

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to all members of the legislature, 28 grade eight students seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are from Coronation Park School in Regina North West. Their teachers, Mr. McDougall and Mr. Forrest who are with them organized the tour. We plan to meet them, hold a discussion and have a picture taken. We extend to each of them a very warm welcome and on behalf of all members we hope that your stay here today is pleasant and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the House, a group of 70 students from King George School in Moose Jaw, a grade eight class. They are accompanied by the teachers, Mrs. Scott, Mr. Ed Segal and Mr. Guidus. I might say that Mr. Segal has himself added greatly to the parliamentary process in our province here by bringing his students down to the Legislative Assembly on a good many occasions and on this occasion of our 75th anniversary in Moose Jaw. I would like to congratulate the teachers and the students for once again coming down to Regina to the Legislative Chambers to see what's going on here. Now, we will meet you shortly afterwards.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Uranium Development in Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister in charge of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan I would like to address a question to the Premier. It is becoming more clear every day that if the uranium development in northern Saskatchewan proceeds that the Government of Saskatchewan will receive literally an economic bonanza from the royalty structure that was developed by this government with the uranium industry. We don't know how many hundreds of millions of dollars will accrue but it's substantial. My question to the Premier is, your intention as a government to ensure that a certain percentage of this money, a percentage which you, of course, would set, would remain in northern Saskatchewan for the benefit of northern Saskatchewan's people and to provide them with such necessary services as roads, sewer, water and so on. Is it your intention as a government to set aside a certain portion of these moneys for the direct benefit of the people who live in northern Saskatchewan and are most affected by the development of that great resource?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think that in part the question is premature since the question presupposes that there is going to be a substantial development of uranium in northern Saskatchewan. That is yet to be determined and

certainly we will make no judgment on this until the report of the Bayda Commission is received. It is our understanding that the Bayda Commission will be including in its reports some comments on the likely social and economic impact of uranium development in northern Saskatchewan, both favorable and unfavorable, and in the course of so doing there may well be comments as to where royalties should be directed and whether or not any portion of the royalties should be directed specifically to northern development. Accordingly, since these issues are, in our judgment, still likely to be considered by the Bayda Commission, we are not in a position to announce any government policy until we have an opportunity to study the Bayda Commission report.

Mr. Malone: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Premier then: — I think you would concede that it is the rights of the people of northern Saskatchewan all of us here are concerned with, and that in the past the people of northern Saskatchewan have had a legitimate complaint in that they have had government programs thrust upon them, both from Regina and from Ottawa, without a consultation process being gone through before hand. May I ask the Premier, (I see the minister is now coming in), if you are prepared to direct certain moneys assuming they become available, to the direct use and benefit of the people of northern Saskatchewan, are you prepared to sit down with the representatives of those areas, including the two MLAs who sit on your side of the House, the Northern Municipal Council, the LCAs and the LACS, to develop a policy on how that money can be best spent for the benefit of the people of northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members will know that very substantial sums of money are, in fact, directed to organizations in northern Saskatchewan, which are elected by the people of northern Saskatchewan — the Northern Municipal Council, the local community authorities, and to a lesser extent, the local advisory councils, and the Northern School Board (which also is elected), spend very substantial sums of money — all the operating grants that would ordinarily be spent by a school board. This process of not only consultation but actual devolution of authority for spending money, has advanced rapidly in the last two or three years, and I would anticipate the process of continuing to consult and going further, continuing to devolve actual spending authority, on elected bodies of northern Saskatchewan will continue.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, the process may be going on over the past two years but obviously not to the satisfaction of the people of northern Saskatchewan. Final question, Mr. Speaker. It is apparent the people of Canada are recognizing certain rights held by Indian and native people in the Yukon. It is apparent as well that you and your government have recognized the rights of Indian people in southern Saskatchewan, to satisfy their land claims. What I am asking you at this time is to acknowledge that the people of northern Saskatchewan have a similar claim and right to be recognized by your government to be able to determine how those resources are going to be used, and how the money that accrues from them is going to be spent in that area. Are you prepared at this time to acknowledge the right those people have in this regard?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, certainly we are of the view that northern people have rights and with respect to land claims we are certainly pursuing them. May I say that if northern people have rights, they are not rights which have just accrued to them since

1971. Our record judged against the record of the previous government, or records of other governments in Canada in consulting with native peoples and people in a remote area like northern people, we would be very proud to hold up and to compare; however we will not be deterred by making comparisons with the efforts, the rather puny efforts, of governments which have gone before us of the stripe of the member who asked the question. We will certainly be expanding the opportunities of people in northern Saskatchewan to have a voice in managing their own affairs and in managing money that comes from resources which accrue from northern Saskatchewan.

\$21 Million Loan — Chemical Bank of New York

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, what are the terms and conditions of the \$21 million loan being taken to date with the Nassau branch of the Chemical Bank of New York? — The terms and conditions.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — I will take notice of that.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Minister, are you serious stating that, in less than a week, you are taken off guard in not knowing about a loan that is being taken by the Department of Finance?

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I will take the next question, the member for Saskatoon Eastview.

\$44.5 Million Loan to Sask Power Corporation

Mr. G.H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Finance on a topic that has been approached with him before but in a slightly different vein. Was the \$44.5 million loan taken out on a foreign market on behalf of SPC taken with your prior specific knowledge and approval prior to it being taken out?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes and perhaps I might add some further information to the members of the House. I did take notice of this question on March 29 I believe. The line of credit that we arranged is in US dollars for an amount not exceeding \$65 million. It is not exceeding \$65 million. Its purpose is to provide interim financing for the purpose of draglines in the US (by the SPC) that are under construction. For the information of the House, the line of credit was approved by the Department of Finance and by the Treasury Board. The authority for the line of credit is in an Order in Council No. 545-77 dated March 29, 1977, under The Saskatchewan Power Corporation Act. For the information of this Assembly I would like to remind members that all borrowings, whether lines of credit, loans or debentures by the government or by the Crown corporation, require an Order in Council. To date, Mr. Speaker, \$44 million in US funds has been drawn down to pay for the draglines. The first draw down was on April 4, 1977 at an interest rate of 6.63 per cent and at a time when the Canadian dollars was at 94.5 US funds. The interest rate for the comparable financing in Canadian dollars would have been at least 1.63 per cent higher, subsequently draw downs of this line of credit have been made over the past year. The most recent draw down was today with an interest rate spread of about three-quarters of 1 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand that the line of credit is interim financing and that permanent financing for the draglines will be arranged likely for 30 years. Given the interest rate spread between Canada and the US we are confident that

April 4, 1978

the cost of financing the draglines after accounting for fluctuation in exchange rates will be cheaper than the alternatives available in Canadian lines. Mr. Speaker, I also table the authority, the Order in Council.

Mr. Penner: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the first place it is about time we got an answer to a question that we have been asking for 10 days.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Penner: — My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Is there any amount of money under any circumstances whatsoever that can be borrowed on behalf of the government or any agency of the government without ministerial approval?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I think that I made my position very clear that all the lines of credit are first of all approved by Orders in Council, the authority is under that Order in Council that is approved, thereafter the officials arrange for the details of the loan.

88 Cent Dollar

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Would the minister tell this Assembly that since the draw down was taken today in light of predictions which have proved in the past year to be so frighteningly accurate, for instance a year ago they were talking 88 cent dollars, we now see 87.5 at noon today. The frightening predictions that are underway of perhaps a 75 cent dollar hence — can the Minister of Finance tell this Assembly precisely why, in the wisdom of the capable people that he has in the Treasury branch, he would not be taking a beating which probably in the long run he is going to be far cheaper to take or is the minister knowing full well that the maturity date of this loan is September 29, 1979, well after the date of a provincial election, mortgaging the future of Saskatchewan at a terrible cost of millions of dollars . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I will take the next question. Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Reclamation of Land

Mr. R.E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the minister indicated during estimates that he felt land disturbed by mining should be reclaimed to a standard as good or better than it was before the disruption. Last week at the hearings in Coronach his department presented a brief suggesting that the reclamation in that area should be divided evenly between wildlife pasture and agriculture. With nearly 100 per cent of the coal field fertile farm land this would mean a drastic cutback in the food production of the Coronach area. Has the minister had any change of heart or does he support the low standard of reclamation?

Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, this government made its intentions clear when a decision was made to proceed with Coronach Unit No. 1 that the old standards of reclamation were no longer adequate. We made that clear. We also made a commitment with respect to reclamation that there would be a minimum of \$1,600 per acre spent in reclamation. Where else in Saskatchewan or in western Canada has that level of reclamation been committed? Since the SPC proceeded with Coronach No. 1, there has been a committee of Sask Power and Environment and other people working up or preparing a proposal for a reclamation. What the hon. member overlooked is that the proposal that has been under consideration for some three or

four years now was presented to the Bergstrom Board in Coronach last week suggesting the level of reclamation that should be undertaken; levels meaning what land should be restored for agricultural use and what land should be set aside for recreational use and wildlife use and the like.

We think there are now very adequate proposals being put to the Bergstrom Board with respect to land reclamation and it is one of the responsibilities of the Bergstrom Board to recommend to the government what a satisfactory level of recommendation ought to be. We do not have our minds made up on this. We are waiting for the Bergstrom Committee to analyze the proposals put forward by the technical group that has been working on this now for four years. We are confident that they will be able to propose a level of reclamation that probably will put us in the forefront in the western world with respect to reclamation.

Mr. Nelson (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. First of all the minister says that the old standard wasn't good enough. I agree it wasn't because we didn't have a standard; we never did have a known standard. Secondly, the minister says that \$1,600 was promised and \$1,600 won't bring it back to wildlife alone. My question is, with all the briefs except the minister's department asking for a standard as good or better and it would be similar to Alberta, Montana and North Dakota, will the minister assure the citizens of Saskatchewan that he will support a level as good or better?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what he understand the previous standard to be. May I say that when we came to power in 1971 there was no reclamation program in place in Estevan. Those spill piles were cast up through the years of the Liberal regime and there wasn't an ounce of them levelled or set aside for wild life or agriculture or recreation. We started early in our first term of office with a modified reclamation program and for the past five years — six years or longer, we have had people in power in the Department of the Environment and elsewhere in this government studying reclamation programs in other areas, looking at what a desirable standard of reclamation ought to be for Coronach. We have made a commitment as long ago as four years that we are prepared to spend a minimum of \$1,600 per acre on land reclamation and lower if necessary, and we are now weighing the recommendations of the people who have studied this in detail for four or five years to see what they will recommend to this government. We will act on their recommendations.

Allegations — Franking Privileges

Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance, and Mr. Speaker, I am referring in this question to new evidence and new allegations which have come to light over the weekend on a matter which was raised the previous week.

Now, I see that the Minister of Finance has just left so I will direct my question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, over the weekend the Minister of Finance, after having withdrawn a comment that he made in the House, in response to questions from members of the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I just want to caution the member about opening up a subject that is already closed and if . . .

Mr. Lane: — This is a new . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, all right. I just want to make sure that the member is aware because I don't want to have to call him to order in the middle of his statement.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, the matter that I am referring to, Mr. Premier, is this. The Minister of Finance said over the weekend, (and this comes between the time of the matter which Mr. Speaker has referred to and the present date) when asked by members of the legislative press corps whether he had made allegations about the abuse of franking privileges, he is quoted as saying in the press and on several radio stations, "No, I did not" thereby re-opening this issue. Now, I ask the Premier in his capacity as Minister in charge of the Chief Electoral Office of Saskatchewan, whether he will now launch an investigation of this and whether he has himself heard these allegations.

Mr. Blakeney: — I have not heard the allegations and I do not see any grounds for launching an investigation.

