

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session – Seventeenth Legislature
54th Day

Tuesday, April 10, 1973.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

**Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of
Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Faris (Arm River) that: The Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan by now received.

Mr. D. M. McPherson: — (Regina Lakeview) Mr. Speaker, I am going to say a few words on a subject that many of the Members of this House know about, but in taking part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan, I must say that the Report certainly covers all aspects of the use of alcohol in this province. I should like to pay tribute to the work of the staff who worked long and hard to bring this Report to its final conclusion.

The work of the late Russ Brown of Estevan, one of the members of the steering committee, must be acknowledged at this time for his great contribution to the Committee.

As I indicated when I adjourned the debate on Friday, every member of the Committee contributed a great deal to this Report and members were not tied to any party lines and were free to write any reservations that they wanted to. I sincerely feel, Mr. Speaker, that this Report is a very sincere effort to deal with every aspect of alcohol and its use in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Committee advertised its hearings in every part of the province. There was an opportunity for every citizen and organization to be heard by the Committee.

The briefs and presentations that were made to the Committee were excellent and proved to the extent the awareness of everyone in this province on the subject of alcohol.

On the preventative education section, I do not think that we, as a committee, can emphasize education enough. School, starting at the kindergarten level takes into their curriculum alcohol education and I feel that they should carry it through to the high school level. In this way the effects of alcohol can be taught in a co-ordinated way to students so that the effects of alcohol can be pointed out clearly and progressively.

In my reservations I disagree with the Committee's report on advertising. We are being flooded by magazine advertising on liquor in this province. To hide our heads and say there should not be advertising, is indeed not looking at it in a realistic way and the way that this province should be going.

Beer and wine advertising in broadcasting is permitted in Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. As a result we are exposed in half of this province to advertising from either Manitoba, Alberta or the United States.

The small radio stations in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and the small newspapers are badly in need of additional revenues. They need this to keep their heads above water. They depend solely on advertising as a means of their revenue. Their contribution to the community activities is something which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Every rural Member in this House recognizes the contribution they make and should keep in mind, when making this decision on advertising, just how much the local newspaper, the small radio station and television does for each and every one of us.

Statistics Canada in their 1971 report shows the profits of the radio stations in Saskatchewan as a very, very small amount. As a matter of fact outside the four large radio stations all the others are either at breaking point or are losing large sums of money.

There is no return on the investment for these people and I feel very strongly that they must be helped. The small rural newspaper, as everyone knows, is in need of additional advertising revenues. Would it not be well to keep them in a healthy position and keep the advertising dollars here in Saskatchewan, where they would employ additional people and make a greater contribution to this province?

As I pointed out in my reservations, if the CRTC regulations are followed in regard to beer and wine advertising on radio and television, as is done in Manitoba and also Alberta, Saskatchewan could adopt this type and go along with the CRTC regulations and then we would be handling it as it properly should be.

This, Mr. Speaker, would eliminate any administrative requirements for the province. The newspaper, radio and television are providing a good service to the people of Saskatchewan. Surely, we as legislators, should not let the advertising dollars go out of this province to promote periodicals in Eastern Canada or the United States.

Manitoba and Alberta are getting along well with beer and wine advertising and Statistics Canada shows that the provinces that are not permitted beer and wine advertising their consumption increased 5.0 per cent, while the provinces that are permitted advertising showed an increase of only 4.40 per cent.

I appeal to every Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, to think of what the radio and newspapers do in their community, to help these people who need the advertising dollars.

In Chapter 6, item 13, on entertainment, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the recommendations of the live entertainment. The basis for my disagreement is that the larger hotels, with more chairs in their beverage rooms and more resources, will bring in musical groups to attract crowds. In this way the small hotels, with a smaller number of chairs, would not be in a position to afford these musical groups. The larger hotels will try to outdo each other and the poor small hotels are caught in between.

April 10, 1973

To me, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba and Alberta have proved that this is what happens and the smaller hotels are the ones that suffer.

I am not against a single piano player or guitarist or singer, but I do object to the loud rock group type of live entertainment.

As I pointed out earlier, I believe this Report is presented to the Government, with a view to bringing many recommendations on the whole aspect of alcohol to their attention. I believe the governments in the past have looked upon liquor as something that should not be talked about. This Report is revealing and as I said, every Member in this House can express himself as there are no party lines at all.

The Committee did not agree on many aspects of the Report, but in all sincerity the recommendations were freely discussed and considered. Every member on the Committee was allowed to put in reservations if he so desired.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any hard nor fast rules as to what Government should do. I only hope that the education and rehabilitation program is adopted by the Government and that they set aside the funds as recommended, ten per cent of the liquor profits for the Alcohol Commission. I believe this would be a great start. This would be a start in budgeting with alcohol education starting in kindergarten, continue it through public schools and high schools and make everyone aware and surely we will have a better Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this Report should be considered and deserves top priority.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer: — (Minister of Highways) Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this, but I certainly want to add my voice to the Member for Regina Lakeview who has just sat down.

As far as this ostrich-like activity that is going on in forbidding advertising within our province, it seems to me that it is pretty obvious, and I can only reiterate what the Hon. Member just said, that all we are doing is cutting the throats of our media and those people who work for our media in advertising.

It is a little ridiculous to sit and watch television or listen to a radio and hear advertising coming in from outside the province when it could just as well, and should be originating within the province. Frankly, if we could go the other way and say that on the North American Continent we should not have any advertising at all, that would be a different argument and I would favor it. However, we aren't in that position and I see no sense, whatever, in balkanizing Saskatchewan at the expense of those people who are making a living out of advertising.

There are other aspects of this Report that are certainly worthy of comment. I am sure that they have been commented on already. As far as I am concerned I certainly would be against

opening up any more avenues for drinking, especially to the younger people. I think we may receive the Report but I don't think that we will be breaking our necks to act on it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow: — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words with respect to this Report.

I should like to start off that on behalf of the Government with respect to the Report I wish to make it absolutely clear that what we are asked here is to receive the Report.

The Government's position is that the Report is a very thorough and complete Report that has to be carefully studied. Putting it bluntly, in its simplest terms we neither accept or reject any of the recommendations that are made therein, at present.

This is a Report to be received and to be very carefully studied before any legislation is enacted. I have received two or three representations from interested community groups and interested people, who, I think, are under the mistaken belief that somehow this represents government policy or somehow represents a government legislative program. To make that abundantly clear, it is not and we will very carefully consider all aspects of the Report before moving into any area of legislation.

One other observation if I can, Mr. Speaker, having said that. There is much in my judgment to commend the Report for consideration to all members of the public and of the House. I think the part relating to education and research is particularly valuable. I think it is important that we educate our young people, in fact, educate everybody about the dangers, the inherent dangers of alcohol. And recommendations such as set out in this Report, which I think succinctly and to the point draw this to our attention, are very valuable indeed.

And before I take my chair I should like to make one personal observation and that is, that none of us can ever subscribe 100 per cent to the Report. I personally have a very strong reservation, as Attorney General, of the provision which suggests that there ought to be the permission for drinking of alcohol in a motor car as long as the driver isn't drinking. I think this is a very idealistic aim, but on which, frankly, I must concur in with the Member for Rosthern and, in my judgment it may very well be impractical. With three or four passengers drinking alcohol and the driver of the vehicle in that type of circumstance not to be induced or otherwise to consume alcohol, may be overly idealistic in terms of its objective.

And certainly with respect to the mounting death toll on the highways of Saskatchewan, concerned with drink and driving, I would have very strong personal reservations with respect to that particular recommendation.

Now that simply highlights the fact that there are probably many different opinions as to the recommendations of this Report as there are Members in this House, or as there are people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

April 10, 1973

I close as I started out, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the Government's position is that we commend the Committee for a very thorough, in many ways very imaginative job done. We are receiving the Report only. We neither accept nor reject any recommendations that are set out therein.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. B. Grant: — (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General touched on a point that impresses me in connection with this Report, namely the question of safety on our highways. In this House we have agreed to set up a Safety Committee to look into this problem, and I for one along with many more in this House I am sure, would hate to see any consideration given to the extension of the outlets and the liberalization of our liquor legislation until that Safety Committee has had an opportunity to look at it.

There seem to be two areas that liquor affects, namely, the slaughter on the highways and the damage it does to the individual and to his family and associates. I am impressed with the Committee's recommendations that the work of the Alcoholism Commission be broadened to include drug addiction, but even more so I am impressed with the suggestion that the budget for the Alcoholism Commission be tied in with the surplus derived from the sale of liquor.

I advocated this when the Alcoholism Commission came into being and while I received some encouragement, I certainly had no assurance that this would ever be. But it seems to me that the two are tied in very closely, because as the consumption goes up, the surplus is going to increase. And as the consumption and surplus increases, certainly the problems generated by that consumption are going to increase.

So I strongly endorse that recommendation and the other recommendations dealing with treatment, research and education, I don't recall seeing any mention made under the heading "Education" that possibly the adults should be setting a better example because certainly this has a marked effect on the actions of our younger people.

There are two or three areas mentioned in the Report that I would strongly oppose and one has been mentioned, namely, the consumption of alcohol in passenger vehicles by those other than drivers. I am a little surprised that that recommendation even got in there, because I think it weakens the Report accordingly.

Sporting events, I am not enthused about that. Private offices, certainly no. Grocery store sales, absolutely no. University campuses, absolutely no.

There are suggestions that consumption be allowed on camp sites, picnic sites and parks. I don't think that this should be quite as broad and all embracing as suggested. I believe that one of the parties petitioning the Attorney General has suggested that it be permitted only where a fee is paid for camping. I think there could be some other restrictions included in that.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member chairing this

Committee did a good job in reviewing the work of the Committee and also the aims to be striven for. He said that whatever program was developed must be directed to a lowering of consumption.

I doubt whether some of these recommendations in the Report will be directed toward the lowering of consumption. He later said that the aim must be toward moderation. I also think that some of the recommendations would lead to consumption in other than moderate terms.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge the Government not to consider any extension of facilities until the Safety Committee has had an opportunity to report because there is just no doubt from figures quoted in this House that the consumption of liquor is contributing to from 50 to 75 per cent of the accidents on the highways. I believe there are figures to indicate that approximately 50 per cent of our auto accident deaths are associated to a greater or lesser degree with consumption of alcohol.

I think this is the type of report that is nice to see brought into this House because we can express our view on it without worrying about party lines and I know quite a number of the Members on the other side of the House who will welcome this approach compared to what has been going on for the last few weeks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault: — (Melfort-Kinistino) Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to get up this morning and say a few words about the recommendations of the Committee.

First of all I want to say that I was not on the Committee for the first year in operation, and I was appointed to replace the late Russ Brown, who passed away. I appreciate the tributes being paid to him.

I want to concur with Members who have previously spoken that the Committee worked very harmoniously. There were no party lines. We took our stands as we saw them, we called the shots as we saw them.

I was assigned the area of the drinking drivers being that I am not suffering from drinking, I thought it was a good field and I preferred to work in it. You will note that on page 52 and 53 showing what direction we would go. I think we should have a very close look at it. You notice in recommendation No. 1 that we are recommending the lowering of the alcohol to .06 for drivers. I know that the general public may resist this quite a bit. But if a proper education program is carried out I am sure that the public will fall in line behind us and back us up. I am quite happy that the Committee has recommended to the Highway Safety Committee that this Government proceed with it, I think it is a step in the right direction.

I want to point out also that as far as the drunken driver is concerned we are going to have liquor with us whether we like it or not. We can have prohibition and then the stills in the bush start going. You can't get rid of it.

April 10, 1973

But if we really make it quite clear that no way can you drive when you are under the influence of liquor, then I think the general public will change its attitude and will really come round to the recommendations of the Committee.

I also want to say that it is a good thing for Members of the Legislature to visit the penal institution as we did some time ago. Because we pass legislation, but we get the law enforcement officers to carry out the laws. But as politicians we have never taken too much trouble to see what the end result really is. And when we are talking in the terms of alcoholics, I know that it is recognized as a disease, and we don't send diabetics to court because they are diabetics, then I think we should treat alcoholics in the same way. I think the courts should have the right to suspend the driver who is driving under the influence, yes, definitely.

