

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Women's Secretariat
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 41

Mr. Chairman: — I would ask the minister to please introduce her officials.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tonight I have the pleasure of introducing to the Assembly the executive director of the Women's Secretariat, to my immediate right, Leah Siebold. To Leah's right is Janet McGregor. Immediately behind me is Ruth Warick.

Perhaps before we get into a few questions, Mr. Chairman, a few opening comments. The past year has been a very busy one and it is an extremely challenging one, and perhaps more challenging than a department itself. Because when you deal with an agency that is responsible for co-ordination between various departments and government agencies, the challenge indeed becomes one of a magnitude that one doesn't often deal with. However, regardless of the challenge, I feel that some of the accomplishments over the year in terms of government policy and the integration of various concerns into some departments has been very good, and I would hope that the year following will be even better. With those comments, I look forward to questions from the opposition.

Item 1

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too welcome the officials to the legislature. A number of members of the opposition will have some questions of the minister on the Women's Secretariat. madam Minister, I think it has been said before, and I think it is quite accurate and I will state again, that it is my hope that your secretariat will eventually be able to have as much clout and as much influence as did the previous women's division in the Department of Labour.

The concern was expressed not only by members of the opposition but by many women's organizations as well as organizations who one would not define as women's organizations, that the Women's Secretariat was something that was formed in haste and controversy when your government cancelled the Department of labour's women's division; found out that there was more pressure to have some organization in government speaking on the issues that relate to women and their problems in the economy and in society; and therefore your government had to act, and created a Women's Secretariat. Another example of backtracking, although I might say that if you can show over not too long a period of time that there are some positive results then I think sometimes you have to even accept that backtracking is an important step.

I will ask you a number of questions. I don't think I have any particular concern with the staff or the activities of the secretariat. But I want to know what some of the particular areas are that you have made a representation

on and what the results have been. I noted that in the last year's estimates you answered a question to . . . In fact, it wasn't a question; it was in your opening remarks that your secretariat had been involved in many issues, as you again said this year — that those issues that you were involved in were pornography and prostitution, business information and conferences, education, guidance counsellors' training, and ongoing liaison with federal and provincial governments.

Can you tell my, Madam Minister, what kind of activities — and I don't mean this in any facetious sense at all — but what kind of work has your secretariat done in the area of pornography?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the member opposite has not had all the historical background, if I may call it that, in terms of the secretariat and the purpose for it. And I would suggest that he go back and he take a good hard look at why the secretariat was set up and the reasons given. And I would suggest that he would also conclude, if he was honest with himself, that it was not done in haste. And in fact I will remind, or tell the member for the first time, when Saskatchewan introduced the Women's Secretariat it was the third one in Canada to be set up. But it wasn't the last. Immediately following that, several other provinces moved and took the structure of the Women's Secretariat, along with the legislation to model their secretariats after it, in order to deal with the issues that governments right across Canada and the Northwest Territories were facing.

So I take with a very large grain of salt what the member says, when he says that it was set up in haste. In terms of the secretariat and its accomplishments versus the NDP and women in the Department of Labour, I would suggest that the scope . . . that the secretariat has branches out all across all departments of government and agencies, which could not possibly happen within one department in government.

And I think the member, if he were honest with himself, would probably agree to that, for he has indeed in his time been minister of several departments and he knows how departments react and initiate various programs, and how they also react to programs and initiations coming from other departments.

The accomplishments . . . And I would like to touch on them briefly, Mr. Chairman. The pornography issue that the member has raised was dealt with more than a year ago now, and I believe that it had at that time received some very positive comments and feedback from the public. I think the next step to that came when the Minister of Consumer Affairs introduced some regulations as it pertains to videos and the classifications of — and which, I might say, was also received very positively, particularly from parents with young children.

Along with that particular accomplishment, Mr. Chairman, we have been involved with such issues as the automatic enforcement of maintenance orders; we have finally seen that implemented. We have been involved in discussions on pension plans, particularly for housewife . . . part-time workers, which the majority of them are

females, many of them single parents. We have also been very actively involved in trying to increase the representation of women on government boards and commissions, and I believe since the introduction of a government policy we have been very successful in that. We have also been very active with the Department of Tourism and Small Business in looking at the women's contribution in business, entrepreneurial, and within the management category. We also have been working with the Department of Social Services in the child care area. And of course, there is the Department of Education.

It wasn't too long ago, Mr. Chairman, that there was an announcement in this House from the Department of Advanced Education and the minister responsible, the member from Meadow Lake, and at that time there was some new initiatives announced, and it included — for the first time ever in this province, and I believe it's probably ahead of a few other provinces — some assistance for single parents that are trying to further their post-secondary education.

Along with those, Mr. Chairman, we of course look at legislation, The Matrimonial Property Act that was under review, and I believe that through consultations and communications, we have in fact been able to impact greatly on the various policies that departments are looking at or in fact have implemented.

If the member would so wish, I would be glad to collect for him the brief that we put out on pornography and prostitution, which was entitled Respecting Human Dignity. If he does not already have a copy, I will in fact send one across for him.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I would appreciate a copy, Madam Minister. I do not think I have a copy. Our office may have that. I do not have it, so if you would either . . . You don't necessarily have to do it today, but if you will make sure that I would get it, I would appreciate it.

Madam Minister, was it the secretariat that recommended to the government and the Minister of Finance last year that there be a tax in the budget on pornographic material? Is that where it was initiated?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I don't believe that the secretariat has ever recommended to the Department of Finance what it should tax and what it shouldn't.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Was the secretariat consulted, then?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the tax that the member from Regina North East is referring to, as he well knows, was not pursued. And I think through consultation there was an agreement that we could perhaps pursue other ways to discourage the use.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm sure that there was consultation in some form, including what must have been an impossibility to enforce it, to change the government's mind. You did not answer my question. Was the secretariat consulted, or were you, as the minister, consulted prior to the announcement, the splashy announcement by the government that it was going to implement the tax?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as a member of cabinet, I have access to information, and that's where those matters come. Of course I would have been, in cabinet.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Minister, you have made a great to-do about the influence of the secretariat in the government and the fact that it's no longer a department and therefore is going to have a lot more clout. One would have thought that if the government as a whole, including the Department of Finance, recognized this new importance of the secretariat, that the secretariat would have been consulted on this issue which the secretariat, as you indicate, has been leading the work on. I'm not complaining about that. I think that's important and if the secretariat has done that, I commend it.

But having said that, do you now think it would have been therefore just as important for the Department of Finance to consult the secretariat as the Department of Industry and Commerce?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well given that the member seems to be so hung up on tax, it seems to me I've spent two days in this House with him and that's precisely all that we've talked about.

The issue of taxation as it relates to the budget — consultation takes place with cabinet. The member knows that as a past minister of Finance, unless of course he didn't consult. I don't know. I wasn't there. I suppose he could answer that better than I. I think what is important is that the issue was not pursued and there was an agreement that we will in fact pursue other ways of discouraging the use, if in fact that would even discourage it.

(1915)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In other words, Madam Minister, you're saying that the government will selectively choose to consult your secretariat when it feels like it. But when it comes to some things, and in this case this particular tax which you have, I'm sure, every intention to implement — otherwise it would not have been announced by the Minister of Finance in 1985 — but when the government chooses not to consult the secretariat, it won't. In this case the secretariat was not consulted.

The Minister of Small Business and Tourism — now I have it correct — I'm sure that his department . . . If you were going to do something in the area of small business and provide managerial training for women who are in business, I'm sure that that minister and his department would consult with the secretariat. As a matter of fact, I know that in the conference that was recently held there was some joint work that was done, and that's good.

Why would therefore not the Department of Finance think it important enough to consult the secretariat before dealing with this kind of an issue which the secretariat was leading the way on in research and in the making of a brief and so on? Can you answer that, Madam Minister?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, my colleague from

Saskatoon Sutherland says, maybe we should talk about the removal of the tax on clothing, E & H tax on clothing. That's perhaps not a bad idea. I can only state, Mr. Chairman, as discussions go in cabinet, most of them are confidential and the member is really — how shall I say it — being rather picky in issues that he's looking for if he wants to dwell on whether consultation took place on a proposed tax that, in fact, never was further pursued after the announcement.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well what I'm trying to establish, Madam Minister, is whether the establishment of a Women's Secretariat by your government is window-dressing, or whether it's a real thing. And you are leading the committee to believe by your evading the answer — which you have done — that as far as the government is concerned, although you have very well-meaning people in the secretariat, in the government's opinion, it's window-dressing. And in the words of the Saskatchewan Action Committee on the Status of Women when they referred to your budget: "Flashy communications and hollow rhetoric have become the trade-mark of the Saskatchewan government."

An Hon. Member: — Where did you read that?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm reading it out of a press release. And I'm telling you, Madam Minister, that your avoiding the question does only one thing. It reinforces the view that people, who are concerned about the work of the secretariat and would like to see it succeed, are saying that they fear the government really does not intend anything serious, but simply has some form of window-dressing.

So since you do not want to answer the question of whether the Department of Finance considers, along with other departments, the secretariat to be important enough to consult it when it begins to initiate policy that may affect some of the work of the secretariat, when you're saying that, then you're saying that the government is not really serious about the work of the secretariat.

Now one of the things that you mentioned, Madam Minister, is that the secretariat will assist women in locating in jobs, and also training, assistance to single parents who may be taking an education. Well I just want to give you some statistics and then ask you a question.

In the last four years inflation has been about 30 per cent, but there has only been one increase in the minimum wage. In four years inflation has gone up 30 per cent, but the minimum wage has increased by 6 per cent — that's all. Over those four years there has been an increase of 15 per cent in the number of Saskatchewan women employed — that's from 1981 to 1985 — but there has been a 70 per cent increase in the number of women unemployed. Now I think that's pretty serious — from 10,000 in 1981 to 17,000 in 1985.

That does not provide evidence to support your so-called accomplishments in pursuing this particular field of government responsibility. Added to that, Madam Minister, the number of fully employable persons on welfare — fully employable persons on welfare, and

many of them are women — has been increased over the past years by some 150 per cent. So your economic policies and your fiscal policies have actually jeopardized the opportunities that women in our society should have.

Madam Minister, it has been now — is it a year since the minimum wage was last increased? At least a year, maybe more, and that was only one increase in four years. Have you recently

...

An Hon. Member: — Five years.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Is it now five? — going on to five years. Have you recently made representation to the Minister of Labour to consider increasing the minimum wage, Madam Minister?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the minimum wage issue — and I'm glad the member from Regina North East raises it along with employment or unemployment, whichever the case may be, because I think the whole area needs a good discussion. And what better arena to have that discussion than in here? I will again state my position on the minimum wage, which perhaps the hon. member from Regina North East has not heard before. And if he has, I'm sure he will forgive me for repeating myself, but perhaps it's worth repeating.

The minimum wage has been raised once. It is still the highest in Canada. It is still the highest in Canada. However, if I were to say to the member from Regina North East, the minimum wage shall be \$10 an hour, where does he think everything goes from there, respectively? It goes upward.