Spring Run-off

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. During the past two weeks, the spring run-off in the southern part and southwest part of the province is just about completed. Because of the rather dry conditions last fall, the majority of this run-off has gone into the fields, there is adequate moisture there for spring germination. However, we find that the moisture in the sloughs and dug-outs is about one-third to one-half of what is normal. The livestock producers in the south and southwest part of the province are expressing concern because of a lack of moisture. The provincial government had a pumping program last fall; there are no areas to fill these dug-outs this spring. Does the minister have any contingency plans to alleviate this problem which we could encounter if rains do not come? I am thinking in terms of a well-drilling program.

Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the difficulty in the southwest with the lack of run-off which is occurring down there, and we are somewhat concerned about that. We have been in touch with the federal people and we have decided that we would maintain the contact we have with the federal government with regard to their program they had last year. At this point in time, because there is no emergency, we are of course not setting up any kind of emergency program. But the mechanics are still there to work with the federal people in case the need should arise. I think you will agree that last year we were able to mount a fairly good emergency program. We will have to wait and see what really transpires in the meantime.

Mr. Wiebe: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Because of the rather low run-off into our sloughs and dug-outs, there is no water available to take advantage of the program that was used last year, to pump water from one source to another. I think we are going to have to be looking at a more permanent supply of water such as deep wells. The federal government, it is my understanding, provides a grant of up to \$1,500 for such a well, the provincial government provides only \$1.50 grant per foot for logging, which is not contributing at all to the cost of the well, deep wells are now costing in the neighborhood of \$6,000 to \$9,000. Would the Minister of Agriculture and the Government of Saskatchewan consider matching the \$1,500 grant provided by the federal government, which would allow the farmers in the southwest up to \$3,000 for deep well construction?

Mr. Kaeding: — I'm sure that my staff is aware of the problems that are there and we are looking at whether there is any need to provide any additional assistance over and above what we now have for our normal problems. Until an emergency shows itself, I think we will stay with the normal program.

Mr. Wiebe: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While the emergency may not be as severe now as it could be in the future, I think the provincial government should be looking at a long range program to change our directives and dependence on dug-outs and slough water to deep well water which is a permanent supply, and I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider making this a permanent program of the Government of Saskatchewan — to look into future development of water in the southwest, not just strictly in emergency and drought years.

Mr. Kaeding: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to look at that, but I think you will recognize from living down in that area, that there are problems with deep water in that area. There are some problems with regard to the quality of water when you get down to those deeper levels, and that may not be an adequate solution.

Educational Programs re Alcohol, Cigarettes

Mr. E.A. Berntson (Souris-Cannington): — A question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, a recent survey in Saskatchewan Health Regina No. 10, has indicated that there has been a significant increase in the consumption of alcohol and tobacco among juveniles in that area. The Department of Health has conducted worthwhile programs as the Aware program and anti-smoking campaigns in the schools. Is the Department of Health planning increased or new educational programs to help curb the present trend as it relates to the consumption of alcohol and cigarettes among our youth?

Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, we have a continuing program of education with regard to alcohol consumption and other related things such as smoking. It does not only exist within the Department of Health appropriations but there is a new curriculum that is being introduced this year in the schools which has a very substantial portion dealing precisely with that subject.

In our schools where we can get access to all of the young children in Saskatchewan and, hopefully, over time with that and along with the Feeling-Good program, which is going to have a very major emphasis on the smoking, nutrition and alcohol related things, we hope that we will be able to achieve some very positive results in an area that obviously has some considerable need.

Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In certain areas of the province the expertise of a Alcoholics Anonymous has been brought into the schools to bring about pertinent information about alcohol and alcoholism. It seems to have worked in the areas where it has been used. Would you as the Minister of Health, with your colleague, the Minister of Education, consider using the expertise of Alcoholics Anonymous and these sort of people in the schools to relate the real problems of alcohol and tobacco use among our youth?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of expertise throughout the province, one of that being the Alcoholics Anonymous, which the member mentions. We have encouraged and we will continue to encourage our teachers and our school

April 4, 1978

boards, who will essentially have to make a decision at the local level, to utilize the expertise that exist in the communities. If organizations, such as the organization the member opposite mentions, offer their services to the schools, I am sure knowing my colleagues in the teaching profession that they would, indeed, be most happy to accommodate the utilization of their knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I think I will take a new question. The member for Wascana.

Foreign Markets

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. I direct the question to him in light of the disclosures of foreign borrowings which now appear to be in some financial difficulty and I ask the minister whether, as a general policy, the Minister of Finance hedges against this gambling of Saskatchewan taxpayers' dollars on foreign market, and secondly, whether the government, as a general policy, sets aside in sinking funds moneys to pay for the loss of these foreign exchange gambles.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we do set money aside in sinking funds when we borrow for Crown corporations, particularly Sask Tel which is the big borrower. I am not sure what he means by hedging; there is some question as to what is meant by that. We do not, you know — perhaps maybe he can give me an explanation of what he means by hedging but there are sinking funds set aside for repayment of the loans.

Mr. Merchant: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the minister doesn't know what hedging means but I ask the minister whether you have done any forward buying on the foreign exchange markets where you are borrowing money? I ask, secondly, what the level of reserve set into sinking funds now is. I suggest to the minister that if you can tell us how much you have set aside in sinking funds the legislature will have an opportunity to judge the degree of loss by these gambles on foreign markets.

Mr. Smishek: — I'll take that as notice.

Extension of Steel Conglomerate — IPSCO

Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Industry and Commerce. Recently there was some speculation that there is a possibility of an extension of a steel conglomerate in conjunction with IPSCO. I understand that with the provincial grants and the department of DREE and the federal government, there is going to be approximately \$30,000 for each job traded up to 300 jobs. I would like to ask the minister if this same grant is available to other parts of Saskatchewan and in the rural areas as well?

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I am not quite familiar with the grant that he is talking about but I am quite positive that that grant, if it is available for the expansion of IPSCO, only relates to the IPSCO expansion. I think possibly if there is any more to add to that the Minister of Mineral Resources might be able to give you some more information.

POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like to first of all get your

ruling as to why I was not allowed a supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, before you give me your ruling I would simply point out that in prefacing my question and I believe my question was concise, there was no argument there, but in prefacing my question I made it very clear . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member wants to know why he was not permitted to continue with his question. My records show that I didn't allow the member to proceed with the supplementary because I didn't recognize it to be urgent to the business of this Chamber.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I gave notice to your office of an intention to move a priority of debate. The Minister of Finance has been kind enough to give . . . this is a point of order, the Minister of Finance has been kind enough to give some information in today's question period and advise that he would take notice of two other questions. I do not, therefore, propose to move the priority of debate of which notice was given to you.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I have asked the members a couple of days ago to acquaint themselves with the fact that there is no such thing as a matter of personal privilege. If the member has a point of order and he wishes to make a correction he should proceed in that matter. If he is talking about a genuine point of privilege I would encourage him to check the Rule No. 6 with regard to that.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — My point of privilege is this. When the matter which was withdrawn about the franking privileges last week, I want to make this abundantly clear, I am referring now to a matter which arose subsequent to after the withdrawal, surely Mr. Speaker would not rule that a matter could be withdrawn that that then gives the person who withdrew it licence to do or say anything he wished to contravene or to make light of the withdrawal. The point of privilege is simply this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The only time that that matter has been raised again is I think by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland or one of the other members of his caucus in this Chamber. Otherwise the matter has not been raised in this Chamber.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, on Friday night at 6:00 o'clock in the evening after the last sitting of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The House was not sitting on Friday at 6:00 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — That is the point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — So therefore your point is not valid.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — But the point of order surely, Mr. Minister, this House has ruled . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would ask the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who should have the ability, I am sure, to study the rules with regard to privilege, with regard to points of order, with regard to matters that have been closed in this House and have been dealt with and with regard to matters which have been dealt with outside of this House which is not within my jurisdiction to make rulings on. If the member will

acquaint himself with those rules, then I think he can handle whatever the subject is that is bothering him in the Chamber and bring it forward under an appropriate heading. But he is not doing it at this time.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, with respect and since I am alleged to have something to do with this matter, might I ask that you re-examine your position in that regard. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that affronts against members taken outside of the Chamber are, in fact, affronts about which Mr. Speaker must examine to which you have to address yourself. I suggest with all due respect that that has been the position in this House and elsewhere and that it would be very difficult for Mr. Speaker to say I carve off this territory and no other, that affronts outside of the Chamber must be examined by Mr. Speaker, as must affronts to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Apparently no one wants to read the rule that I keep referring the members to. It is Rule No. 6 and it says, in bold type above it, ‘privilege’.

- (1) A Member who proposes to raise a question of privilege shall first advise Mr. Speaker of his intention so to do and the subject matter thereof, at least two hours prior to the regular daily opening of the Assembly.
- (2) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Speaker shall have the right to waive notice.
- (3) When a prima facie case of privilege has been established it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

I am quite prepared to live by that ruling. Point of order.

Mr. Lane (Qu’Ap): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could clarify for me: — we have a ruling of the Assembly that if a member makes a statement outside the House which is contrary to the one made in, he in fact is still subject to the discipline or the rules or the censure or the control of this Assembly. You are now saying that former ruling of this House is no longer operative. I am wondering if Mr. Speaker could give us some of the precedents that perhaps he is basing his decision which seems to be contrary to a ruling made in this House last December, a ruling again made by a majority of this Assembly. I join the member for Regina Wascana and urge Mr. Speaker to reconsider, so that, (1) there is a degree of consistency and, so that Mr. Speaker’s chair will, in fact, remain in the members’ minds as they speak outside the Assembly in bringing members into perhaps disrepute. I suggest that we are in a dangerous position if your ruling stands as made today. Secondly, it is highly inconsistent with the rulings of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — I would suggest that the member, if he has something that has affronted the House, in some way abridged the rules of the House or is a matter of privilege, he deal with it under Item 6 in the Rules of the House; he can bring forward something in a substantive way which the House can consider.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might raise a matter of order with you. It is related to the same subject matter. May I say that I think Mr. Speaker has been dealing with the matter properly. If you could give me a little leeway, Mr. Speaker, I want to just lay the bit of background in respect of it.

You will recall that a comment was made. There was a partial withdrawal in respect of it when it was challenged. Then, on the following day, the matter was raised again and there was an unqualified withdrawal of the comment that was made. Now, a member who feels aggrieved by a comment of another member has one remedy open to him. He can rise, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege and ask for a withdrawal. The remedy of this situation was sought and it was obtained, and that was done immediately. Now the point I want to raise with you, Mr. Speaker, is, does not a point in time come when a member who persistently and calculatively raises points of order, points of privilege and questions which are clearly in breach of the rules, as the member for Saskatoon has been doing in respect of this issue, is that not itself a question, Mr. Speaker, of order of the House? Mr. Speaker will appreciate that if there is one fundamental to these rules, it is the fundamental of fairness. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that on these points of privilege and questions in order that are taken when no one has a chance to respond because they are not in order and they are consistently ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker will appreciate the unfairness of that. Now I say that Mr. Speaker has been ruling correctly in this respect that the remedy was sought and attained. These continuing questions which are themselves out of order I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is a new matter of order. What I want to invite Mr. Speaker to do is review that and to see whether that conduct in itself which is at least dishonorable because it omits basic fairness in it and his odious conduct in the House by a member who ought to be honorable in the House, Mr. Speaker, whether that is the question Mr. Speaker ought to deal with it, thanks to a member who persistently, calculatedly continues to ask questions, raise points of order and privilege that he knows is out of order in respect to which no other member can respond.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege and I would ask leave . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There is no such thing as a point of privilege, not at this time.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I'm talking about a matter of privilege and I'm asking leave to raise a prima facie case of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Under Rule 6?

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I would ask that the member present it to me in the usual form.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, to present it to you now. I believe I have that right under Rule 6, a prima facie case of privilege and I'm referring to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Before I will accept the member's statement of privilege, I will inform the member for Regina South that I will examine his comments with regard to the conduct of the House and if I feel a report is appropriate I will bring one back at a later time. The member for Qu'Appelle.