But also the Committee recommends an assessment unit to study the individual and to prescribe ways and means that will help him to separate his drinking and his driving. I think that area we must move into.

Rather than read all the recommendations on page 53, you will note the recommendations for installing breathalyzers in drinking establishments. You may think it is silly but we have had a few experimental units. And in some of the countries that is what they do today. If you get people to realize – look it is going to be .06 and don't drive above that – I am sure that you can develop the attitude that we really want, and get the sober driver rather than people just trying to sneak their way home when they are under the influence.

I don't intend to spend too much time this morning, but I want to draw to your attention that during the visits of the students to the Legislature – I have had some 300 of them – I gave them a questionnaire to answer. It is amazing the answers that I got from Grade 12 students, the maturity that they displayed in their answers. One answer that we should concern ourselves about a great deal, is on the question, do you think the attitude towards the rule of law is good, bad or indifferent? The answer was on the good, I got three replies saying that the attitude was generally towards the rule of law, good. At least 70 per cent said it is bad, the rest said it was indifferent.

I think we had better have a good look at that because we are sitting on, we would say the breeding grounds for crime. And unless we can develop a better attitude in our young people towards the rule of law, then we can look for nothing else but trouble.

I think we have got to look at our judiciary, the system that we use, the approach that we use. I have been thinking along those lines for many years. But I've restrained myself in talking about it. But after we visited Cook County and the trip to Cook County was a good one, and anybody quarreling with part of the Committee going to see a certain jurisdictions – how they operate something – is wrong. I think if there is a need

for a committee to visit certain establishments or certain jurisdictions which have a good record in a certain field, then, it doesn't cost that much and the Government is not wasting money by sending them there to see it. The committee has done a considerable amount of traveling and I am sure that that traveling was not a waste of money.

I hope that we will see the recommendation for setting up the Highway Safety Committee set up as soon as possible. I am glad that the Government has gone ahead with some of the recommendations. But I think some of the recommendations that do not have to wait are likely the following: The assessment committee for the drunken drivers, we should come to grips with that one immediately because we studied the situation and it is there – the recommendation is there. I hope the Attorney General will see fit to proceed with this one even at this Session. You don't have to wait for the Highway Safety Committee for the recommendations that are in here on that question because probably the recommendations that the Highway Safety would make would be very much along the same lines. I could go on but in closing I would say, let us come along with programs that society will accept. Let us give it the kind of publicity, honest publicity and I am sure society will accept it. I am sure if we set up the Highway Safety Committee as recommended on page 52 that it's going to be a committee that is going to bear a lot of good fruit.

If we have a Highway Safety Committee set up, I hope that it will go ahead in the same atmosphere that was displayed by the Liquor Committee. Because I have served on four of them now and I would say that this Liquor Committee was one of the best. But I must say that all four committees that I served on, two of them under the Liberal Government, one under the CCF and one under the NDP, I say it was the most fruitful time that I have spent. And as one Member remarked a while ago, it is a lot better spent that way than what we have been doing in the last while.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. Taylor: — (Minister of Social Services) Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to reinforce what the Attorney General has already said in that we certainly appreciate the work that has been carried out by the Committee. And they have worked hard, the study has been long and arduous, I am sure. They have had many difficult decisions to make. At the same time I reinforce the comment that we receive this Report for study and do not receive it as adopting its recommendations.

Certainly I have a number of reservations concerning the Report. One thing we have to remember is that we cannot in any field, alcohol, sex or anything else legislate morality. Governments have tried this in the past and have failed miserably. What's more I am not sure that governments should want to do it even if they could count on succeeding. Morality must be an individual and family responsibility. It seems to me, though, that the responsibility of government then, particularly in reference to the alcohol question, is, at least, to control the problem in sensible proportions. In my estimation alcohol is still, in spite of all the other drugs available on the market, is still the most abused drug in society and probably the most

April 10, 1973

dangerous to the greatest number of people. It has an extremely serious effect not only on the person who becomes an alcoholic but on all those around him and on society as a whole. We cannot in this sense shirk our responsibility.

As I mentioned there are some parts of the Report that I certainly want to consider further and which certainly at first glance, I cannot accept.

I think, for instance, of the recommendation regarding the drinking in cars; and the carnage on our highways has been mentioned. I think it should also be pointed out that the carnage on our highways has not been as high, the accident rate on highways is not as high as it is in the urban centres. In 1972 for example there were something over 4,200 accidents on provincial highways, while on urban roads there were almost 11,000 accidents. Now, I don't know if a study has been conducted in this but I cannot help but wonder if this could not be partly because of the easier accessibility of liquor within urban centres and the greater change of someone who goes out for the evening drinking and then drives home, compared to people on the highway. But it is one of the things that ought to be considered. I see no way in which we could control drinking by drivers, if we allow drinking in the car at all.

I also question very seriously the suggestion that minors in company with parents should be able to drink. Statistics, I think, will bear out the fact that the younger people are who start to drink, the greater their potential for becoming alcoholics. We don't always like statistics, we don't like to admit these facts, but I think this is a fact.

I question very seriously, and in this I disagree with my friend from Battleford, I question very seriously the idea of advertising beer and wine on radio and television within our province.

I don't see how a government can seriously attempt to slow down the abuse and at the same time permit the media to use its force to increase the consumption of the product. And that is what advertising is all about. You can say it is merely to convince people to change brands but I think everyone in this House is aware that it doesn't matter whether you advertise a car or a baby crib or liquor, you are trying to sell a product, and advertising does increase sales.

Likewise I have serious reservations about alcohol at sporting events. These can be emotionally charged by themselves without the addition of the added problem of alcohol which can create some danger actually in causing even riots to break out. Not in causing them, I suppose, but in assisting in the precipitation.

A number of other parts of the Report I also have serious questions and reservations about. And I think it probably stems from my own experience in the field of counseling. In most, or in many cases, one of the root problems in the homes that I was working with was certainly the problem of alcohol. We can say what we like about that being a result rather than the basic problem. The fact of the matter is that if it hadn't been there the problem would at least have been lessened.

Parents today are getting very up-tight apparently about their children possibly getting hold of some marijuana or some of these other so-called soft drugs. I don't want my children to become involved with that kind of drug either. I don't think anyone does. But I fail to understand why the same parents seem to think it is a joke if their kids go out and get drunk. The one is certainly no better than the other. I think the same sort of concern ought to be there.

One of the concerns which I faced – the problems I faced and I must admit it was a new one just a few years ago – was the coming to me for counseling of young people who had become alcoholics before they were legally old enough to drink. And this is an increasing concern to me and I am sure to many Members of this House. And we talk about education. I believe in it and I hope we can do something in the future about this. I am not convinced, however, that we can educate people to drink in moderation. I really don't believe that can happen. I am willing to try it, I think we have to try it but it seems to me from the evidence which I have examined and from the discussions which I have held with a good number of doctors, that there is a physiological problem and it is not just a matter of deciding to drink just a little. There are some people who will be alcoholics. The only way that we can avoid that, I suggest is by not drinking at all. So I am not convinced but I think that we ought to at least try education.

Once again I want to commend the members of the Committee who have worked hard over this Report. I thank them for the opportunity of being able at a later date to study the Report, and I can certainly assure the House that I have some serious reservations about some of the recommendations, while I very strongly support some of the others.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. I. Wood: — (Swift Current) Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to take part in this debate although I am at a loss to know exactly why I should. The Resolution before us is that the Final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now received.

I don't imagine there is anyone in the House who would be prepared to vote against this motion. I don't see how you very well could. Whichever way people might feel on this matter I am sure that we will all be supporting this motion, because we are simply voting that we receive this Report and not whether we are in favor of it or not. Others are expressing their opinions and I think that I should like to say a few words as well.

I should like to say that we must all appreciate the work that the Liquor Committee put in on this. As nearly as I can see by going through the report, they have done quite a thorough job on it and have given good consideration to the problems that have been brought to their attention. I am glad to hear from the members of the Committee that have taken part in it, that the relationship between the members on the Committee was good and they gave the problems before them sincere consideration without any thought of political bias or other matters which might divide them. I think this is the way a committee should work and I am glad to hear that they have operated in

this way.

I won't have too much to say, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to say that there are some things in this Report that I definitely do not agree with and I should like to say that I do not agree that we should allow liquor in cars. There have been things said on this already, that it is going to be pretty difficult to keep the driver from imbibing when everyone else in the car is. I think that this is something that we don't need.

I agree with those who have said we just don't need more liquor. I think that we have enough liquor in the country now. There is enough being used and I don't think we need to extend the places and ways in which liquor may be consumed.

I also don't believe in having wine and beer for sale in grocery stores. I think this again, is just making it that much more available. As has been said here, if you want to sell more of anything, the way you do it is to advertise it and you make it available. You see a lot of gas stations along the road, in fact, there are more gas stations than what there needs to be for the welfare of the industry itself. The one is choking out the other. But it is the companies behind them. I know that the more outlets they have, the more gasoline they are going to sell. And Irrespective of how it may affect the station operator, the big companies are quite happy to have a lot of outlets. And I think the more ways and more places we have in which liquor is to be sold, more is going to be sold. I don't think there are very many people in the House here today who will say that this is advantageous to our province, to have more liquor sold in the province. I know that it raises the provincial revenues but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the province can find other ways of making money that are better for the people of the province, than collecting liquor revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I basically go along with the minority reports that are brought out in this Report by the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris), especially the Hon. Member from Arm River in his saying that the thrust of the Government and the regulations in regard to liquor in this province should be to endeavor to lower consumption and not to increase it.

Some say:

What is it to me? I am an older man who has been around quite a long time. If people wish to use liquor, that is their business and not mine and it doesn't make any difference to me. It doesn't bother me one particle if a person wishes to use liquor. In fact I enjoy the company of people who are drinking and it doesn't bother me a little bit.

But there are some things about this whole situation. One is that I would continue living. And I should like to continue driving a car on the highway. I think that if you are going to make liquor more available to people driving in cars, the situation is not good now and it is not going to improve any. I think this does affect me even though I don't use liquor myself, it does affect me and it does affect my right to drive a car in safety on the highway. I think that I have a stake in this even though I don't pretend to use liquor myself.

Also, I think that it is important to our young people that we don't put too much temptation, if I may use the term in that

way, in their way. I think that the more liquor we have used, the more it is going to seem to be an example of the young people.

I agree with what was said about education. I think we should have education. I think we should endeavor to educate our young people as to the proper use of liquor and so on, but I want to say that there is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, that says: "Example is better than precept." And you can talk all you like in the schools and have as many lectures and say as much as you can on this subject, but as long as the young people know, they are going to come to the idea that this is the way things are to be done. That if they are going to be anyone at all they are going to have to drink liquor.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I am an old coot that this sort of thing doesn't affect very much, but I do have a young son, whose birth I announced 11 years ago in the Legislature. This young fellow is just coming to the age of being very impressionable and I think a lot of that boy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see that we do pass laws that don't make liquor more easily available. It is one thing to talk about prohibition and I think that has been tried. I don't know that it was such a great mistake or such a howling misfortune as some would like to portray that it was, but it does in some ways appear to be unworkable.

But that isn't saying that we need to have more liquor available and go out of our way to advertise it and have it in grocery stores. It has been said here about drugs. If we started selling cannabis in the corner drug store there wouldn't be a person in this House who wouldn't be up on their feet about it immediately. Because it would be terrible to have these drugs made available in a free and easy manner to young people. We say that they shouldn't be using it. We could talk about it in the schools and we could do everything we could, but if it were made available freely in every drugstore and every corner grocery store there isn't anything that you could do about it. The young people would be swamped with it.