And when I hear the opposition tell me that if only we would raise the minimum wage everything would be great for women, I wonder where he's been for the last 10 or 15 years. Everything would not be okay if the barriers are still there to better job opportunities, if there is no incentive there for your further education and training, and if there isn't a concerted effort made to deal with attitudes that put up the barriers in the first place. So you have to look at the thing in a much broader perspective than the minimum wage.

When we took a look at the minimum wage — and I might add, its impact on females, and there's no doubt about it that a lot of women, particularly women working part-time, are on minimum wage — we found that there was approximately 3 per cent of all Saskatchewan residents working for pay were earning the minimum wage; 10,000 people, Mr. Chairman. Seventy per cent of the minimum wage earners were women. I have already recognized that the majority on minimum wage are in fact women.

Seventy per cent of those earning minimum wage were under 24 years old. I would suggest that that takes into consideration seasonal employment also. Seventy-one per cent were single and 52 per cent were students, Mr. Chairman. Sixty-six per cent of those worked part time and 68 per cent were employed at present jobs for less than a year. Fifty per cent of all minimum wage earners were women working part time, and 69 per cent were in

the service industry, 21 in sales, and 8 per cent in the clerical jobs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you tell me by raising the minimum wage, that anything changes. And it doesn't. Prices go up, expenses go up, and they're still at the same point where they were before, if you do not put into place those factors that allow them to move up within the job force to areas that pay more. Mr. Chairman, we took a good hard look at it, and we have done precisely that.

I will remind the member for Regina North East the skills development program within Social Services has been very successful. It gave people an opportunity to upgrade themselves and to become independent and self-reliant, and that is basically what most people ask for. And that particular program gave them precisely that opportunity.

Along with that, Mr. Chairman, we put an emphasis on education, advanced education, and training. Mr. Chairman, we took a look at some barriers that we felt we could control or at least show a position of leadership on, and that was in the area of women in management. The minister in charge for Public Service Commission about a year and a half ago announced the affirmative action program for the Government of Saskatchewan. All of those, Mr. Chairman, have given women a greater opportunity in terms of economic equality.

Mr. Chairman, I do not — and I will emphasize again — believe that the opposition really believe that all that is necessary is the upping of the minimum wage. If they do believe that, it tells me how very little they actually know of the work place and of the opportunities, the expectations, that women have set for themselves.

I think there's no doubt about it that we still have some areas where women get locked into in terms of job opportunity, and there's some reasons for it. Some of it will be not finishing their education; some will be no training into particular jobs; or perhaps they will have taken a job training in an area or got locked into a job that has traditionally required low education levels and the opportunity has simply not been there. All those factors come into play when you're talking about the minimum wage and the work-force and women as they relate to the work-force.

(1930)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Madam Minister, if rhetoric could accomplish anything, you would have a star rating. But unfortunately rhetoric and words do not solve problems. Action does. And you just stood in the House for about five minutes and given nothing but rhetoric about minimum wage and about other things, totally ignoring, Madam Minister, and I say in a very irresponsible way, the problems that women — because we're talking about women, many of them single parents, but other people in society as well — face because of the kind of priorities that you and your government set; priorities where if you are in an upper income bracket you're going to get all the breaks, but if you're in a lower income bracket you get no breaks at all. As a matter of fact you even get taxed more and more and more. That's the policy of your government.

You suggest that the only issue that we are raising or that I am raising is the minimum wage and somehow assuming that that's going to solve all the problems. That's not what I'm suggesting at all. That's only one component of many and we will get to many more. That's only one component.

I am saying to you that you have increased the minimum wage by 25 cents an hour in over four years. Now I don't know whether you can raise a family of two or three children on \$9,000 a year, but I kind of doubt that you could. I know I would find it very difficult. We would do it, but I can tell you that those children would have to give up an awful lot. I can tell you that those children would be going to school — and I have seen some of them — and they would not have some of the things that other children have because of your miserly approach to people on low incomes in our society.

You suggest that the way to deal with the problem is reduce the barriers to job opportunities. I don't disagree with that. If we can reduce the barriers to job opportunities, that would be very commendable. But I ask you, Madam Minister, and I wish you would answer the question: how are you reducing the barriers to job opportunities when unemployment has doubled in the last four-and-some years to over 8 per cent, when the fully employable persons on welfare has increased by 150 per cent; when there has been a 70 per cent increase in the number of women who are unemployed? How is that, Madam Minister, will you explain, reducing the barriers to job opportunities?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well the member wants to talk about rhetoric. He sat there and he says for five minutes he listened to rhetoric which tells me he wasn't listening, because I gave him precisely the information that he has once again asked for. I would be more than pleased to give it to you again. Mr. Chairman, no rhetoric. Let's talk some figures and facts that the member can easily understand if he takes the time to listen. And if he doesn't believe what I'm saying, I would be more than glad to send him the documents that they come out of. Keep it simple, the Minister of Health says. That's probably wise when dealing with the member from Regina North East.

On April 30, 1986, Mr. Chairman, the overall Saskatchewan unemployment rate was 8.2, and I might add that our employment rate was one of the highest — if not the highest — in Canada. But because we are talking about women tonight, I'm going to tell the member from Regina North East that the number, the rate for women was 7.4 compared to 8.8 for men at the same time. Now I'm not too sure where he says that the unemployment factor has grown so much more for women than it has for men. I am giving you statistics, sir.

Women's participation rate in the labour force, Mr. Chairman, is in fact increasing, and the member knows that. In 1985 the number of women in the labour force increased by 15,000, in 1985 alone, by 15,000 for women in the work-force. That's a statistic. Now I'm not sure which statistic the member's dealing with but they're certainly not mine. He says, what are we doing — the barriers.

Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan skills development program began June 1, 1984. And it was a program in co-operation with several departments — Advanced Education, Social Services, and the Employment Development Agency. And what it was, it was upgrading for single unemployed social services recipients. The total number of registers to that date, May 8, 1986, is 5,960, and approximately 57 per cent of those are women. We also in realizing that these single parents would require child care facilities, that was set up to assist the women that were accessing that particular program.

Mr. Chairman, we had the Saskatchewan employment development program that began on April 1, 1984. That too was a job creation program for single unemployed recipients; 4,883 placements were made; 1,363 of those were women.

Mr. Chairman, we ran the opportunities program in '84, '85, and '86, and approximately 50 per cent of each of those years were women on those jobs.

We also had the Access youth program. That was a provincially funded job creation program aimed at helping young people from ages 16 to 25 find work. And there was approximately 1,600 jobs created in 1985, and half of those were female.

So as you see, Mr. Chairman, the opportunities were indeed there. And those opportunities must be created by government in order to bring down some of the barriers that we talked about earlier.

Mr. Chairman, to come back to the female participation rate, it's interesting to note — and I would encourage the member from Regina North East to read in Statistics Canada the labour force annual averages. And they show a very interesting picture for Saskatchewan.

And let me take the years from 25 to 34 years old. In 1975, and that was the year the member was around, 45 per cent participation rate by women. Well in 1986, Mr. Chairman, that figure is 69.7 participation rate by women. So, Mr. Member from Regina North East, when dealing with statistics, don't tell me that that hasn't been increasing for females. It has, very much so. And females have been taking advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, you can use all of the statistics that you want. The fact that there has been a 70 per cent increase in the number of women unemployed speaks for itself. A 70 per cent increase in the number of women unemployed is not an insignificant figure. But there are other kinds of arguments and other kinds of concerns that I would like the minister to consider.

You speak of all of these job creation programs that your government has initiated and you boast about them. But let me tell you what you've done. With those job creation programs and with other things that are happening which you are not addressing, you are maintaining the traditional approach for jobs for women. And that is that their jobs mainly will be, in your approach, in the traditional work that women have always done, the

lowest paid jobs in society.

You boast about your job employment program. Well I want to tell you, Madam Minister, just in case you don't know — and I got this from the Minister of Social Services just the other day, because I asked him for it — that the duration of those jobs was from 22 . . . This is important. I want the minister to listen to this. I'm not finished. I just wanted to get your attention, Madam Minister. Those jobs that you talk about lasted on the average of 22 to 26 weeks — 22 to 26 weeks, and you're boasting about the great things you have done for young women getting into the work-force, young women or single mothers you've taken off the social assistance rolls.

Well all you've done under that program, Madam Minister, is played games, cruel games, for political purposes. You take people and you give them a job at low wages, around the minimum wage, for 22 to 26 weeks. Guess what? That's the time that's required to qualify for unemployment insurance. Then you tell them, now you can go on unemployment insurance and then you won't show up on our statistics as somebody who is on the welfare rolls. Now I can't think of any more insensitive way to deal with the unemployment problem than that, than to play with the lives of families in this way. That's the kind of program you're boasting about.

Madam Minister, even you would not disagree with your statistics, that the number of part-time jobs has been growing at a very rapid rate in our economy. At a quicker rate than ever in history, part-time jobs has been growing and has been replacing full-time jobs. As a matter of fact, in SuperValu, something like 90 or 91 per cent of the employees are casual or part-time. They get no benefits; they get no pension plan.

And I know that your government talked in either the budget speech or the budget speech or both about introducing a pension plan. We have still to see the light of day, and it's day 52. We know, and we will want to see, but I suspect that that pension plan will not help any of these people we're talking about, because they won't be able to afford to make a monthly contribution to that plan. Because your voluntary pension plan, I suspect, will only benefit those people with a large enough income so that they can put aside whatever the amount is going to be each month and put it into a pension plan which you will then match. but anybody on a minimum wage, or a low wage somewhere close to the minimum wage, won't be able to afford to do that and will therefore not qualify for the pension, but will actually be subsidizing upper income people who will be able to qualify for the pension because the government will be making a matching contribution.

Madam Minister, people on part-time work get no benefits. They do not earn enough. And you say somehow that it comes up in job statistics — you claim that as being jobs created. That's your claim to job creation. What have you done? You have put people into the kind of jobs where they cannot possibly make a decent living; get no security because they can't develop any security for the future. And therefore, Madam Minister, you have failed them.

(1945)

I ask you again — and I'm not dealing as if it's a cure-all for anything — do you not think that it is a responsibility of yourself as the minister in charge of this agency, and the responsibility of this agency, to make a representation to the Minister of Labour expressing some concern about the minimum wage and at least addressing the question on whether the single mothers and others who are on minimum wage can afford to make a living working for the minimum wage as it is today?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, that's probably true. As the . . . I thought it was the member from Shaunavon saying, but it wasn't. Sooner or later it will be; it will be.

I'm going to tell the member from Regina North East what my . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're going to have a long wait; we can only hope you'll hold your breath while you're waiting.

What my responsibilities are in terms of being responsible for the status of women — it is my responsibility to ensure that there is an equal opportunity there, opportunity not necessarily given, but that the doors are open and that it be taken. It is also my responsibility to ensure to cabinet that there is a voice there for the various concerns of women.

