

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature
22nd Day

Friday, March 14, 1958

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

STUDENT VISITORS

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): —Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and particularly to the members of the Government, that this afternoon they will have the extreme privilege of looking at some beautiful faces in this gallery to the back of us. They are the high school pupils of Lafleche together with their principal and vice-principal, Mr. Martin and Mr. Davis, and some other visitors.

The fact that they came here, today, is no coincidence with might be discussed in the House, but I hope that whatever is discussed they will find it very fruitful and educational as well.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to a very fine group of 26 pupils up in this balcony. They are the Grades XI and XII students from the Rosthern High School, in charge of their principal, Mr. Doyle. I hope that their visit here will not only be pleasant, but educational.

LIQUOR SALES OUTLETS

Appointment of Committee of Inquiry

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

"That, pending a complete review of the legislation relating to the distribution and sale of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan, and the Regulations thereunder, this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the appointment of a Committee composed of members of the

March 14, 1958

Assembly to conduct an inquiry, following prorogation of the Assembly and during the inter-sessional period, into such as acts of the matter as relate exclusively to Sales Outlets in Province;

"that the said Committee consist of the following members:

Messieurs: Howe (Chairman), Fines, Walker, McDonald, Barrie, Neibrandt, Wood, Weber, and Mesdames Batten and Cooper.

"and have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath; to receive representations from interested parties and from members of the general public, and for this purpose to hold meetings away from the seat of Government in order that the fullest representations may be received without unduly inconveniencing those desiring to be heard;

"the said Committee to submit its report to the Government, on behalf of this Assembly, on or before July 31, 1958, in order to facilitate action being taken upon any recommendations it may desire to make arising from its inquiry, the said report to be submitted to the Assembly not later than the tenth sitting day of the next ensuing Session of the Assembly.

"Further, that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that, notwithstanding anything contained in The Legislative Assembly Act, the members of the aforementioned Committee be made a per diem allowance in lieu of travelling and other expenses incidental to their attendance at sittings of the Committee, without thereby disqualifying them as Members."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the motion which I am about to move is for the setting up of a Select Committee of the Legislature to study the matter of sales outlets for the sale of alcoholic beverages in the province, with the power to sit after this Legislature prorogues, and to report to the Government by the 31st July, and to the Legislature within 10 days after the opening of our next Session.

This whole question of liquor legislation is an extremely difficult and controversial one. The reason it is difficult and controversial is that the matter of the consumption of liquor is

primarily a matter of opinion. Some people have the opinion that it is a bad thing; and these opinions, of course, cut across political parties and church groups and social classifications, because, in the final analysis, we are living in a democracy and in a democracy the people have the right to their opinions.

I have never made any secret about what my opinion is. I would prefer that people did not drink at all. I think that society would be happier, we would have less heartaches, less poverty and probably less crime if there were no alcoholic beverages consumed. That is only my opinion; but I recognize that in a free society I have no more right to prevent another from drinking than he has a right to force me to drink if I don't want to. It seems to me it is in that spirit we have to approach this problem. After all, we sit here as legislators seeking to legislate for adults, for grown-up people who have a right on basic moral questions to make their own decisions. We can tell a child that you must do a certain thing, or you ought not to do a certain thing because we think it is good for you or it is not good for you, but we are not in that position when we are dealing with grown-up people.

In the final analysis, one cannot legislate morality. Commendable social conduct is a matter of inward discipline much more than it is to the presence of legislative restraint. That does not mean we have no responsibility. Members of the Legislature have responsibility, when we come to talk about liquor legislation, to see that we protect minors from being exploited, to see that those who do desire to drink don't become a public nuisance, that they do not violate the ordinary decencies of the community, and that they do not become a hazard to the other members of society.

We also have a responsibility, it seems to me, in this complex and technological age, to do everything we can to carry on a program of education to teach people temperance and moderation in the matter of the consumption of alcoholic beverages. The Department of Education has been carrying on temperance campaigns through its curriculum in the schools; they have made very extensive grants to various temperance organizations — and I would like to take this opportunity of commending the Temperance Federation, who have done a most commendable job in our schools in the matter of scientific temperance education.

Our Department of Health in its education grants for Health Education shows films and helps to instruct people in the advantages of temperance in the matter of drinking.

We have also the Bureau of Alcoholism. We have given assistance to Alcoholics Anonymous in dealing with the problem of the alcoholics. Of course, the alcoholic, in my opinion, in a totally different question, and should not be confused with

March 14, 1958

the matter of drinking. The alcoholic is a person who usually needs medical and psychiatric treatment, and that is a different problem altogether.

I think we have to recognize that the whole question of liquor legislation has been under review in all parts of Canada, and very far-reaching changes have been made in Canada during the past ten or twelve years. About ten years ago, as a result of a Royal Commission, the Province of Ontario introduced legislation for increased outlets for the sale of liquor. Two or three years later, the province of British Columbia set up a Royal Commission under the Hon. H.H. Stevens, a former Federal Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that Commission brought in recommendations which were implemented by the Legislature of British Columbia, also providing for increased outlets. Then, several years ago, the Legislature of Manitoba appointed a Commission headed by Mr. Bracken, a former Premier of Manitoba. That Commission carried on one of the most exhaustive and far-reaching investigations that has been done in our country and, following their recommendations, the Legislature of Manitoba provided, I believe, for some five additional types of outlets in that province.

About two years ago the Legislature of Alberta set up a Legislative Committee. That Committee brought in its recommendations at the last Session of the Alberta Legislature. Their recommendations were that the liquor legislation be left alone, that there should be no fundamental change. The Legislature did not agree with the Committee however, and finally, on a division which cut across party boundaries, and I believe divided even the Cabinet, a resolution was passed by the Alberta Legislature calling for a plebiscite on this question in the province of Alberta. That plebiscite was held last October and most hon. members are familiar with the results. I think in the urban areas they were predominantly in favour of increased types of outlets. In the rural areas they were either against increased outlets, or they were in favour by a very small majority. As a result of that plebiscite, I understand legislation is now being introduced in the province of Alberta for increased outlets. My information is that it is largely along the lines of the legislation which is now in effect in the province of Manitoba.

In Saskatchewan we have had no major changes in our liquor legislation since 1934 when, most members will remember, a plebiscite was held on June 19, 1934 at the same time as a provincial election, to see whether or not the people of this province wanted to set up beer parlours for males only. That plebiscite was in the affirmative, and those beer parlours were set up. Since that time there have been no major changes in the general types of outlets the beer available in the province so that we have, in Saskatchewan, the beer parlours and the Government stores for the sale of liquor.

There is no need, of course, for Saskatchewan to try to keep up with the Joneses. The fact that Ontario, British Columbia,

Manitoba, and now Alberta, have introduced new types of outlets does not necessarily commit us to following their lead. I think, however, it is necessary that we at least stop and take a look at our liquor legislation. There have been suggestions from a number of quarters. Last year, my friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think on three occasions mentioned that he thought we ought to set up a Legislative Committee to look into this question. I believe the leader of the Social Credit group, the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber), made a similar suggestion. The Government has received representations from the Chief of Police in Regina and the Chief of Police in the city of Saskatoon, and the Provincial Treasurer tells me representations have been received from the Chiefs of Police of all the cities, pointing out that some of our legislation, in their opinion, was not conducive to temperance, but actually, in their opinion, encourages drinking in some respects. They have urged us to take a look at the need for a revision of our liquor legislation.