This, as I understand, and I have been told as I don't know too much about marijuana and these others, but I am told that it is no more detrimental to the health, or is no more habit forming than liquor. And yet here we are proposing in this Report that liquor be made available in corner drug stores. This, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that we should have any consent for that practice whatsoever, because of what it could do to our young people. I just hesitate to contemplate. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you gather from what I have said, that while I will be undoubtedly voting for this motion, because there is absolutely nothing else to do. We must receive the Report and I think that it is not that bad a report.

There are some things in it that I pointed out that I think is quite clear that I do not agree with.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, there are just a few points that I should like to touch on concerning this liquor Report.

April 10, 1973

One of them is in regard to advertising. I really hope that advertising is not permitted in Saskatchewan in regard to liquor. I had the privilege of seeing a brief presented by a certain group of people, who were in favor of allowing advertising. And as far as I could see from the brief, one of the points was that it would not increase consumption of liquor. I got the impression that what they were trying to say was that it would make more discriminating drinkers out of us. Somehow I think that if they want to make us a little more discriminating, I think maybe there are other areas in which they could involve themselves in the regard. I hope there is no advertising allowed.

Insofar as drinking in vehicles, I am totally opposed to that. I think we all know what would happen just with the toss of the bottle from one person to another, a person could avoid getting caught. I might say that I relay the opinions of many people in Hanley constituency on that particular point.

Another thing that I should like to mention is that I was hoping that this Committee would come up with a recommendation insofar as the sale of liquor in the various smaller communities of Saskatchewan is concerned.

I was hoping that quite possibly a recommendation would be made whereby our beverage rooms or our hotels would be able to sell liquor by the bottle. I say this because under the present setup in some areas of the province, if you are going to utilize the liquor vendorships, you are able to buy liquor on a Monday, in some places, and in some places you are not, because they are closed on Monday in certain areas of the province.

In other areas you can buy a bottle or you can't buy a bottle on Wednesday afternoon. Now maybe it is for selfish reasons, but I should like to think that I could buy a bottle if I wanted to, at say 11 in the morning, 2 in the afternoon, 9 in the evening or even 11 in the evening. I think the proper place for the selling of liquor by the bottle is through the outlets we already have and I am thinking in terms of hotels and beverage rooms.

There are other points that I can't accept on which I certainly will make myself vocal at some other more appropriate time. But I am just wondering why we can allow people with severe problems of alcoholism, why we do allow in our society, from them to create 'living hells' for their families, and we don't do a darn thing about it. Now, I don't know how we would go about doing something about it, but I do know that there are some instances where people create 'living hells' for their families and we do nothing about it. It may be a case of deciding that this particular person should have to visit the hospital for a period of time for enforced confinement. We don't do that with liquor.

I wish we would take a good hard look at that, because the number of families that are living in so-called 'hell', are very numerous, and I don't think it is fair, particularly to the children, of those families. I have seen plenty of them. I have been around the country enough, and I teach, and I have seen many cases where the boys and girls were in a 'living hell'. They come to school. They do not complain to anybody. I think maybe it is time that government took a good

hard look at that and consider possibly forced confinement of alcoholics to a treatment centre where situations like that exist.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. C. Whelan: — (Regina North West) Mr. Speaker, the study of liquor regulations in the Province of Saskatchewan by the Committee, during the past two years, was probably the most complete and all embracing and thorough investigation on alcohol and its use ever undertaken by a group of legislators in this country.

I think the criticism that was leveled by Opposition MLAs who did not sit on the Committee has been unfair, because without exception my colleagues who sat on the Committee were dedicated to the job at hand, and when the study was completed I felt that there were Members of this Legislature who were fully aware of all aspects of liquor, its management and its problems, not only in provinces across Canada but in many parts of the United States.

I also wish to express my thanks to the staff who worked with us, particularly the research assistant, Joe Zakreski. When one considers that soon \$80 millions to \$100 million worth of liquor is, or will be sold, in the province in one year and the profits from liquor will be perhaps \$30 million or \$40 million, the expenditure for this Committee to investigate the handling, the legislation, the effects, the whole management of liquor, in general the use of alcohol, is a very small amount.

I recommend the Committee method of study because: (1) It gives the members the chance to meet the public; (2) It gives the Committee an opportunity to listen to those involved with the problem; (3) It provides an opportunity to study solutions close up.

Because alcohol has brought about an illness of a chronic nature, we are confronted with a serious problem. I do not think the solution nor the cure for this illness can be effected without an expenditure of money. We say in the Report that 10 per cent of the profits and frankly, unless the people who are given the money use it wisely, this amount may be insufficient.

When we talk about a pricing policy to curtail the consumption of alcohol, it is obvious from the initial publicity that appeared in the Press regarding this Report, that this recommendation has been misunderstood by many.

Many of the customers in beverage rooms, for instance, are convinced that we are going to stop them from drinking by raising the price beyond their means. This kind of approach may cause resentment. Let's not suggest to them that we are hitting at them because they overindulge. They do not, but to advocate and force a pricing policy as a method of discouraging the purchase of liquor, is a good idea. However, I will have to admit that it should start in the schools prior to the time that the young citizen establishes his drinking pattern. Otherwise introduction will be looked upon as a clever maneuver to do the customer out of something that he is entitled to and that he already has.

I agree with the recommendation that negotiation of a

April 10, 1973

pricing system will have to take place on a federal level or at least on a regional level, as is set out in recommendation number four. I suggest, as the Committee Report says, this may be some time off. It will require a good deal of education before it is exercised and a good deal of negotiation as suggested in the Report.

One of the most shocking aspects of the problem regarding alcohol dependency is that there is very little research to be had in regard to the problem and the right approach to control or cure it.

Mr. Speaker, we looked at a number of facilities stated in the Report, it seems that the Ontario Research Foundation is the best equipped, provides the best service and has the best information, and even their finds are many years ahead of public acceptance.

Research facilities in other provinces and in the United States are not adequate, not conclusive and not extensive enough to justify the undertaking of programs. The evidence that is at hand is in many respects too limited.

The recommendations in the early pages of the report regarding the refusal to permit advertising is, in my view, realistic, because advertising is one more cost added to production regardless of whether it is a product or whether it is community advertising. The consumer has to pay in any case. The only reason any manufacturer advertises is to increase consumption and to increase sales. I concur in the Committee decision to recommend against advertising of alcoholic beverages.

The Committee spent hours considering the problem of rehabilitation with its many complex areas. Some excellent work is being done, particularly among native people. But there is a need for more work, for more training and for more facilities. It is particularly gratifying to see the type of leadership that has developed among the native people operating their own rehabilitation program. While the rate of rehabilitation is still undecided, the training and leadership is commendable, and the approach they have to the problem is very impressive.

While I should like to see native programs co-ordinated under one body, such as the Alcoholism Commission, I am convinced that the Indian leaders, given proper leadership, training and facilities, can do the work of alcohol rehabilitation among their own people.

The meetings we held with this group in northern Saskatchewan were worthwhile and I am convinced were an educational experience for every member of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could turn for a moment to the Committee work in the area of drinking and driving. Studies reveal that with a tolerance of .08 allowance, which means it is well within the margin of .08 to .10, that persons are definitely unfit to operate a motor vehicle. If we are going to allow for a tolerance, I think the Committee was wise to recommend that the rate be reduced to .06.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Some States in the United

States and four countries in Europe have a breath testing rate at this rate or lower. In addition it is not enough to apprehend a driver, we must decide too, whether this is his usual performance or just a social incident. If it is a social incident, then he is not likely to be driving in this manner every day. But if he is dependent upon alcohol in many instances he will return to driving behind the wheel with a .08 reading even when his license has been handed back to him. In some cases he will drive without a license and cause a serious accident involving the death of other people.

If we ever get to the point in Saskatchewan where no one gets behind the wheel of a car while drinking, as is the case in Scandinavian countries in Europe, then we will have gained our objective. In those countries it is considered a social error to offer a drink to some one who is going to operate an automobile.

The main recommendation for changes in the administration of liquor regulations, liquor licensing and retailing of liquor by the Committee, suggests the Liquor Board be increased to a chairman and three additional members. At present it is made up of one member. There is a strong feeling in the Committee that there is a need to get a cross-section of the general public to express a point of view in the administration of Saskatchewan's Liquor Board. Since so many people are involved and concerned regarding the licensing of liquor outlets and the handling and administration of these outlets, the Committee recommends, and I think wisely, that the Liquor Licensing Commission be made up of a chairman and four other members and that the chairman of the Liquor Licensing Commission be the same person as the chairman of the Liquor Board. The additional four members of the Commission would consist of two from the public, one from the Alcoholism Commission and one from the liquor retailing industry.

Mr. Speaker, many retailers, particularly independent retailers, asked for sale of beer and wine in independent grocery stores. In one area almost every independent owner, I am told, made this request. The Committee recommend that a pilot project be tried on a regional basis, with lower alcohol content beer and wine being offered in the independent grocery stores. Fears have been expressed about children handling liquor and purchasing beer and wine in these stores. Regulations would have to be written to take into consideration the solution to this aspect. Conflict with hotels and other outlets is evident. But there is a need for such additional service particularly where there is no service. It has been in use in other countries. This suggestion and some of their experiences indicate that it can be handled properly.

One of the recommendations for this type of outlet came to me personally from a long-time resident of Quebec, who sits on the board of one of our alcohol rehabilitation clinics, Mr. Speaker.

The recommendations for liquor services in northern areas would do away with bootlegging among the native people and, I think, would be approved by Members of the Legislature. In addition there have frequently been wrangles about the naming of special liquor vendors. It is therefore the feeling of the Committee that the number and location of these vendors should be the responsibility of the Liquor Board, and such decisions

April 10, 1973

should be made keeping in mind the availability to the public the sort of service that is required by the people living in a given area.

In the Province of Manitoba the Committee found live entertainment was permitted in licensed premises. This has brought about one of the largest entertainment industries in any province in Canada, opening doors of opportunity to singers, comedians and other entertainers. There are probably more professional entertainers per capita in the Province of Manitoba than in any other province. Many of them come to this province to provide entertainment for us. We felt that this feature of the Manitoba legislation permitting music in licensed premises should be permitted in this province. In addition, we felt that entertainment changed the atmosphere providing a background for a pleasant evening rather than just sitting by the hour holding a drink in your hand.

To discourage bootlegging and to provide a service to the public, and to provide a rehabilitation fund at the same time, the Committee felt that off-sale liquor should be allowed in all licensed beverage rooms, cocktail lounges and dining rooms, provided there is a regulation that there be a surcharge. The Committee could not agree on the amount of the surcharge but it had been suggested it could reach as high as 25 per cent, and that in each case the customer will be advised that the 25 per cent was a levy for rehabilitation.

The Committee spent a good deal of time discussing with the people of Manitoba the sale of alcohol beverages at the football stadium. After they had quoted their experience, and after visiting Taylor Field on a number of occasions and seeing the hundreds of empty bottles after a game, and after having attended games and seeing beverages poured and sprayed on spectators, in spite of the fact that I am told that the police now have the situation in hand, I am convinced that there will always be people drinking at sports events. They are doing so now in spite of any new procedures, and we will be unable to stop them unless we take drastic action against a large number of people. Therefore, I wholeheartedly concur in the position taken by the Manitoba Government and the recommendation by the Committee that the Saskatchewan Liquor Licensing Commission allow the sale and consumption of beer in specially designated areas.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, people would not be allowed to drink in the stands but in a place set aside for those who want to drink. They could drink during the game or at half-time but not in the stands. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, at sports events in many other areas this has gone on for years. In spite of the claim of those who say the matter has been cleaned up at Taylor Field, I do not think this can be done without providing a designated area for drinking.

At the present time in certain urban areas of the city that have developed there are no licensed outlets. That means that people have to drive four to five miles in an automobile in order to purchase off-sale, or sit in a beverage room and consume alcoholic beverages. The trip to and from this type of establishment by automobile may be hazardous to the driver himself and to other citizens. Even the driver at .04, whose license would not be suspended, experiences some loss of

judgment. Because of this and as a service to the public, location of outlets should be closer to the people in the outlying areas of the city. The recommendation in this respect will receive wholehearted approval from the vast majority who live in the newer urban sections of the larger communities.

