considered.

Example

Shelley was receiving benefits from the Workers' Compensation Board and was awaiting surgery. As a mother of three young children who lived in a rural area, she asked that she not be scheduled to be in hospital over the Christmas break. Sure enough, an opening became available on December 18 and it was offered to Shelley. She declined that opportunity and had the surgery in the spring. After the surgery, she was able to return to work.



The Workers' Compensation Board took the view that by declining the December date, Shelley had delayed her recovery. That is, if she had undergone the surgery in December, she would have recovered and been able to work four months sooner.

The Board believed that Shelley could have found child care even in December and so concluded that her decision to decline the December surgery was unreasonable. Consequently, the Board refused benefits for the four months of delay.

The Ombudsman agreed that if Shelley's refusal of the December date was unreasonable, her recovery was delayed and she would not be entitled to benefits during the period of delay. However, the Ombudsman was not convinced that Shelley's refusal was unreasonable.

Shelley advised that she and her husband farmed in a rural area. Her husband also had off-farm employment that sometimes placed him on 24-hour call; it happened that he was on call during the Christmas break. The couple did not have family members who could assist by coming in to care for the children, nor, despite inquiries, could they find anyone in the community to do this during the Christmas season.

The Ombudsman did not find any information suggesting that Shelley was exaggerating her circumstances, nor was there evidence supporting the Board's position. It appeared that the Board simply assumed or speculated that child care must be available somehow.

The Board's decision was based on speculation and was inconsistent with the facts and the evidence. It was therefore unreasonable. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, Shelley received the disputed benefits.

Unreasonable: Cannot be Rationally Explained

If a decision or action, when challenged, cannot be rationally explained, it must be unreasonable. We can have intelligent discussions about whether reasons are sound or even whether another person would have come to the same decision. But if it simply does not make sense, there's no discussion necessary: the decision is unreasonable.

Example

Dawn was a social assistance recipient who had recently earned a Bachelor of Social Work degree. Dawn applied for positions in several locations and was thrilled when she was called for a number of interviews. Unfortunately, the Department of Community Resources and Employment advised her that social assistance could not provide funds to cover her expenses for travelling 350 kilometres to one of the interviews.



Social assistance rules state that expenses for travel to job interviews can only be funded if there are no similar opportunities available in one's current location. While this rule would make sense if Dawn was looking for a minimum-wage job in a fast-food restaurant, social work positions are not common and the competition for them is fierce. Even though there was a job advertised in Dawn's community (for which she had applied), it was unlikely that she would be the successful candidate. The Ombudsman thought it didn't make sense to apply the rule so narrowly that relevant circumstances were not taken into account.

The decision, based on that narrow interpretation, was unreasonable. The Ombudsman recommended a broader perspective and the department agreed. Dawn's expenses were reimbursed.

Unreasonable: Effect Contrary to What Was Intended

Governments make rules and create programs to achieve certain results. Usually they succeed, but occasionally rules or programs have unintended impact. Should this occur, the Ombudsman will find that the rule or program is unreasonable.

Example



Lenora, a senior citizen, owned and resided in her own home. She applied to participate in a federal/provincial program that offered grants and low-interest loans for home improvements to low-income people. Lenora was stunned when she was advised that she didn't qualify, given that her income was very minimal.

Lenora's health was somewhat challenged and she required the assistance of a live-in caregiver. Therein lay the problem. As live-in help, the caregiver was also a resident in Lenora's unit and the rules of the program required that the income of all residents be included when determining eligibility. The Ombudsman concluded that the rule was intended to apply to those who resided in the house as their home, and not to people who assisted in their care. Certainly, the caregiver's income was not available for the operation and maintenance of the house. It was also the case that this rule would render ineligible many of the very people who are most in need of the kind of help the program offers - seniors and people with significant disabilities. This was an unintended effect of an otherwise well-intentioned program. The inclusion of the care-giver's income was unreasonable.

Contrary to Law


While the ultimate power to interpret and apply laws lies with the courts, the Ombudsman is legally authorized and required to consider whether or not an action or decision of government is contrary to law. This is one of the most complicated of our considerations.