Prima Facie Case of Privilege — Statement by Minister of Finance on Franking Privileges

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Well, under Rule 6 I am asking leave of the Assembly to raise a matter of privilege. A prima facie case of privilege I believe has been raised by a statement purported to be made by the Minister of Finance and I am quoting from the Leader-Post of April 1 where when asked outside the Assembly whether he had made up the allegations referring to allegations of abuse of franking privileges, Smishek said,

“No, I didn’t make them up,” and he considered the matter closed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is a prima facie case of privilege, that in fact allegations have been made against members that they have abused the franking privileges for reasons stated previously by the Minister of Finance. These allegations have not been restated outside the Assembly and the Minister of Finance is quoted as saying he did not make up those allegations. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it now is incumbent upon yourself to ask the Minister of Finance to either prove the allegations or unequivocally withdraw and apologize to this House and admit that in fact the allegations that he referred to are not true.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I’ll take the member’s comments as notice.

POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have a very small point of order compared to the very weighty and earth shaking points of order that have been taken so far today. This is for my own clarification and I suppose for clarification of the members of the Treasury bench. It has to do with the matter of taking notice of an oral question and in particular whether or not a supplementary can be asked of a minister when he takes notice of the initial question. This situation arose today when a question was asked of the Minister of Finance. He simply got up and said, “I take notice.” The member then got up and purported to ask a supplementary.

I would direct your honor before I take my place to the interim report on the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures, March 12, 1976, page 10, sub (m), which talks about supplementary questions and says the following:

Supplementary questions may be allowed at the discretion of the Speaker and must pertain to the question in order to clarify the answer, or illicit further information on that issue.

My question is whether you can ask a supplementary when the first question has been taken notice of?

Mr. Speaker: — I will take the minister’s comment as notice and bring back a statement later on the matter.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 1

Mr. R.E. Nelson (As-Gr) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 1 showing:

- (a) The names of the companies or individual that have received loans from SEDCO from 1970 to date.
- (b) The names of companies or individuals receiving loans from SEDCO which either discontinued business or closed from 1970 to date.
- (c) The name, address and type of business engaged in by each of the companies or individuals who did not clear their debts with SEDCO.
- (d) The amounts of money owing by each company or individual in (c).

He said: — Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are straightforward and little can be added

that hasn't been said many times over. I am saying the opposition has a right to much more information with regard to SEDCO than has been made available up to this time.

The government tells us to ask questions in Crown Corporations and this is an absolute joke. The minister in charge even if he knew the answer refuses to answer in the question period in the legislature and we cannot get answers and even not trust the ones given by the Minister for SEDCO.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to March 13, in question period, when I asked the question of the Minister in charge of SEDCO, the question regarding Western Press 1976 Limited. The minister indicated the company was in operation and a receiver had not been appointed to his knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the office of the Saskatchewan Provincial Secretary, dated March 9, 1978, stating Western Press 1976 Limited incorporated in Saskatchewan on the 13th day of August, 1976. This corporation was struck from the register on the 30th day of September, 1977. Richard Wayne Probe was appointed receiver of this company on the 20th of February, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, after that question period, when the minister denied those statements, I phoned the office of the Provincial Secretary to see if a mistake had been made. I was told, again, that that company was in receivership at that time and, indeed, Mr. Probe was appointed the receiver. It is difficult at the best of times to get information out of this government and on this occasion I was not given the truth either by one department or by a minister of another.

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a personal point of privilege and was ruled out of order without having a chance of any kind to explain the situation to this House. I am very disappointed in the government being allowed to cover up in this fashion. I believe it is typical of what has been happening over the past several years with regard to SEDCO and their financial disasters. Many times the answers we need in Crown Corporations have been ruled out of order on our questions because they claim they are not in the year under review. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when the citizens of Saskatchewan have money invested in companies they should have the right to information of that company.

This government has covered up transactions of SEDCO to an extent which one wonders what is really happening in that corporation. People in SEDCO have come and gone on a very regular basis and it's time some light was shed upon the workings of that corporation. I have a particular case in my constituency where a young businessman began a business and put in an application to SEDCO for funds to assist him. Many months after he put in the application and waited for the results and for an answer from SEDCO, I found out that they had in fact lost his application. Desperately in need of funds he again placed an application to SEDCO. The particular representative from SEDCO phoned me and told me personally he had seen few people that had asked for funds that had as good an application as this particular person. My constituent waited many weeks but to no avail. After not having heard from SEDCO and not being able to meet obligations he had promised for many months before, he was forced to lock his doors and declare bankruptcy.

This is the type of treatment citizens of Saskatchewan are getting and it is unforgivable and certainly cannot be tolerated in the years ahead. Often we do not hear about the fiascos that go out of business unless the out of business sign has been put up. There is a cover-up so it is next to impossible to find out how many taxpayers' dollars are going

down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot help but wonder when we see businesses start with the involvement of MLAs across the way only to go broke later, just what is happening. Why are the facts not made public? What are the minister and the government covering up?

Certainly a question has been raised with regard to the bankruptcy of the Golden Acres Motel in Moose Jaw. We have not been able to find out how much this bankruptcy has cost the people of the province of Saskatchewan. The minister has admitted he has personal guarantees on the loan but has not told this Assembly or the people of the province who gave those personal guarantees or why they have not been collected. It will be interesting to see if we can get some light on this particular disaster just to see whom the minister has been covering for and how much the people of the province have been forced to pay on this bankruptcy.

They shout about a war on business but it seems to me that that is what they are really waging. Their war is an underground war cloaked with secrecy and too often their secrecy has ruined successful businesses. If the government is prepared to put taxpayers' dollars into ventures then they are obliged to tell the people the amount they are investing and the nature of that business. If the minister and this government have nothing to hide it is time they come clean and tell the truth and stop talking with forked tongues.

I suggest they support this motion and give the facts to this legislature and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move Return No. 1, seconded by the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan).

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I will be moving an amendment to that motion but before I do that I would like to say a few words. First of all, in reply to the hon. member with the problem that he has with his constituent, I want to alert the House that the hon. member is quite aware of what the problem was with that particular constituent because the hon. member came to me and we discussed it the day that he found out that the chap had closed his door. I need not say anything further.

Further to the Golden Acres Motel, I will continue to keep the guarantor's name out of the public eye as do banks and other institutions until such time as we need to call upon them.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg as well as other members opposite know full well that it is not in the public interest to disclose the names of SEDCO's loan clients. Other financial institutions do not disclose the names of their borrowers and likewise, nor do we. It comes down to our simple belief that business enterprise is entitled to privacy in financial matters.

The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg knows that the appropriate place for information about SEDCO is the Crown Corporations Committee. He knows that for a fact yet he persists in directing his questions improperly. SEDCO wants to keep its clients' financial transactions confidential. On the other hand, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg apparently wants the names of SEDCO clients printed on the front page of every newspaper across the province. SEDCO wants to support the small businessmen and women and particularly the business people in the smaller centres. There is some risk involved in doing that. SEDCO is willing to take that risk because

small businessmen and small communities are important to this province and to this government. On the other hand the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg does not want SEDCO to take any risks. To my mind that is the same say suggesting that we turn a deaf ear to the needs of the small business person, particularly those located in smaller communities. Mr. Speaker, in view of this I am quite sure that it is not the government that is declaring war on business but it is people like the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Let me also assure you and assure this House that there is no cover-up of SEDCO activities on my part or on any part of the government. All we seek is the privacy of the financial matters of the SEDCO clients.

Mr. Speaker, I will move, seconded by the member for Canora, (Hon. A.S. Matsalla) that the motion for Order for Return No. 1 by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg be amended to read as follows:

That all the words after the word showing in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The number of amount of SEDCO loans or guarantees approved since 1963, the name, address, type of business, date of loan and amount written off, if any, on loans to companies or individuals on which SEDCO was required to take legal action to collect the amounts due under the loans, the percentage of loan funds disbursed since 1963 which has been written off as uncollectable.

Debate continues on the motion and amendment.

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I think when the subject of SEDCO comes up it is usually an occasion for the passions, and blood starts to run and the adrenaline starts to flow and generally discussions of SEDCO get pretty colorful — pretty colorful from all corners of the House.

Mr. Speaker, SEDCO has evolved into, I think it is fair to say, a relatively questionable organization. It has evolved to that stage mostly in the last four to five years. SEDCO originally was conceived as an organization or as a financial institution to help bring manufacturing into Saskatchewan and to hopefully diversify our base. SEDCO has long since orbited beyond that. They have done that under two different administrations. I suppose the most perplexing thing about SEDCO as they operate in the year 1977 is the way they portray themselves on television and in the press. Once upon a time SEDCO used to portray itself as the lender of last resort, that after you had been turned down by everyone else, come and see SEDCO. Mr. Speaker, that is certainly not the case now. SEDCO very clearly advertises on television, "Come and see us first". Mr. Speaker, I really don't think that that was the question or the original concept of SEDCO nor do I really believe that it is necessary. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in recent months the thing that has concerned me most about SEDCO in talking to various people who have made loan applications to SEDCO always in a direct or indirect manner, usually direct because the expertise to make it indirect isn't all that subtle, get the question posed to them, "Wouldn't you rather do your project up in the northeast corner of the province?"

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that there is a feeling . . . perhaps the Attorney General would like the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield it to him if he needs

it that badly . . . Mr. Speaker, unquestionably there is a feeling among those who would use SEDCO that if your project is going into northeastern Saskatchewan that the money is readily available.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the area which concerns people most of all is the secrecy with which SEDCO has operated. Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to be an expert on the ins and outs of SEDCO around the province but certainly all or a couple of events not very far away from where I reside that I think are borderline or highly questionable to say the very least. One of these has been raised in this Assembly on numerous occasions, that being the Golden Acres Motel, Fairview Developments, a transaction which will be on the year under review when we come to Crown Corporations. And one that I can assure the minister we will sit there an awfully long time in Crown Corporations until we receive the pertinent documents to the Golden Acres Motel. In fact, Mr. Minister, as the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg suggests you can save yourself an awful lot of sitting days there by simply bringing those documents right off the bat. I have had the occasion to notice my colleague for Rosthern's file on SEDCO a couple of days ago. It was that thick and when I suggested, well, SEDCO may be there for awhile, we may need a little help from you, my colleague's file has gotten that high and believe me you will sit there until next June, until we get that business on the Golden Acres Motel.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Golden Acres Motel? I am sure all of you have had occasion to travel down the Trans-Canada Highway towards Moose Jaw and as you decide to go around Moose Jaw as much as SEDCO financing has done the past few months, as you get up past the winery you will see a forlorn, pathetic looking little building that has a bunch of boarded up windows, a sign that is long since dilapidated and you wonder, what is that. Now, if you are a remarkably good guesser, I mean a remarkably good guesser you might conclude that that was some form of a hotel. Mr. Speaker, who built that motel? The taxpayers of Saskatchewan built that thing. Who approved that thing? Who made the approval on that? Well, that is an interesting question too. It is a very interesting question. I notice the director of SEDCO is in a similar, or ended up in the same condition that the motel is, in that he and his board approved. I don't know whether there is any correlation or not.

Mr. Minister, the financing on that hotel, the concept on that hotel was unbelievably bad. If you are going to play the real estate game there are three rules that you follow — location, location, location. Mr. Speaker, I think just one glance at that and those three rules become pretty obvious that they have not been followed. They never did have a hope.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the question — being from the Moose jaw area and talking to people who have had SEDCO applications turned down, I then pose the question, how did that screwball project ever get sent to financing? How did they ever get it?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I cannot really answer that question. They ask me, as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, who is supposedly to play some role in keeping a watchdog eye on how the government spends our money, but I cannot answer it because I am denied information. I am denied access to that. The interest made on the total bill, if I am not mistaken, is up to some \$700,000 but oh no! — We cannot let that out. We cannot let accountability of that out. It is not in the public's interest. Again, what public interests or the ND Party's interests?

Mr. Speaker, what happened with the financing on that? Why did it go broke so quickly? It was underfinanced at the start, granted. There were changes in ownership. Mr.