A number of provincial organizations at various times have made submissions to the Government and asked that at least we set up some type of machinery — either a Legislative Committee or a Royal Commission — to give us an opportunity of ascertaining the wishes of the public regarding this matter. Therefore, today, I am proposing to the House that we should set up such a Legislative Committee. I am proposing it in the first place, because in a democracy it seems to me that we should always be prepared to ascertain the wishes of the people whom we represent. After all, laws are only good if the great majority of the people are in favour of those laws. Unless they meet the wishes of the great majority of the people it is virtually impossible to enforce laws. I don't think any legislature or any government should be afraid at any time to ascertain the wishes of the people, particularly in respect of so controversial a matter as that of the sale of alcoholic beverages.

I am suggesting this Committee, secondly, because frankly, I am not convinced that our present liquor laws leave no room for improvement. There is a wide variety of opinions on this matter. Certainly I am not in a position to speak with great authority on the matter, but, last fall, I addressed a number of meetings in my constituency — I ought not to use the word 'addressed', because I had addressed so many meetings in provincial and federal elections that I held a series of meetings at which I simply sat on the platform and asked the people to tell me what things they thought were problems, what things they thought the Government should be doing that it is not doing, or ought not to be doing that it is doing. Inevitably, of course, the question of liquor legislation came up and a doctor, who had come from the United Kingdom and had been practising in that community for some years, got to his feet and said: "Mr. Chairman, all of you know that I have been practising medicine in this community now for several years. You know that I don't drink and that I advise my patients not to drink. But I must say

March 14, 1958

that in the United Kingdom where they have the British Pubs, where people go in and have a beer with their meals, or with their lunch, conditions are quite different from what I find here in Saskatchewan." He said to me: "Mr. Premier, I must say quite frankly that I have seen more drunkenness on a Saturday night in this little town than I saw at any time in all the years that I lived in the United Kingdom." He said: "I frankly think that there must be something wrong with your liquor legislation."

Well, of course, that is only his opinion. I pointed out to him that this may not be the real explanation. Maybe it is to our tradition of a pioneer, frontier civilization, maybe our different social standards of conduct — it may not be the explanation, but nevertheless I think no person can be dogmatic on this matter. No person can say with assurance that our present liquor legislation is the best possible legislation that we can produce.

I was interested in noticing, the other day, that the Chief of Police in the city of Regina, in making an address to a convention of commercial travellers, had some comments about the liquor legislation. I am not quoting him because I agree with him; I am quoting him to point out that one charged with the administration of law enforcement must have some familiarity with this problem. The newspaper report says that Chief Cookson urged the dignity of mixed drinking and liquor permits for clubs. It said the Chief praised the provincial Department of Education for introducing the subject of alcoholism in the high school curriculum: "However, the Department's good work is being frustrated by retention of the present Act. Our Liquor Act encourages, rather than discourages, the consumption of liquor. It encourages quantity drinking on the part of the individual."

Again, I say this is simply the point of this particular individual. He could be right, or he could be wrong. I do think, however, when quite a number of responsible people have said that they seriously question whether or not our liquor laws are adequate and have suggested that there is room for improvement, that we ought to take a look at this matter.

I have discussed with people in other provinces where liquor legislation has been changed, what the effects have been, and again you get differences of opinion. I have friends in Ontario who do not think the changes in Ontario have been beneficial. On the other hand, I have friends actively working in the temperance movement in Manitoba who tell me that they think the changes in Manitoba have been a very great improvement on the drinking habits in that province. I think any person who takes a purely dogmatic position and says we ought not even look at this matter that we ought not make any changes, is not facing up to all the facts.

So the Government is recommending that we set up this Committee. We don't think that a Royal Commission is necessary. The work done by the Bracken Commission in Manitoba, and the Royal Commission in British Columbia gathered a wealth of information. I think the province of Manitoba spent some \$150,000 collecting a wealth of information which would be available to our Legislative Committee. We don't feel that the money would be well spent in setting up a Royal Commission to duplicate the gathering of data which is already available. I do feel, however, that a Legislative Committee which would be able to study all aspects of the problem, which would be able to hear representations from representative groups of citizens in the province, which would be able to ascertain the views of the people of Saskatchewan, would be beneficial.

We also think such a Committee would get a great deal of value out of looking at other provinces, probably visiting them, trying to ascertain there, from different groups, what has been the effect of liquor changes in other places. Then, as a result of that, they would be able to bring back to this Legislature the results of their findings and place before us their recommendations. I would hope, of course, that this Legislative Committee would consider the fact that this legislation (whether it is the present legislation, or any amended legislation) affects the lives of a great many people, and that they should be consulted in some form or other with reference to any changes which are made.

In Manitoba, they introduced the legislation but the people were consulted by means of local option. In the province of Alberta, a plebiscite was taken. In this province we might want to do both — it would be entirely up to the Committee to study that question. But we have suggested that they should report to the Government by the 31st of July. If they, think a plebiscite is desirable, then, of course, that would leave us sufficient time to have such a plebiscite at the same time as the municipal elections, and it would save us a good deal of money. If they feel that legislation should be introduced, then that legislation could be drafted for the consideration of this Legislature. If they feel that no changes should be made at all, then their report can be brought before this House within ten days of our next sitting and the whole question can be debated at that time.

I would like to say, too, before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, that I think we ought to extend our thanks to the members of the Legislature who are willing to act on this Committee. Theirs is a very heavy task and a very serious responsibility. It will take a good deal of their time, and I think they are placing the people of this province in their debt when they are willing to undertake this arduous task. That is particularly true of the private members who will have to be away from their homes and spend some time in Regina and wherever else the Committee may want to hold hearings. I think we should express our appreciation to them for the fact that they are willing to serve in this capacity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Fines, the motion as it appears on the Order Paper.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to associate myself with the Premier's remarks. I am sure you will agree with me that that doesn't too often happen, especially here in this Legislature. However, I also realize that this is a difficult and a controversial problem. It is quite true that, a year ago, I suggested to the Assembly that we should consider setting up a committee to study this problem. I made that suggestion when we were considering some amendments to The Vehicles Act. However, the question of liquor is far greater than considering the types of outlets we are going to have, and, therefore, I wonder if the terms of reference are quite wide enough. It seems to me that the Committee which is to study these problems ought to be able to make recommendations perhaps for an educational program, so that we could bring to the attention of all our citizens the problems that confront the people of Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada as far as the use of alcoholic beverages is concerned.

I am not one who has a dogmatic view one way or the other. I don't think there is any question over which more representations have been made over the last several months, than the liquor question. Some people, as you know, are vitally opposed to increasing outlets. Some people believe we should have prohibition; other people say we should have increased outlets. Well, I am one of those who believe that our present liquor legislation in Saskatchewan is promoting drunkenness rather than controlling it. I am inclined to go along with some of the statements of the Chief of Police of this city. Therefore I think it is more than appropriate that a Committee should be set up to study this very problem.