The most obvious manner of acting contrary to law is to contravene legislation or the common law. It is also, in our experience, the least common error. One can act contrary to law, however, without directly contravening legislation. For example, a government agency may do something that is not legislatively authorized. Or, an agency may use its lawful powers in a manner that the legislation granting those powers did not intend. In the former case, government acts without authority. In the latter, it has exceeded its authority. In either case, its actions would be contrary to law.

Example

Rural municipalities in Saskatchewan levy property taxes on land in their municipalities. If land owners don't pay, the municipalities expend a lot of time and effort trying to collect.

Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management (SERM) grants annual permits that allow ranchers to graze cattle on crown lands. Most of the people it gives permits to are land owners. Some of them, it seems, don't pay their municipal taxes.



SERM agreed to help. The legislation under which SERM grants grazing permits authorizes the department to set conditions for permits that it thinks are appropriate. Using this power, SERM made the payment of municipal taxes a condition for the renewal of grazing permits.

The Ombudsman concluded that this condition, while well intentioned, was contrary to law. The law requires that even when legislation appears to allow broad discretion for setting conditions, those conditions must nonetheless be related to the permitted activity. In this case, therefore, the conditions must relate to the land and its use. It would be acceptable, for example, to impose conditions respecting the payment of an annual fee or limiting the number of animals allowed to graze.

In this case, the municipal taxes and their payment were entirely unrelated to the grazing lands. In law, SERM could not use its powers to assist the municipalities in collecting those taxes. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, the condition was removed from the grazing permits.

Unjust

A decision or action of government will be unjust if it is inappropriately punitive or has consequences beyond what is appropriate to the circumstances.

If government was to act arbitrarily, that would also be unjust.

A decision or action of government would also be considered unjust if its effect was to impose inordinate and unnecessary obligations.

Example

June was looking for a place to stay and moved in with her sister Mary temporarily while looking for an apartment of her own. The following month, Mary was stunned to find that an additional amount had been added to her SaskEnergy bill with a statement that if it wasn't paid, her service would be disconnected.



Mary didn't understand this because she had been a customer in good standing and had no accrued arrears. What Mary didn't know was that June hadn't been as responsible and had an outstanding debt to SaskEnergy. SaskEnergy took the view that since June was benefiting from the service at Mary's residence, that residence's account ought to take on the arrears. In the end, Mary had been made responsible for June's arrears and would remain so even if June left her residence.

SaskEnergy is frequently compromised by people who can't or won't pay their accounts, and has developed a number of methods for collecting the funds owed to it. Indeed, the Ombudsman has generally found these strategies to be fair. But this one was not.

SaskEnergy had for a long time taken the view that all people who benefit from service are responsible for the account, irrespective of who is named on the bill. The Ombudsman agreed that this was generally reasonable, especially since it was based on a provision in the legislation governing the corporation.

However, SaskEnergy applied this to cases when a debtor subsequently enjoyed service elsewhere - as June did at Mary's house. The Ombudsman thought that this was an unreasonable interpretation. Mary had nothing to do with the outstanding account and had derived no benefit from the unpaid service. It was unjust to saddle her with June's debt. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, the debt was removed and Mary's good standing was restored.


Oppressive

Government acts oppressively when its actions or expectations overburden a person participating in a government program. For example, it might impose requirements that are out of proportion to the decision or circumstances.

Example

Tom owed SaskPower a rather large sum of money, but when he applied for new service, SaskPower agreed to temporarily defer collecting it. Tom received service and paid his bills as they were rendered. Eventually, the circumstances that led to the deferral ceased and the deferred amount was added to Tom's current billings.

Tom met with SaskPower staff and they agreed to an arrangement whereby Tom would pay off the deferred amount in monthly installments. At the end of the conversation, Tom commented that his wife had a different surname and that if they had put the application for service in her name, SaskPower might not have noticed the deferred amount and made him pay it.



The next day, as is routine and reasonable practice, SaskPower checked and found that Tom's wife had an account from a few years earlier that she hadn't paid. That same day, SaskPower transferred the outstanding amount to Tom's new account and delivered written notice that the power would be disconnected unless the amount of his wife's debt was paid within four days. Unfortunately, Tom and his wife did not receive the notice and woke on the fourth day to find themselves without power.