Speaker, it, I think, raises a legitimate point. With all the transactions that took place — people jumping in, people jumping out. I wonder what happened to shareholders' equity. I think that is a very valid question. Mr. Minister, I want to tell you right now, coming into Crown Corporations, we want the report of the receiver; we want the financial documents; we want everything on Golden Acres or you plan to be there one long time. That is my colleague for Rosthern's strong suit.

The minister, of course, gets a grin on his face. We will see how long he is grinning after he is in Crown Corporations for awhile and the chairman can shout, you are under review, all he wants.

Mr. Minister, there is another one going on that I would like some information on at some point in time, that looked for awhile that it was on its way into receivership but has gotten its doors opened again. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has predicted that one of the next SEDCO bankruptcies is going to be a business operation in Moose Jaw known as Western Press. I think the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is right on. In fact, they just about went about three or four weeks ago, Mr. Minister, as you are aware. The doors were shut for some period of time. They are having their problems, such as accounting, paying their sales tax, being sued, etc.

It is very interesting about Western Press, Mr. Speaker, because Western Press is a business that, over the years, I had occasion (when it was in the Millard family) to do a fair amount of business with. It is a highly successful family operation, the best printing business in Moose Jaw, bar none. The Millard family ran a very fine operation. Seventy-six years, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg points out.

Mr. Minister, you financed the whole bill on that one on Western Press, to a bunch of NDP supporters. They put up virtually nothing and you financed it all. Once again, just like the Golden Acres a bunch of NDP supporters that did not know a hill of beans about business seemed to have unlimited access to SEDCO money. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg points out they got a second mortgage on that old machinery. That is a real winner of a project, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I think we have got other things to get on to and I wish to say to you most emphatically, when SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) is called in Crown Corporations, bring the documents that we, as supposedly responsible legislators — debate that if you want — but nonetheless, rightly or wrongly we are here; we are asking legitimate questions on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and particularly constituents in the Moose Jaw area. I think they have every right to know what went on in the Golden Acres. How was that loan ever conceived? How as it ever approved? What is the ultimate disposition? Who is on the hook; who is not on the hook? Those are legitimate questions out of public money that can and should be answered.

Mr. Minister, you are on record in this Assembly as promising to provide me with certain lists and certain information. We know how good your word is; you backed out on that. I think that says a great deal for your character. Frankly, I think it is a tragedy, at this point in time in this province, that a portfolio such as Industry and Commerce, a potentially sensitive and very important portfolio such as Industry and Commerce with SEDCO, is in your highly incompetent hands, and I say that respectfully. Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the motion.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may speak for about 90 seconds. I don't

want to renew all of the arguments about SEDCO, let me only say that I share the view of both my colleague for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and my friend for Thunder Creek, and I want to repeat to the House the position that I advanced earlier this week in question period, which I think on any fair reading, would be found to be true. That simply is that the government in an effort, as a part of the cover up regarding SEDCO, and in an effort to make SEDCO look better than it is, keeps putting so-called equity money into SEDCO, not drawing interest, trying to cover up the mess that SEDCO is in. This year, that amount of money goes up to \$49.9 million. A year ago at approximately this time in March, I asked the now minister, when there was a dramatic increase of \$16 million in so-called equity, (and really that is just an interest free way of financing the funds) — I asked the minister last March whether there was any intention this year to put further money into this so-called equity. The minister said, no. I asked him last year because there had been a dramatic increase from \$16 million to \$40 million. Now I see from the current return that, in that period when he said there would not be an increase, there was in fact a further increase of \$9.1 million. The intention, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, is to cover the fact that SEDCO is losing drastic amounts of money. If you take any sort of reasonable interest rates on the amounts of money that SEDCO is carrying interest free from the Treasury, you will find that SEDCO, since this government has taken over, has lost \$20.5 million. In three of the six years, by their accounting, SEDCO has lost money. In every year, by any fair accounting, SEDCO has lost money, and the accumulative loss is over \$3 million per year for each year that SEDCO has been in the control of the NDP. In every year that the Liberals handled SEDCO, it made money. It was a program that was designed to act as a lender as a last resort, it was not designed to be a program in the hands of people who treat taxpayers' money as though it were Monopoly dollars.

Mr. Speaker, with those few kind remarks, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 2

Mr. R.E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 2 showing:

(a) The name, address and type of business of the companies in which SEDCO holds shares. (b) The names of the companies in which SEDCO held shares that: — (i) are no longer in business; or (ii) are in receivership; or (iii) have a receiver manager appointed. (c)(i) The amount of each loss that has occurred to date; and (ii) the name of the company in each case. (d)(i) The number and the total amounts of the loans from SEDCO which are overdue six months or more; (ii) the name and address of the companies with the overdue loans.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I do move that an Order of Assembly do issue for a Return No. 2 showing, seconded by the member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone).

Mr. Vickar: — Mr. Speaker, I believe I have already stated my case adequately in the previous Return No. 1 and I don't like to add any further remarks to it. Therefore, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the member for Regina Victoria (Mr. Baker), that Order for Return No. 2 be amended to read as follows:

That all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

The name, address and type of businesses of the companies in which SEDCO holds shares. The names of the companies in which SEDCO held shares that: — (a) are no longer in business or are in receivership, the amount of loss, if any, the company in respect of the shares in the above, or the total dividends received in respect to the shares referred to in the above.

I so move.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 19

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 19 showing:

(1) The recidivist rate of former inmates of the provincial correctional system on a yearly basis commencing with 1970 to the present. (2) The recidivist rate of inmates of the various racial origins of the provincial correctional system for each of the years on an annual basis starting in 1970 until the present. (3) The correctional systems and the federal penitentiaries system now in the possession of the department. (4) The studies reported in answer to (3) above. (5) The dates and nature of discussions or negotiations regarding integration of the Saskatchewan correctional system and the federal penitentiaries system proceeding with the federal government.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I am in this motion asking a series of questions about the correctional centre because I and the public are very concerned about the operation of the Saskatchewan Correctional Centre and the lack of results in decreasing the high crime rate in this province.

I said, Mr. Speaker, in previous speeches about this subject that part of the problem is a lack of funding provided by the government to the system. A second part of the problem, as I have previously said, is the improperly high case load of people working in the probation service and the lack of funding to the probation service, a much higher case load in the probation service that exists in the parole service. I reiterate those statements. I believe them to be increasingly true. The government, I suggest, is starving the whole criminal justice area and one of the results is that Saskatchewan has an unacceptably high crime rate, a higher crime rate than Manitoba or Ontario, even a higher crime rate than the province of Quebec.

We have allowed an approach to creep into — I trust the Attorney general isn't challenged that statistic — we have a higher percentage crime rate in this province than they have in the province of Quebec. It's true. We allowed an approach, Mr. Speaker, not just in — are you challenging those figures, Mr. Attorney General?

Mr. Romanow: — I certainly am.

Mr. Merchant: — No question, no question.

Mr. Romanow: — There are holdups every day in Montreal and he says Saskatchewan has a higher crime rate.

Mr. Merchant: — We do, we do. Holdups and beatings every day in Regina. You should spend a little time here. Regina is a problem. I am a Regina member. A higher crime rate, Mr. Attorney General, a higher percentage crime rate, Mr. Attorney General, in Saskatchewan than exists in the province of Quebec. Montreal may be a problem with holdups but the rest of the province is in good control, so I say to you, Mr. Attorney General, that what you have in this province is a very serious crime rate and a very serious problem and indeed your attitude about it that things are all right is probably contributing to the problem. We are spending so little money. We are spending so little money on the prevention of crime in this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, in part . . .

Mr. Cowley: — . . . spend more money.

Mr. Merchant: — Spend more money on the prevention of crime, I certainly do. Mr. Speaker, part of the problem not just in Saskatchewan but in Canada is that we have allowed to creep into the criminal justice system a tendency to think that the criminal should be absolved of any personal responsibilities for his conduct. We've almost reached the point where everything is allegedly the fault of society and society therefore has to make it up to the criminal from driving him into a life of crime. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. Governments decided somehow that if we put people into prison, whether it's the provincial or federal level, we would be able to rehabilitate them as though we had an instant rehabilitation sausage machine and that's a myth. The results of that thinking have been, in this country, one of the highest recidivist rates in the world, dramatically higher than the recidivist rate in Europe. The division of the system into provincial and federal, the division . . . well of course as all the members know, this government has made us the best in North America is almost everything and they have made us a good high recidivist rate as well.

Mr. Speaker, the division of the system in the provincial and federal jurisdictions further complicates the process and further complicates the problem for this nation. The British North America Act divides the responsibility for incarcerations giving to the federal government terms of two years and above with short term offenders going into the provincial systems. That division . . . (interjection) . . . well, of course, I don't as the minister may know, agree with the voting of his leader and my leader and the rotten Tory leader on capital punishment but I'm pleased to hear from the minister that he doesn't agree with his leader either. Mr. Speaker, the division of which I speak made by the Fathers of Confederation over a hundred years ago, I believe should be reviewed and that thinking updated. Now you see, Mr. Attorney General, I think that good, tough Tory opposition might have done something about that and they missed their calling and opportunity . . . (interjection) . . . oh, yeah, I'll bet. We'll wait, yeah, it'll be a while. Mr. Speaker, currently most of the people in the provincial system are short-termers serving from a week to 180 days. Most of those within the provincial system are first time offenders, alcoholic offenders, people down on their luck serving time for petty crimes against property. These first time offenders are the easiest to cure and they should not, I suggest, be mixed with the 20-year-old serving two years less a day on his way to more serious crimes that will next lead him to the penitentiary. Now this question of where one would make the cutoff between systems to avoid interaction between the very ardent criminals and the green first time offenders is a difficult one. I suggest that the question should now be re-examined. In current conditions six months seems a more logical cutoff than two years. In the harsher sentencing of 1867, I believe that that

upper limit of two years less a day, in fact, meant that few first time offenders found their way into the company of the more ardent criminals. In those days of harsher sentencing, two years less a day was usually the sentence for a first time offender but more lenient sentencing has meant that frequently people who have been sentenced four, five, six, seven times may be far more hardened criminals but still younger find their way into the provincial system. We now have 16 and 17-year-olds being in the provincial system affected by those 21 and older who are far more hardened and because of the more lenient terms they are mixed together. Regardless of the explanation for the decision to make the division two years less a day, this is the time to re-examine that arbitrary division that exists in the British North American Act. This change could be negotiated between the province and the federal government without need of amendment to the BNA Act and I know that some negotiations along those lines have been undertaken by various governments. The Manitoba government when it was an NDP government was considering some negotiated transfer of control. The federal government by agreement could look after responsibilities of the province. The advantage of the provincial level would be if that time break was changed to six months, that we would be keeping the true short termers of under six months away from the more hardened criminals. The other advantage of a new division would be the greater flexibility available within the penitentiary system made possible by the larger numbers which now would be, in fact, enhanced by the greater size of that enlarged penitentiary system. Greater emphasis could be put on different institutions which I hope would include, and I'm sure would include, institutions for young offenders. Criminals are anti-social, most have never developed proper work habits and part of the job is to make sure that they become used to, or perhaps used for the first time, to the fact that they have to work. Because of the small numbers of provincial inmates only a few institutions per province are possible. The penitentiary service on the other hand provides great flexibility which can be increased. An institution, for example, now operates in British Columbia where every inmate is expected to work a regular eight hour day. There are many benefits in that institution and if somebody starts to act up within that institution, it's not necessary to punish that anti-social approach by punishment within the institution but merely to send the person back to a tougher institution such as the BC pen. That, Mr. Speaker, is an example of an institution where the whole flavor and direction of the prison works in one direction. The concept is similar to the way high schools, for instance, work where you'll have one high school with a whole class or, perhaps, the whole school streamed towards getting people into university. You may have another entire school streamed towards getting people practical trade training. Any teachers knows the effect of having a whole classroom wanting to do well in a scholastic way. Having a whole penal institution moving in a particular direction is the same concept. It means that punishment for anti-social activity need only be to remove the person from the institution. Authorities then avoid the situation where they have an inmate sulking under punishment affecting other fellow prisoners.