And if the member from Regina North East thinks that women talk with one voice, he shouldn't be in here. Women, first of all, are individuals, and they have as many differing views as what you find in this Assembly by the males. So why does he think there is one cure-all for all women? There isn't.

An Hon. Member: — That's socialist mentality.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, that's very true. As the member from Weyburn says, that's a very socialistic mentality. In fact, what it comes down to is you set the lowest common denominator and then you make sure everybody fits into it. And bless us — if we don't fit into it, there's nowhere to go.

I have a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that through education, advanced education and training, through small business, that women in fact are in there participating. And I would encourage the member to look at what is happening in advanced education and what women are starting to take in the colleges.

For example, Mr. Chairman, let's use agriculture, because that's what Saskatchewan is all about — agriculture. You know, in 1975, when my good friend was minister of Education away back then, there was 90 per cent of women taking agriculture. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to say under the Progressive Conservative government, in 1985, there were 32 per cent of those in the College of Agriculture as women — as women. Now can you imagine the opportunity that those young women will have in coming out when Saskatchewan's economy is based on agriculture? And the spin-offs that are out there in terms of jobs are great in number. I have great faith for the future when this 32 per cent graduates from college.

The member says, "What?" He wasn't listening.

The College of Commerce. When the member was the minister of Education, 21 per cent of those in commerce were women. Well today, now that the member from Meadow Lake is the minister, 47 per cent in the College of Commerce are women.

Dentistry, 1975 — 14 per cent in the dentistry faculty were female; in 1985, 34 per cent are women.

The College of Medicine is another good example, Mr. Chairman. In 1975, 31 per cent were women and today 42 per cent are there.

An Hon. Member: — Got the numbers for veterinary medicine?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, I do. For the member from Weyburn, for his benefit as a vet, in 1975, 22 per cent were women; in 1985 almost 60 per cent of those in that college are women. So that should tell the farmers within the Assembly who's going to be looking after the animals in a few years down the road . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well of course it does. You know, you can read what you want into the statement. The simple reality is that those girls coming out of vet medicine, when they graduate, will have a very good opportunity in terms of vet medicine in this province. More than half of them are female . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There is only one statistic on length and it comes with the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I think some of these things speak for themselves. You know, he wants to talk opportunity. he keeps saying, women, minimum wage; and I keep saying, women, given the opportunity, will go a way beyond that.

And I look at advanced education as only one good example. I look at the public service as another good example where the numbers are increasing. I look at the banking community, which for years and years has been the domain of male managers, and the doors are wide open. You have only to go into any credit union or bank in Saskatchewan, and you will find a female bank loans manager, a bank manager. They are there, but you have to look. Take the blinders off. There's a few other areas where they have made great strides, and we still have a few areas where it's been extremely tough, and there's some very difficult work that remains to be done.

I look at the world of small business. And let's talk about that for a minute, because all the trends tell us that the future with the economy and jobs is in small business for the future. Well 49 per cent of small businesses are owned or operated by women in the province of Saskatchewan, over and above the national average. That is an extremely good opportunity. It will also impact on the future down the road if you get women into those decision-making positions. There is an impact on the women that come after them.

Role models, that's what some people call them, but they will in fact probably operate their businesses in a little

different manner; pay perhaps a different attention to areas like starting wages, particularly if it's a single parent that comes on. So I would ask the member to broaden his vision in terms of what women can do given the opportunity over and above the minimum wage.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Madam Minister, I do not need any broadening of my vision. I am quite aware of what women can do and in fact are doing, and are doing in greater numbers. And that trend that you talk about: nothing has happened because of any effort that your government has instituted, Madam Minister. It's happened because women have decided to take part in those, and that's good. I don't object to that.

I object to your making two classes, is what you're doing. You're talking about those who can get into better paying jobs, and then you're saying you're going to ignore those who do not have jobs other than minimum wage jobs. Somehow you want to build this economy on the backs of the lowest paid people in our society. You refuse to address that question, and you want some people who are on low incomes to shoulder the burdens of an economy which you have brought down almost to its knees while those on higher incomes are able to benefit even more.

You mentioned, Madam Minister, that you have a responsibility. Well I want to ask you about another responsibility. You say that you have an ongoing liaison role with the federal and provincial governments. Well I want to ask you about the federal government.

There is a special parliamentary committee on child care that's been established by parliament. It comes as a result of a task force which the federal government spent \$1 million on. That parliamentary committee on child care is going to travel the country and hear representations made to it. As a matter of fact, I think it's here on the 6th of June.

Are you, Madam Minister, making a representation or is any other of your colleagues making a representation on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan to this parliamentary committee on child care?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Can I ask you who is making the representation? Is it officials, or which minister, Madam Minister?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I don't know why it's so important that the member knows who is making it, but he can be assured that the appropriate people at the appropriate time will be making the presentation.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's the height of arrogance — absolute arrogance, Madam Minister, you are here in a committee to answer questions on behalf of your government. If you can't answer a simple question like, who is the minister or who the appropriate officials are that will make the representation to the parliamentary committee, you are being absolutely arrogant like all the rest of your colleagues in your cabinet.

The question is: who is responsible for making a

representation to this parliamentary committee on child care?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — What is arrogant? That the member from Regina North East stands here and tells me what I answer and what I don't. I'm doing estimates as it relates to the Women's Secretariat. Now if we want to talk about day care for a while, we can do that — day care, rest, child care, in terms of government policy is the responsibility of the Minister of Social Services.

Now if everything goes according to plan, there will perhaps be two of us that are making it. But if everything doesn't go according to plan, then there will only be one. And I would assume that it would be the Minister of Social Services and then myself. How that relates to my estimates I'm not too sure.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Madam Minister, whether your government is making a representation on as important an issue as child care, I think, is important to your agency because the agency has a very broad mandate. It talks in your annual report about consultation:

In Saskatchewan, there are numerous local and provincial organizations related to the status of women. Representatives from the Women's Secretariat consult with these groups to explain government programs . . .

In your own words you say it is the function of your agency to do liaison with the federal government. What better opportunity to do liaison than to make a representation to this committee? I am quite pleased to hear that indeed you're going to make a representation. I don't know if I'll be so pleased when I hear what you or the Minister of Social Services presents, but I am prepared to give you the benefit of the doubt and wait until I see what the content is.

Can I ask you this question then: did the secretariat have input into the brief that's going to be presented to the parliamentary committee on child care?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the member from Regina North East is pleased that we are making representation on such an important issue as child care. At the same time I also made a mental note to myself, that I don't recall the opposition making any kind of representation to the Fraser committee on pornography and prostitution, but if they did so and I missed it, I would certainly apologize to them.

Yes, we have been in consultation with the Department of Social Services on the brief, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Minister, either you didn't answer the question or I didn't hear it because of the noise coming from your side of the House — but will you sit down until I'm finished asking my question. You really have to understand, Madam Minister, that you're here to answer question and you will have to be patient while we ask them and then you will have to answer them, and keep away . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well that's fine. I agree. The member from Moosomin says that the ministers don't have to answer the questions. Well that's fine. If ministers feel they don't have to answer the questions then they will have to answer to the public about that. They can spend millions of dollars . . . Mr. Chairman, will you call the government members to order. Thank you.

When the government cabinet ministers spend millions of dollars — and I'm not suggesting there are millions in this agency, but millions of dollars — for this government to say they don't have to answer questions about the expenditure of those millions of dollars is really highly irresponsible. And the member from Moosomin may have the view that ministers don't have to answer the question, and I guess they don't, but they have to decide if they have an obligation to answer the question and I submit that they do.

Madam Minister, I ask you for the last time on this particular question: did the Women's Secretariat have a role to play in helping to prepare the brief which the Minister of Social Services or yourself, or both, are going to present, and in the process of preparing that brief were child care groups in the province also consulted?

(2000)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe I answered that question. And I think it is incumbent upon the member when he doesn't hear the question to recognize why he didn't. He was consulting with the member from Shaunavon and that's why he didn't hear my response . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. yes. If you'll stop talking long enough for me to answer, for the second time, the answer is yes. We were in consultation on the matter. And if you want to know if there was other consultation with the public, yes. I can assure you that the Minister of Social Services has met with many and in fact did some public consultation, and I also have met with some women's groups and with the advisory council on the status of women.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, thank you very much, Madam Minister. I'm surprised it took us a half an hour for you to get around to say that. It would have been quite simple for you simply to say it in the first place, and the question would have been answered.

I'm glad that there was some consultation. I'm not sure whether it was simply listening and not hearing, which is the tradition of your government. If that's the form of consultation that you had, then I submit to you that it was not very adequate. I will have some further questions on this later but I think there are other members who want to get into this consideration of your estimates, and I will bow to them for a few moments.

Mrs. Caswell: — First of all, I would like to thank you for many of the comments you made while the member from Regina North East was asking questions. I appreciate your stand on minimum wage, not because neither you nor I necessarily want people to have low income jobs, but I'm sure that we understand that to climb up the ladder of success first of all you have to have a job and experience, and that's what minimum wage can do.

I appreciate also you explaining to them very clearly that women don't think alike and that women have views of their own just as men do. And I certainly appreciate the good sense that you have presented to the member from Regina North East.

The first thing I want to mention is that there was a Saskatchewan Federation of Women's Conference in P.A., and I understand from the people organizing it that you were responsible in helping them get funding for that conference. I'm not sure if you actually gave the funding or that you helped them get the money.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I have to admit I don't remember a letter on a particular conference from the Saskatchewan Federation of Women. I do know that they had pursued the avenue of Secretary of State funding for several years, and were simply told no. And I did write a letter at that time in support of the Secretary of State taking a look at it and encouraging them to assist them in funding of some kind.

I'm wondering at this point in time if the funding for the conference in Prince Albert was perhaps — I might have directed it to protocol. If it's a national conference and there's people from out of province they would qualify, as do other conferences, under those same rules, or in fact it could have been done with assistance from the Secretary of State. But I would have to check my file to find out for sure.

Mrs. Caswell: — The Saskatchewan Federation of Women is provincial, and I believe perhaps it was from a heritage grant and that you were responsible for helping them get this. Is this not correct?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The heritage thing rings a bell now.

Mrs. Caswell: — I want to tell you that Mrs. Betty Lemke of Saskatoon told me that you were particularly helpful in helping them get that grant and made sure that their application was on time. The conference . . . You know, I might say I was biased because I was asked to be one of the guest speakers. The conference was attended by people all over Saskatchewan.

There was a very good representation of northern ladies, and one of the issues we were discussing is the area of family rights. And so many people felt that the conference was very worthwhile. John Gormley, the MP from the Meadow Lakes was there, and just on behalf of the Saskatchewan Federation of Women, we appreciate the support that . . . We appreciate what you have done . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thought maybe you'd have a comment about it, sorry.