Tom immediately went to the SaskPower office. He was told that power would not be restored until he paid all of the outstanding amounts - the current billing, the previously deferred amount and his wife's old account - plus a reconnection fee and security deposit.

The Ombudsman was of the view that Tom had acted in good faith when he attended the office to negotiate the payment arrangement. At that time, the corporation was not aware of Tom's wife's outstanding account and there was no indication that Tom was either. His circumstances were such that SaskPower was prepared to allow him to pay off a rather large amount in several installments.

The Ombudsman concluded that SaskPower's actions were oppressive in the sense that they were disproportionate to the circumstances. On discovering Tom's wife's debt, SaskPower frankly overreacted. Instead of giving Tom notice of her debt and even one billing cycle to pay it, SaskPower served notice and terminated Tom's service. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, Tom's power was restored and a reasonable payment arrangement was negotiated.

Improperly Discriminatory

Many government policies benefit a particular group of individuals and are intended to do so. Consider, for example, student loans. Interest-free loans granted with no need for collateral to a select group of people (students) is clearly discriminatory to those who are not students.

However, government sees a benefit in assisting students to complete post-secondary education and knows that many cannot secure conventional loans. Clearly, this discrimination is not improper or offensive.

Discrimination is improper if government applies discriminatory criteria that are not necessary to meet the objectives of the program. Conversely, discrimination is improper if government fails to treat similarly-situated people equally when there is no justification for differentiating.

Example

Dan was a farmer who received social assistance benefits to top up his income. His children, like many farm children, raised calves. When they sold them in the fall, the income was included when the Department of Community Resources and Employment calculated the family income. This, of course, reduced the family's social assistance benefits.




While the department calculates family income for all social assistance recipients, the Ombudsman noted that the income for "city kids" who have paper routes or Saturday jobs was not included in family income. The department's practice differentiated between types of children's income without justification and, in effect, discriminated against farm families. It was improperly discriminatory. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, the policy was changed.

Mistake of Law or Fact

In general, if a person does something because they think, in error, the law either permits or requires it, that person has made a mistake of law. On the other hand, if a person does something because the laws permits or requires it in certain circumstances and the person believes, in error, that those circumstances exist, the person has made a mistake of fact. In both cases, the person has acted unlawfully, and was not aware of it.

While admittedly confusing, the distinction between mistakes of fact and law can be very important in a purely legal consideration of the case. However, the distinction has little impact on an Ombudsman's review. This is because any consideration of the impact of mistake of law or fact will be offset by considerations of fairness. As such, the Ombudsman has had few cases where the conclusion was based solely on mistake of law or fact. That being the case, consider the following hypothetical examples.

Example



David purchased a sport fishing license that allowed him to catch six jackfish per day and to possess six jackfish. David had a few good days on the lake but never took more than six jackfish per day. He ended up with twelve in his freezer, and was surprised when the conservation officer told him that he was over the limit. He thought the license allowed him to possess six jackfish per day, not six in total. David made a mistake of law.

Let's say, on the other hand, David had six fish in his freezer that he thought were jackfish but which were in fact pickerel. He would also be surprised to learn that he was not in compliance with the conditions of his license. He knew the license allowed him six jackfish and thought that's what he had. But he was wrong and had made a mistake of fact.

Wrong

This is possibly the easiest of the criteria to understand and apply because it means just what it says: the decision or action or its effect is simply wrong. The decision or action may also offend one or all of the other criteria or it may not offend any. But nonetheless, it is wrong.

Example

Correctional centres are anxious to eliminate contraband (for example, drugs) and they know that visitors sometimes bring contraband into the centres. Therefore, a number of policies are directed at preventing visitors from bringing contraband into correctional facilities.



One policy allows centre staff, when they have information that leads them to believe that a visitor might be bringing contraband, to require that the visitor submit to a strip-search or be denied access to the centre. This policy is generally reasonable in a correctional setting.