Police officers before the Committee representing the whole province indicated clearly the difficulties with legislation regarding drinking and vehicles. At present, even those under age can be charged and are, although they may not have been drinking but happen to be sitting in a vehicle where there is an open bottle. If no one admits to ownership of that bottle every occupant in the car is automatically charged. The administration of this legislation is difficult and, I think, in many instances unfair. It was written prior to the time that breath testing equipment was introduced, it was written to stop people driving an automobile while they had been drinking. The breath testing equipment sorts out the driver and levels a very harsh penalty. Perhaps legislation should be written to give every one in the vehicle the breath test. But in my opinion consideration should be given to innocent people in these circumstances, all the occupants of the car, including those who have not been drinking. The present legislation, as I have said earlier, was written before the breath testing legislation came into use. I think it is difficult to administer. We should have a good look at it and this is probably the reason for the recommendation that appears in the report.

While there are some differences of opinion in the Committee, these differences were respected and the chairman and the vice-chairman both submitted minority reports. It must be pointed out, however, that eight of the 12 members agreed to the report in total. Party politics had nothing to do with the conclusions because the reservations came from members of both parties. In my estimation dissent came about honestly and directly. I think on a controversial subject of this kind with wide variety of backgrounds, training and professions and experience it is most remarkable that eight of the Committee were unanimous and that nine agreed on all but two items. The majority position is the one that we should look at very carefully. This is why I think the Legislative committee technique is so successful.

Let me return to one recommendation that I think is most important, that is that 10 per cent of liquor profits should be spent on education and rehabilitation. Education must begin at an early age. Let's not kid ourselves, we are not going to stop people from drinking but if we begin early enough we may be able to persuade them to drink within reason and with discretion. I think that is what every member of the Committee was aiming at.

I am in favor of the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod: — (Regina Alberta Park) Mr. Speaker, I just have a word or two about this particular Resolution. I concur with the remarks of the Hon. Members from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). But there are two or three things that I think require to be said. One of them relates to what I regard

April 10, 1973

are some stupid laws relating to drunken driving.

The law today provides that if a person is in charge of an automobile and is impaired that he is guilty of an offence and can be charged and will normally lose his license for up to six months, and sometimes a longer period of time. The law states, briefly, that if you are in charge of an automobile, if you have the care and control of it whether the car is in motion or not, (it doesn't even require that the car be on a highway nor does it require that you be in the automobile); the fact is that many people have been convicted of this offence without any real intention of putting the car in motion. The laws as they now stand, (and they are Federal Criminal Code laws), do not give any credit at all for the responsible person. If a man goes out and gets into his car and decides that he is not in fit condition to drive and decides to leave the car standing and does not intend to put it in motion because he does not believe he can drive properly, he can nevertheless be convicted of being the person in charge of an automobile while impaired. The laws as they are now structured are not fair to him. He is far better off, if he finds himself driving down the road and not in good shape to drive – he is still far better off to sneak on home and try to get the car into the driveway and get himself into the house without being caught.

If he does act responsibly and he does pull over to the side of the road and says, I won't go any further because I just don't think I am in condition to drive, he is actually acting against his own best interests when it comes to the criminal laws. Now to me that doesn't make sense and I should like to see an alteration of the law which gives recognition to the fact that many men do decide that they should stop driving or don't even put the car into motion in the first place. I believe that an alteration here is absolutely essential for fair treatment, and more than one car would be stopped by a responsible driver if these laws were changed.

Another part of the Report deals with liquor in offices. I believe that we are hiding our heads with respect to this one. We have heard all sorts of pious remarks, some of them I believe by Members who themselves may have had a bottle in their own offices, and may well have had a drink out of that bottle in their own office, and yet piously oppose having liquor in offices. As far as I can see we should give recognition to the kind of situations that do exist. And if people do keep liquor in offices – and I am convinced that it occurs – we should put some reasonable regulation on it.

It seems to me that if the prohibition were, and I think it should be, that no liquor should be allowed in offices or to be used in offices during regular office hours or when any of these offices are open to the public. But if an office is shut up tight and the public is excluded, I see no difference between that office and a man's home. In fact, for many men, the office is to a large extent their home, because they frequently spend more time in the office than they do in their residences. And consequently some of the pious talk that we have heard today, is marvelous and while I understand and sympathize with the Members and I don't criticize them, I simply don't agree with them. I think that we should recognize the situation where it does exist and put reasonable regulations upon it.

As it is now I am convinced that the law simply hides its

head and ignores what is theoretically a problem but is a problem in law but is not a social problem in the sense that most offices that do keep liquor around, I am convinced, do not create a social problem any more than liquor in general is a social problem.

The third and last remark that I have to make with respect to this Report is that so far as music in these places is concerned, it is not entirely a blessing. I agree with the Hon. Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that it has given a wonderful opportunity for entertainers in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan and in the other places where it has been encouraged or allowed. But it is not entirely pleasing to my ear to sit and be shattered by some loud music while I am trying to enjoy a quiet meal or quiet drink.

I was in a hotel in Saskatoon – I will refrain from mentioning the name – trying to get a quiet dinner and I was in the dining room which is entirely separate from the cocktail lounge, but I was separated only by partitions, I surely was not separated from the rotten music that was coming from it. I just finally got so annoyed at the tremendous sound that was imposing itself upon my ears that I finally stalked out of there. I paid the bill and I stomped up to my room and I still couldn't get away from the music.

So if we have music in these places, I hope that the Liquor Licensing Commission will have regard to the fact that there are people who like to go to these places. We don't mind quiet music in the background but we don't like the shrill imposition of this upon our ear drums and this occurs in so many places. I believe they drive as much business away as they attract by some of this so-called music.

Having said that, of course, I can see that the Government is very cautious about adopting any position about whether it adopts or does not adopt any part of the Report. I think I can concur with the caution that is being expressed today and I will support the acceptance of the Resolution receiving the Report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan. Just before my main remarks that I wish to make this morning, I should like to make a comment or two with respect to the previous speaker's comments. I can see some logic in his arguments. However, I feel that alcohol is the gay deceiver and the fellow who gets in his automobile may well think that he is quite responsible in terms of handling that automobile and I think the tendency is there that he is likely to take off in the car. I realize perhaps you could train people to come to the conclusion that they are not in fit condition. However, I would take a pretty strong stand in terms of the driver regulations and I don't want to be vindictive in any way in that respect. I certainly have agreement with the previous speaker in relation to the level of the sound of music that occurs in licensed eating establishments. It's totally unreasonable and I think it does drive a good number of people away from going out for a meal

even on occasion.

I should like to commend the Members, Mr. Speaker, for a well prepared and a well researched Report. Unlike the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) I particularly commend the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris), the chairman of the Committee for his participation and his input. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, and I may be wrong in this assumption, that the Hon. Member for Rosthern was critical that a United Church Minister should head up a committee investigating the problems related to the use and abuse of alcohol. Yet, Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that alcohol is a severe problem, a tremendous social problem in our society. I am sure that ministers of the gospel of all the faiths are interested in the problems of humanity and if they are then it's obviously rational to have input and participation in a report such as this one.

The Member for Rosthern was critical because Committee members traveled east and west to survey the situation in relation to liquor problems in other jurisdictions. I disagree. This is one of the major reasons why, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a well researched Report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The statistical evidence in relation to the use of alcohol is quite clear. It indicates a chapter in the human journey which is filled with tragedy. Direct measurable costs according to this Report in the Province of Saskatchewan in the year 1971-72 total \$17,564,343. The amount we spend to rehabilitate the victims is pitifully meager and totally insufficient. I agree with the Hon. Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) that at least 10 per cent of the liquor profits should be used for education and rehabilitation. I would, like the Hon. Member for Rosthern, put the emphasis on the former, but unlike the Member opposite, I would strongly support expenditures for rehabilitation. I am convinced the Hon. Member for Rosthern is sincere in his convictions, but one may well be sincere and be sincerely wrong. The whole basis of the Christian ethic is based on the theory of agape love, a concern for another no matter how unresponsive the object of that concern may be or how far down the road to total degradation he or she may have traveled. I take my hat off to those people who work with the victims of alcohol. It is a frustrating business in many respects.

I am in concurrence with the distribution of consumption view which demonstrates that there is a direct relationship between the per capita general consumption and the level of alcoholism. This view is concerned about increasing the accessibility which results in corresponding increase in consumption patterns.

I oppose, Mr. Speaker, commercial advertising as it, in all probability will lead to an increase in consumption and therefore an increase in the incidence of alcoholism. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I presented a brief to the Committee at its public hearing in Saskatoon, B-39 in the Report. I received a courteous hearing. Although I realize that some of the Committee members did not agree with my contention, I am led to believe that I may have influenced the Committee at least in a limited degree in their recommendation that no commercial advertising

of beverage alcohol be permitted in Saskatchewan.

Personally, I believe in abstinence and I choose abstinence. I am, however, realist enough to realize many people do not and many will not. I do not believe one can simply prohibit, one can only logically help. Therefore, I support any measure which will tend to reduce overall consumption.

In education a good deal depends on what is taught and how it is taught. Much of our current health education, particularly in relation to alcohol is, in my opinion, a waste of time and effort. Public opinion can, I think, be modified when we cease to consider drunken behavior as being amusing and humorous rather than something which is personally degrading and potentially dangerous to the inebriate and to others. Social pressures would be relieved if we showed young people that one does not need alcohol to have a good time. For those in society who choose abstinence, general support for a rational choice in relation to one's self and others should be commended. For those who choose otherwise every means should be taken to encourage moderation. While I do not condone drinking even moderately, neither do I condemn it. My reason for this position is that merely to condemn is, in my view, a completely negative and irresponsible approach, and devoid of any positive results.

Generally, I support the recommendations of the Report relating to prevention, education and research. I particularly agree that the pricing policy may be properly utilized to reduce consumption and control alcoholism. I endorse that recommendation wholeheartedly.

As previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I endorse the recommendations in relation to treatment and rehabilitation.

I support the Committee recommendation in relation to a drinking driver program. I would, however, and I have done this before in this House, support the reduction of the blood alcohol level of .08, above which it is illegal to drive, to .04. My reason for doing that is that it's clearly indicated in the charts in relation to the Report that the capability of handling an automobile begins to worsen particularly at that level. I readily realize this cannot be achieved solely within our own jurisdiction but I would urge consultation with other jurisdictions with a view to attaining that goal.

In chapter 6 of the Report, Mr. Speaker, the Committee deals with The Liquor Act and liquor licensing. I want to make myself perfectly clear. I would oppose beer and wine sales in grocery stores, I would oppose delivery services of beverage alcohol by taxis, and I would oppose the establishment of liquor establishments on Indian reserves, although I would agree to a pilot project to study the implications, and I believe any such establishment on the reserves should be operated by Indian people.

I would oppose additional liquor vendor appointments. I opposed them when they were established initially by the previous Liberal administration and I oppose them now. I believe a liquor outlet should be government owned and operated not because of any belief that automatically all public ownership is preferable but because employees do not have any motivation to push sales as private vendors do for personal economic return.

April 10, 1973

In addition, I have observed that a number of such special liquor vendor outlets are not well operated and, in fact, consistently break established rules. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I was in conversation with a liquor representative in Saskatoon who informed me that he is aware of infractions in relation to the operation of special liquor vendors which he described as incredible.

I oppose off sale of spirits and wines from licensed premises. I oppose permission for minors in the company of their parents to consume beverage alcohol with meals in licensed premises. I oppose the sale of liquor at sports events. I oppose transportation of and consumption of liquor in vehicles. I oppose consumption of liquor at park camp sites and picnic sites. I oppose consumption of beverage alcohol in private offices. I oppose community event licenses. I base all of that opposition and all of the points that I have raised on the contention that they tend to increase overall consumption when what society requires is a reduction in consumption.