I, too, do not believe that it is necessary for us to appoint a Royal Commission in Saskatchewan. As the Premier mentioned, we have the reports of the Royal Commission in Ontario, from Manitoba, and from British Columbia, and I understand those reports will be made available to members of the Committee. They were very widespread reports as the terms of reference were very widespread and comprehensive. I think probably if we were to broaden the terms of reference the Committee might, in their wisdom, make some recommendations with regard to an educational program.

I was rather interested when the Premier was telling us the thoughts or remarks of a doctor who had come to this country from the British Isles. As I had some experience with liquor legislation in the British Isles, I can certainly agree with the views of that particular doctor. I think most of us realize that in Great Britain they have a pub on practically every corner, and I found, during my stay in Great Britain that, because of an education program or from habit itself, their pub was satisfying the needs and wishes of the British people, and it certainly was not promoting drunkenness in that country. I doubt very much if we could have the pub system in Canada, because we are a new country, and I doubt if our people would avail themselves of the outlets that are made available through the pub.

However, I do think it is wise for a committee to receive representations from interested individuals and organizations in our province. I think it is wise for us to study the reports of the Royal Commissions, and I think it is an excellent suggestion that the members of the Committee be given the opportunity to travel to other parts of Canada, where they have changed their liquor legislation over the last few years, so the members of the Committee would have the opportunity of discussing this problem with those in charge of the administration in other provinces with those people who are in charge of the establishments that are making liquor available, and with the general public. I think in that way the members of the Committee will be given the first-hand opportunity to decide for themselves as to what we ought to recommend here in Saskatchewan.

As a prospective member of the Committee, I want to say that, as far as I am concerned, I want to have an open mind and to judge my actions and my recommendations according to what I can find out from the people in Saskatchewan, and the people in other parts of Canada. I am sure if all members of the Committee will do that (and I'm sure they will), we can bring a recommendation to this Assembly which, in all possibility will meet the wishes and the needs of the majority of the people in our province.

The chiefs of police in the major part (I think) of our larger urban centres in Saskatchewan have definitely expressed views whereby they think we should take under consideration the liquor legislation in Saskatchewan. They are the people we have asked to administer the laws, and I believe they are the next in position to say whether our law is a good law, or whether it is not, and I think that is one great reason we ought to have under consideration this to very question at this time. Perhaps the Committee will come back and recommend that there be no change. The Committee might come back and recommend that there be prohibition. The Committee might recommend that there be increased outlets. I do think, however, that the terms of reference ought to be made wide enough so that the Committee could make recommendations as to an educational program as well, because excessive use of alcohol is a tremendous problem. I want to commend the Government of the day for introducing into the curriculum the study of alcoholism in the higher grades of our school system. I want to commend them, too, as far as their attitude toward Alcoholics Anonymous is concerned.

I am wondering if we couldn't go a little further as far as trying to provide some facilities to take care of those people who do use alcohol to excess — in other words, the drunks. There are places on our North American continent where establishments have been made available to volunteer organizations so that they can take care of their own people, and I am thinking of Alcoholics Anonymous. I am wondering if it would not be a good thing here in Saskatchewan, if we were to do the same thing, if we were to make

March 14, 1958

some home available and provide some staff for taking care of these people. Actually these people are sick. They need treatment the same as people suffering from other diseases; but perhaps I am getting off the resolution a little when I mention that. I believe there is another thing the Committee could take under consideration. We could probably investigate what is going on in other parts of Canada, and what facilities are being made available for treating this type of individual in other parts of Canada.

So I would like to see the terms of reference broadened a little so that we could give a more comprehensive report to the members of the Legislature. All of this could be covered at the same time. I don't think it would add any great additional burden to the members of the Committee, and I don't think it would cost any more money for us to cover those other fields as well as the exclusive sale outlets. I would like to recommend at this time that the Legislature consider broadening the terms of reference enough to take care of these other problems.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, there is not very much I can add to what has been said by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, but I do agree that something must be done in solving this problem in the province of Saskatchewan.

Apparently the same problem confronted the Legislatures in various other provinces that have been mentioned by the Premier and by the Leader of the Opposition, and they also thought it necessary to take some action to relieve that problem for the people in their provinces. Therefore they have proceeded accordingly, and have legislation within their provinces.

I also agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the terms of reference could be broadened here, and not be confined only to the outlets provided for the sale of alcoholic beverages within our province. With all the other ideas that have been expressed here, I am in an in wholehearted accord and, as a prospective member of this Committee, suggested by the Premier, I will be very pleased to do my best to see that my responsibilities will be carried out to the fullest extent of my ability.

Mrs. J.M. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I also am very much in favour of setting up a Committee to study this whole matter. I know it is very complicated and a very difficult matter to deal with. I feel certain that a study is warranted and honest opinions are from all over this province on this matter. As a member of the Committee, I am going to do my best to see that this objective is carried out.

A few statements have been made that I would, at this time, like to mention. I would particularly like to mention some of the

things said by our Chief of Police. I think a couple of his statements were rather unfortunate, and I believe when he suggests that our legislation is geared to over-consumption, (and that is his opinion), he should also have had some facts to substantiate this opinion, and there were no such facts to support this statement. I wish also to say that, if he were reported correctly in the paper — and he may not be; if I am wrong, you will understand am only going by the newspaper report; but he suggests that alcohol is now a social necessity. That, it seems to me, is very bad and very poor advice for a Chief of Police to be giving to the young people of this province.

I would like to touch just for a few minutes on the other side of the picture. If our legislation is geared to over-consumption (and possibly it is; I'm not prepared to say), I want you to note what is happening to some of the provinces of Canada where they have all the outlets. I have here an article from the 'Toronto Daily Star', and I would like to read a little bit of this article because I think it is very good. This is the issue of February 19, 1958, and I picked up this article when I was down there at a United Church Conference, very recently, where I met with people from every province in Canada and where this was the subject that was being studied. Here is what I would like to read to you from the 'Toronto Daily Star' about the situation in Ontario:

"Ontario sold more alcoholic beverages and made more profit from it last year than any time in history. It also had more drunk driving — 1,833 charged; more impaired driving — 6,760 tried; more people killed in highway accidents — more than 1,200; and more people injured in traffic accidents — 25,183 on provincial highways and city streets more than ever before.

"These figures are from the Annual Report of the Attorney General, Robert Kelso. And this connection between the sale of liquor and highway accidents — lest it be overlooked, Dr. Strong of the Canadian Medical Association stated that alcohol is a factor in 80 per cent of motor accidents, and 25 per cent of fatalities.

The increased sales are responsible for the creation of more new alcoholics last year than ever before, so the number cannot be precisely calculated; the number of new alcoholics in Ontario has been increasing by 4,000 a year since 1945, according to the Alcoholic Research Foundation —

March 14, 1958

and that increase was maintained last year and there are now about 80,000 alcoholics in the province of Ontario.

"These facts are indisputable', says the Alcoholic Research Foundation in its annual report. The number of citizens in Ontario who have developed this illness is very large. The number is increasing year by year at an alarming rate. Special clinics operated by the Foundation and Mental institutions of our province, Alcoholics Anonymous, and other institutions, are handling only a fraction of the new cases that come up each year . . . "

Now, that is Ontario. I have here a clipping from British Columbia when the budget was brought down. The heading is "B.C. Booze Profits Reach \$25 million":

"Net earned profit from B.C. liquor last year was the highest — \$25 million; a profit of \$3,500,000 higher than originally expected by the Government in its budget of 1956-57. Sales to the public of liquor totalled \$63,118,000 . . . "

So there consumption is rising.