So I just would encourage . . . There's also REAL Women of Canada, Saskatchewan branch, and I'm sure the Saskatchewan Federation of Women and groups such as this would be very interested in giving input to the kinds of concerns that you expressed as is your prerogative as Women's Secretariat. And I just hope that you will continue to consult with them and they appreciate the support you've done.

This is the next question . . . That really isn't a question. But the next question I'm going to ask is really a federal concern. But since you in some ways are the liaison person between the Secretary of State, particularly in the funding of women's groups and Saskatchewan concerns, I would like to express my concern about some of the unbalanced groups. That's a little bit facetious, maybe. People might think that's really what I want to say, but the groups which I perceive are unbalanced in creating a broad view of women's concerns. First of all, have you had any dialogue with the secretary — I believe McLean, Walter McLean — about the funding of Saskatchewan women's groups?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — My apologies for the delay. We were just trying to remember who the new Secretary of State was. The member from Saskatoon Westmount, on the Prince Albert conference . . . I was not at the conference and that's why I did not feel that I could contribute any more to it.

There is not a formal line, if I could say that, in terms of liaison on the funding of women's groups. The federal government has had total responsibility and does not consult with the provinces, I guess for a lot of reasons. Perhaps they feel, well, that's their responsibility for letting the money go, and there is no consultation process that is set up.

However, that's not to say that — as I stated before, I had written them in regards to the Saskatchewan Federation of Women and at one point had also asked for the criteria, because there was more than the federation of women that were asking how they could access federal moneys to do some things. And I think there is a growing concern that that access is not necessarily there to a wide range of views. And I'm well aware of some women's groups that feel that it should be, instead being narrowed and isolated perhaps as it is.

I have not had any kind of great success when Mr. Walter McLean was Secretary of State in terms of getting anything more on the issue of how women's groups are funded and on what issues. And when I say what issues, I use the example of a very good event that took place a year or two years ago at the university of Saskatoon, and it was the summer extension program which was set up for rural women. And the Saskatchewan Women's Institute, I believe, had a particular interest in it at that time — and Glenis Joyce, who works at the university, was trying to access funds for this kind of a conference and had no great success at all. And that's only one other example, other than the federation of women that have had a problem with it.

However, our discussions will continue with the new Secretary of State, and perhaps we will eventually get somewhere in terms of more women's groups, whether it's rural or urban, being able to access some moneys for some particular concerns and causes that they may have in their respective communities.

Mrs. Caswell: — Well I appreciate that answer, and I appreciate the . . .

An Hon. Member: — — Was it an answer or was it a

preachment?

Mrs. Caswell: — Well, it was an answer — sorry, I understood it. And I appreciate the help that you're giving, and I think that will gain credence to people who are saying that there seems to be an unbalanced view presented in the Secretary of State, that they seem to have a very, sometimes radical agenda.

And I'd like to just, you know . . . and once again, I'm not blaming you for this but to give some example. For example, we have Briarpatch — and I must clarify that. I have no objections to Briarpatch existing; I have no objection to Briarpatch being published; I have no objection to it being read — it's rather amusing. But Briarpatch is a very admittedly left-wing magazine. And one would suggest, if you want to write a magazine, you could pay for it himself. And their funding, 7,500 for the potential for articles in Briarpatch. And one of the things is the potential impact of the emergence of reactionary women's groups on the women's movements and women at large. And many people will be very distressed to find that the Secretary of State is funding groups . . . organization to write tax on other women's groups.

And one of the articles here we have is the "Freedom to be free and fear of the far side of the moon". And it's featured and it says it's from Secretary of State women's program, and the entire article discusses women who are, in particular, the enemy, namely Gay Caswell, Gwen Landolt, and Phyllis Schlafley — two out of three who happen to be Canadian women.

And I tend to think that this puts up people's ire that they're very much choosing sides about women's concerns. They're saying one group has some legitimacy and one group doesn't. And I appreciate that you have tried to speak to the Secretary of State in Ottawa and deal with that issue.

(2015)

Another example of their mentality, and this is from the Montreal Gazette front page, and it talks about and there's a small print, "P.M. begins to discuss trade," so on and so on. And there's an article "REAL Women: The pretty pink facade," and REAL Women is an organization of women who would support, you might say, more traditional values, not necessary in what we call radical feminist group, although they most certainly are for equality and equal opportunity.

And it says here:

Tory MP John Gormley, one of a growing number of politicians impressed with REAL Women goals, calls on the spirit of fairness that says if feminists get public money from Ottawa, then so should REAL Women.

And I just would like to know, and I think probably you've already clarified your views on your efforts to get such sensible groups as the women's institute funded, what your views are on such groups as REAL Women or groups that may not take a hard-line feminist or Marxist position getting funded from the Secretary of State to provide some

balance.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think there's a very basic issue and a question to be asked when it comes to third-party grants and funding that governments can do, whether it's provincial government or federal. And I think the first question that we as elected people have to begin to deal with and that is the question of funding either direct service groups or the advocate group. I don't think it's any secret in Saskatchewan that I think the dollar is best spent in terms of direct service to other people. And I think that somewhere along the line government is going to have to really look hard and review the whole question of funding the advocacy groups. And that's basically what we're talking about in terms of funding out of the Secretary of State.

The one thing that we must never forget, Mr. Chairman, and that is that whether it's the Secretary of State's money or the provincial government, it is still a taxpayers' dollar. And whether it's right wing or left wing I think that groups have an equal opportunity and have to be given serious consideration because it is in fact everyone's money that the Secretary of State is handing out. And as I said earlier, I'm well aware of some of the concerns that some groups, for whatever reason, whether it be religion, politics, or something else, have not been given the serious consideration for opportunity of funding from Secretary of State. I will make a commitment to the member from Saskatoon Westmount tonight, and that is to press once again for a review of the funding of women's groups out of the Secretary of State.

Mrs. Caswell: — Thank you very much for that sensible answer. And I might add that one of the things that they talk about women's groups really, as far as I am concerned, really aren't women's groups at all. For example. Project Ploughshares is a group of unilateral disarmament, and I don't necessarily think that women are more concerned about, you know, wanting a communist take-over than men.

And I think I want to . . . I'm to ask questions, but I want to express that your view on advocacy funding, that the taxpayer has to pay, no matter if it's right-wing or left-wing, is very well understood. And I think groups like REAL Women of Canada would be very happy to see no advocacy groups funded. But because some are, to the tune sometimes of \$11 million, they need to have a balance. And I guess it's always a question — what the pro lifers come to me about health or whatever — if one group is funded, should the other group be funded or should none be funded. And I think the question is that until we have no advocacy funding, we have to be very careful of our balance. And I appreciate your efforts that you've done in the past on this. And I'm sure that both of us will continue to make sure there's more balance.

And that's the end of my questions and comments on the Women's Secretariat.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a couple of questions about the proposed pension plan which has been announced in the throne speech and in the budget by your government, and I have some questions that maybe you will be able to answer for

us. And I understand that you will not be the minister bringing the Bill through the House — or maybe you will be — but in terms of your role as minister in charge of this area, as well as being one of the senior cabinet ministers and in charge of the Women's Secretariat, that you will have input into the design of the pension plan.

There is a good deal of interest in what the details of the plan are. It's now a couple of months since we've heard the announcement that there would be a plan. And I think there are some people in fact who are interested to start making payments into this plan and they're wondering what the plan will include. There are others who are more cynical, who are saying that this is merely an election gimmick and there will be nothing brought forward before the election call and before the House adjourns. But I was pleased to hear from the Premier yesterday or the day before that he intended to have the Bill passed before the session ends.

And I now have a couple of questions that I wanted you to outline for the committee. And I wonder, can you basically outline how the plan will work, if you're in a position to do that for the committee. And maybe you aren't; maybe there isn't; maybe the people who are cynical are right, that there isn't anything to this plan. But being the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat, I'm sure that you will have — if in fact there is a Bill ready to go — you will have a broad outline of how it will affect women in the province.

The other thing that cynical people are saying is that it will only benefit wealthy families where the husbands are earning enough money to put in a good chunk of cash, and that people who have a family income that is 9 or \$10,000 of course will not be able to put their share in.

But I wonder if at this time you could outline what that pension plan in broad terms will look like — and I'm not here looking for the details clause by clause of any Bill — but what suggestions have you made from the Women's Secretariat on that pension plan?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all it will be the Minister of Finance that is carrying it. And secondly, the member from Shaunavon, now he's either slow on process or he thinks I'm absolutely stupid. But the process is that those things are not released until the legislation is tabled in this House, and that stands on this issue.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, referring to someone who is slow, what I was asking you is whether the representation that the Women's Secretariat made to the Minister of Finance, if you could outline what lobbying you have done as a representative of the women of the province who will be affected by the pension plan. Can you give an outline of what lobbying you have done or what representation you have made to the Minister of Finance?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, those things will be handled after the legislation is tabled in this House.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well what I was asking is not the legislation or any details of the legislation, but what

representation have you made as Minister of the Women's Secretariat. And I can't for the life of me understand why you would want to be secretive about the work that you've done in representing women's pensions in the province. I can't understand for the life of me why you wouldn't stand up and say, look, I've been working very hard, I'm one of the architects of this legislation, and here are the proposals that I have put forward — and be proud of what you've done.

Well why wouldn't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Souris-Cannington says that she is proud of the work she's done in this area, but yet she seems to be embarrassed to give an outline of the pressuring or the lobbying she has done.

And I'm not here asking for a great deal of detail, but if you could outline what representation you have made. Have you done any studies into the area of pensions within the Women's Secretariat? Have you done a review of how many women presently have a pension? Let's start out there and maybe we can go at it in a different manner.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only state once again, I am not prepared to give an outline of what is going to be in that legislation. I believe that would be most improper, and I also believe that the member from Shaunavon knows that that would be improper. And the mere fact that he can have the gall to stand here and ask that it be done, I consider to be improper. I would be more than pleased to answer any kind of questions that my friend from Shaunavon has after the legislation is tabled.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I want to ask it a little slower this time. I want to say I'm not asking about an outline of the legislation now. I'm asking about the lobbying that you have done — and it may be nothing. Maybe I'm overestimating your role within the cabinet. But I want to re-emphasize that I'm not asking you now for an outline of the legislation. And we'll get that point out of the way.

Twice you've risen and said that I'm asking for the outline of the legislation. I'm not asking for that. I'm asking for what lobbying or suggestions you have made as the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat. And I just can't believe that you wouldn't have done some lobbying, because there will be people out there who will have expected you to do that, and I think you probably have.

I want to know what lobbying you did. That's what I'm asking is: what lobbying and what suggestions did you make as minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat? Did you suggest, for example, that a certain level of funding be put in by the government and a certain level by the individual? And if you did suggest that, what was the level of funding?