However, if an adult visitor brought children for the visit, the children were subject to the same policy. Even recognizing that some visitors will conceal contraband on children, the Ombudsman concluded that it is morally wrong to require children to submit to the invasive and disturbing process of a strip-search. On the Ombudsman's recommendation, the practice of strip-searching children was discontinued.

Fair Process

In deciding whether or not a decision is fair, the Ombudsman places considerable emphasis on the process through which the decision was reached. No matter what the merits of a particular action or decision are, if the process followed is improper, government has acted unfairly. A fair process increases the likelihood of sound and supportable decisions and will also help to secure confidence in and acceptance of decisions. These are important to both government and the people it serves.

A fair process is one that assures, to use a common expression, a level playing field. On that field, the rules are fair, all participants know the rules, all parties play by the rules and the rules are applied equally in every game and on every play. In law, that level playing field is assured through the application of the rules of natural justice and these are the Ombudsman's reference when deciding if a process is fair.

Fair process requires that:

- The person affected is aware that a decision will be made.
- The person affected is aware of the information that will be considered when the decision is made.
- The person affected is given an opportunity to provide his or her own information and to challenge the information in the decision-maker's hands.
- The decision-maker considers all relevant information and nothing irrelevant when making the decision.
- The decision-maker is unbiased.
- The person affected is notified and provided reasons for the decision.

This does not mean, of course, that every person will be entitled to a formal hearing with a right to counsel and cross-examination in every instance. Instead, the requirements of fair process are fluid and the Ombudsman's expectations will depend on the nature, impact and complexity of the decision. That is, a person who applies to renew his driver's license can expect the requirements of fair process will be met but should not expect a process as complicated as would be afforded to a person whose driver's license is being considered for suspension. And that person would not expect a process as complicated as would be given in a case where a person faces imprisonment for driving while suspended.

Example



While correctional facilities are primarily charged to work toward the rehabilitation of inmates in a living environment as normal as possible, they are also required to ensure the good order of the institutions and the safety of inmates and staff. Sometimes, inmate behavior threatens good order and it becomes necessary to segregate an inmate from the general population of the institution. This is an extraordinary measure because it restricts an inmate's liberty beyond what is normal for an incarcerated person. Fair process is, therefore, especially important to minimize the chance of error.

If, for example, an inmate threatens or assaults another inmate, the aggressor may be placed in segregation. Following placement there, a panel of corrections staff will review the placement at regular intervals to determine whether the inmate's conduct justifies continued segregation.

Fair process requires that the inmate knows when the panel will review his case, what information will be considered and what is necessary to obtain a placement back into the general population. Then, the inmate must be given an opportunity to provide his information to the panel and to argue against information that the panel has received from other sources. Finally, the inmate must be notified of the panel's decision and its reasons.

In a public report on conditions of custody in Saskatchewan's adult correctional facilities, the Ombudsman concluded that the correctional centres do not always meet these requirements. Segregated inmates are often not aware of all of the information before the panel and there is no clear process to provide the inmate's perspective to the panel. The decision is provided but reasons are not always thorough or complete. In addition, the Ombudsman questioned whether the panel ought to include independent members who are not part of the corrections department's staff.

The Ombudsman concluded that the process, while often leading to decisions that were appropriate and fair on their merits, is nonetheless unfair. It does not meet the standards required for a decision affecting an individual's liberty.

S

Statistics

Complaints Received in 2006

Complaints Received Against Saskatchewan Government Departments, Boards, Agencies, Commissions, and Crown Corporations

	<i># of Complaints</i>	<i>% of Complaints</i>
Community Resources	857	34%
Corrections & Public Safety	632	25%
SGI	225	9%
Workers' Compensation Board	128	5%
SaskPower	116	5%
Regional Health Authorities	70	3%
SaskEnergy	59	2%
SaskTel	54	2%
Department of Health	41	2%
Saskatchewan Legal Aid Commission	33	1%
Other	318	13%
Total Complaints Against Government	2,533	100%

Complaints Received Against Other Organizations or Individuals

These complaints are outside our mandate and are considered non-jurisdictional. We try to refer these complaints to an appropriate organization.

Total received in 2006	1,195
------------------------	-------