Now I have this report for Manitoba of March 7, headed "Guzzling it in Manitoba", and it points out that in Manitoba today, there are more people drinking more liquor than they have for quite some time, and liquor consumption has gone up 10 per cent in the province of Manitoba since new outlets were opened. But it does point out that cocktail bars have accounted for only 3 per cent of the total liquor consumed in that province.

So it does appear that, if our laws are geared to over-consumption, then surely the laws in these other provinces must be also, because our record here in Saskatchewan — and I'm still saying that I'm not satisfied that everything is perfect, — I certainly don't think it is; but certainly from the experiences of these other provinces, there is nothing to indicate that it is our laws that are at fault, but there is everything to indicate that in these other provinces they have their problems too. I am not saying that all these problems are created by having more outlets, but I am saying that we should not just jump on a bandwagon and take all these statements without any facts accompanying them, such as many people are doing today.

I also have here an article written by Dr. L'Heureux, a medical doctor and Medical Superintendent of the St. Boniface Hospital. Dr. L'Heureux was a member of the Bracken Commission, and this

article was written not for any temperance organization; this article was written for a medical paper. I'm not going to read it at length at all, but I just want to point out one or two things which he said, and he said this:

"The rate of increase of alcoholics in Manitoba is eight or nine times greater than the rate of increase of the whole population. Estimating the number of alcoholics by the Jellinek formula, we find in 1921 there were 2,300 in the province; in 1955, there were 10,300 and it was predicted that by 1960 there would be 12,500. But this prediction was made before the new liquor law was passed — "(I want you to note this)" — and I believe that with the increased number and types of outlets, we may well add a few thousand to that estimate . . . "

He goes on and cites the case of France, where they have actually no restrictions at all. He points out that they have the highest rate of alcoholism in the whole world, that they have the highest per capita consumption of any place in the world, and that it is a dreadfully serious problem. Mental hospitals are filled with people who are alcoholics. And he said that we "don't quite wish to get ourselves in this same position", and at two or three points he states that he believes that consumption will rise. I have given you the facts that it has risen by 10 per cent.

Now, I would like to say also that Dr. L'Heureux did agree and was in support of the recommendation for more outlets in Manitoba; but if you will read his statement you will notice that it isn't more outlets that we want. He states the beer parlours are the worst possible outlets, and I think possibly he is right. He feels that the beer parlours should be closed and other types of outlets, where food is served, should be replaced. This is Dr. L'Heureux' opinion.

I did not think we should let some of what I feel were rather exaggerated and irresponsible statements that were made by the Chief of Police in Regina go unchallenged. I believe the only way to answer this question is to get busy and make a study, and I do welcome the fact that such a Committee has been established.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I had, to start off, with no intention of speaking on this motion. I think the Premier and the Opposition Leader stated quite clearly opinions that I can wholeheartedly agree with on this particular motion. Since listening to the junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper), however, I do feel that I should say a few words, not exactly for her clarification, but for the clarification of the other members and perhaps the general public.

I might be a little naive about these committees that are

March 14, 1958

set up by this House, but I am of the opinion (and I think that most people in the country agree with me), that when the Committee or Commission is set up, their duty is to investigate conditions and study briefs and presentations, and then make up their minds about the recommendations and about the facts. I think it is very unfair to the subject before us, if we make up our minds before we go on a Commission or on a Committee, and before we have an opportunity to study the entire problem.

I don't think there are very many people who say they are for liquor or against liquor, because liquor in itself isn't very much; it is the consumption of liquor, the use and misuse of liquor, that is important. I have only one objection to the wording of this motion, and it was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition. I have allowed my name to stand as a member of that Committee, but I do so only on the condition that I, as a member of the Committee and the entire committee have the right to go into the whole question of liquor consumption. Certainly I could not, in good conscience, sit on a Committee to study exclusively sales outlets if that means consideration merely whether there should be more beer parlours or fewer beer parlours, more cocktail bars or fewer cocktail bars. That is not the purpose of this Committee, as I understood it when it was being set up, and from the remarks of the Premier, I think perhaps I am right in thinking we can study the entire field of liquor consumption as it relates to liquor sales and so on, which would include very many phases other than that of purely retail sales, because to me, that is a very, very small part of the problem, and certainly you cannot study merely how many beer parlours should be open or should not be opened in a province, without studying all the social implications and relationships that enter into the picture.

I have a prejudice about liquor which I am going to try to clear my mind of, when I study various things that are presented, and I think I speak for almost everybody in this province and in this country when I say that I would be quite willing to be sufficiently undemocratic as to entirely outlaw the consumption of alcohol in Canada, not only in Saskatchewan, if it would really outlaw the consumption and that there would not be any consumption whatsoever and no evils that result from the misuse of alcohol.

I don't feel that there is anything wrong in the temperate use of alcohol. Many people disagree with me and think there is something evil in the use of alcohol. I don't think that; but I do realize, as I think most Canadians realize, that a terrible toll has been taken in human suffering because of the misuse of alcohol, and the misuse of the consumption — the way it has been used improperly and the way it has hurt families and finances and businesses and the economy of this province, as well as all human values that we value in this country. However, we have to recognize, and I think every thinking person does recognize, that alcohol is not going to be outlawed merely because it has been misused; that

alcohol will be consumed, whether it is done legally or illegally — and that is one prejudice that I am going to have remaining in my mind. I'm afraid, because it is a deep conviction that would take quite a few facts to make me change my mind, to make me think that you could put in prohibition in this province or in this country, and not merely drive the traffic underground. However, if facts prove otherwise I am quite willing to look at them.

The thing that I want to draw to the attention of this House is, in setting up this Committee, this Committee cannot be restricted in its recommendations to merely recommending more outlets for the sale of alcohol, or restricting the number of outlets, because that recommendation can be so conditional that it can have no meaning in itself. With that understanding, I am quite willing to be a member of the Committees should this motion pass.

I want to say just another word or two, and that is to agree wholeheartedly with the Premier of this province when he says that we legislate for the adults of this province — we must protect our minors, we must protect those that are sick, and I would put alcoholics in that category. But we are legislating for the adults of the province, and therefore, I think it is a very good thing that this Committee is being appointed because there isn't any question in anybody's mind that there is a great diversity of opinion as to the effectiveness of our liquor laws in this province, and certainly the question should be studied but the whole effectiveness of this Committee is, I think, in its open-mindedness and in its ability to study the various points of view which are going to be put before us and assess them intelligently and logically.