What I'm asking here is not what is in the legislation, or an outline of the legislation, but what suggestions you, as the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat, made to the Minister of Finance in drawing up what we think will be a piece of legislation introduced before the end of the session.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, any kind of

suggestions that I may have made in regards to the forthcoming pension legislation will be released publicly after it is tabled in this legislature.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder — I had asked a question earlier, and I want to go at this in a different direction — can you tell me how many women in the province presently have a pension plan? Do you have that statistic out of the Women's Secretariat?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I do not have that material with me tonight.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I wonder if the minister would be able to get that information for us. It seems like it's a very important issue that the Women's Secretariat would be dealing with, that is, pensions for women. I'm a little surprised that you don't have it with you, but I wonder if you'll give us the commitment that you will get that number for us. Basically what I'm asking for here is: how many women, and the age groups, who have pensions and those who don't — if you will be able to get that for me.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not surprising at all that I don't have that. I just told the hon. member from Shaunavon that the Minister of Finance will be carrying the pension legislation through this House, and the material as it relates — statistics, background material, options, etc., etc. — will rest with the Minister of Finance. At that time I would be more than glad to try and get any kind of figures and answer any questions that he may have, but I will not do so until then.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I'm not asking about the legislation; I'm asking about an important women's issue, and that is: how many women in the province presently have a pension plan? And believe it or not, there will be women in the province who will be surprised that the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat doesn't know what percentage of the population who are female have a pension plan. And that is just shocking, and will be shocking to a good number of people.

And I just want to ask you again, as part of your estimates for the Women's Secretariat, if you would get me that information. I'm sure that the staff with you there today either know it off the top of their head — because I know they're professional people — or they would be able to get it for the committee.

And I would just like to ask you again . . . and of course you can refuse. Mr. Chairman knows and everyone knows that ministers can refuse to give information. I don't know why you would in this case, but I want to know if you'll get that information for us.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I've already told the member that I would indeed give him that information and any other information that he may want, that I could possibly supply, after the legislation is tabled by the Minister of Finance.

I find great difficulty in believing the member from Shaunavon in his sincerity, you know, that he's trying to ask about an issue that is important to women. Last year in

this House, there wasn't one question from that floor on estimates — not one. And the member looks at me with a question mark on his face. Not one question.

And now this year, all of a sudden this is important. Is it any wonder there's a little bit of cynicism out there? I would suggest that it's out there because it rests with members like him that have been around for a fair amount of time.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I simply can't understand why the minister will not give us the percentage of women who have a pension in the province and those who don't. But the people of the province, who think that our job is to ask questions . . . And many of these questions that we ask are not questions that we make up on the spur of the moment, but are questions that come to us from various women's groups or from individuals.

I know I have a couple of letters from farm wives, and I want to ask you a question on their behalf. Do you think that the pension plan will apply to farm women? Let me put it a different way. Have you made a recommendation to the Minister of Finance that this pension plan apply to farm women, women who would classify themselves as home-makers, in the home on farms?

And here again, you can refuse to answer this question. I want you to know that this is not my question, but representations have been made to us asking that we find out from the government. And I wonder if you can outline whether or not farm women will be eligible for the new pension plan.

(2030)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well I'm sure that the member from Shaunavon must have received a pension card in the mail, and I would ask that he simply take the time to read it. And there would be a fairly good indication that possibly housewives would qualify — I mean, that was released some time ago — into the government's pension plan and the intent of it. But as to the details of it and everything else, once again, Mr. Chairman, I will not get into it until after the legislation is tabled.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I just want to get one point straight. Did you say that possibly farm women will be eligible for the pension plan? Is that the statement you made, that they will possibly be eligible? Did you make that definitive, hard statement that farm women will possibly . . . I just want to know what to write back to these farm women who are writing us, that the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat has outlined now that they will possibly be eligible. I just want you to get that straight.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could refer the member from Shaunavon to the Women's Secretariat news-letter, there is a section in there dealing with pensions for home-makers. Now, you probably have two or three different categories that farm women would fit into. I know a lot of farm women that work full time off the farm besides working full time at home. They could, for instance, be a nurse or a teacher. In that case they may already be into a pension plan. They may be working part time and for whatever firm or business, have access, too.

Then you have the farm wife who is on the farm as a housewife, and if that's the case, then yes, they would probably be looking at that pension plan. but to stand here and say that all farm women are going to be able to qualify, I think the member only has to go back and read the Minister of Finance's budget speech. I will send you a copy of the women's newsletter tomorrow. I'm sure you will enjoy it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to use an example to get this straight. I think we're now getting an answer. A farm wife who is classified as a home-maker and doesn't have a pension plan would probably be eligible for the pension plan. Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to read what is in here and perhaps it will answer the question. it says:

The government will introduce the Saskatchewan pension plan to provide an opportunity for home-makers, employees of small businesses, and self-employed people to save for retirement. The pension plan will be designed as an option for those people who do not qualify for or have access to other pension plans.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder in the consideration that you've done in building towards this plan and in the studies and analysis that you've done within the Women's Secretariat, would you be recommending or would you, personally, be in favour or opposed to a family income limit? And here I want to use for example, a doctor who would be earning \$150,000 a year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. Would they be eligible for the plan or not? And here I would like you to put on the record, not in terms of what's in the legislation, but what you personally would recommend as minister of the Women's Secretariat. Would the plan, as you would see it, I suggest to the minister, be income tested or not?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we're getting back into details and the outline and the hint of what's in the pension plan. And I have simply stated that I am not prepared to lay that out — the details of the pension plan.

I would say to the member, if he wants to talk about the doctor's wife, I'm quite willing to talk about the doctor's wife or the farmer's wife or perhaps the politician's wife. And I would suggest that if you were wondering which way to go, you have a very serious question to ask yourself in terms of those that do not have access to pensions. You know, is it dependent on the fact or who you're married to or what you're married to? I would suggest that maybe you roll that around in your mind for a while. You know, this is 1986 — not 1906. And I think we are long past — that's my personal opinion — long past a point where questions are asked as to the doctor's wife as if they aren't an entity on their own; they are.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well what I'm asking you is whether, in your opinion and your recommendation as the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat, whether the plan would be income tested. Now you can laugh and make fun of and ridicule the question, but believe it or not there

are many plans in your department that are income tested. The doctor's wife is not eligible for welfare, so you're income testing the welfare plan, obviously, with good reason.

What I'm asking is whether or not your recommendation would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, the Minister of Social Services who has taken money out of the pockets of many women in this province now says that doctor's wives are eligible for the welfare. I just would say to the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat, that in asking questions about what your department does in terms of pension recommendations are well within the bounds of what we should be asking here.

And my question to you is not one that . . . Well, you can ridicule it if you would like, but I think the question is legitimate; whether or not your recommendation from the Women's Secretariat would be to income test the pension plan or not. I think that's a legitimate question. For you to stand up and arrogantly make fun of whether or not government plans are income tested or not shows how naive you are about how your own government works, because many of your plans are income tested.

Your farm programs — many of them are income tested. The heritage grant program to the senior citizens was income tested. And here the question is whether or not the pension plan or the recommendations from yourself to the minister in charge of the plan will be income tested. And I would like your view of the issue and whether or not you can tell the committee.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member thinks I'm naive. Let me ask him this: does he see a difference between person income or . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would you listen. I sat here and listened quietly to you.

An Hon. Member: — I asked the question and you're supposed to answer it.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I'm going to answer you. The member has to answer another question, and I will endeavour to answer his. Is there a difference between personal income and family income?

Of course I'm aware government programs are income tested. I mean, most people are. What will this one be, he says? How many times have I said, and let me say it again — I am not prepared to give the details of the pension until it is tabled in this House. Then you can ask me anything you want on the pension plans.

I will also inform you that as far as the recommendation from myself and the secretariat, it has been one — and that's been on record for two years — that we were in favour of home-makers' pensions and pensions for small business, particularly part-time while they have family responsibilities. So they go into the part-time work-force, and that access to pension is simply not there.

That has been my recommendation. As for the details of those recommendations, they rest with the Minister of Finance until the legislation is tabled in the House.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well now, after half an hour you're giving out what some of your recommendations are. Half an hour ago you weren't going to give out what any of your recommendations to the minister were. In the recommendations, did you include a provision that would income test the plan — in your recommendations to the minister — or will it be open to all income families in the province, in the recommendations that you gave to the minister that you're now referring to?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I just told him what my recommendations were and the details, in order to implement that recommended policy were to be worked out with the Department of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, I have a series of questions which really are for information and for getting facts on the record. Some of the questions, I suspect, I will know the answers to, but others who may be watching or reading may not. Some of the questions I will not know the answer to.

The first area deals with equal pay, or pay equity, or questions of that nature. I ask you, Madam Minister, do you have figures which indicate the approximate income of women in the work-force as a percentage of the average income of men in the work-force in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I do not have up-to-date figures. I only have the 1980 statistics and those were out of StatsCanada. We have been looking at how we get a more up-to-date, complete figure in 1986. I know that StatsCanada is right now doing the census taking. But their figures will not be compiled for another two years, and we are really feeling a need to have an update on them. So we will be having a look at that over the next year.

What it was in 1980, which is one figure I can give you, was 66 per cent. Women employed full time in 1980 earned 66 per cent of what men employed full time did.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Madam Minister. And I think that's a good comparison. So we don't have the factor of part-time work and whether or not more women work part time than men blurring the picture, with respect to equal pay for equal work and the legislation with respect thereto, which is on our statute books now.

Would the minister indicate what progress, if any, has been made in the general enforcement of the statutory provisions for equal pay for equal work. And if you wish me to direct this to the Minister of Labour in due course I can, but I thought it might be something that would be of interest to the Women's Secretariat.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, the statutes in Saskatchewan are not on equal pay for equal work. The statute in Saskatchewan is equal pay for similar work. Okay? And I think . . . which is not the same as the first term that you

used when you began to speak, which was pay equity or equal value. Those are three different terms and in fact there are several differences even in pay equity and the equal value, depending on the kinds of policies put into place with them.

(2045)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I'm aware of at least part of the point you make. The categories are frequently stated as two — equal pay for equal work, and equal pay for work of equal value, and we readily admit that they are very different concepts.

With respect to the one of equal pay for equal work, or if you prefer, equal pay for similar work, could you indicate what progress if any has been made during the year in having that particular principle adhered to in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I have to admit I'm . . . The question is not quite clear, Mr. Chairman. And I'm not sure what you mean by what progress has been made in this last year. Are you referring to the number of complaints to do with equal pay for similar work? Are you referring to labour standards, or are you referring to the statistics that would show the wage gap narrowing and women moving up the scale in some categories?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, I was not referring to the latter because that, whether women move up the scale is not, or whether the average income earned by women working full time in the labour force is closer to the average income of men so working, is not only a function of equal pay for similar work, but it's a function of the various types of work they do. And I don't want to enter into that.