I would support food bars in beverage rooms on the basis that it would tend to reduce beverage alcohol consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I would oppose permission for a married minor to enter a licensed premise and consume liquor in company with a spouse of legal age. I realize, Mr. Speaker, this may be construed as an anomaly and in some sense an interference in a family relationship. However, it does create the right of an individual to legally use alcohol when they are not of legal age. It may well lead to pressure to lower the legal age of maturity once again. I believe that would in turn lead to increased consumption to which I am fundamentally opposed.

I commend, Mr. Speaker, the chairman and the other Committee members for some of their reservations. I'd just like to make reference, if I may, to one reservation of Dr. Faris. I think there's a bit of humor in it but I think it's basic to the whole Report.

Education is an important part of an all out attack on alcoholism but by itself apart from the pricing policy it will fail as badly as anti-smoking education has failed. Everyone now admits that heavy smoking causes cancer and heart disease yet per capita cigarette consumption climbs steadily. Only sharp and steady price increases will reduce cigarette consumption and alcohol consumption. There are some who argue that this would be unfair. Cancer and alcoholism would become diseases largely confined to the wealthy. So be it. The wealthy also tend to have a higher rehabilitation rate.

I think the basic premise in the Report is related to the pricing policy if we are, in fact, going to achieve a reduction in the consumption of beverage alcohol.

In general application, Mr. Speaker, I oppose additional liberalization which in my view will lead to increased consumption. I add my influence, if any, to those of other Members for Government to inaugurate only those recommendations of the Report which will reduce consumption and therefore alcoholism and initiate preventative and curative procedures which will

reduce alcoholism incidence and effect rehabilitation for those who have already succumbed to complete dependency upon this drug. A drug, Mr. Speaker, which creates massive social and economic problems for every citizen of this province.

I will support receiving the Report with the reservations and the comments that I have already made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens: — (Elrose) Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the final Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan, I note the terms of reference were to conduct an inquiry into “all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan”. I wish to commend the Committee for the time and effort put into the inquiry and the writing of the Report. The facts and statistics gathered and compiled and edited into an easy to read booklet is a permanent record of their dedication to a difficult assignment. They deserve praise and thanks from this Assembly for accepting such a challenging task and from the people of Saskatchewan for their patience and endurance in listening to and reading the many briefs presented. The information contained in this Report will undoubtedly be used numerous times by groups and individuals when seeking for and presenting their views on alcoholic beverages. The recommendations and presented for the considered opinion of this Legislature and will, in all probability, be the basis of some future legislation.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to make a detailed study of this Report before I comment on some of the recommendations contained therein. However, I’m taking the liberty to make a few general comments. A significant statement in the Report is found on page 25 and it reads:

Alcohol abuse is one of Saskatchewan’s major health problems.

And then the question is asked:

What can be done to minimize the harmful effects of alcohol in a society which has long since decided that the social use of this drug is acceptable?

Mr. Speaker, before I say more, probably I should make my personal stand on the use of alcohol perfectly clear. I know there are those who will consider me an old prohibitionist and I will accept that criticism. I also know some will brand me a killjoy and I suppose I must accept that. Others will merely say, too bad, the old boy is just not with it in today’s society and possibly they’re right. But as for myself, I’m not stupid enough to believe that the use of alcoholic beverages can be stopped but I am of the opinion that the use of alcoholic beverages can be controlled and used in moderation if we as people are prepared to accept the facts of life, in the use and abuse of alcohol, and prepared to do something about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to go back to the question of the acceptability of alcohol in our society. The Report again says alcohol has apparently been accepted because of its benefits and use the example, “to break down inhibitions in social

April 10, 1973

gatherings". Well, Mr. Speaker, I am in no position to dispute this argument but merely state that I feel it is only an excuse for the use of alcohol. Further, I feel a social gathering is one of the places that a large number of people who are now confirmed alcoholics had their first glass put into their hand, just a social sip.

However, Mr. Speaker, when we consider benefits in the use of alcohol we must also consider cost. To me the benefits are few but the costs are another story. Costs do not include only the costs of the beverage but also the costs of the results of the use of alcohol. May I read a couple of sentences from an editorial from the Leader-Post of April 6, 1973 and I quote:

Sales in Canada of spirits, wines and beer total almost \$2 billion a year. In 1971 Canadians consumed 473 million gallons of alcoholic beverages, an increase of 51 million gallons over 1969. The fact is as the amount of disposable income increases for Canadians, there is an equivalent rise in the consumption of alcoholic drinks.

This editorial was commenting on a CTV program entitled "A CTV Inquiry Into Your Health" broadcast last Sunday representing a controversial study on the nutritional problems facing Canada with some new and though provoking ideas on the medical and social consequences of alcohol use and abuse in this country.

Another editorial appeared in the Leader-Post February 19, 1973 headed "Accidents and Alcohol". Mr. Speaker, may I take the liberty to read this short editorial into the records:

Canada today is being swept by an epidemic, with nearly 12,000 dead and one million injured annually, with Canadian hospital beds occupied daily by 12,000 victims. The whole resulting in an economic loss in the region of \$2 billion. Philip J. Farmer, Executive Director of the Canadian Safety Council made these facts known in Regina a few weeks ago. Mr. Farmer said this nation has not been hit by the Black Plague but that the toll is as a result of accidents. Of these, traffic accidents account for 5,500 deaths and 193 injuries annually. The Safety Council Director went on to pinpoint one major contributing factor to many accidents, booze. A review of fatal accidents in Saskatchewan in 1971 involving driver deaths showed that 57.6 per cent of the dead drivers had been drinking.

Evidence indicated that in general as blood alcohol levels increased over .04 per cent, accidents became more frequent and severe. One survey showed that at .08 per cent alcohol level a driver is five times more likely to be involved in an accident, and at .15 blood alcohol level 25 times more likely.

In Saskatchewan in 1971 all of the drivers tested in the 16 to 19 age group killed in motor vehicle accidents had been drinking. About 66 per cent of them had blood level alcohol above the legal limit of .08 per cent. In the 20 to 24 age group the situation, while not quite as bad, was still alarming. Some 66 per cent of the drivers killed had been drinking and

all of these had blood alcohol levels in excess of the legal limit.

It goes on to mention the special Legislative Committee which has just issued its Report on the use and abuse of alcohol noted that some 20,000 residents are known alcoholics.

The Committee found that over one-third of the money spent on social assistance in the province in 1971 was directed to persons or families ruined through the abuse of alcohol. These statistics doubtless shock all Saskatchewan residents and many will be led to support the call for tougher laws and stricter enforcement, improved rehabilitation programs for problem drinkers and a continuing program of public information and education.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a Government, had made a drastic increase in the availability of alcoholic beverages. We have licensed in the availability of alcoholic beverages. We have licensed more outlets and substantially lengthened the hours during which they may remain open. The increase in accessibility has shown a corresponding increase in consumption, which is further aggravated by the rise in disposable income as mentioned earlier. Also aggravating the consumption problem was the action taken to make alcoholic beverages available to a higher number of people by the lowering of the age of majority to 18 years. Posh premises provided in many (in fact most beverage outlets) are highly attractive, very inviting, silently beckoning. Where else in our society do we find duplication of such splendid surroundings, except possibly in exclusive clubs, and without a direct door charge. Why not drop in – join the gang; become an accepted member of our society. Accepted, Mr. Speaker, until inebriated or worse yet, until an alcoholic.

I point these things out, Mr. Speaker, trying to show to you, Sir, only one of the magnificent sales jobs the alcoholic beverage makers are doing and by our lack of counteraction we are showing our agreement. I often ask myself, are we as a society, allowing ourselves to be degraded by default, and I personally feel the use of liquor is degrading. Why can we not provide anti-alcohol centres that are attractive, inviting and beckoning, and provide recreation with an upgrading and moral up-lifting projection? Why cannot recreation without liquor be as exciting and enjoyable as recreation with liquor? The liquor industry uses advertising to weaken the strong and take advantage of the weak. I would suggest that we use advertising to strengthen the weak and enlist the aid of the strong.

Mr. Speaker, in their Report the Committee has quite an extensive section on education and therein point out the great need for a program to inform the people of the hazards in the use and abuse of alcohol.

I am in complete agreement. One of our greater faults is the almost total lack of alcohol education. We do carry on a rehabilitation program of a type, but in many cases we are already too late. When we think of an education program, just what do we foresee? I see, Mr. Speaker, a classroom oriented presentation in a lecture and slide-setting. This may be good, but that does not go far enough. I believe we would be presenting a case of “do as I say” – “not as I do”. We would be leaving ourselves open to criticism of a double standard of living – one for me and another for you. We are already criticized for this, especially by our young people. I believe we must become involved on a personal basis. We have often

heard it said 'education is everybody's business'. If we accept that premise, then let us join in the crusade. If we really believe that alcohol abuse is one of Saskatchewan's major public health programs, let us stand up and be counted as supporters of an educational program that points out the effects and dangers in the use of the alcohol, and more especially in the abuse of the use of alcoholic beverages.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that our greatest potential, and most effective method of education, in this regard, is personal example. I urge our adult population to accept the challenge of personal example, starting in our home and continuing in our daily surroundings, whether it be in the office, business group, social gatherings, licensed premises, or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for refraining from calling me to order. Quite possibly I have strayed from the topic under discussion.

The Committee Report includes a number of recommendations. With a good number of them I agree, but with several others I cannot agree. At this time I will point out some of the ones with which I cannot agree:

1. A number of outlets where alcoholic beverages may be sold should not be increased, except in very isolated cases.
2. Independent grocery stores should not be allowed to sell liquor of any kind.
3. The purchase and delivery by taxi drivers should not be permitted.
4. Licensed premises should not be allowed to extend to side-walk cafes and patios.
5. Minors should all be treated the same – marriages should not alter their status in this regard, nor should parents expect special privileges for their children in licensed dining rooms.
6. Consumption of alcoholic beverages in vehicles should not be allowed. Recommendation 34 of the Report is just not feasible.
7. Sporting events, parks, camp sites and picnic sites should be out of bounds.
8. Permits for outlets at universities should not be granted. If this should happen it would be difficult to determine what other educational institutions should be granted the same privilege.
9. Special occasion permits for Sunday should not be granted under any circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, you must surely realize by now that I am opposed to any further relaxation of our liquor laws and also to the easing of the availability of alcoholic beverages.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Committee on the splendid job they have done on such a controversial problem. In my opinion, the Chairman of the Committee, the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris), deserves special thanks. His ingenuity and his patience must have been severely taxed on many occasions. His comments when presenting the Report to this Assembly were representative of the facts and feelings gathered during the hearings throughout the province. I compliment him for his unbiased presentation.

It is not surprising that several members of the Committee

have added reservations to the Report. They have taken the lead in which I hope will be a thorough discussion of the pros and cons of all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan, by many residents of our province as presented to them in this well done Report.

I will agree to receive this Report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. W. Engel: — (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) Mr. Speaker, I'd like to enter this debate this morning and I think the debate indicates the value of this Liquor Report and the value of the study that the Committee has made. I appreciate the diligent work they have put into it and the figures they have given us, but somehow in society today we have the implication that if you remain silent, this means that you agree, or that you consent to everything that is in the Report. Therefore, I should like to just make a few comments.

As I already mentioned, the statistics and the information that are made available and the way they are catalogued in this Report, will be a very useful document and I think will add much to further debate and further study on this problem of liquor in our society.

The one thing that really stirred me when I read this, and I think maybe why I am involved in this debate here today, is the statistics that 86 per cent of our high school young people are drinkers. If our young people consume some alcohol at that early age, we really have a problem on our hands, and as leaders in society I think we have to take strong stands on this problem of the use of alcohol. Maybe we should have a second look at some legislation we passed last year on reducing or lowering the age of majority and these are questions that I should like to raise at this time.

The one point and the one area that the Committee studied and that I feel was really good, and that's on the level of the alcohol blood level and the tests that are made. I think that the recommendation possibly should have been at .05 per cent, rather than raising it to .06 per cent. If you look at the graph inability to control an automobile appears with just that .01 per cent more alcohol in the blood content. This is a recommendation that should be acted on very soon. I would encourage that kind of an action now.