I also agree, and I want to reiterate, that certainly morality cannot be legislated. Morality is a matter of choice and free will, and if we don't allow people to exercise their free will, we are destroying that very morality that we are seeking to foster. In my opinion, the purpose of legislation of any kind is to promote an atmosphere in which people themselves can choose to be good and to act sanely and wisely for their own good, the good of their families, and the good of society. If we legislate, and the Committee thinks in terms of that general social atmosphere in which people can exercise their own discretion, their own free will, then I think we will be doing a service to this province. Otherwise, we will be merely clouding an issue that is already beclouded, and we are further going to introduce an atmosphere of emotion and sentiment, sometimes false sentiment, into a field that has already been terribly beclouded in that way. If our people keep free of sentiment on a question of this kind, try to use their intelligence and try to appreciate the points of view of all the people involved, I think we will be much better off — and that is where I have to disagree very strongly and I want to do so publicly, with the junior member from Regina. I don't think she meant to make an attack on the Chief of Police, or anything of that kind; but I think it is most unfair to take his few remarks, as reported in the newspaper without his entire speech of explanation, and disagree

March 14, 1958

with them or say that he has not put forth facts to justify that stand. If anybody can justify a statement as to whether laws are being obeyed or not, it should be the Chief of Police of a city of this size, and he should know whether laws are being broken.

I don't think there is much question that people in Saskatchewan are so used to hearing and seeing liquor laws broken, they have held them in contempt. The laws themselves have fallen into contempt, and I don't think there is any question about it; everybody knows about it, whether we admit it or not. We have been closing our eyes to this problem for a very long time, mostly I think, because there was so much emotion involved. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, when the question of the drunkometer came up last year, there was so much emotion generated in this Chamber over it, we were asked to picture the dead bodies of people killed in accidents, and things like that. Certainly there is a lot of emotionalism concerned and connected with the alcohol problem but those things are part of a wider picture, and I think they should be studied exactly like that. You cannot take an isolated incident and from it draw a picture, no matter how illustrative it might be. I think this Committee has to be governed by fact, and I think this Committee must see and study the entire picture before it makes up its mind or makes any recommendation.

I hope that will be the attitude of the Committee, and on that condition and on the condition that those terms of reference are wide enough to include the complete study of the human element that might be involved in the change in liquor laws. I am very happy to be asked to be part of that Committee, and I would certainly support the motion on that basis.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should say I had not intended taking part in this debate, but I just happened to see some notes in front of me on my desk here, that I thought might be of interest to the members.

First of all, I would like to say this to a question to which the Government has been giving consideration for a number of years. I might say that we did seriously think of taking some action two years ago, but at that time the province of Manitoba was considering the question, the Bracken Commission was investigating the problem, and we felt that, in view of the fact that there was a Commission studying the question in the next province, we should leave it alone. Last year the province of Alberta brought in a report of a Legislative Committee and asked that a plebiscite be held in that province. Again we felt that, until such time as we had the results of that plebiscites, it was not in the best interests for us to do anything here. Well, the result of the plebiscite came and we are still very little farther ahead.

I would hope, too, that every member of this Committee will go

into this question with an open mind. I hope we will have only one purpose, that one purpose being to try to bring in recommendations to the Government and to the Assembly that will result in a reduction in the consumption of alcoholic beverages, and in the better use of those alcoholic beverages. I agree there is a great deal of emotion connected with this question. On the one hand you have those who emotionally think that our liquor laws are so tight in Saskatchewan as to cause gross violations and drunkenness and lead us to all kinds of difficulties. On the other hand you have another group that says our liquor laws in Saskatchewan are far too open, that people are being able to get too much liquor. There doesn't seem to be any happy medium; there doesn't seem to be, in the province generally, an objective outlook on this question. I hope that the 10 members who have been appointed to this Committee will be able to get an objective outlook. I hope we will be able to arrange for the Committee to visit the province of Manitoba and probably the province of Alberta and British Columbia, to see first hand just what the results have been, and to see for themselves just what change has been brought about as the result of the change of conditions.

I want to say very frankly that I am alarmed at our increasing consumption of alcoholic beverages here in Saskatchewan. I think we should all be very alarmed. The United Church of Canada put out a booklet, 'Liberalization Theories and Facts', in which they point out that, in the province of Ontario, convictions for violations of the liquor act other than drunkenness showed that from 1947 to 1956 there was an increase of 66 per cent in the province of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is very bad, and I think it should cause some alarm until we read the statistics in Saskatchewan, and what do we see? In 1947, there were 3,130 cases; in 1956, 5,348 cases, or an increase of 71 per cent, compared with the 63 per cent in Ontario. So, you see we should not be too satisfied.

I have some other figures here which, I think, are very interesting. The hon. member (Mrs. Cooper) from my own constituency, (the finest constituency, of course, in Saskatchewan), gave the figures concerned with Ontario. May I point out that in Ontario, in 1947, the average per capita consumption was 15.35 gallons; but in 1956 it had jumped up to 17.46 gallons, an increase of almost 14 per cent. This is for everything; spirits which went up 21 per cent; beer which went up 15 per cent, and wine which actually decreased 24 per cent. But an overall increase in Ontario of 14 per cent. That corresponds roughly to the period they have had additional outlets in the province of Ontario, and there has been an increase of 14 per cent. British Columbia have had increased outlets to about three years, and what has happened? Well, in 1953, the total per capita consumption was 13.17; in 1956, the total per capita consumption was 12.78, an actual reduction of 3 per cent, in the consumption in British Columbia. What is happening in our province of Saskatchewan, where we have had no change in our outlets at all? In 1947, we had a total per capita consumption of 7.27 — and may I pay tribute here to the people of Saskatchewan; our total consumption is considerably less than either of the other

provinces. However, the thing that alarms me, Mr. Speaker, is that by 1956, per capita consumption in Saskatchewan had gone up from 7.27 gallons per capita to 10.83, an increase of 49 per cent: 49 per cent in Saskatchewan, and only 14 per cent in Ontario, the province which has these new outlets! I think those figures in themselves are enough to cause us some concern and should give us reason to study this question. May I say that we have now got to where our consumption is still less than 11 gallons, whereas Ontario's is 17 gallons; but when you stop to think, in 1947 our consumption was only 7 gallons compared to their 15 gallons — in other words, it was over twice as great in 1947, and now we are gradually narrowing the gap.

I was very interested to find out just what the result of the increased outlets would be. The hon. member for Regina, (Mrs. Cooper), pointed out that in Manitoba there had already been an increase of 10 per cent. It is very difficult to give any figures that are meaningful on the total increase, because the new outlets have been in existence for such a short time — in fact they are still getting them open. But I went to Manitoba and spent three days with the Chairman of the Liquor Board examining the outlets there, in the month of January. I found that in the new outlets, the total purchases of liquor were just over 3 per cent, that is, less than 4 per cent of the liquor sold in Manitoba was sold in these outlets; 96 per cent was still sold in the stores in Manitoba. Now, that made me think that it was only because they've been in existence for such a short time; there must be much more than that in a province like Ontario where they have had them for 10 years. So we checked up in Ontario and what did we find there? We found that the total sale of spirits on licensed premises was 5.8 per cent of total sales — less than 6 per cent; but 94 per cent of all the spirits — (that, is whiskies, rums and so on), was still being purchased in the stores of Ontario and only 6 per cent in these outlets. So even after 10 years when we have these statements made that these increased outlets are leading to greatly increased consumption, I think we have to consider it in the light of the statistics which have come directly from the Liquor Boards of these other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say more. I hope that all hon. members will support this motion. I, too, would like to join with the Premier in expressing my appreciation to all those who are going to assist us in solving this very, very difficult problem. I would hope that this is a problem we can solve without it becoming a political issue. I want to pay a tribute to all the parties in Saskatchewan who have kept this out of the field of politics throughout the time this province has been in existence. The two things we will always want to try to keep out of politics, I think are the liquor question and religion, because when you get into those two things, you get emotions, you get a lack of reasoning, and so it is going to be a difficult . . .