What I was asking was whether or not you are satisfied with the manner in which the legislation is working, and whether you feel that the — if I may put it this way — whether you feel that virtually all of the women in Saskatchewan who are doing similar work are receiving equal pay, or whether you feel that there is still work to be done in order to have the principle which is enacted in the legislation, apply on the ground.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you: that helps. Now I can only hope I can answer your question to your satisfaction. As I stated earlier, and I'm going to come back to that first point about the 1980 statistics and the secretariat feeling a need to perhaps bring those up to date, has been because when we've looked at the issues — and rather than talk just women's issues, I think it's, you know, perhaps people issues that we're talking about — we have had a concern that perhaps the gap is not closing as quickly as what some would like it to close.

And yet, when we take a look at various mechanisms put into place that we think and we know that eventually will address some of that — like educational opportunities, training, affirmative action, aggressive management policies — that those in fact do have an impact down the road on the issue.

When you break down the overall 36 per cent gap, you

find that about one-half, one-half of that 36 per cent is accounted for by hours worked — and that's where you get into even the little bit of the part-time stuff — or by productivity factors like experience or education.

However, there's another 10 to 15 per cent that relates to occupational segregation, or in other words to the fact that women tend to hold different jobs than men; and those particular jobs tend to pay less, whether because of low needs in terms of education, market-place . . . There's various factors, including attitudes from a way, way back — there's no doubt about that. But that's another 10 to 15 per cent.

Now another 5 to 10 per cent you can attribute — 5 to 10 you can attribute — to not paying women the same as men even when they hold the same job. So you have that 5 to 10 per cent that is really the attitudinal and the barrier factor that you have to deal with. And of course the big question is, how in fact do you deal with that, and is it a long-term solution or a short-term?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Madam Minister, and I think that that 5 to 10 per cent that you refer to is the target group for legislation of the kind of equal pay for similar work — I will use your term.

I now turn to the other concept which you refer to — equal pay for work of equal value — and I ask you whether or not the secretariat has had an opportunity to examine how legislation in other jurisdictions works, legislation providing equal pay for work of equal value. And I think we should say at the outset that this legislation is not nearly as broad as those words usually indicate. But the federal government has some limited legislation on equal pay for work of equal value, I believe. The Manitoba government has some. And I would be interested in knowing whether or not the secretariat has had any opportunity to look at that legislation to see how it works and whether or not it appears to be a suitable pattern for legislation in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, for some time now the Women's Secretariat along with myself has been in discussion on the perceived issue of equal pay for work of equal value. I want to state to the Assembly that over the last year in talking to various sectors of the public on it — including some women's groups, doing radio phone-in shows, that type of thing — if there's one thing I have found that is consistent throughout the issue, that has been one of some confusion on the equal pay for work of equal value, or for equal work.

And I don't think that there's any doubt that Saskatchewan people believe in equal pay for equal work or, as Saskatchewan's legislation which has been in place for some time says, similar work. I believe that Saskatchewan's legislation is probably one step further than the equal work, and in fact allows an appeal procedure and that type of thing, which is precisely what we have found over the last year — that, for example, the federal legislation is, that has been in for a very short period of time. In the number of years that it's been in I think they've received 12 — 12 complaints that they have had to monitor.

I am familiar with the Manitoba legislation. It is pay equity legislation and it is quite precise in terms of what's being put in and how it's going to be monitored. I am also familiar with the green paper and the proposed legislation for Ontario. I believe that is about all that is in Canada at this point in time.

We have also gathered what materials we have been able to from south of the border, and from around the world — Australia, Great Britain — and I guess what we were looking for in the course of our discussions was who has had it in for a period of time that they have been able to evaluate it and, in fact, measure the impact on society, the work-force, but more particularly on women. To date, my records show that Australia is probably one of the older ones and at this point in time they are somewhat worried because there seems to be an indicator that the participation rate for women within the work-force went down after it had been in place for a period of time. However, I have not seen any specific documents on it, and that is something that we will be pursuing over the next year.

I have some concerns with it, with what I know now. That is not to say that I do not have a concern with the wage gap. I think our government has recognized that there has to be some support measures put in place to try and close that gap. And as I said earlier, it becomes a matter of deciding which way is the best way in the long-term as opposed to kind of a quick fix it on the short-term. We've looked at several issues. We believe that it made sense to focus on reducing some of the occupational segregation that was taking place through education and training and advanced education. If I look at the participation rates of women, into post secondary. I'm very hopeful for what is down the road.

We also believe that there still has to be an encouragement for women in the management and professional levels. And while not everybody will work at that level, it is important that women be in to those management positions where decisions are made, where there is a role model opportunity, if that in fact is what they choose to do, that those barriers have to come down.

We also believe that it is very necessary to equalize the pay level entry. That is where you start from. And you know if you go into a job where the man next to you is starting out more than you are for very, very similar work, equal work, chances are the gap will grow even wider down the road. So we believe that the equalizing pay entry levels must take place. And of course affirmative action is also another one.

There has been some caution by the experts that have been dealing with the equal pay for work of equal value. If there's one signal that is consistent in the programs that are in place, it is that it is bureaucratic and that it certainly adds to the cost of the program. And I don't believe any jurisdiction that has gone into it has found a way to minimize the red tape and the bureaucracy with it.

(2100)

I guess if one of the concerns that I hear from women is valid, is that it is a value-based judgement call by

somebody when they're setting up the program. And what they say to me is, well how do we know that who's doing the valuing doesn't have some biases to begin with and aren't built into the program? I think that there is curiosity on the program. And as I said, there is no doubt that the wage gap is still there. However, we will have a better idea of how far that wage gap is after we have been able to bring the 1980 statistics up to date.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Just a last question on this area, Madam Minister. Do you have any plans for introducing a proposal or recommending a proposal for equal pay for work of equal value, either comprehensive or limited, in the near future?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I had stated the need for some statistical gathering, and that will take place first before any decision is made on what kind of a program is going to be put in. If in fact at that time there should be one, I do not believe that you can stand here and say that equal pay for work of equal value should go as it did to the east in Manitoba without knowing what the statistics are that you are dealing with.

I also do not think that it can take place by itself. And I will once again emphasize — and I will sound like a broken record — it is important that support services be put into place, like education and training, affirmative action, encouragement for management positions, professional levels. All that must happen.

The equal pay for work of equal value, without taking a good hard look at it, could have some serious detriments to women. And they could find themselves out of jobs if in fact what they have found is true at a glance in Australia and a few of the states in the United States. So I think the matter has to be given very serious consideration, and I do not believe that it is in the best interests of anyone in Saskatchewan to jump in.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, I take the answer to be no.

I want to move to another area now which is a matter of . . . I'm just touching on two or three areas which are of great interest to many women's groups and individual women with whom I talk. And one of them is the place of women in the workplace, and we've touched on that. Another is child care. And a third one is retirement.

And with respect to retirement — and I'll try to ask my questions very carefully here — could you tell me either of the following: the approximate number of women who are in the labour force; or the approximate number of women between the ages of say 18 and 65 who are in the labour force. And when I say number, I'm not looking for the absolute number but the percentage of the women between the ages of say 18 and 65 — if it's 16 and 65, or 20 and 65 it doesn't matter. Approximately what percentage are in the labour force and of what percentage are not in the labour force?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I don't have the breakdown from 20 to 60 with a total figure. I can give you those categories . . . (inaudible) . . . Well they're separate categories, for instance: 15 to 24, I believe I'm dealing with the year

1985, 65.6 per cent of Saskatchewan women in the labour force, this is by age; 25 to 34 was 69.7 per cent; 35 to 44 is 73.6 per cent; and 45 to 54, 67 per cent; and 55 to 64 years is 41 per cent. Total number of employed women is 176,000. And full-time is 69 per cent of that, 121,000, and 55,000 being part-time. I believe that should answer your question in part.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Madam Minister. It looks as if we have of the order of 160,000 people in the labour force of whom are 40 or 45,000 are part-time. And 120,000 or thereabouts are full-time, if I've got the figures right, and that it represents, full-time and part-time together represent about 65 per cent, perhaps, of the women between the ages of . . . Well it starts at 15, but I will say between the ages of 20 and 65, and that's plenty good enough for me. That gives me the idea.

Do you know, Madam Minister, approximately what percentage of the women in the labour force have access to a pension plan?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information with me tonight, and I have gone over that with the member from Shaunavon.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, I don't want to get into a dispute with the minister. I say again that areas of high importance to many individual women and women's groups that I speak to are — and I mention three — the treatment that women receive so far as pay is concerned in the work-force; child care; and retirement. And I anticipate that most women in Saskatchewan will feel that the Women's Secretariat will in general terms be monitoring these areas and will be able to have information, basic information which is relevant in dealing with these three areas. I'm not expecting you to have details of the child care program operated by the Department of Social Services, but I would suspect you might have some general idea of how many children may be in need of child care. And I'm not asking that now.

You have given me some information with respect to the relative position of women's wages versus men's wages in the labour force, and I thank you for that. You have given me the approximate number of women in the labour force, and I have asked you to tell me the approximate percentage of those who would have access to a pension plan, and you are telling me you don't know. I find it difficult to think that that sort of basic information wouldn't be in the hands of the minister, wouldn't be in the hands of the Women's Secretariat. No one is asking for precise figures, but if the Women's Secretariat has not concerned itself enough to know the approximate number of women in the work-force who don't have access to a pension plan, then I think that that speaks volumes for what the Women's Secretariat is doing or not doing.

Members opposite may feel that the women in this province are unconcerned with access to pension plans, or with child care, or with pay equity. If I may, Mr. Chairman, may I just rest a minute while the members opposite exercise their lungs. It may be, as people are shouting from across, that I need a rest, but I will take it

now and again ask the minister: are you asking us, Madam Minister, to believe that the Women's Secretariat does not have any approximation — any reasonable approximation — of the number of the people, women in the labour force, who have access to a pension plan? You just have no information on that?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, asking the Leader of the Opposition to believe something is like asking me to believe that this concern of his on women's issues is really so great. I mean, it was 1982 that I had to wait — and I was born in 1943, if you can imagine — to find a female in cabinet. And it sure wasn't under an NDP ticket, I'll tell you that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — What I am telling the Leader of the Opposition tonight, whether he believes it or not, and it doesn't really matter if he doesn't, the Minister of Finance is carrying the pension plan in this House and will table the legislation for it. And he has been dealing with the pension people, Department of Labour, and of course Department of Finance.

And as I told the member from Shaunavon, as far as my recommendations, done in conjunction with the Women's Secretariat, was to bring forth issues of concern, which we did, whether it was home-makers, small business, those people that didn't have any access to pension. That has been done. The details and statistics, I do not have with me in my memory. They are with the Minister of Finance and will stay there until it is tabled in the legislature.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Madam Minister, I am sorry that I have not been able to make myself clear. I am not asking about the pension plan and did not express one word about pension plans that your government may be bringing in or not, and a review of the *Hansard* will indicate not one mention. Nor was I asking what you had recommended to the Minister of Finance. I did not, and a review of the *Hansard* will make that clear.