The breathalyzer when used to police the use of alcohol, as I previously mentioned in the debate on the Highway Traffic Safety Committee isn't that effective. I think we should encourage and we should educate the public that the breathalyzer should be used to help a person to help himself, rather than to be used as a policing device. And, therefore, I would highly recommend that we make funds available, or we assist places that are selling alcohol to install breathalyzers, so that people can measure the condition they are in. I think this is a valuable part of the Report.

I am not prepared, as many of our speakers have already said today, to go along with relaxing the availability of

April 10, 1973

liquor. And, therefore, I do not agree with some of the recommendations that they make, that liquor should be sold in grocery stores or at recreation facilities or that there should be more outlets. I am definitely against the use of liquor in automobiles.

Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services) made a very good point when he was talking about advertising, so I will not elaborate on that either. I think that the more we advertise, the more the product is shown to people, the more use will be made of it.

While our Business Committee was down at Estevan, we received a very good brief from the Director of the Board there at the Estevan Rehabilitation Centre, at the St. Joseph's Hospital. And I should just like to comment on one of the statements he made to our Committee and that underlines these statistics that 86 per cent of our high school young people are already using alcohol, and that there is a dramatic decrease in the age of confirmed alcoholics. I think this is a serious problem that is affecting our society.

Another point that I should like to make is in reference to the pricing of alcohol. I think that the statistics point out that the wealthier people have alcohol more readily available but I think pricing is an effective way to control the use of alcohol.

I will vote to receive the Report. I think there is one comment that should be made and that's from letters we are receiving and I received another one this morning. I should just like to read one line out of it:

The Legislature is now debating changes in our provincial liquor laws. I think the media has given a misinterpretation of our actions here, out in the country.

I have received much correspondence in the past regarding this and just because we are debating this Liquor Report, and because the studies that are here, does not say that we at the present time are debating changes in the liquor laws. I should like to make my stand very clear in that aspect that I am not in favor of supporting the relaxing of liquor laws. So, therefore, I would suggest that we should stand 'pat' on where we are now until the recommendations are brought in by the Highway Safety Committee that has been established to look into the effect of the liquor laws in Saskatchewan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. F. Gardner: — (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, I should like first to add my remarks to those who commended the Chairman and the staff of this particular Committee for the work that they have done. I was a member of the Committee. I consider the subject of the Committee extremely important. I should like to say that in my opinion everyone who appeared before the Committee had a fair hearing. I believe that all briefs and opinions were given complete consideration and I think that it is a problem that needed a very comprehensive consideration. I might add also my comment that there was very good association amongst the members, certainly not political. I believe that all members worked hard

and were sincere in their deliberation and were conscientious.

I don't agree with some Members, some of my colleagues on this side of the House, who are suggesting that perhaps the Committee overextended themselves in some ways. I don't believe this.

I certainly may criticize Government spending in many instances and I plan on doing this, but because of the importance of the alcohol problem, I don't criticize the cost of this Committee or the activities of this Committee in any way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — I might say also, that my own opinions on the problem changed considerably during the life of the Committee. I started out, as many members perhaps did, saying that we should be responsive to what people want; should as much as possible let people do as they like in this regard, but after studying the problems and seeing first-hand what was involved, I decided that we should do all that we could to limit consumption and that we should do all that we could to limit consumption and one point became very clear to me from the research and from my own observation, that the more consumption you have, the more problems are created.

I might say at this time that I appreciate the remarks of Members not on the Committee. I am interested in their remarks and I listened closely to their comments. However, I must say that I can't be quite as impressed by them as I would be by Members of the Committee.

It is quite easy to thumb through the Report and to say that I oppose this and I oppose this and I agree with that. But decisions that were made after a very thorough study of all aspects of alcohol and a thorough study was made, would perhaps be more reliable. I mention again that my ideas were changed considerably during the work of the Committee.

Initially I thought that we could open up the use of alcohol, the number of outlets, hours and this type of thing, and that perhaps a good education program would control consumption. Now I'm not too sure. We know that increased facilities, increased hours, will mean increased consumption, and we also know from the study of the Committee that increased consumption leads directly to increases in alcoholism and the problems involved.

Now, we think but we are not sure, that we can control some of these problems and consumption by education, by a good education program in the news media and other methods, through the schools, but we are not sure of it. Nobody is really sure of that point, and I don't think we can take that chance. I don't think that we can say, "Let's lower the drinking age, let's increase the facilities; increase the hours, and then we are going to put on a massive education program to look after this". I don't think it is a chance that we can take. The results would be too terrible if this type of a program didn't work.

I might say also that we looked at a mass of research, we talked to very knowledgeable people, but the research was often inadequate and it was often contradictory. People who had

April 10, 1973

spent many years in the field couldn't completely agree on what an education program would do, on the types of rehabilitation and so on. In my opinion most of the people who appeared before the Committee and wanted it opened up, had ulterior motives of some sort. They were interested in some sort of personal gain that would accrue to them. Those who opposed liberalization of liquor laws did so from their own conscience.

I might say also that we had a lot of people who used the argument that people are going to drink anyway. Young people are going to get it anyway, therefore we should lower the age, therefore we should make it more available to them. That we should let them drink whatever they like. But I didn't agree with them. I think it is something like robbing banks, you can say that people rob banks everyday, therefore we should make it easier for them or we should make it legal. And just because they are going to do it anyway, to me, is not an argument of why we should make it easier for them to do. Everyone, of course, favors more education and better rehabilitation facilities. As I said before, this may or may not be the answer. We must somehow control consumption or decrease consumption. Different people have mentioned prohibition and the favorite saying, of course, is that prohibition was tried and it didn't work. Of course, what we have now doesn't work either and I am not advocating prohibition but I would just like to bring to your attention that you may criticize what happened during prohibition but if you look at the statistics you will see that the problems involved even though they are well publicized, bootlegging and this type of tying, the problems weren't nearly as great as the problems that we face with the system that we have now.

I don't agree, for example, in the Report with the estimated costs of the alcohol problem on page 18. If you look at these figures, I think that the cost is actually much higher. It is impossible actually to determine the cost. The cost of policing, for example. How do we know what percentage of the time of law enforcement officers is taken up with this particular problem. It hasn't been properly accounted for in the estimate of the cost that was made. I would suggest that the figure should be very much higher.

I might say on page 76 of the Report, we suggested a warning be put on bottles and cartons. I am surprised that among all of the people who were speaking no one has mentioned this. I thought this was something that everyone would pick up, the Press would pick up. It may be a bit spectacular but I believe that it should be thoroughly considered. The warning says that alcohol is a drug, prolonged, excessive use may cause impotence, liver damage, brain damage and premature death. Now this is pretty severe language. This would shock people if they saw it on a beer case or on the bottles but perhaps this is the type of thing we should be doing. If we brought this to people's attention on a regular basis perhaps it would be listened to.

I might say also that I consider myself one of the more moderate members of the Committee and I back this up by the reservations that I have made. I listed some seven reservations and this is perhaps as many as all other 11 members on the Committee combined. I make no apology for wanting restricted facilities. I might say that I have had some criticism from people in my area and in hotels and this type of thing, but this is something that I would have to put up with. I tried

not to oppose recommendations that may improve service to the public but would not increase consumption. This is a pretty fine line. You would have to study this very carefully. An example of this would be special liquor vendors in small towns. Now this I favor, I didn't put in a reservation, because in my opinion this doesn't increase consumption. It makes liquor available to people in a manner the same whether they live in a small town or a large town. In talking to people in my area where liquor vendors have been put in, among these are people that drink and don't drink and all shades of people, I find no strong objection. Many of the fellows I talked to who are drinkers say, "We can get a bottle and take it home. We used to get into more trouble going down to the next town and buying a bottle and drinking on our way home in the car. Now we can go and get it and go home". Ladies have the same impression, they say now, "If my husband wants to drink he can go and get a bottle and bring it home", and they don't have to worry about him taking off for the next town to buy a bottle. So I feel that liquor vendors are not going to increase the problem in a small town.

Entertainment in food and beverage rooms is another example perhaps of a service to the public that won't increase consumption. Perhaps it may even decrease consumption. If people were allowed to dance or sing in a beverage room and have food, food bars, hamburgers and this type of thing, perhaps in the three hours that they are in that particular outlet they would actually consume less than they would if entertainment and food were not available.

We also recommended, for example, a greater wine selection. Again I believe that something like this could increase the service to the public and I am not too sure that it would increase the overall consumption of alcohol. Again it may decrease if people could get the type of wine they prefer, they could sit and enjoy it rather than drinking hard liquor or something else.

We also recommended, for example, the possibility of allowing some sort of license in nursing homes. Again there is perhaps some merit in this. These are older people who don't have the opportunity of getting out. They are at an age where their drinking patterns and standards are set, I don't think we are going to cause alcoholics by allowing senior citizens to have a drink before supper or something of this nature in nursing homes. This is the type of thing that I would support.

There are some recommendations that I have mixed feelings on, for example the one on interdiction. We had a fair bit of representation to the Committee that interdiction was not successful. I don't know whether this is correct or not. I personally know of cases where it has been beneficial, just the fact that the person knew he was on a list and it was added influence on him to stay away from the outlet and actually to help in rehabilitating himself. So this would be one case I believe we should take a very close look at. I am not too sure whether it is beneficial or not.

As far as the longer hours that we recommend in the interim report in the outlets and liquor stores, where liquor stores are concerned, again I have mixed feelings. You can argue that you can prevent bootleggers if you have the liquor store open longer but you may increase the availability and increase the problems involved.

April 10, 1973

In the interim report you might have noticed that we advocated greater control over age limits in beverage rooms and in my opinion this has not been done. I would suggest to the Members of the Legislature here that you could go down town or around this city on Friday night or Saturday night and find literally hundreds, not one or two cases, but hundreds of people under 18 years of age in the beverage rooms in this city in one particular night. I don't fault the police that much, this is an onerous duty to check them, perhaps we need some sort of special people from the Liquor Board or the Liquor Commission who could have the job of policing this, checking the outlets and checking the beverage room owners. I believe that they are chiefly responsible. I believe the onus should be largely on the beverage room owner. I don't blame the young people that much as other people are going and they may take a chance. But cards are now available, the beverage room owner has no excuse for letting people in there under 18. The reason they do it is of course to increase their business. The young people get to know this. If you talk to young people in rural areas you will hear them say, well let's go to such and such a town tonight because they don't really check us that close over there whereas if we go here or someplace else the owner is a little more severe and checks a little closer. So they know the places where they can get in without being checked and this is what is going on. I think they should have special inspectors for this and we should not hesitate to close down any operator for a certain period of time if he persists in these infractions.

Some of the people mentioned the noise in beverage rooms and I would agree with them to some extent. I might point out that this seems to be a chronic problem. The proprietors of course are more interested in drinkers than eaters. The Member from Albert Part (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned stomping out of a place because he couldn't stand the noise but for everyone like him that stomps out, four or five young ones stomp in and don't mind that noise and sit there for the evening. Perhaps the hypnotic effect of this highly amplified music may actually increase their sales of alcohol otherwise I don't really now why they would insist on this high noise level.

I might say also that I am against advertising and I must disagree with my own colleagues and the other Members who favored advertising. I don't believe that the CRTC rules regarding advertising are adhered to the way they should be. We saw examples of advertising where it was supposed to be only promoting a certain brand. It was not to be associated with sports or young people or this type of thing and still you see two or three young people in a boat and drinking beer. This is supposed to be the good life and certainly the CRTC's rules are being flaunted by the media people as far as advertising is concerned. I don't see any useful purpose in it and I believe that the problem of alcoholism is so severe that we can't chance the extra consumption just to provide business for our local people. Now I agree that some of our rural newspapers and perhaps some of our smaller radio stations would greatly benefit by this advertising, perhaps we should be looking at some way to help them, but I don't think the way to help them is to promote the sale of beverages.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about the obsolescent hotels that are mentioned in the Report. No one else has mentioned this but as far as I am concerned I feel this is a very important aspect in the province. It has got really

nothing to do with whether you are for or against increasing the outlets, but it does have to do with liquor licensing. I think the Government should take a very close look at the problem in rural Saskatchewan. If you look at the figures you will find that about 100 hotels in Saskatchewan change hands every year. They are sold from one person to the other. Almost no new hotels are ever built in Saskatchewan, and if you check with the Liquor Licensing Commission you will find that there has been only perhaps four or five new hotels in the past three years. Of course the reason they are not being built is simply due to Government regulations and it has nothing to do with any particular government because it has been going on for 20 years or 30 years. But really if you look at the situation you will find that it is really the regulations that we have that are denying the people in rural Saskatchewan, in particular, but also the cities, the possibility of having a new hotel in their town.