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — You can add wheat to that, too!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Wheat! Well, I can't think of anybody who has done more to bring it into the political arena than my hon.

friend who just interfered here. He's done his best!

But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to pay tribute to all those who are willing to give their time and energies to try to find a solution to this question. I, too, would like to see the terms or reference broadened, but I want to say to the members of the Committee that, if it they do the job I have in mind that we shall have to do, there's going to be very little time for anything else. For instance, we get into this question of education. I can see here the whole question of advertising is going to be opened. That in itself is a question that will take a great deal of time, if we start hearing delegations from all the papers and press and radio, and all these other people, and those who are opposed to advertising; and if we get into the whole field of education (mind you, I'm not opposed to it, in fact, I would welcome any recommendation the Committee may make in connection with the question of education), the question of controlling the emotional outlets and the promotion. May I here say I would like to pay a tribute to previous administration for the steps they took in the early days to prohibit promotion in this province. I think that is one of the chief reasons why our consumption is much less than it is in other provinces. Here in Saskatchewan there is no advertising, there is no promotion, and I hope that it will continue to be that way.

May I say one other thing. There are some people who think the liquor interests are the ones who are pushing this desire to have increased outlets. May I say that the only representations I have had from the liquor interests have been that they would hope that in Saskatchewan we would not have additional outlets. They would much prefer to have the products sold in the stores only, because, as far as they are concerned, when you have additional outlets, it means a great deal of additional expense. I want to make the point clear to the people of Saskatchewan that the liquor interests are not interested in having additional outlets in Saskatchewan.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by again expressing my thanks to those members who will work on this Committee, and by expressing the hope they will be prepared to set aside their own opinions and examine this question objectively, and that we will have legislation that will result in making Saskatchewan a better province, that will result in having better conditions, that will bring about more sobriety and will do a great deal towards cutting down the number of automobile accidents, because I do want to say to my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) that that is still a very, very serious problem facing people of this province.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I had not expected we would have a merry-go-round of speeches this afternoon. However, it is probably a good idea to discuss the problem as we have. I can assure you that I do not intend to make any speech whatever. However, since I have been named to act as

Chairman Of this Committee, I want to assure the people of Saskatchewan, the members of this Legislature and the Committee, that I fully recognize the tremendous responsibility attached to the work of this Committee. It is a much greater responsibility, I think, than many people realize, because of the many factors that enter into the liquor problem which have been so well described by previous speakers.

Personally I can assure members of this House that I propose to proceed with an open mind on this question. I believe firmly that we must have an open mind in proceeding to study this liquor problem, and I can also assure the people of this province and the members of this Legislature and the Committee that I shall do everything I can to assist in making possible the best possible investigation we can make under the terms of the resolution, and that I shall try to be fair and impartial at all times to every member of this Committee. And lastly, I hope I shall be worthy of the responsibility that has been placed upon me.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to prolong the discussion on this motion, except to just say a word with reference to what was said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) and the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) in respect of the terms of reference. The terms of reference are, it is true, fairly narrow, because it was thought that if we were to have any recommendations that could be acted upon at the next Session, they should probably be reasonably narrow. I would take it however, that this does not preclude the Committee looking at the matter of temperance education and these other fields, and making representations and recommendations to the Legislature. I would say however, that if they were going into an exhaustive study of temperance education, or an exhaustive study of alcoholism, I would like to see a separate Committee act up for that purpose. For instance as far as the Government is concerned, if we were going to have a committee looking into temperance education, I would certainly like the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) on that committee; and if we were going to look at the problem of alcoholism, which is itself a tremendous problem, I would certainly want to see the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) and the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) on this committee, because this in a field in which they are interested.

It may be that this Committee will recommend to the House that an extensive study be made into these things, but certainly there is nothing in my opinion, in the terms of reference, that would preclude the Committee looking at this question and making such observations and recommendations as they will have time to do so between the time this Committee is set up now, and the next meeting of the Legislative Assembly. While I am not a member of the Committee, I am quite sure that I am safe in saying that there will be no attempt to narrow the terms of reference; but it is, of course, imperative that the primary questions should be dealt with as expeditiously as possible. Whatever other questions the members want to look into and make recommendations on, they should feel perfectly free to do so.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

"That on Monday (March 17th) and each sitting day thereafter until the end of the Session, the Assembly shall meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m.; that there shall be an intermission each day, from 12:30 o'clock p.m., until 2:30 o'clock p.m., and that Standing Order 5(2) be suspended in order that the Assembly may sit on Wednesday evening, as on other sitting days."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this is the usual motion that we bring in when the Session gets half-way through, or two-thirds through. May I say that what I am suggesting here is that the House start its sittings in the mornings and afternoons, which will leave us the evenings free for committee meetings; some of the Committees have not finished their work and they can sit in the evenings. The advantage of having this arrangement is, it seems to me, is that it gives us some flexibility. At the present time, if there isn't a Committee meeting in the morning, the House cannot sit in the morning, so we just waste the forenoon and go on in the afternoon and evening. It seems to me if we now have the power to sit in the morning and afternoon and evening, then if there is no Committee meeting, the House could meet; and if any Committee wants to meet, and I am acquainted of that fact, at 5:30 we will move the adjournment of the House and let a Committee sit.

It also lends us the same flexibility with reference to Wednesday. It does not mean we have to sit on Wednesday evening. Your Honour has announced that there will be a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and a dinner on Wednesday night, which means we will adjourn at 5:30. There may be something also the following Wednesday; but at least it gives us the authority to sit on Wednesday evenings if the House so desires.

I think, therefore, this will help now to facilitate the business and I would move the motion which stands in my name, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two observations I would like to make.

In the past it has been necessary, I think, to bring in this resolution because of the fact that we were getting late into

the season, or the early spring days were upon us, and it was necessary to move along and get the work of the House completed. But, last year, when we changed our Standing Orders, which came into effect this Session, limiting the Throne Speech debate to seven days and the Budget debate to eight days, it was my understanding that one of the reasons for doing that was to get Estimates into the House a little earlier and to give us more time to pass the Estimates.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Government has a secretariat at their disposal. The Ministers have all of the members of their Departments who must be a great help to the ministers and to other members who sit on the Government side of the House, whereas we in the Opposition have to do all of our research ourselves. We have no secretariat, and I believe that, because we are fairly well along in the Session and are still in the heart of winter, the members could do a better job in Estimates if we were given more time to do our homework. If we sit in Committee, or in the House, in the mornings, and in the House in the afternoons, and then either in Committee or in the Legislature in the evenings, it leaves very little time for the members to do any homework. We have a new form of Estimates, this year, which I think is a great improvement and I am hopeful that the members of the Legislature will be able to do a better job of perusing the Estimates and getting more information before the sums of money are granted to the Government. Firstly, because we are not being pressed for time at the moment, I think it would be wise to give the members on both sides of the House more opportunity to do their homework in the hope that we could make a better job of Estimates.