What I asked, Madam Minister, was whether the Women's Secretariat has any information on the number of the women in the work-force that have access to a pension plan. And I will just make it clear. I will say as of approximately January 1st last year — this year — had access to a pension plan. That will be before the Minister of Finance's budget speech. It will be before any active consideration, presumably, of a pension legislation, so we won't get it mixed up with legislation. It will be before you presumably made any recommendations to him, and I'm not asking that. I am asking whether, at any date, some previous date — and you may pick it, Madam Minister — you are able to give me the approximate number of women in the work-force who have access to a pension plan in Saskatchewan?

(2115)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I simply don't have those by memory or with me tonight, and I would endeavour to collect the information, along with the information that the member for Shaunavon has

requested, and send it to him.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well thank you, Madam Minister. That's a measure of progress. I'm a little bit surprised that the matter of access to pensions, general retirement schemes, would not have been thought of as an item likely to arise under Women's Secretariat, but I thank the minister for her offer to send me what I understand to be such information as the secretariat may have on the approximate number of women in the work-force in Saskatchewan, or the approximate percentage, either one, who have access to a pension plan. Thank you, Madam Minister.

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, we hear a lot of concern about alcohol abuse in the province, and I'm just wondering, madam Minister, if your department has done a study on alcohol abuse and what your position might be regarding alcohol abuse and liquor advertising on TV?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — No, Mr. Chairman, we have not.

Mr. Lusney: — Well, Madam Minister, if you haven't done the study in the Women's Secretariat department, Madam Minister, what is your position on liquor advertising? Do you think that it is something that should be going on in light of the many concerns there are in the province regarding alcohol abuse today?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to relate this to the Women's Secretariat estimates. I have great difficulty with it. I would encourage the member to read *Hansard* from my estimate in Education, and he will perhaps find the reply in there.

Mr. Lusney: — Madam Minister, you seem to have difficulty in relating a lot of things to the Women's Secretariat department. I don't know why you established the department then.

There is a concern in this province that many young women are victims of alcohol abuse, if you want to relate it to women alone. And it isn't only women that have the problem, Madam Minister, but if you want to relate it to the Women's Secretariat, let's say there is a problem in the area of women and alcohol abuse.

Now, Madam Minister, we have seen a lot of liquor advertising on television. Your government is part of the body that allowed it. What is your position, Madam Minister, as a minister of the Women's Secretariat and your concerns or the concerns that are held regarding alcohol abuse among young women in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health just recently released a report, a study, on alcohol and drugs. And I would suggest . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well he says, what about my department. Well, let's talk about that. You want another study. Typical NDP — study, study, study, and no action, and just keep studying and on and on it goes.

It is not within the mandate, the alcohol and drugs. We have alcohol and drugs as it relates to education in the Department of Education, and you have the Minister of

Health who has the mandate through the drug and alcohol commission. And we have not done a study. I would suggest to the member that the statistics, though I have not looked at them myself as it pertains to girls and women, would probably be about average and perhaps a little bit less. I'm not sure; I'm only saying perhaps. But I don't know for sure and I would have to check with the Minister of Health.

Mr. Lusney: — Well, Madam Minister, you get into a little snit every time somebody asks you a question that might be a little touchy. You complained about the fact that I want more studies and study and study and study and study, and that's what you're saying. Well, Madam Minister, that's been the direction of this government for the last four years, over four years now — it's nothing but studies and studies — and I'm surprised that your department wouldn't be part of the same direction.

Madam Minister, we know what the Minister of Health's position is regarding liquor advertising, and he seems to approve of it. We know what the Minister of health and Welfare federally, what his position is, the Hon. Jake Epp. He is opposed to liquor advertising. We know what the candidate from your constituency, John Penner, thinks about liquor advertising. He's opposed to it. Madam Minister, what is your position on liquor advertising?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I related this in education. I felt that that was appropriate in my estimates. I mean, he knows the process of the House. And for his benefit I want to send over to him a book is called *A Sense of Balance: Equality in Government Communications*. And I want to tell him that as a female I object to his communications in this House. He has constantly — him and other members — portrayed terms that are a put-down to females, and perhaps he will benefit from such a book.

Mr. Lusney: — Well, Madam Minister, you seem to object to any terms we use regarding females, so I haven't used any terms that would be objectionable to females. I only asked a question regarding women, young women in this province, because you are the minister responsible to the Women's Secretariat.

Now if you want me to say, Madam Minister, what is your position on liquor advertising regarding the alcohol abuse of young women and young men in this province, fine. I don't object to using that term either. I am just asking you what your position is on liquor advertising. And since you are the minister in charge of the Women's Secretariat, one would assume that maybe your concern would be more in the line of how it affects women than men. But if you want to answer on both counts, I'll certainly accept that.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I am really pleased to see the concern that is in the opposition tonight. I believe just about every member has had a question to ask. Unfortunately he is not asking on the issues of the day as it pertains to women's issues, whether it be automatic enforcement of payments, owning your own business, equal pay for equal work, education opportunities; he can't seem to get to those points.

I wonder when it was that he last called a male colleague a snit. I can't remember that ever happening. yes, today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, well, well, I doubt that very much. Mr. Chairman, it still remains inappropriate in terms of doing the estimates.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On Item 1, I just have a couple of short questions. I see here . . . well, the minister from Meadow Lake is all in a rush here. But I have a couple of little questions.

Under administration there is a number of increase in staff, and I believe that these have been transferred from Advanced Education and Manpower. Can you just outline how many people were transferred and the amount of money that was in that area — Advanced Education — last year, both in terms of staff and moneys?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, there were 13 employees transferred; and approximately \$313,000.

I gave the member from Shaunavon the wrong answer on the number of years. I'm sorry, I was looking at the total. The number transferred was six.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I just want to get this confirmed. There were six transferred from Advanced Education and Manpower. There were six there already; so there's been an actual increase of one as opposed to what people might assume to be an increase of seven? In actual numbers there's an increase of one staff?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — No, my . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. The minister's trying to answer the question.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — My official informs me there was no increase. It was a transfer of seven, and there were six there, for a total of 13.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 41 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Women's Secretariat
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 41**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 41 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — That concludes estimates for the department of the Women's Secretariat. The minister may wish to make some concluding remarks.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, just briefly, Mr. Chairman. Once again I thank the opposition for some interest this year. It was much better than having nothing, like we had last year. And I would hope that that interest continues because, while we talk about Women's Secretariat, many of the issues, in fact, are people's issues and have an

impact on all of society.

I would also like to thank the officials that are with me tonight and the Women's Secretariat for what I deem to be a very good year and for what I also think is going to be a very busy year coming before us. Thank you.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I just want to add my thanks as well to the staff of the minister. And also, if the minister would assure us that the information that she promised to get for us would be forthcoming expeditiously, and that we will look forward to it with a week or so, if she would do that for us.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Energy and Mines
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 23**

Mr. Chairman: — I would like to call on the minister to please introduce his officials.

(2130)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce to you and to the committee, Bob Reid, the deputy minister seated to my immediate right; John Reid, assistant deputy minister, resource policy and economics, to his right; behind the deputy is Les Beck, executive director of geology and mines; and behind myself, Jack McPhee, manager of special projects; and at the back we have Peter Leier, Dale Fletcher, Janis Rathwell, and Maurice Hall. Peter is the natural gas policy analyst; Dale Fletcher is the director of economic and fiscal analysis branch; Janis Rathwell, director of personnel and administration; and Maurice Hall, potash policy analyst. I think Bruce Wilson's here somewhere. And to my left, Bruce Wilson, executive director of petroleum and natural gas, Mr. Chairman.

Item 1

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you some routine questions. Maybe we can start out that way, at any rate, then get into some detailed questions and answers. I wonder if you have with you a list of your personal staff, executive assistants, special assistants, and that sort of thing, with their salaries and also the increases that have taken place to those salaries within the last year. Let's say the calendar year 1985.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, what I have is as of March 30, 1986, Energy and Mines minister's office staff complement. I don't have any increases for 1985, but I could undertake to get that for you if you so wish, and I'll send this across to you as soon . . . The Deputy clerk is going to help us out here. Thank you.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I just want to get one thing straight on the increase here. Are you saying there were no increases in '85, or that you don't have them with you and will get them? If you're saying that you'll get them for us, would you arrange to have them here tomorrow morning and that would be fine. But the increases not only for '85 — let's say from January '85 to present, that time period.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, I'll undertake to provide you with that tomorrow.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — In the area of your deputy's salary, as well as the associate deputy and the executive directors within the department, have you got a similar list of salaries and increases that may have taken place during that same time period from, let's say, January 1st of '85 to present?

And here again if you've got the list that you could send across I would appreciate it. And if you could just jot down, I'm sure that your deputy would at least have some of the increases that would have occurred in that time period. Both by the way of increases that may follow some guide-lines, and if you could explain as well how you establish the increases. Is there a formula that is applied across the board, or is it done on an individual basis? And if you just give a little outline about how those increases occur for your upper levels in that department.

And here I'm not making the argument, at least not at this point, that the increases shouldn't occur because I think as we have argued that minimum wage should increase on a regular bases to reflect inflation, I'm sure that people who are doing a good job within the department at every level should have that kind of an increase.

And always we have difficulty understanding how one minister — and we heard it earlier this evening — argues that people on minimum wage need no increase, but others at the top end of the spectrum should have an increase. And these arguments are difficult for people to understand but — well, the member from P.A.-Duck Lake indicates that he agrees that people at the bottom should be frozen while people at the top increase, but that's his position. I don't share that view, but I wonder if the minister could just outline how those increases occur. And here I'm not saying there shouldn't be increase. I'm just wondering what the formula is.

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise a point of order. There was some mention by the member just now that I had indicated that people on minimum wage should not receive increases and clearly I made no such indication. And I wonder if the member would be willing to withdrawn those comments, since he did put them on the record. They simply aren't accurate and I believe he knows they aren't accurate.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe it is a point of order, but in listening to the ministers' comments, I clearly heard someone indicate that they were in favour of the policy of having the minimum wage frozen and having increases for upper echelon civil servants. And . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! Would the member please be seated. The point of order that has been raised is a dispute between members regarding alleged facts, and as such I don't believe it's a point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that with respect for the member for P.A.-Duck Lake, it may not have been him who indicated that the minimum wage — people at the bottom should be frozen while those at the top get increases. But it clearly did come from some

member of the Conservative caucus. If it was not him, then . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! The member is once more alleging certain facts between members. This time he has decided to include the whole caucus on the other side of the House. And as such, no more comments will be made on that topic.

Please get back to the topic at hand which is the estimates for Energy and Mines.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I agree with you that we should get back to topic. I'm sorry that the member for P.A.-Duck Lake brought the issue up, and I, of course, wish he hadn't have. Like you, I agree with you that he shouldn't have.