We find new filling stations are being built, stores in small towns even some small towns that are not advancing that fast, but no new hotels are built. The reason is that in order to get any type of a hotel in Saskatchewan today you have to pay a very large amount of money. Really you are paying it for nothing. You get an old building that is often 40 or 50 years old, what you are buying is the license. If you look at the ads in the paper everyday under hotels for sale, you will see that they don't describe the hotel, the size of the town or the location, they don't say that it is a brick building and that it is only 12 years old or that it has so many rooms. All they say is the last year's liquor sales were \$96,000, therefore, we want \$120,000 for this hotel. If you look down farther you will see gross sales \$200,000, sale price \$180,000 or something like this. The sale price has got nothing to do with the structure, the value of the structure, what they are selling is simply the liquor license that is granted to them by this Government or any government. I know the problem is rather severe. I have talked to a number of hotel owners, people for example will tell you that he has paid \$75,000 for this place and he knows that it is only worth \$15,000 or \$20,000 for the actual building but he wanted to be in the hotel business. He made a very substantial payment and has, of course, no money after paying that \$75,000 for the place and can't afford to rebuild. He can hardly afford to renovate.

Even renovations are not the answer. I know the Liquor Licensing Commission will say, "Well, we demand certain standards, we make the fellow do this and fix up his lighting and the décor inside". The building of hotels in rural Saskatchewan would be a great service to the rural community. It would stimulate the building in the province, of course, and I think that some sort of a plan could be worked out. I don't know the answer as I say, we need some sort of a policy that would subsidize this replacement. It's a merry-go-round type of thing, one person buys the hotel for \$60,000, two years later he sells it for \$65,000. The next year the fellow sells it for \$70,000 and I don't think it is fair to go in and tell this fellow now, you have to build a new one. I don't think it is fair either to go in and say to some other individual, build a new hotel across the street. Many of them would be glad to do it but then the person who has invested this large amount of money in the old hotel would be stuck. So I think the Government

should take a close look at this and work out some policy whereby new hotels could be built. If you look at the figure you will see that there are just none being built in the province at the moment.

Now as far as the reservations that I have made, Mr. Speaker, I should like to just refer to them rather briefly. I might say that in each case that I made my arguments against these particular recommendations in committee and I was outvoted by them in each case so I don't want anyone to get the idea that I looked at the Report later and picked out several things that I was against and put them down as reservations. In every case I tried to present my arguments in the Committee to not have these recommendations in and in each case they were in in spite of this. Now they are not certainly in order of preferences but one has to do with self-service. I am against that particular recommendation. Not so much that it would increase consumption but I believe that in that particular beverage business people who operate these facilities are well able to hire the type of staff they need and to pay them a good wage and to provide the service that they should in that facility. I don't believe that people who want service should have to stand in line at a crowded bar to get the glass of beverage they want and then have to walk back to some distant table balancing this glass. I just don't think that it is necessary.

Another recommendation, recommendation number 18, on off sale of spirits and wine. We looked at this very, very closely, but the suggestion is of course that this would be sold through a hotel or beverage room and perhaps some surcharge and the surcharge would be designated for a certain purpose.

I would be against this as I believe it would be an unfair advantage in some particular cases as far as the competition in the business is concerned. The person who could well afford it may not mind going to a hotel in a place where there was no vendor and paying the extra price. But the other person wouldn't be able to afford it and would perhaps have to drive to another town. I just don't think that it is the type of recommendation that would be useful.

Recommendation 21 – minors in the company of parents. I have reservations about this because of the undesirable influence it may have on other minor patrons in a place where drinking was taking place. You may say that parents should have the privilege of serving wine, perhaps, to their children when they are eating out and that this should be up to the parents. But the problem is that at the next table there may be parents with children of 8, 10 or 12 years of age, and they look over and see other children having it made available to them and they may think it is the acceptable thing to do and it may be a bad influence on them. So I am against this.

Some of the Members have mentioned recommendation 23, which has to do with sport events and I have certainly reservations regarding this. I don't believe that it is a good idea to encourage the association of liquor with sports and some may argue that they are doing it anyway. They carry it in a pop bottle or something of this nature, but I still don't think this is an argument for making it legal.

Recommendation 27 has to do with private bills. The suggestion here was that the owner of the private hall should be

able to get a licence whereby he could provide liquor to groups, weddings, or a group that is having some function in his hall. I would be against this. I think the control would be lost and the present situation, if it is a wedding or some club function, some member of the family or that club is responsible for seeing that the liquor is handled in a proper manner. Certainly that individual has no profit motive, whereby the person who owns the hall would have and he could be promoting the sale of liquor and we would have the problem also, of course, of him storing the supply of liquor in a hall out of the city someplace where there isn't staff available all the time and this could lead to problems.

Recommendation 34 – transportation, consumption of beverage alcohol in vehicles. This has been mentioned before and, of course, I am also against this. We did have some representations, strangely enough, from some police departments suggesting it. But when you look at all of the aspects of it, to me it is just not feasible. I could foresee the possibility whereby a person could simply park his car on the main street of a town on a Saturday night and invite his friends in for a drink. He could have the bottle and mix there and he would have, in effect, a mobile bar. I would just be against this type of thing. I think it could lead to many, many problems.

Recommendation 35 – consumption in park, camp site or picnic sites and, of course, the reasoning is much the same as far as I am concerned. You are influencing other people who are at that place and maybe there is some argument to say that if I want to go on a picnic why am I denied the right to drink a bottle of beer with my ham sandwich. But what about the other people who are picnicking maybe eight or ten feet from you, young people perhaps, who haven't been associated with drinking and perhaps this would be an influence on them.

The work of the Committee, Mr. Speaker, I believe has made the public more aware of the problems. And regardless of what the recommendations are, whether you agree with them or not, I think the fact that it has been brought before the public that this alone could justify the existence and the expense of this particular Committee.

I might say again, that those promoting liberalization, were well organized and well financed and came with well prepared briefs, people who are articulate, who could explain what they wanted. And as I said, most of these were motivated by some sort of self-interest.

Those for moderation were not well organized. We had people come before the Committee who couldn't really explain too well what they wanted, but you could see that they were concerned. They were mostly individuals. They took time to write and to express their concern, and I should like to commend them for this. We are still getting letters from people who see what is going on. These are men or women, old people, young people, throughout the province who still write in to the Committee and express their concern.

I hope that someone will take time to listen to them. I would hope that the Government will encourage the distribution of this Report throughout the province as early as possible to stimulate study and thought on the problems of alcoholism.

April 10, 1973

I might comment also that I personally feel that the Report deserves better Press and media coverage than it has received to date. It was unfortunate that through some accidental happening that the draft of the Report was made available earlier than was anticipated. This seemed to stifle the type of press, the type of reporting that we should have gotten on it. I might say, also, that I regret the fact that all of the Committee members were not invited to the Press conference when the Report was made public. I would say that I hope that some of the very important observations in the Report are not lost in the very large mass of material and we have heard many people speak on this. I would hope that the pertinent parts of the Report are not lost.

I am sure there are still Members on both sides of the House who would like to express their opinions on this Report and so at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Interim Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) that the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms be now received.

Mr. J. G. Lane: — (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Members of the Government side of the House on the Committee in extending our thanks to the staff who assisted the Committee in extending our thanks to the staff who assisted the Committee through its deliberations. We should like to extend special thanks to both Merry Harbotle and Al Virtue who has seen fit to resign as research officer for the Committee which was very unfortunate.

We had some comments by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Friday afternoon, and I think at the outset the review of the reservations of the Opposition Members of the Legislative Committee make it quite clear that the objections of the Opposition Members were with the failure of the Government to listen to the Committee and not with the actions of the Committee itself.

Now, however, that Government Members opposite have seen fit to draw the Committee into the political arena, it is with a great deal of pleasure that we join the debate.

The chairman of the Business Committee accused myself of supporting the Committee system as he referred to the debate on the compulsory marketing commission. Obviously through a lack of attention or ignorance he failed to listen to the fact that my comments were merely repetition of speeches made by Government Members on the advantages and the disadvantages of the Committee. The very debate which the chairman referred to was an indication that the Government is playing politics with the committee system. Since the Foreign Ownership Committee, politics has been the guideline of the Government when it came to the committee system. The Government is extremely selective

about what topics it forwards to a committee.

The Foreign Ownership Committee was nothing more than an attempt by the Government to hide a stupid and unnecessary piece of legislation. And the Foreign Ownership Committee was set up by the Government merely to try and hide and cover up its own political mistakes.

The failure of the Government opposite to have a committee to study marketing commissions, which is a considerably more vital issue than that of foreign ownership, was direct proof that the Government opposite is playing politics with the committee system. The Government only selects for committees those topics which may be controversial and which were stirred up by the Government itself.

The chairman is guilty of rank hypocrisy when he attempts to portray the Opposition Members as the only ones who play politics in the committees. We failed to see that the legislating of such an Act as an Act to Establish the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, with the power to close down any business for five days would not be of interest to the business community. Any attempts by Government Members to state or imply otherwise is indicative of the Government's attitude towards business.

The chairman's attempts to state that the discussion of the power to close down any business for five days was playing politics is an example of his continuing efforts to downplay and cover up controversial Government legislation.

As I say, our reservations were solely with the actions of the Government opposite in failing to listen to the legitimate voices of the business community as they were heard before the Business Committee.

Our criticisms were with the Government's actions in arrogantly and arbitrarily telling the business community what the priorities were without regard to the real concerns of the business community as stated by the business community itself.

Government Members opposite have now made it quite clear that this Committee is to be brought into the political arena and the choice to do so was solely that of the Government and its Members. We will now show that the Government has extended its political activities to the Business Committee and we will also show that the chairman and Government Members of the Committee played partisan politics and were merely puppets of the Premier of Saskatchewan. And we will start by referral to the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance.

He stated, in his Budget Speech, that one of the high priorities that had become obvious to the Business Committee was the need for business reps. He repeats this and he says:

Although the Committee has not yet presented its report, we believe that immediate action is required to assist the businessmen of this province.

We ask the Government Members opposite on the Business Committee, how did the Minister of Finance know what was presented by the Committee unless you took the transcripts to him; you reported to him on a regular basis, obviously playing politics. And then

April 10, 1973

you decide and let the Minister of Finance or the Premier's office decide which ones you want to pick out of there.

There is no doubt that the Government Members are as I say guilty of rank hypocrisy when it comes to allegations of politics.

The briefs which have been presented to the special Committee on Business identified several basic improvements which were required to enable the businessmen of this province to develop and expand his operations. Again, one of the most frequent requests is for management advice for consultative services and nowhere in the reservations is there any objection to that. There are objections to your choice and the Committee members on your side obviously had something to do with it. Your choice in pulling that priority out and ignoring the very people whom you say you came to hear or what to hear in the Business Committee.

As a matter of fact the chairman has admitted in the Leader-Post of March 28, 1973, that the two Liberal Members might be partly right in stating the need for consultative services was not the top priority. As a Committee member himself, he said he would not consider them a priority and that the Committee Report had not listed them as such.