For that reason I wonder if it is necessary for us to have sittings of the Legislature in the morning, and night sittings as well. I do believe in all sincerity that we could all do a better job if we had a little more time to do our homework. As you know, Mr. Speaker, since we came in at the beginning of this Session, most of our time has been taken up either in Committee and the House or with some social function which all of the members have been invited to attend, and it leaves very little time other than the very late hours in the evening, or the very early hours in the morning, for us to do any real homework.

For that reason I just wonder if it is wise for us to rush into this thing when we seem to have lots of time for all of us to get home between now and the spring break-up.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say I have found this difficulty this Session. We came in later than we usually do, and we got down to the routine of business much more quickly this Session than we have at any Session, I think, since I have been a member of the Legislature. I know that I am often chided for being absent from Committee meetings, particularly the Committee of Public Accounts.

I am in the position of where, this year, I just had to resign from the Committee of Public Accounts because we go into a committee meeting in the morning, we have sittings in the afternoon, and our social functions are usually going on in the evenings. I would like to point out, too, that the Ministers have a full-time job. They know the legislation which they are introducing. It has been discussed and mulled over in caucus, and they know the direction in which they are travelling. We come in here 'cold'. I come in here, after leaving in April, last year, far removed from the immediate work of the Legislature; and have to get back into the swing of things. We have to get back to our research work and our study even to get refreshed on what went on last year, to get our thinking in the trend of the developments that are going on.

That takes study, and to expect me, or the other members, to come into Committee work immediately, take part (as we should do) conscientiously in every Committee, and then to sit in the morning, afternoon and night is too much. I, for one, cannot see that I can do justice to the Estimates or also to the Crown Corporations report, which I find I have to study before I go in to the Committee meetings. It is useless to go in there and, when they open to Page 1, and it is the first time I have even looked at the report, to expect to ask intelligent questions, or to assess the thing intelligently. These reports are heavy, and they are important. The Estimates are important. I was amazed at the Provincial Treasurer, the other day, in winding up the debate making reference to the fact that we are spending \$130 million, and nobody made reference to it. That vote has not yet taken place, and the debates are on the Estimates, not on the Budget, when you are voting these Estimates of \$130 million. That is where the research work is done; that is where you approve or disapprove of the amount that is being voted under each Department; that is where that work takes place, not in the Budget debate. We are coming into the Estimates immediately. We are going to sit in Committee meetings in the morning; we are going to sit either there or in the Chamber in the afternoon and at night, and I just cannot see how our minds can absorb the tremendous amount of material that is being brought down in the House and do justice to it.

I think we should be very careful in going into this tremendous amount of work at this time. For that reason I am not in favour of this motion at this time.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in regard to the motion we have before us at the present time.

I can understand, in a sense, the attitude of the Government in wanting to expedite business. There may be more than one reason for that at the present time; but I would like to point out that we had the Orders changed. We had a different system set up for us, this year, to what we had a year ago; and in past Legislatures in the history of this province we found that, years ago, they would start the Sessions in the month of January.

March 14, 1958

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, that isn't true.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes, it is true. By having the Sessions start in the month of January, the private members, especially Opposition members, had more time to study their work and to set up their work. In the case of a member, (like myself), from a rural seat, we are expected to be here in the mornings, in Committee at nine o'clock, and sit all afternoon in the House, plus sitting at night. That is expected of us now, and if this motion goes through in its present form, that is the way it is going to be.

When you represent a rural seat you have countless numbers of your constituents in that seat wanting business attended to while you are in the city. You get numerous letters from your constituents wanting you to deal with some matter in this Department or some matter in another Department; and I think it is the duty of the elected member to get that work done for his constituents. And now, if this motion goes through — in my own case I would be expected to sit in the morning, be expected to sit all afternoon, and, if we have Crown Corporations at night, then I would have to sit until 10 o'clock at night. That does not give one the chance to take care of the requests of his constituents.

As has been mentioned before, the fact that the Government has the opportunity to have access to all the different Departments, their Departments can set up the work for them; but in the case of the Opposition members, we have to do all the research ourselves, and that means a great deal of work. In spite of that, I have been in the House every day. I have never missed a sitting of this House during the last two years; and during that course of time I think that the attendance of the Opposition members has been very satisfactory. I think our percentage of attendance is even better than that of the Government members. The fact that there may be only three or four Cabinet Ministers in their seats, this afternoon, I don't think is a reflection on the Cabinet Ministers concerned — they may have work to do in their Departments, too; but I would suggest that they give that consideration to us on this side also.

It states in this motion that the Government is recommending that we sit on Wednesday nights. Now there are some things we have to do during the course of the week; and if we are to stay fresh at all and be ready for work five or six days of the week, I think in all fairness to the members of the Opposition at least, we should have the privilege of having Wednesday nights off. The way it is now we don't even have the privilege of being able, if we are going to attend to our duties here, to see people from our constituencies. When somebody 'phones in, or writes in, and asks for an appointment, we have to have at least one free night or one free morning we can deal with their interests.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is fair to the members on this side of the house to have this resolution go through as it is at the present time. If the Government thinks the work should be

speeded up then I would suggest that they start the Sessions a little earlier in the winter — probably start earlier in February or in January. When I mentioned before that some past Legislatures had started in January, I think that can be borne out. I think possibly the reason for our Sessions starting later in these years compared to years ago is the fact that we have so many Crown Corporations and I think possibly if those Crown Corporation reports could have been brought in earlier, if they could have been audited earlier, we could deal with them earlier. I suggest it is just not fair to indicate that to the Government side as it is for them to suggest that we sit more often during the week.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this motion.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the hon. member who has just taken his seat that I have the Journals and in 1944 the Session opened 8th February; in 1943, it opened on 23rd February; in 1942, it opened on 19th February; in 1941, it opened on 20th day February; in 1940, it opened on 8th February . . .

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Why get so mad about it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . in 1939, it opened on 19th January; in 1938, it opened on 20th January, in 1937, it opened on 11th February. So you see the average of the last few years, the second Thursday in February, is much earlier than the average of the previous ten years.

There is just one other thing I want to say and it is that there is no more work involved. The hon. members won't have any more time to attend to their correspondence and their other legislative duties, their constituency duties, because we have been meeting from 10 o'clock to 12.30. We do that anyway. So, actually, when we sit in the mornings from 10 to 12.30 we are not adding any additional hours, but it will give us flexibility, and it will enable us to adjourn in the evenings if the members see fit to do so. We won't have to sit at nights.

May I say, when this suggestion first came up, this year, I think the first people who proposed it was the 'Leader-Post' in their editorial. The 'Leader-Post' suggested, this year, that they thought it would be a good idea to start right off meeting at 10 o'clock in the mornings . . .

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Who is running the House, you or the 'Leader-Post'.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Here we are. We have had four weeks of this, and I see no reason at all why it cannot be done. It certainly isn't going to be any more difficult. May I say, too, that the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), has made the suggestion year after year after year, that we should change our Standing Orders and start in the morning at 10 o'clock and do our Committee work at night. Here we are getting these suggestions from the opposite side, and we try to oblige them by doing the things they want . . .