Another example of an institution working on a particular type of criminals is Matsqui, against in British Columbia where drug offenders who want to work their way out of the problem are all assembled in one institution. Those offenders, to a greater extent than people committing crimes against property, can frequently be well educated people, can frequently be people who have a potential for university education. So that by assembly them all together, not only do they have the advantage in Matsqui of dealing with their particular problem, but they are able to give to those people, the availability of a higher education which couldn't be available in all other institutions.

Many drug offenders do indeed, complete their education in Matsqui. There are other

similar institutions within the penitentiary system and more could come about. This sort of varied use of the institutions however, involves the change of division that inmates mentioned earlier by the joint sharing of institutions between provinces or perhaps between western Canadian provinces. The change of division is more practical. Provincial prisoners at six months to two years would have access to the flexibility of the federal system. The change of division between the systems would also involve, and should involve, I suggest, the re-examination at the provincial level of the whole concept of parole and probation.

Several European countries, Holland and Denmark among them, have abandoned parole mechanism. Massachusetts in North America is considering the abandonment of parole. The impact of parole on the perceptions of justice is devastating. A recent example within our institutions caused a sit-down at the provincial jail at the end of January. That example was the 14-day parole by the former RCMP officer, Mr. Fitzpatrick. I have no doubt but that he deserved the parole. Indeed I know him and like him, but the fact of the parole was that it very severely affected the perception of his fellow inmates and they believed that favoritism was being shown to him.

In the institutions, as on the street, perceptions of justice are crucial and again, Mr. Speaker, I know that when I speak about perceptions of things that even faintly sophisticated level of thinking is too touch for Treasury benches, but it is the perceptions of justice that are so crucially devastated by the parole system. Inmates must be made to feel that if they play ball with society, society will treat them fairly and equally. Part of the price of maintaining the parole and probation systems is the look of favoritism — the appearance of a lack of an even order of treatment to inmates. The whole system of analyzing whether a person is rehabilitated in prison is in any event, an impossible one. It is at best an educated guess to grant parole to one inmate and reject parole for another, and it causes disregard for the law and for the fairness of the law by prisoners.

The parole system causes serious distortions of the perceptions of justice by the criminals themselves but also by the public and our whole body politic and our whole regard for the fairness of our criminal justice system is dragged down by the parole system. Is it worth the price? Is it worth the price particularly in the case of short-term provincial offenders?

Regardless of the case load the probation system is somewhat of a joke from the perspective of the parolee. Providing meaningful supervision is almost impossible. The public is deluded into thinking that the criminal is controlled on the street. Of course he is not controlled on the street — he was not intended to be controlled on the street. So that the probation service might say we are doing (if the minister would only give us enough money so we didn't have this massive case load) we are doing in part what we are trying to do, but again on the question of perceptions — the perceptions are devastating because the criminal is believed to be controlled on the street and he is not.

The public perception is a far cry from the reality of the situation. A discretionary release system requires reconsideration no matter how you cut it. I am of the view, parole must remain for the longer terms but should be reconsidered within the revised provincial correctional system for short terms. Within the revised provincial system, sentencing should be certain in length and sentences should be served to their duration.

Mr. Speaker, those are the proposals that I make. I believe the provincial government should be reassessing the current concepts upon which the operation of our correction system is based. There exists a very real look of permissiveness which troubles the public and I believe there is little to speed the rehabilitation of inmates, to look at the correction system which has been so much in the news in the past few years with suicides, riots and hostage incidents and frequently the appearance of pandering to our inmates. As a lawyer and as a MLA charged with responsibility to some extent for society. I say to you that pandering to the inmates must end; they must be held responsible for the crimes. People working in the correction system and probation services are in my view very well motivated. They do a difficult job working with a level of society that most of us seek to avoid. They deserve our praise and trust; they deserve better financial support from government and our support as individuals for the tough and difficult jobs that they do. I wholeheartedly say that we within society should support them for the work they do to make society safer and stronger for us all, but government both with its spending and in the priorities that it directs to those people should look again at the direction that we are setting because the direction that we are setting is not a good direction and the direction that we are setting is perceived to be very bad and the perceptions of justice are being dragged through the mud by the whole course of the way our criminal justice system is operating.

With those remarks seconded by the member for Lakeview I move Return No. 19 showing.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, just a few comments before I would ask leave to adjourn the debate. I hadn't expected the member to make the same speech that he made last year wherein I indicated to him he had made 14 errors in the speech that he gave and obviously he wasn't in the House when I rebutted the speech; he made most of the same errors again today.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I did find out about the member for Wascana — he really doesn't care about what the facts are as long as it sounds good. Right? I'll tell you the member for Wascana would do anything right now to say exactly what the people are thinking out there whether it is right or wrong in the long run. It must be understood what the member is attempting to do. He is detecting as is the member for Qu'Appelle, as is everyone in this House that there is a backlash, there is a backlash on the offender regardless of whether the offender — there is a backlash in this country.

Mr. Cameron: — Why?

Mr. Rolfes: — I'll tell you why; you ask me why. It's because of actions taken by the leader that the two of you want to join. Mr. Speaker, with which actions I agree, with which actions I agree. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not do what Hamlet did and stab him in the back, as the two members over there are attempting to do, excuse me, as the member for Wascana is attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, I know what the member for Wascana philosophically says but he knows what the political atmosphere is out there and he's putting himself, his own interests before the interests of the people of this society.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that the member has mentioned today that I can agree with but I get rather annoyed at the member when he sets himself up as being sincere, when I fully believe that the member does not believe in half of the things that

April 4, 1978

he said, but politically, Mr. Speaker, politically it is wise if each and every one of us is in essence reputing my motives but are accusing me of lying to this House and all members of this House. Of course, I believe in the things that I have said.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the member in placing his point is quite legitimate in correcting the record or saying that he said what he said and he meant what he said, but at the same time I don't think that he should say that the minister has accused him of lying, because I haven't heard that.

An Hon. Member: — He is just getting around to it.

Mr. Speaker: — That's a presumption. I think the member has made his statements and the minister has to accept his word. The member also has to accept the word that the minister didn't say that he was lying.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the motives of the member for Wascana are obvious, for the immediate future he needs to be elected. For the immediate future he needs to be elected and what to say out there is that you want to be tough on criminals. You want to be tough on the offenders . . . Yes, he should, but I give you more credit than the member for Wascana. I don't think that you would do that. I don't think that you could go home at nights and sleep. I don't think you could. The member indicates that he could sleep well in one of my jails and I welcome him to it and I am sure that we could make a spot available for him and see how much he would really enjoy one of the jails.

Mr. Speaker, the member indicated that we are not having very good results in rehabilitation. With that, I agree. Neither is any other jurisdiction having very much results in rehabilitation.

Last spring, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to attend the United Nations Conference on Young Offenders, where 19 different countries were represented. For you we would even have to provide a card . . . Mr. Speaker, there were 19 different countries represented at that conference and every one of those countries was experiencing the same problems as far as criminals were concerned, as the countries in North America. This is not a concept nor a phenomenon that is peculiar or unique to Canada or to Saskatchewan or to the United States.

Those people, Mr. Speaker, who think that it is a phenomenon that is unique to Saskatchewan should read the report of Arthur Maloney of 501 pages, which he recently submitted to the Ontario cabinet and it is a devastating report, a devastating report on the criminal system in Ontario. Those of you who haven't read it, I would ask you to read it and it was supported, by the way, by the minister in charge. I will ask the members opposite, I think each and every one of us for political reasons could make the statement as the member for Wascana did and I suppose get away with it. It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to deal with corruptions today for any minister.

When we met as provincial ministers we made considerable recommendations to the federal government. One of the recommendations that we made to the former Solicitor General, Francis Fox, was that the federal government should accept responsibility for all criminals who are sentenced to six months or more. We made that suggestion as provincial ministers. That was turned down by the Solicitor General.

We intend to make the same suggestions again to the present Solicitor General, but,

Mr. Speaker, I have no hope that the federal government will accept our suggestions. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I also in a letter to the former Solicitor General asked him to make changes to the penitentiary Act, to change section 16(1) so that people on remand would be housed in a federal institution.

Arthur Maloney, again indicates in his report, the biggest problem the Ontario government has is with people on remand, because these individuals know that once they are sentenced they will be put into a maximum security institution. They know that if they want to escape they must do so while they are in minimum security institutions. All the provincial ministers said to the federal government, now that you have abolished capital punishment, and you are going in many instances to sentence the individual to 25 years or more. It is becoming more difficult for us to keep them in minimum security institutions. Give us the opportunity to have them transferred to maximum institutions. Again, Mr. Speaker, we are turned down. And the federal government did have some legitimate arguments on their side. Because they said in some of the provinces the individual would not be close to his source of legal people and he would not be close to the source of his community where the crime had been committed and that he should have the right to be sentenced in his community. The federal government said that these were two valid reasons. We did not agree with them, Mr. Speaker. I think the time has come and I think we need to look, for example, at the riot we had at the Prince Albert Correctional Centre and at the riots, for example, that have occurred in other provinces, British Columbia and Ontario. You will find that in the majority of cases these riots are caused and initiated and abetted by those people who are on remand. We need to have these changes made. We have asked the federal government to make these changes.

Mr. Merchant: — I take it you agree with all of it.

Mr. Rolfes: — I agree with some of what you said. I said I did agree with some of the things that you suggested but we didn't make the suggestion today, we made those suggestions a year and a half ago, you are 18 months behind.

Mr. Speaker, the member says there is a lack of funding. I haven't got these statistics with me but I am going the next time I have an opportunity to bring to this House how much increase in funding there has been since 1971. I believe it goes into the hundreds of per cent of increase. Again, Mr. Speaker, he said staff, lack of staff. I think there has been a 400 per cent increase in staff since 1971. Mind you we didn't have to do much since 1971 because we had a very low base to start with and any increase that we make is going to look tremendous. When they were the government they really starved the system. I will just give you one example, in 1971 there were 17 probation officers, 17 in this whole province. Today we have 64 — 64!

Mr. Penner: — What was the crime rate?

Mr. Rolfes: — Very similar. You look at the number of people that were in our jails at that time and the number that are there now and you find it is very, very similar.

Mr. Speaker, the member says, and I do agree with him on this, that the criminal should be held responsible for his actions. I don't know anyone who would disagree with that motherhood statement. Everyone would, everyone agrees with that. I think that when an individual is sentenced by the court whether it is to a treatment centre and I hope that very shortly we will be able to announce a treatment centre for second offenders, impaired drivers and second offence. When an individual is sentenced by the courts that, Mr. Speaker, is their punishment. Anyone, for example, that does not agree with

that should read again the McGuigan report. The McGuigan report which was made up of committees of members of the Conservative Party, of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party and I am not sure of the Social Credit Party. But all of those parties and all of those members came through with what I consider, Mr. Speaker, one of the best reports that has ever been produced by a committee of elected officials. It has been highly praised but obviously it is not in keeping with what the public opinion of how to treat criminals is today. That is what certain members, elected members are latching onto right now.

Mr. Speaker, in the McGuigan report they said the punishment is the second thing and no individual has the right to inflict further punishment on those criminals whether it be through lack of accommodation, through lack of food, by lack of self-treatment by the individuals, by the staff. The McGuigan report incorporates those principles. I accept those principles. I think once an individual has been sentenced and he has served his time, then we should not inflict further punishment as though we were the courts, they have been sentenced.