But I wonder if the minister would have the increases? I have the deputy minister and the petroleum natural gas executive director and the ADM and the executive director of geology and mines. Could you just give me the increases if you have them there?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have the increases. But I, in fact, will undertake as well to provide that for you and the basis, although for the most part it's been limited to merit increases.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Can you explain how the merit system works? And I understand that the guide-lines that apply to the people who may be unionized within the civil service, those guide-lines wouldn't apply to the executive directors and ADMs and deputy. But what . . . Is there an upper limit in these merit increases throughout the government? Or what guide-lines do you have as a minister? And I'm not even sure whether you're the person who would make the final decision on the merit increases. But maybe you can just outline how that process works for us.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, the procedure for merit increases, I'm advised, is not unlike what was in place when the NDP were the administration. There is an annual employee assessment, and other than the deputy, the deputy does them. Obviously he doesn't do them himself. The merits, the normal step is four per cent, and they may or may not be eligible for an additional performance bonus, or they may be just eligible for a performance bonus by itself, in which case there will be a two per cent — something in the range of two per cent.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I asked you about the performance bonus. Are you saying that the performance bonus is limited to two per cent, or if I'm wrong in assuming that, or hearing that coming from you, what would be the maximum that the performance bonus could be? You have the normal four per cent, and that would be more or less automatic. I imagine you could — if the work of the individual wasn't satisfactory, it could be less — but what you're saying is the normal increase is four; then what would the performance bonus maximum be?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, the merit step is four per cent. Now if somebody had reached the maximum and there were no more steps

available to them, or if there had been extraordinary and exemplary service — in either one of those two instances — they might be eligible for a performance bonus. The maximum performance bonus is four per cent. However, the department, because of the economic conditions, if you like, that we all have to live with — and very responsibly I might add — use two per cent as their sort of normal performance bonus for those who had performed in an exemplary fashion.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — That's what I wanted to know. The normal step increase is four per cent. Then there could be the possibility of a four per cent increase. But you have chosen in your department, to limit it to two. And you will get those numbers for me, what applied to each of these individuals, and I'll leave that as well.

On your personal staff I just want to get it straight here. I believe there's six individuals. Their income range is between 44,000 for a Doug Emsley, to a 20,000 a year income for Ruth Classen. And you will be getting me the increase for each of those six?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — That's correct.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the individuals you've listed here, the four chief executive officers of the department, can you tell me whether or not there are any perks that are forthcoming to those individuals? Do they have an automobile assigned to them, either from CVA or otherwise? And would you tell me as well what arrangements do you have for the use of the executive aircraft? Are there a group of people within the department who are eligible to use it, or is everyone eligible under the direction of the ADM or the deputy?

Can you indicate two things: whether or not executive officers in your department have vehicles assigned; how many individuals would have one; and who does the policy as it applies to executive aircraft work within your department?

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, not unlike the merit increases, the so-called perks are unchanged with this administration as from the previous administration. The deputy minister has an assigned vehicle, CVA. As it relates to exec. air, departmental official use is sparingly, to say the least, and all approvals are done through the minister's office.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, can you arrange for us — and I don't think you would have it with you — but the number of flights that were taken in province and out of province using executive aircraft by your department?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, to allow us to answer that question more specifically for you, over what time frame?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — If you would get it for me from January 1st '85 to present, and by present I don't mean today, but if you could set a date and let's say, up to April 30th of '86, if you could provide that for us.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, we'll provide it tomorrow, hon. member.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if the minister would also include on that the individuals who were on each of the flights.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, in keeping with the tradition of the House, I'll undertake to provide to you the number of miles travelled, the cost, and the number of people who accompanied me.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — What about when you weren't on the flights, will you provide . . . What I want is for the total department. I don't only want your flights but, oh, let's say your deputy had to fly out to Lloydminster and that sort of thing, or out to Calgary to meet with oil executives, or Husky — that sort of thing. Will you include that in the list? And I would like to have the individuals on the flights.

I'm not sure whether or not those manifests are public documents with the Department of Transport, and whether or not we can get those names. I believe we can. Through freedom of information I think that it is now possible to get them. Well we may have to go that route. I was just thinking that it makes much more sense for us to do it here. But . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I'll tell you. The member from Saskatoon, former minister of Energy and member from Sutherland, says why would we want to know. Well I'll tell you, after Jimmy Garner was caught flying around with his family . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! The hon. member knows that he is not to use the names of members of this House.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — You could have fooled me. I thought he had resigned.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! Would the hon. member please accept the ruling of the Chair without any further speeches about it and get back to the topic.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I am not making a speech about the fact that the member from Wilkie hasn't been in the House for 53 days. I'm not making a speech about that.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The hon. member also knows that members are not to speak on whether or not a member is in the House. It is also a ruling of this House. So once again, the hon. member is out of order in his remarks.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to ask the chairman about that very issue. You've raised an issue about asking questions about . . . or mentioning members not being in the House. We've asked this question in question period and the Speaker has allowed it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm asking for a ruling on this, because we have asked questions of the minister about attendance in the House. And now you're saying we can't ask that in the House.

Mr. Chairman: — I've just said that the members are not to refer to other members as not being in the House. That's the ruling.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, the issue here is not whether or not the member for Wilkie is in the House at the present time. I'm not saying that he's not in the House. Whether or not he's in the House at the present time, people will be able to make up their mind. But I'm referring to the fact that he hasn't been here for 53 days. And the public will make up their mind whether he's in the House at the present time. I'm not saying that ... (inaudible interjection) ... No.

What I'm saying is that when I ask for the flights of the minister in his department ... And I don't know what these people are getting so excited about. It was nice and quiet in here till I bring up the member from Wilkie, and then they all get excited and jump to his defence, and he hasn't been here for 53 days. And they're all yelling, point of order, and I don't know what they're yelling about.

Why would the minister and the people on that side of the House be so excited about air travel and not giving out the list when I bring up the former minister of highways, the member from Wilkie and the fact that he had to resign from cabinet because of misuse of the aircraft. And now when we bring it up, the minister won't give us a list of who flies around with him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these people opposite have got the nickname of birds. Everybody refers to this government as birds. And the reason that is, is because they're like the member from Wilkie, because they fly all over the country. And I know I want to ask the minister about his flights — his flights. And I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, why I mention this. There were a number of people in my constituency who were saying: why do you always refer to these guys as birds? He says: why do you refer to them as that? Well I say it's because of the member from Wilkie and others who spend all their time flying around. They fly here and they fly there.

And what I want to know, Mr. Minister, is who's flying with you? Who's flying with you when you go around the province? I don't know why you're embarrassed about that? I don't know why you're embarrassed about that? I'll tell you, the people of this province who are paying the bill, the people of the province who are paying the bill for these flights around Canada and around the world, I'll tell you, are getting a little upset.

And it's not that long ago the Deputy Premier, when he was asked about his flights around the world, gave out the list, and you couldn't believe all the places he had been to on one trip. He'd been in Saudi Arabia and he'd been here and he'd been in California and he had stayed everywhere.

And now when we're asking about where this minister went and who he took with him, he won't give them to us. I don't know. There are cynical people in this province. And there are also people who are legitimately concerned about their taxes going to flying these people around.

Now I'm not assuming that this minister made any flights that weren't legitimate or any other stuff. I don't think he did. I don't think he did. Nor do I think any of his staff did. But the suspicion is there when you're so secretive that

you won't give a list. And then people will include you with this other individual, the member from Wilkie, who was caught flying around inappropriately and had to resign from cabinet. And I don't think you deserve that reputation. And why are you being secretive? ... (inaudible) ... It had nothing to do with flying? Well what did he resign for? Oh, he didn't tell the truth.

Well I'll tell you, you're not telling the whole truth by being secretive. That's right. That's right. You're holding back information that should be rightfully in the hands of the public. And that is, who has been flying around with you? And I think, Mr. Chairman, that these are perfectly appropriate and legitimate questions. I think even you are curious. I think even Mr. Chairman would be curious to know who these people in the treasury benches are taking with them on the flights.

I say to you that I believe that they're legitimate in the case of this minister. I'll defend him, but I can't for the life of me understand why he is being secretive to protect other ministers who may not be legitimate in who they are taking with them on these flights.

I say that there's a suspicion out there when you won't tell us that you're taking political people with you on these flights to do campaigning. That's a suspicion ... (inaudible interjection) ... Yes it is, and the taxpayers of this province are suspicious of this government. That's what they believe.

When they see the aircraft flying hither and yon this summer with cabinet ministers with staff on, and then think about the fact that this minister wouldn't tell the public who was with them, that they're out doing a little campaigning — that's what they're going to believe. And they're going to look at that aircraft every time it stops and say, this is costing me \$5, \$10 out of my pocket to pay for these birds to fly around and try to get re-elected now that they're in trouble ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well, I know, and the member for Meadow Lake says that would be a good idea. Yes, he says he's going to fly around in Shaunavon and do some politicking. Well that's what I'm afraid of. That's what I'm afraid of. And I want to tell you that the taxpayers of this province are not in a mood to deal with a government that is fearful of them, and now into their fifth year, and is going to spend this summer spending millions of their dollars flying around trying to get re-elected.

Well, the member for Meadow Lake, if he's the only one that comes, that's all right. We could handle him because I've travelled with him before. He's no problem. He's no problem to travel with. What I worry about is the political hacks he might bring with him.

An Hon. Member: — I'll bring them all.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, he's bringing them all. Well I'll tell you that if the people of this province could witness what we're seeing tonight, of this government blatantly admitting that they didn't call the election in June because they're going to spend this summer campaigning, I'll tell you that we have got a problem with the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, order. I believe that the member is making allegations which are not related to the estimates for Energy and Mines. And I also believe that the member is wandering all over the board, and I believe he's being repetitious. He's tried to ask the same question over and over for about five or ten minutes in different ways. And I'm just asking the member to get to his question or else we'll move on to another question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister will be interested in the question that I'm going to put from him when I'm done my remarks. And I'm sure that he will be, because what we're talking about is the taxpayers' dollar as it affects this department. That's what we're talking about.

What we're talking about is where the taxpayer's dollar is going to in this department. And the minister has already said and clearly stated that some of it goes to executive aircraft and flights around the province, out of province, and out of country. And I agree that that is a legitimate reason to be spending the taxpayers' money — that there are legitimate reasons to be flying around the province. And I believe they have three executive aircraft that fly cabinet ministers, and besides that they use a number of private carriers to lease their planes or to charter planes to fly ministers and their staff around the province and out of the province.

And I understand, Mr. Chairman, that that is legitimate. That's why we have them. And it's much better for the minister to be flying than it is to be driving a car down the highway taking valuable time to be doing it.

But I want to say that in not giving us the list of names . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. According to rule 3(4) and the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan 1981, members who are deemed to be repetitious in their questions by the Chair — and I believe that now the member has had sufficient time to put his question and his comments, and I recognize the minister.

(2200)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman . . .

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have an important question to ask the minister, and I would appreciate the opportunity to . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I have warned the member a few minutes ago that he should put the question, and he has been wandering all over the map. I have told him to put the question; he has not done so. I now recognize the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, the member may well have a question that's reasonable, but at this time of the night he has a tendency not to be that way. So I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 p.m.