March 14, 1958

Mr. McCarthy: — Ah, baloney!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . and they are not satisfied. How can you satisfy them?

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, who is running it? You or the Leader-Post?

Mr. Cameron: — I take it then, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that you will not necessarily sit these evenings. It will just leave us free, but if we can adjourn we will do so? If we have that understanding, I am not too averse to the motion.

Mr. McCarthy: — I don't know why they would bring it in.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to inform the Assembly that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. Anyone who wishes to speak should do so now.

Premier Douglas (closing debate): —Mr. Speaker, the Government has no desire to start rushing things through. We have been sitting four weeks and we usually try to finish up by Easter, if we can; and I think it will keep us going to do just that with the amount of work we still have ahead of us.

Actually we are already sitting three times a day. We are sitting in committees in the House in the afternoon and evening. All this will permit us to do is to reverse the order and sit morning and afternoon, and then the members who are not on committees do not need to come back in the evenings. They can stay downtown and work in their rooms, if they wish, so I don't think it is going to make any difference. If there isn't a Committee meeting in the evening and the members are finding that the going is too tough, then we can discuss it. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber) and myself can discuss the situation and we may agree to adjourn at 5:30.

I appreciate the problem my hon. friends have. I sat as an Opposition member for nine years in a House that sat for six or seven months straight through, morning, afternoon and night. There were committees every morning and the House afternoons and evenings; and then, later on, they started to sit Saturdays as well; and I know what a terrific job it is trying to do all your own research and dig up material, when you are discussing matters where the Minister has somebody at his beck and call bringing the stuff to him.

We have no desire to hurry things through. If my hon. friends find that we are going too fast and they prefer to adjourn at 5:30 rather than come back in the evening, we can do it. But if, on the other hand, we find there isn't any Committee meeting, and there is some work in Committee of the Whole, or some Department

could be put on, and the members who are interested in that Department are going to be here, then we could go into Supply for that particular evening.

With reference to Wednesday evening, if anybody wants to move an amendment knocking out this part about Wednesday, I would be quite prepared to vote for that. The only reason I thought we should have some flexibility about Wednesday — we cannot sit next Wednesday, but there are a couple of other Wednesdays, or members might want to sit Wednesday and adjourn on Friday at 5:30 and have Friday evening off. Some members might want to go home for the weekend and prefer to have Friday evening off rather than Wednesday. But if anybody wants to move that we leave Wednesday out, I am prepared to accept that.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I realize I am out of order, but I would like to say a word. With that understanding, I have no objections if we are not going to sit mornings and evenings as well. As far as Wednesday is concerned, as you say, next Wednesday is out because we have a meeting of the Parliamentary Association; and, who knows, the Federal election in a week from the following Monday and we might want to sit on the Wednesday to get away Friday to let the members go home and vote. I have no objection to that.

Premier Douglas: — I would be prepared to go home and vote for each of the members opposite if they wish. But just so there will be no misunderstanding, the Leader of the Opposition has said he is quite prepared to agree providing that if we sit in the mornings we don't sit at night; but there might be occasion where they might want to sit at night.

Mr. McDonald: — That's right.

Premier Douglas: — I don't think there will be any difficulty, if it is agreed upon by all the parties.

Mr. McDonald: — As long as it does not bind us to sit at night.

(The question being put, the motion was agreed to.)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Liquor Act.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad this Bill to amend The Liquor Act has come up for second reading this afternoon, so that we can get it all over with in one day, otherwise the people of Saskatchewan will think that is all we are really interested in.

March 14, 1958

The amendments being proposed to The Liquor Act are amendments similar to those we have brought in from year to year to try to eliminate those sections of the Act which become more or less obsolete.

The principal amendment this year is to provide that no Liquor Board store may be opened without a vote first being held. The way it is at the present, if we wish to open a liquor store in a community, we advertise that fact, and give the people an opportunity to present a petition signed by 25 per cent of the ratepayers; then a vote will be taken. This will eliminate the necessity of the people in a community having to get busy and get this petition signed. We will just simply advertise the fact that it is the intention of the Liquor Board to open a store and that a vote for the purpose of determining the wishes of the people will be held on such and such a date. It then becomes automatic that a vote will be taken, and if the people do not want the store, well, of course, there will be no store put in.

Mr. McDonald: — That vote would be taken at the time of the municipal elections, would it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh no, any time at all. The date is set by the Clerk of the Executive Council.

Mr. McDonald: — It would be administered and financed by the Liquor Board?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — They pay the costs; that is right. The other important section is the one which, at the present time, limits the amount or quantity of liquor which may be purchased in any one day. At the present time a person is able to get three 26-ounce bottles, or 80 ounces altogether, in one day. We are finding that if people want to get more than that quantity, they go to one store and get their quota and then go to another store and probably go to a third store. Or they send their secretary, or they send their partner, or they send their wife so the wife will get her quantity and the husband will get his quantity; probably they take the neighbors down and each of them will get a quantity — all paid for, of course, by the one person. We feel that this will bring the thing out into the open. It will be better for purposes of administration. It will give the Board and the police a better opportunity to find out who the purchasers of quantities are. It will give them much better opportunity to find out who the local bootleggers are and then to take action to put them out of business. So we feel that this is a good change.

The next change of importance has to do with minors going into beer parlours and liquor stores. This has become one of the most serious problems facing the enforcement officers; particularly it is a serious problem for the clerks in the stores and the clerks in the beer parlours. Many of these young people, 19 or 20 years of age, today look like men of 25 or 30 years of age; especially if

they get a little beard or whisker on them you cannot tell what their age is. Very frequently these young people will go in and will lead the bartender to believe that they are 21 years of age. Now, of course, they know they are breaking the law; the bartender does not. Yet the bartender can be fined \$50 and costs, while the person who is actually breaking the law can only be fined \$25 and costs. It is proposed, therefore, to increase the penalty to \$50, to make the penalty the same for the person who knowingly breaks the law as for the other person who unwittingly does so. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the principal changes. There are other minor amendments, but I think we can probably discuss those better when we get into Committee when we will have the different sections before us. I would therefore move the Second Reading of this Bill.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question for clarification regarding Clause 12?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The clauses can be dealt with in Committee.

Mr. Wood: — But this has to do with the principle as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker: — You may speak to the motion then.

Mr. Wood: — I just wanted to know if this — I may be out of order entirely. Can we change one of these clauses?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Sure, and you can put some more clauses in it if you want to. Any member has the right to amend a clause or put more clauses in. It is completely in the hands of the House once the Bill gets into Committee.

(Motion for second reading agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole, at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this is a 'Money' Bill of consequence. It increases the rate at which members of the Board in a vocational educational school may be paid per meeting to \$10. It is in line with other changes which have been made in the Municipal Acts and will be recommended in other School Acts. I would move Second Reading.

March 14, 1958

Mr. McDonald: — What was it before, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — According to the Bill here, it says \$6. I presume we forgot to change it; it is \$8 in most cases.

(Motion for second reading agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 94 — An Act to amend The University Act.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is to carry out a request which we have had from the University. It simply adds to the Council of the University those persons who are full-time lecturers, as well as the Deans, Librarians, Professors and so on who were members before. I move Second Reading.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.