Mr. Speaker, some members here indicate to us that when people are sentenced we should try and find work for them while they are being incarcerated. I agree with that, and for the most part in this province I think we have been successful. Certainly we have to increase the number of spaces that we have for individuals, but when we have work camps like the one we have at White Gull Camp and another one that will be established at Meadow Lake — we have arrangements with the Department of Tourism; we have arrangements with various communities and, Mr. Speaker, we have arrangements with various communities and, Mr. Speaker, we have arrangements with (and I want to congratulate here) the city council of Prince Albert. We have had over the years, a good arrangement with that council and in return, Mr. Speaker, that council has said, 'because we can benefit by the work that these inmates are doing for us, be it on the golf course or be it in their civic centre, we will allow these individuals to make use of those facilities.' That was an agreement made between the city council in Prince Albert and the correctional institute in that city.

Members opposite would not have criticized the recreational program I'm sure, had it not been golfing. They didn't criticize the program for example, where the inmates went into the civic centre and did skating, where they went into the civic centre and played hockey — that wasn't criticized, but golfing — that should be reserved for the middle-income group I guess — maybe to lawyers and doctors and elected officials. That, Mr. Speaker, I just don't believe. I don't believe it. But again, Mr. Speaker, it sounds good out there and I believe that those people who are criticizing the program, not only are criticizing the Prince Albert city council, but they are also I think, degrading themselves. If you want to make a distinction say, look, no inmates should have any recreation. That's fine — then say that, but don't say that hockey is fine, baseball is fine but golfing isn't any good . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it was mentioned over there too, today. Mr. Speaker, let me say for the record that the golfing program has been cut out in the Prince Albert area, but it has not been cut out because of suggestions made by the opposition. It has been cut out because it was an individualized program and it took too much staff to carry it out — not for the reasons that the members opposite wanted to give. I know it is difficult for me as a member to defend that but that is part of my job and I suppose that is part of politics, but I in principle, Mr. Speaker, accept the idea and again, I would ask you people to read

Arthur Maloney's report where he says that there must be an opportunity for inmates to release tension. One other way of doing it is to have a good recreational program, and he warns the Ontario government that if you do not provide those opportunities, you can expect more riots. Arthur Maloney I think is a pretty tough individual. He was a tough criminal lawyer and I think he is a tough ombudsman, but that is what he says. Now, the Moore report indicates exactly the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, let me get off of the area of recreation and get into the area of what we really should be talking about. I had hoped that the member for Wascana would have talked about that. Why do we have in this country, particularly in this country and in the United States, an increase in crime rate? It is not because of the color or political color of the government in power because in this country we have NDP, we have Social Credit and we have Liberals and we have Conservatives and they all are experiencing the same difficulties. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is at another level. The problem is one of how the society treats certain individuals. Our native people have a socio-economic problem in this country and we have mistreated them for the last one hundred and some years. We have got to find a solution at that level. But, Mr. Speaker, any time the unemployment rate increases we know that crime increases. We know that we have family breakdowns — they increase. So the solution to our problem is not rehabilitation. Our solution to the problem is prevention. We must change the society in which we live. We cannot increase the gap that is now increasing between the poor and the rich. We must, Mr. Speaker, close that gap.

Mr. Speaker, what we must do is find solutions for high unemployment and that high unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is a direct responsibility of the federal government, first and primarily. Certainly the province has an obligation but that problem must be resolved. We must find employment for our people. If you don't find employment — people's expectations are still there; they get frustrated; they turn to alcohol and then they commit crime. When they turn to alcohol we have increased family problems and we have crime. We have crimes against children, crimes against the spouses, crimes against property. Mr. Speaker, those are the solutions and those are the ones that I hoped the member for Wascana would have turned his attention to.

Mr. Speaker, the member says that we must reassess our current concept of corrections. I do not know what his current concept of correction is but for the record, let me tell you what mine is.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the objectives of corrections must be, first and foremost, the protection of society against the offender. That must be the first and foremost objective. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I say that, some people say, yes I agree, but what some people forget is that you do not protect society just when they are in prison. You must protect them also after the individual is released. How do you do that? By creating an embittered individual while he is incarcerated or by attempting to change his behavior patterns by what some people sometimes refer to as rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you must try to change the behavior and patterns of that individual while he is incarcerated so that when he is released he then will go back into society as an individual who will be able to contribute. You do not simply take an individual on Day 1 and release him in society; you prepare the individual.

We are talking about people here who do not commit (the majority of the cases) serious crimes. They are not the hard core criminals. We are not talking about the penitentiary

system, so I think when Maloney and when the McGuigan report says that we should try to rehabilitate in the penitentiary system, surely it is not wrong for me then to deduce from that that we could possibly have some success in rehabilitation in the correction centre where we do not have the hard core criminals. The second objective of corrections must be, I think, to change the behavior patterns of the individuals while they are in prison.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we must prepare the individual so that he is competent to go back into society. We must educate him, we must try to give him some skills, we must try to get him to accept his responsibility in society whether it be as head of the family or whether it be as a single individual, or whatever it may be. If his problem is an alcohol problem we must treat that problem. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that, very shortly, we will be able to announce a treatment centre for those people who have committed second crimes or impaired driving due to alcohol and are, because of the law right now, sentenced to a correctional centre. I hope that we will be able to announce that very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, the member goes on to say that we must stop pandering to inmates. I do not know what he means by that. As far as I am concerned we do not pander to inmates. I expect, when the member for Qu'Appelle brought a letter into this House stating that it was a letter written by, or alleged to have been written by an inmate, where he thanks me as the minister for that winter holiday, I could have brought into this House also, Mr. Speaker, a letter left by an inmate when he committed suicide because he could not tolerate the conditions in that same correctional centre. I think we have got to find a happy medium and all I want to say is, I think it behooves every member in this House to forget about the immediate political gains we can make. Let us come to some commonsense solution to the offenders in our correctional centres who, by and large, are there because of inadequacies that exist in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would adjourn the debate today or ask the House to adjourn debate and the reason, Mr. Speaker, I am doing so is that I cannot provide the member with the exact information that he asks. We do not have that information. I was just informed before the House opened that my department cannot give you that information. We want to give you all the information that we can. I have to, therefore, bring in an amendment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will beg leave to adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 32

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Rolfes
Pepper	Mostoway	Cowley
Bowerman	Banda	Tchorzewski
Romanow	Whelan	Vickar
Messer	Kaeding	Skoberg
Snyder	Kwasnica	Allen
Byers	Dyck	Koskie
Kramer	McNeill	Johnson
Baker	MacAuley	Thompson

Kowalchuk
Matsalla

Feschuk
Faris

Lusney

Nays — 16

Malone
Wiebe
Merchant
Penner
Cameron
Anderson

Stodalka
McMillan
Nelson (As-Gr)
Clifford
Collver

Larter
Bailey
Ham
Berntson
Lane (Sa-Su)

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 13 — Equality for Saskatchewan Women

Mr. W.J.G. Allen (Regina Rosemont) moved, seconded by Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife-Lloydminster):

That this Assembly go on record as supporting the principle of equality for women in Saskatchewan and further commits itself to continue taking positive action, in the future, in furtherance of this principle.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I have the honor, this afternoon, to rise and move a motion dealing with the question of equality of half of our population, namely, the women citizens of Saskatchewan.

This subject has received a great deal of attention over the last few years and as a result of this attention there is much greater awareness of the problems facing women among the public in government have had to respond, resulting in, I think, some very marked progress.

The Blakeney government has been in the forefront in Canada of measures to improve the status of women in our province. I commend the premier and his government for their actions so far, however, it is not my intention to spend the time I have this afternoon in a long recitation of these accomplishments. I am sure others will do that in this debate. Neither, Mr. Speaker, is it my intention to spend these few minutes enumerating the sins of our political foes in this area, although this would be an easy task and one that I would greatly enjoy. I am sure I could spend an hour doing this and not leave the province of Manitoba where the Conservative government's Neanderthal approach to women's issues is well known and aptly demonstrated in their handling of married women's property rights. Rather, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss some of the problems that have not been solved. In some areas I can offer solutions and in others I must admit I know what the problems are but I must admit I don't know what the answers are.

The first area I want to deal with today is the whole question of women and how they relate to the Canadian economy. The most serious problem, Mr. Speaker, facing Canada today is unemployment. There are over a million people officially unemployed and maybe thousands more who are not even on the list because they have lost hope and have quit looking for work. Women are particularly hard hit during periods such as

April 4, 1978

that, in fact, Mr. Speaker, much harder than men. Not much attention is paid to this fact. Women in Canada, Mr. Speaker, make up 36.9 per cent of the total labor force but of the people who are looking for work 44.2 per cent are women. In all the provinces of Canada unemployment was higher among women than men in 1976 and 1977 except in the province of Newfoundland in 1977. In our province, Mr. Speaker, over the two years '76 and '77 unemployment among women was 70 per cent higher than among men. Hidden unemployment is particularly prevalent among women. R.H. Robinson in a study in the October '77 issue of the Canadian Forum estimated that there were 455,000 people unemployed in Canada in 1976 who are not being figured into the unemployment statistics. The study showed that when this hidden unemployment was figured in, unemployment among women aged 15 to 24 increased by 49 per cent while for women over 25 the unemployment rate increased a whopping 93 per cent. Just these figures will give you an idea of the extent of the problem. One has to ask oneself why, if this problem of unemployment is greater among women, there isn't more attention paid to it. I think that the reason for this is that there are a number of myths prevalent in our society surrounding women in the work force.

The first myth is that working women don't really need to work. The women are basically working for frills and luxuries and are therefore only secondary earners. Mr. Robinson again in his report wrote:

Working women and women wanting to work are coming more and more under attack with rising unemployment. There are multiplying signs of a drive, like the one which followed the second war, to make women believe that their true place or role is not at work but in the family at home. Instead of being marginally attached to the labor force they would be completely detached from it. This is like treating an illness, not by curing the patient but by denying that she exists.

The simple fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the vast majority of women who work or who are seeking work are doing so not for luxuries as suggested but because they are economically compelled to do so.

Thirty-one per cent of the female labor force is single women and these women must work to support themselves. Another 9 per cent of the female labor force is either widowed, divorced or separated and they must also work to support themselves. Of this 9 per cent, one-third is single parents. In the 1971 census, Mr. Speaker, 180,870 women in the labor force had to work to support their children as well as themselves. I am sure this figure is much higher today.

The impression is also, Mr. Speaker, that married women do not have to work. However, here again the figures show that 21 per cent of the female labor force is women who are married to men who earn less than \$10,000 a year. What is so striking is that of all the families where both the husband and wife work fully 47 per cent earn less than \$15,000 combined income, both incomes of the husband and the wife. Almost 50 per cent of the families where both spouses work do not even have the income required to purchase a home.

In conclusion on this point that women do not have to work in Canada, I would like to quote from a paper done by Patricia Connelly called the Economic Context of Women's Labor Force Participation in Canada; she did this at St. Mary's University in 1976, and I quote:

It would appear that as the standard of living in Canada rises, married women whose husbands earn low incomes must work outside the home to maintain a relative standard of living. That is, married women don't work in order to close the gap between rich and poor families, rather they work to prevent the difference from increasing. To stay at home and to try to stretch their husband's wage is no longer a viable alternative. To maintain what is now considered a reasonable standard of living, families must purchase a growing number of goods and services which are rapidly becoming indispensable. In order to be in a financial position to purchase them, many wives must work outside the home.

Mr. Speaker, the second myth, that I think people have about women in the labor force, is that women should stay in the home because they are taking jobs away from men. This myth, I think, is refutable, Mr. Speaker, primarily on the grounds that the labor force in Canada is currently, and I might add unfortunately, segregated by sex. Women and men seem to be concentrated in different occupations. It is clear that most women are still limited to service industry jobs such as waitresses, maids and babysitters, or jobs that require particular skills which men don't have at the present such as nurses, secretaries, bank tellers, those who work in the garment industry. Very few women in Canada are in the executive, professional or industrial work force. Very few men are applying for secretarial bookkeeping jobs and very few men have the skills required to enter into the nursing profession. As well, there are very few men who are generally prepared to work for the wages that women receive in these occupations.

The third myth prevalent in our society today is that women have a weak labor force attachment and because of this they have a higher unemployment rate. Perhaps more likely the weak labor force attachment of these groups is a consequence of their unemployment rather than a cause of it. I think there are four points that can be made in this area:

1. Women have generally faced less attractive job opportunities than men have.
2. Employers are reluctant to invest in the training of women and have not invested in them; firms are not too concerned about losing them permanently should they be laid off in the recession.
3. Women are not unionized as men and, therefore, do not have the job security associated with a union.
4. Geographic immobility is still more likely to be true for women than it is for men.

The fourth myth, Mr. Speaker, that I want to mention is that women tend to abuse unemployment insurance. There is absolutely no evidence which indicates that women abuse unemployment insurance any more than men do. In fact, the statistics show that unemployed women are not collecting benefits which rightfully belong to them. In February, 1977, in Ontario, a study was done and there were 71,749 women collecting unemployment insurance and yet there were 142,000 women who were unemployed and had the right to collect those benefits. I think that we should, perhaps in this area, have a look at how women are discriminated against as far as unemployment insurance benefits are concerned.

1. The denial of unemployment insurance benefits to workers who have participated in a labor dispute also applies to maternity leaves and maternity benefits. This should not be the case as it takes nine months to come to term and labor disputes can't actually be predicted that far in advance.

2. The recent case involving Stella Bliss in British Columbia, I think, brings out a very important point. It shows how the Unemployment Insurance Act discriminates by sex. Stella worked from September 1975 to March 1976. She left a few days before the birth of her child. Therefore she had worked well over the required number of weeks to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits. She could not qualify for maternity benefits because she was not working at the time conception occurred. If you can imagine! Six days after childbirth, she was able and willing to work but was unable to find a job. She therefore applied for regular unemployment benefits, and she was denied them.

3. Women are expected to have made firm commitments concerning child care arrangements before meeting unemployment insurance requirements, regarding a claimant's availability for work. Of course, this in many cases is impossible, Mr. Speaker, because one must have an income to be able to afford the child care facilities. I think that the Unemployment Insurance Commission should tell their local officers, to grant them full discretion, not to disqualify claimants with dependents when they have problems in making these child care arrangements, until such time as child care arrangements can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have clearly demonstrated that, for most women who work in Canada, they do so out of necessity. It seems to me therefore incumbent upon us to try to make it easier for these women, not more difficult, in terms of establishing the conditions by which women work in Canada today.

One of the prime considerations in establishing these conditions, must certainly be the provision of child care services. I believe that we have a good system of day care in Saskatchewan, probably one, if not the best, in Canada. However, it is apparent that the earned income levels of this program will have to be increased to keep up with the increases in the cost of living. I think also that we have to begin looking at some more imaginative ways of providing day care services. Some people, notably the Status of Women, have suggested that employers be encouraged to provide day care centres at places of employment. This might be a good idea. I would suggest to the government that they encourage employers to do so. By way of example I think it would be a good idea for our government to set up day care facilities, say in one of our larger departments, perhaps on a pilot project basis, just to see how it how it might work out. A good day care service is absolutely essential for single parent families, and for working mothers who must work to help provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. There are a number of other things in the economic area I think we, as a government, should be doing. It has always amazed me why homemakers are not able to contribute and receive benefits from the Canada Pension Plan. If a family wishes to pay the premium that the wife would have paid had she been working, I can see no reason why it isn't allowed to do so. I certainly encourage the federal government to take immediate steps to do this.

Another area, that I must confess I was not aware of until I had met with the group from the Status of Women, was the fact that women who are homemakers are blatantly discriminated against by The Automobile Accident Insurance Act . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right, I hadn't. These women pointed out that Saskatchewan Automobile

Insurance Guide stated, "A housewife who is totally disabled is entitled to receive weekly indemnity of \$60, or, if partially disabled, \$30 per week for a maximum of 12 weeks". People who are employed get permanent weekly indemnity of up to \$60 for as long as they are disabled. I just think in my own case. If my wife was disabled totally, \$60 a week would not come close to providing the service that she provides to our family. And what does the family do after the 12 weeks are up, to provide homemaker services, etc., that are needed in the home? I know that we are looking at making some major revisions in the whole concept of auto insurance. I don't know how long this will take. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge the government to take immediate steps to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act so that homemakers can be recipients of permanent weekly indemnities in the case of total or partial incapacity.

One of the areas that has received a great deal of attention over the last few years, is the whole question of married women as they relate to property and the assets of a marriage on breakup. I understand that the government will be bringing in legislation in this area, so I will not take any time of the House on this question today.

The idea of equal pay for work of equal value, I think, should go without saying. I know that there have been some problems in this area and some problems in enforcing the equal pay laws as they exist now. The example of the Wascana Hospital women is a good case in point. Women who work in this institution have been waiting for two years for settlement of a case that was clearly proven to be in contravention of our equal pay laws. I certainly hope that they will not have to wait another two years to see the completion and rectification of this problem. However, where this is a problem of some magnitude I think an area we should really be looking at as a government is a whole question of promotion of women in the public service and on our boards and commissions. I know that the government has instituted a program to upgrade the educational levels of women in the public service so that they may take on administrative jobs with more responsibility. I want to commend the government for this and I think it's a very, very good program. However there are a number of other things that has to be done. We have to set goals for ourselves in this area. We are going to see an advancement of women in our public service and in our Crown corporations, boards and commissions.

It seems to me to go without saying that for a woman to advance to the level of a branch head or deputy minister in this or in any other government, in any other government, she must be clearly superior and intelligent to any of her male counterparts. This is not the case with men. In our political party a few years ago, we dealt with the whole question of women on our provincial council, our provincial council for those of you who aren't aware, the provincial council for the new Democratic Party is the governing body of our party between conventions, therefore a very important institution in our party. It used to be that there was one representative from each constituency of the province who sat on the council. As it turned out, most of these individuals were men. A few years ago it was suggested that we should have our council representation doubled by having two representatives from each constituency, one of whom had to be a woman. I at the time, I must admit, vigorously opposed this. I felt at that time it was clearly a question that should be decided on the basis of merit, that is that we should be choosing for our council the best person in the constituency whether it be male or female. However, we went ahead with this proposal and I want to tell the House that our party is better for having made that change, better for having made that change.

I hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs agreeing with me. We were together in not

April 4, 1978

agreeing on it at the time. It's always easy, honest to God, I'm serious, it's always easy to find an excuse why women can't do something, why women would be less preferable than a man on our provincial council; they were married, they had to take care of the children, it was more difficult for them to get away from their families than it was for their husbands. We would still have a disproportionate number of men to women in our council if we had not made it the law of our party, that half of the council would be women.

I think similar action must be taken in our government for the advancement of women. We should be breaking down the number of senior administrative positions, setting goals for ourselves as far as the promotion of a fair number of women into these positions. It's always easier to put a man into and we will never see a better proportion of women advancing in our civil service unless we set these goals. Also, as far as boards and commissions of the government are concerned, it seems to me that we should set a goal for ourselves of having just as a start, 30 per cent of the makeup of the boards and commissions of the government — women. This would double the representation of women on these boards and commissions. I admit that it will be more difficult to find women to fill these positions than it would be to find men. It will mean that the people who recommend people for these boards will have to work a little harder. I believe it's worth the extra effort and should be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other areas that I would like to discuss, but I know there are members who would like to make a contribution to this debate, so I won't take any more time in the House. I hope to have the opportunity to touch a few of these topics in closing the debate on this resolution.

I therefore, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move, seconded by my colleague and friend from Cutknife-Lloydminster, Mr. Kwasnica, resolution no. 13.

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to second the motion put forward by the hon. member for Regina Rosemont.

The road to equality for women has not been an easy one from the earliest days of Emily and Christobel Pankhurst in Great Britain in obtaining the right to vote to the present, where women in society are still striving for equal pay for equal work, an equal chance for promotion and executive jobs, to the right of proper day care for their children when work is available, for the farm wife who needs a few days a month free of family responsibility to contribute to community activities, or a provincial organization such as the Saskatchewan Action Committee.

Before I examine more closely, some of the specific needs of women in society today, let me take this opportunity to summarize some of the initiatives taken by our government since June, 1971.

Regarding women and the law, just last fall we passed legislation creating a United Family Court for Saskatchewan — a system that embraces all family matters including divorce, division of matrimonial property, adoption, deserted wives, child maintenance, reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders, juvenile delinquency and protection of children. In the Speech from the Throne it was announced that the Matrimonial Homes legislation would be introduced this session.

On January 12, 1978, Mr. Speaker, The Extra Provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act received royal assent and became law in Saskatchewan. From now on, custody

orders from other provinces will be enforced in Saskatchewan as if the order had been made in Saskatchewan. In the fall session last year the minister also introduced another bill, The Infants Act. One objective of these amendments was to eliminate sex discrimination in the legislation which presently states that a father has the right to determine the religious faith of his child and a mother has custody of her child until age 14 and thereafter the father has custody in the absence of written agreement or a court order to the contrary. The amending legislation recognizes that it is the suitability of the parent that should be considered rather than the sex of the parent.

As can be expected from an NDP government the Department of Labour under the able leadership of the Hon. Gordon Snyder, has made great strides on behalf of Saskatchewan women. The newly created women's division was substantially expanded in January of 1976 and assigned responsibility for recommending policies and developing programs to improve the status of Saskatchewan women generally. I will be enlightening the member for Wascana a little further in a few minutes.

Also the career development office was established to recommend policies and initiate programs to improve the status of women employed by the government in its Crown corporations. A host of new activities are now in place, including such things from monitoring staffing competitions, career counselling, holding work shops, upgrading programs for dead end clerical positions and many more.

The Public Service Superannuation Act which did differentiate in benefits available to male and female employees was amended to provide full equality.

Changes in legislation to provide greater maternity leave benefits for women including the removal of the practice of firing employees because of pregnancy have been passed.

A national study has shown that Saskatchewan has the best equal pay for similar work legislation, and has the most effective enforcement procedure but our government realizes that this legislation does not effectively deal with a large gap in average annual wages between men and women. It has also set up a study committee on the matter. In this area the problem is acute because women who do work find themselves earning only a portion of what men earn.

In 1975, in Canada, the average annual income for all female earners was \$4,710 or 43.7 per cent of the average male salary — less than half, Mr. Speaker.

Further developments in the department — the women's division and the advisory council have a project to assist the appointment of more women to provincial boards, commissions and councils. A compilation of a list of prepared women to sit on boards and commissions is underway continually and so far over 800 responses have been received to date. A study of farm women has been completed as well and has cited the federal income tax law as a real stumbling block which denies the right of a farmer to pay his wife for farm work done and claim it as an income tax deduction. This also means that she cannot participate in the Canada Pension Plan. It is for all of these initiatives that the Hon. Gordon Snyder was presented a trophy by the Saskatchewan Action Committee on March 20.

Mr. Speaker, I have just done some research regarding this government's attitude and position regarding hiring of women. I would like to place, before the members of this House, the statistics which prove a point.

April 4, 1978

Regarding provincial employees as of March 31, 1977, who are categorized as permanent employees of the government in all the departments there were 6,956 men employed by the government in =s and 5,033 women. That is a percentage split of 58 per cent for men and 42 per cent for women. Now that is reaching a fairly close rate of equality.

What is it like regarding women on boards and commissions — on Workers' Compensation Board, the Alcoholism Commission, etc. I have the figures for those too. Mr. Speaker. Men on boards and commissions — 652. This is as of March 31, 1977. How many women on boards and commissions? — 487. What is the percentage ratio there? Mr. Speaker, it is even better than in the departments — 57 per cent men, 43 per cent women. That too is very close to achieving equality.

Also, regarding agencies such as Ombudsman, Provincial Auditor, Sask Media, transportation companies, Provincial Secretary, rentalsmen and Centre of the Arts — in these agencies the number of men employed as of March 31, 1977 was 110 for 59 per cent of the total and 76 women for 41 per cent of the total.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record of our government, since 1971 to have almost reached the 50-50 split regarding hiring of women in departments, women on boards and commissions and women in agencies. But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Consumer Affairs is in the midst of initiating a program to remove all discriminatory clauses or requirements in job specifications. The Department of Education, in co-operation with the Human Rights Commission, STF and the SSTA, has developed the teacher awareness of stereotyping in classroom projects. Curriculum committees and department personnel are scrutinizing all approved textbooks to see that books used emphasize human worth and dignity of all people, regardless of age, sex or occupation. Subject to budgetary approval the Department of Education plans to organize a two-and-a-half day provincial conference on women in education, emphasizing development of strategies for recognizing and alerting sexist attitudes and behaviours in the classroom. However, our government has progressed most favourable in the area of Social Services and women. In the area of day care grants to women's organizations, the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, and the Family Income Plan, the Department of Social Services has an amazing record. Last year, the Family Income Plan statistics showed that 45 per cent of its beneficiaries were single parent families and also that 96 per cent of the single parent families have female heads. Increased benefits are planned for the future for this particular program.

Since two out of three families using the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan are headed by female single parents, this program is extremely beneficial to women. This plan stresses training grants to its recipients to assist its plans to become self-supporting. The Employment Support Program, known as ESP, will spend some \$1.6 million to assist women in obtaining employment in the coming year. Day care, a most crucial requirement, has progressed well in the last two years by assisting in the setting up of day care centres and subsidizing working parents with lower incomes. At the end of January, 1978, 48 day care centres were operating throughout the province, providing space for 1,800 children. Also, the number of family day care homes has increased significantly since that program commenced in March of 1976. Today there are 116 family day care homes licensed in the province offering approximately another 348 spaces. A program has been approved this year to provide 40 hours of compulsory child care training for workers in provincial day care centres. The Department of Social

Services is paying tuition costs and making grants to centres to allow them to hire extra staff while the regulars are taking this compulsory 40 hour course. I want to commend the Minister of Social Services for that particular program.

Taking both of the programs we have for child care together, 2,151 children were participating in day care programs in December of last year . . . the most recent figures we could get. Almost \$1,000,000 is budgeted for parent subsidy payments for the 1977-78 fiscal year. But, Mr. Speaker, good as the record is in day care according to the Saskatchewan Action Committee there are some 20,000 children under the age of 5, whose mothers are working in the province. If it is expected that all the children should receive day care by properly licensed day care centres and if it expected that the government should do it, I'm not sure that they should do all of it, the provincial budget for this item alone should be \$10,000,000 and not \$1,000,000. And, Mr. Speaker, it is at this point that I must stop talking about what our government is doing and become a little more critical and analytical of the problem regarding child care that we still face in this province today.

The present day care program is not meeting the needs of Saskatchewan women. We are some 18,000 day care spaces short. Child care for children under 3 is particularly difficult to obtain. Simply, centres won't take younger children. Shift work presents a real problem for working mothers. And what about farm wives, Mr. Speaker? Where do they take their children if they need to help their husbands with spring seeding, calving or harvesting? Women in villages and towns in rural Saskatchewan are at a terrible disadvantage. There are few day care centres in Saskatchewan towns or villages. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, according to statistics I have just received there are only three day care centres in hamlets of populations under 1,000 in our province. Only three.

What about the mother who is not working out in the labor force but would like a day or two a week to participate in the community organizations, a women's organization or run for a position on a hospital board or school board or a rural municipality or a town councillor or even to run as a MLA. It is here that we are that we are losing our greatest potential. It is with day care that we create the worst stumbling block to employment and education equality for Saskatchewan women. This is one area that needs much more attention in the days ahead. And what I visualize is not just child care and the glorified baby sitting service, Mr. Speaker, I see for this province, child development centres which present a host of learning experiences with well trained staff — not just a few toys and games and cookies and a few treats to carry the child through the day. Developing the total child should be paramount. And Saskatchewan child care centres are sadly lacking today because of the narrow scope given them, Mr. Speaker, more must be done in this area in the months ahead. It is simply a matter of priorities. Is it logical to let the children of our era lose the advantage of early learning experiences because we will not put the highest priority on their development. Our day care program, as good as it may be, in Saskatchewan is not even scratching the surface of the real demands and our present day care programs have not reached or even begun to reach rural Saskatchewan. I represent the rural riding and this is why I make this point.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Department of Social Services set up a pilot project to utilize the hundreds of one room country schools in this province as rural child development centres. Many of these schools have been kept up by the communities and by the Department of Culture and Youth with lighting grants, etc. And I offer my constituency as the basis for this pilot project. I have several such schools in

my riding. I would like to see the criteria for eligibility be completely open to rural wives whether they are working out or whether they are working on their farm, whether they are rich or whether they are poor, absolutely. These centres should accept children even if the mother wishes to spend some time in club work or run for public office. Since, Mr. Speaker, it is the federal government that has not allowed farm wives to be paid a salary which should be income tax exemption for the family farm, I suggest that the federal government pay one-half of the operating cost of these rural child development centres. However, Mr. Speaker, if Ottawa refuses to assist in this program I hope our minister will pursue this proposal on his own as soon as possible. Mr. Speaker, I'll be putting this proposal more formally to the Minister of Social Services in the next few days for his consideration. We'll discuss the details and hopefully a pilot project will be set up.

I'd like to turn now to the problem which we face in society and indeed even in the legislature, the problem of stereotyped clichés and attitudes that prevail in society today mostly among the large numbers of men but, indeed, even among some women as well. The first cliché that I want to bring to the forefront is the one that says a woman's place is in the home. End of cliché. So old and worn out now that we wonder why it's still around. This is an old but prevailing attitude started by men and seemed to be a quick answer for those who want to keep women totally subservient. And this attitude becomes particularly prevalent, Mr. Speaker, in times of high unemployment and job scarcity. We, as men, in this legislature just need to think for a moment and you can substitute the word 'man' in place of 'woman' in such clichés. The slogan would then read "A man's place is in the home." This would draw immediate gales of laughter from the men, a man's place is in the home.

One must ask, how would men like to be house-husbands day after day, year after year, hour after hour. How would you like that? If we are serious about equality for women we must consider the mother role or be prepared to do something concrete to free our wives, who are the mothers of our children. The saying, a woman's place is in the home, does hold true for the women who chooses to accept it. It must not hold true for every women in every situation. Many women are well-trained, bright and capable of much more than just keeping house. It is not fair to suggest that these women do not love their children because they want to do more in society, any more than it is fair to say to a man, you do not love your family because you go out to work day in and day out and you are never home.

If we are serious about equality then let's move some of these Victorian attitudes that have enslaved women for centuries . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I listed a host of things that would put your party to shame over the years, absolute shame.

Mr. Penner: — Absolute baloney . . .

Mr. Kwasnica: — Baloney? I'm glad that that is on the record, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that that's baloney. It is the member for Saskatoon Eastview who said that this is all baloney.

Another myth that must be wiped out is that women don't have to work. The myth that women work for luxuries rather than for necessities can easily be refused. There are ample data which clearly indicate that the majority of women in the labor force do not freely choose to work but are economically compelled to do so. Statistics Canada states that in 1975 there were 2.2 million women who were single, divorced, separated or married to husbands earning \$10,000 or less. This represented 61 per

cent of the female labor force. Single women, who constitute 31 per cent of the female labor force, must work to support themselves. Similarly the 9 per cent of the female work force who are widowed, divorced or separated must also work to support themselves. In fact, single parent families headed by women make up 7.3 per cent of all the families in Canada. No doubt some women work because they like to and may not necessarily need the money but those are few in number and cannot be considered a serious problem.

Before I conclude, I want to turn to one more area of concern. The Saskatchewan Action Committee in its presentation to the MLAs on March 20 (and every one of you sitting here defying, and whatever, about that brief) stated very plainly the women's views on sexual assault. No one can deny that rape is the most insidious crime today, yet the laws are evasive and courtroom procedures are abhorrent, insinuating, and do little to maintain the dignity of women. Just before this matter is under federal jurisdiction, we in this provincial legislature cannot side-step this issue because the law is administered by Saskatchewan lawyers, judges and police who hold the stereotyped views and ask the same questions — questions like, “Pardon me Ma'am, but what were you wearing?” or “Have you had sexual intercourse before?” In a courtroom, Mr. Speaker: — “How often? How many boyfriends have you had?” Of course none of these questions has much to do with the rape case at hand or anything at all.

The Storaska film, Mr. Speaker, titled *How to Say No To a Rapist and Survive*, according to my information, should not be considered a viable solution to propose to women in society in Saskatchewan or anywhere else for that matter. The major premise of the film that they go along with the rapist is contrary to all the laws of self-preservation. As a man, I would not go along with a sexual offender for one minute and would not urge women to do so. There is no guarantee that they will not be raped, hurt or even killed by going along with the offender.

Being nice to your rapist so you can possibly get away at some point just gives the rapist a stronger case in the courtroom because he can safely say that was what the woman wanted all along. I urge the minister in charge to withdraw the film from the Sask Media Library immediately.

Mr. Speaker, giving serious consideration to that brief, I wholeheartedly support each of the five recommendations regarding rape as proposed in the Saskatchewan Action Committee brief presented to all MLAs.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks today, I cannot help but make an observation about the only woman legislator in this Assembly, the hon. member for Wilkie. I am disappointed that in her 33 months in this legislature I have not heard one word on the serious matter of equality for women from her except this last Thursday or Friday, I believe it was, when she finally asked a question to the Minister of Social Services during the daily question period. I have not seen her present any bills; I have not seen her present any resolutions to this Assembly urging anyone to do anything to better the position of women in society. I look forward to what she and other members of this Assembly have to say on this matter. I want to hear what the member for Wascana will have to say on this matter and others too. We, as elected members of this legislature and men in society, must now be prepared to grapple seriously with these problems. As legislators and because we are men, almost 99 per cent men, we are very comfortable in our position in society. We must be prepared to advance far beyond what we as men consider reasonable and acceptable in our narrow and selfish view in order to achieve the kind of a balance that there should be. We must accept a far

April 4, 1978

broader perspective of equality. Only then will a happy and productive and satisfactory lifestyle be achieved. We owe it to our women in this fine province of ours. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in seconding this resolution and asking that all members support it wholeheartedly and that I support this resolution which asks for continued positive action to further the principle of equality for women which has already begun. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for leaving me two minutes. Let me begin by saying that it ill behooves the member from a party that has been incapable in two decades of finding a constituency in which a woman could run successfully, to be critical of our party which during those same elections has elected four female members. Our party has always been prepared to make available good constituencies for women in which to run and our party then elected two of fifteen in the last group of MLAs that were elected in the last general election. The member for Cutknife-Lloydminster however, at least had the good sense to ignore by and large the massive shortcomings in the current NDP policy; the member for Regina Rosemont took it upon himself to try to justify some of those shortcomings which seems amazing to me. What the member should be doing is explaining to this House and to the people of the province why the government that he supports goes on ignoring the rights and requirements of females in this province. Because the list of things that this government fails to do takes a darn sight longer to recite than the list of things that this government has done, particularly when this government has done those things after the pressure and persuading of members from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, the government continues within its own public service to hide women in poor areas of earnings. The positive action proposal that I made which resulted in an affirmative action program has had little success and is not receiving the kind of emphasis that the government should be giving to it. The member for Rosemont says that he'd like to see us do something about appointing more women to boards and commissions when he knows that only 15 per cent of the women in the boards and commissions are female. Surely, as the secretary for the Premier he should be saying that to the Premier, not lecturing us in this House. Twice, Mr. Speaker, I've introduced material on the Bill of Rights to amend for age in marital status, the government does nothing. The government has not taken any steps. The member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) has, for three years running, raised with members of this House, discrimination over The Automobile Accident Insurance Act — three years, and the member for Rosemont (Mr. Allen) says well, I've now figured it out, some women were in to tell me we are doing a lousy job and now he says, well, perhaps we should do something about it. It is amazing . . . (interjection) . . .

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.