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 to 2:30 o'clock.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D. F. MacDonald: — (Moose Jaw North) Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to this Assembly and to yourself a group of students sitting in the east gallery, 52 students from Grade Five from Palliser Heights School. They are accompanied by two teachers Mrs. Wood and Mrs. Ayerst. I am especially happy this afternoon to have the group with us. My son is one of the students and I am very pleased to have them here today. The group has had a busy morning. They have been to see the RCMP, the museum and apparently toured through the park and they even stopped to see Mr. Diefenbaker's homestead.

I think they are a very alert group and appreciative group. I think evidence of this was the cement by a group of young boys who explained to me that they were very envious of me being able to work in the Legislative Buildings with all the beautiful girls around. They were of course, referring to the guides in the building and I think that most of us will concur in the observation of the attractiveness of these girls. I hope that the group will find the proceedings very interesting this afternoon and will develop an awareness of the Parliamentary procedure. I will be very happy to meet with them at 3:00 o'clock.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Tabling of Dental Committee's Report

Hon. W. E. Smishek: — (Minister of Public Health) Mr. Speaker, several days ago I advised the Members of the House that the Advisory Committee on Dental Care for

Children had completed its studies and that I expected the Report to be in my hands within a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, our officials have had time to reprint copies of this Report. I am pleased to see that the Committee concurs in the broad principles of the Dental Care Program for Children as originally contained in the Departmental proposals, which were released some time ago. The Committee's Report also supports the concept of using dental nurses in the Dental Care Plan.

I want to publicly acknowledge my thanks to the members of the Advisory Committee. It was a Committee of six members under the chairmanship of Dr. Jack Paynter, Dean of the College of Dentistry.

I want to thank them for the fine work they have done and the speed with which the Committee proceeded with delivering its Report.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table for the Legislature the Report of the Saskatchewan Advisory Committee on Dental Care for Children.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, before we carry on proceedings for this afternoon I want to, through you Sir, introduce a group of students in the gallery in front of me here, on behalf of my seatmate the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) a group of Grade 12 students from Avonlea, with their teacher Mr. McKellar. On behalf of my seatmate, the Member for that area, I want to welcome them here and hope that you do have an enjoyable time of it here and a safe trip back home. Come back again sometime.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I began the debate this morning. There were allegations of the Members opposite on the Business Committee that the Liberals had played politics on the Business Committee and had taken politics into the deliberations of the Business Committee. We had referred to the reservations to the Interim Report of the Special Committee on Business Firms and it was made quite clear by the Opposition Members that our objections were to the arrogant way in which the Government ignored the business community that had appeared before the Committee. How the Government had ignored legitimate concerns that had been set out to the Committee and the chairman of the Committee had listed those concerns and made it quite clear that we, in our reservations, had merely repeated what was in the Interim Report. All of which is quite correct. Our objection was that Members opposite saw fit to take the deliberations of the Committee to either the Premier or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley), give him the information that came before the Committee and then allowed, or recommended to the Minister of Finance, what the priority should be that the Government should speak about in the Budget Speech.

April 10, 1973

It was an unfortunate situation that Members opposite did take that approach.

Again, our criticisms were with the Government arbitrarily telling the business community (not asking – telling) what the priorities were without regard to the real concerns of the business community as stated by the business community itself.

But it was the Members opposite who last Friday afternoon brought the Business Committee into the political arena and the choice to bring that Business Committee into the political arena was solely that of the chairman and members of the Committee. As I say, we will now attempt to show that the Government has extended its political activities into the Business Committee and we will also show that the chairman and Government Members of the Committee played partisan politics and merely were puppets of the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Blakeney).

We have referred to the remarks of the Minister of Finance when he misinterpreted deliberately, or otherwise, the priorities of the Committee as had been set out, and which were repeated Friday afternoon by the chairman. We have an admission from the chairman that the Opposition Members were quite correct and that he wouldn't have put the high priority to it that the Minister of Finance did, and I am referring to the Leader-Post of March 28, 1973. But let's look at the priority as chosen by the Minister of Finance and he said:

One of the most frequent requests is for management advice and consultative service.

He goes on:

You will be asked to provide funds for program additions to Business Assistance Branch. A field organization will be established to provide consultative services on a regional basis. The field representative will provide the necessary link between the department and the business community, establishing communications on a two-way basis.

But let's look and find out really what the Members opposite were doing with that, because it was stated in the Committee. Let's go back to the New Deal for People, the NDP program set out prior to the last election, which has been held aloft in the House on many occasions. Let's look under the heading 'Small Business', and it's quite clearly stated:

That the NDP intends to appoint business reps to provide technical services and information.

In other words, the Members opposite had the nerve and the gall to play partisan politics with the Business Committee and try to legitimize the Party platform by tying it into the Business Committee. Cheap politics is what was played by the chairman and members of the Committee.

But the Members opposite went further. They became mere puppets of the Premier's office when his long clutches reached into the Business Committee and squeezed out of the Government Committee members any credibility that they have had.

In 1973 the NDP campaign in the Federal election referred

to by the chairman, was more or less a non-campaign. The role for the NDP in Saskatchewan was, don't stir anything up, let's hold what we've got. NDP candidates spoke at very few public meetings. The Premier spread half-truths throughout Eastern Canada, but he didn't speak in Saskatchewan. The reason was very simple – the Government opposite was in political trouble over its Foreign Ownership Bill – its Foreign Ownership proposed legislation and they didn't want anything stirred up. But this campaign strategy and these campaign tactics were taken right to the Business Committee itself.

The Committee began its hearings with two very, very successful meetings in Saskatoon and Regina and it became extremely obvious and very obvious that these meetings were too successful and were too good a forum for the Opposition and for members of the public. Complaints about the 'hours of work legislation' and the need for 'financing assistance' became very clear in these first two meetings, but because of the criticisms that were building up about Government legislation and complaints about lack of Government assistance, the Premier decided to cancel further meetings while the Federal election was on. The decision to end a series of successful meetings was an arbitrary one, designed to stop public criticism of the Government, designed to stop public criticism of Government legislation and designed to stop criticism of the Government's failure to act.

The chairman admitted last Friday that we, on the Committee, had agreed on a schedule; that the advertising was scheduled to be released and he goes further to state and I quote:

And I called in, and I was informed that I had one-half day or so to decide whether we were going to cancel the advertising or not.

Who called him in? Who informed him? Who told him? We know very well who told him, who called him and who informed him, that those Committee meetings were to be cancelled and it was all part of the NDP strategy for the last election. The chairman of this Committee accuses the Liberals of playing cheap partisan politics on the Committee when he himself under direct orders of the Premier cancelled very successful meetings and cancelled the public forums and the opportunities the business community had.

The chairman has admitted in his speech of Friday that he was too soft. There is no doubt but the chairman was too soft when he failed to stand up to the Premier of Saskatchewan and failed to demand that the Committee meetings continue in spite of the Federal election, he failed to do so and he backed down under the onslaught of NDP campaign strategy which as I said went right into the Business Committee. The chairman played cheap partisan politics and did not have the political courage to continue with the meetings during the Federal election, notwithstanding that he is an elected Member of the Saskatchewan Legislature. His first priority should be provincial matters and not a Federal election. The result of the chairman's actions was that the Committee meetings were poorly attended from then on and when they eventually resumed the blame for the poor attendance is strictly on the shoulders of the chairman. He must take the blame for ending this forum. He must therefore take the blame himself for failing to give the business community a chance to air their problems at a time convenient to themselves and he did it under direct orders from the Premier.

April 10, 1973

He bowed as he was summoned to the tribunal and the results were poorly attended Committee meetings from the date of resumption. When it became obvious to the Opposition members that the Committee meetings were becoming very poorly attended that it was a waste of the taxpayers' money to have two members when one was sufficient. Only one went to ensure that the political practices of the Members opposite did not become too blatant. The chairman has admitted that he became a puppet of the Premier and jumped when the strings were pulled. He was too soft in the face of his own leader's orders and too soft in the face of his Party's campaign policy.

In making the decision the chairman destroyed his own credibility as being concerned with the business and destroyed the effectiveness of the Business Committee. The action and the admission that he acted under instructions and of bringing this Committee into the political arena has prejudiced this ability as chairman and has prejudiced his position as such and he should resign his position as chairman. The sincerity he tried to portray on Friday was a false hypocritical portrayal.

We are now, Mr. Speaker, going to spend some time on the accusation of the Members opposite that the Liberals were playing politics. I am going to take them in order and I hope the Members opposite do not feel slighted if they are not first or second. We are going to start with the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins). Members opposite have accused the Liberals of playing politics by advising members who appeared before the Business Committee of Government legislation which allows the Government to close down any business for a period of five days. It was wrong for the Liberals to bring this legislation, it was politics to bring this legislation before the Committee. That's what we were accused of, but let's look at what the Members opposite did during the Committee. As I say, I am going first of all to refer to the Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins). One of the big issues that came before the Committee and one of the first objections that the public had to Government legislation was the hours of work legislation.

On September 25, 1972 at the Regina meeting, the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre started the Practice of advising those who appeared before the Committee of changes in Government legislation. He started to advise members who appeared before the Committee that they could obtain exemptions to existing Government legislation, exemptions which were not public knowledge and in the appearance by Mr. Gerrard, as I say, page 151 of the Regina meeting, September 25, Mr. Robbins question was, "You haven't made application for an exemption"? He goes on further:

I think you can get exemptions from that rule.

He goes on further as discussion continues:

There is an exemption rule, you know. If it is followed up again, I don't know why you should have to follow it up.

He goes on on the following page discussing exemptions to hours of work legislation. Well there is an answer, providing you can get that exemption and it is supposed to be there. There are people getting that exemption. Why is it wrong for the

Liberals to bring Government legislation before the Committee, but so right and proper for Government Members to do the same thing?

We then had the question of business reps. Supposedly a high priority by the business community, if we listen to the Minister of Finance. But we find out that the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre is referring to business reps in September of 1972, September 25th. Before an appearance by Mr. Claxton and I'm going to quote words of the Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre. He mentioned the fact to Mr. Claxton:

It would be wise and of value if we could get assistance to people starting in business because of the complexities of regulations, etc., etc.

And I'm quoting:

It is the intention of the Department of Industry and Commerce to set up a business rep service something like an ag rep service currently in effect in the Department of Agriculture.

Obviously, stating Government intentions, Government programs and making this a forum for dissemination of Government information.

We have other examples. On page 148, sorry page 11 of the Saskatoon meeting. Here is a statement again by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre:

Are the people here fully aware of what the intent is?

The intent was to establish business representatives of the Department of Industry and Commerce, similar to ag reps, the way they are stationed around the province so that you wouldn't always have to be running to Regina. Presumably this person would have enough information and would be a competent enough individual so that you could contact him and get some answers, or at least he could get the answers fairly quickly. Again, he was reiterating his statement of Government policy and practice. Not only that, he stated it, and it became a matter of policy, notwithstanding the immediate next line, quoting from the transcript:

Mr. Jennings: May I say something on that, I was at the meeting in Regina on that and I would like to see that go slowly.

He made other representations at various other meetings around. We can certainly spend the time going through them all. I can refer to one at Swift Current, specifically page 7 if you want it read. There is no doubt that the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre, by the criteria of the chairman, was playing cheap, partisan politics in this Committee, because those are his statements and that's what the chairman has said.

Throughout that Committee, the Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre constantly reminded people of the distinction between Federal and Provincial, so that the Government would get no criticism of Federal Government programs.

But he went further to show how far he was going to go to

defend the actions of the Government. He went on record as stating, categorically, that Alberta would be having a sales tax. He promised that sales tax for Alberta every time there was criticism of the provincial sales tax, and he reiterated that on several occasions in the Committee hearings. I am going to refer, for the evidence, and read into the record of this House a statement at the Lloydminster meeting. Page 61 for the reference of the Member and he is referring to tax rates. He says:

36 in Alberta, 37 points in Saskatchewan on top of the Federal rate. Alberta's has gone up fairly recently (defending the provincial position). Just like their sales tax is coming.

That statement was made on more than one occasion. That's the type of practice that was followed on this Committee and you accused the Liberals of playing politics.

We can now go to the Member from Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker). We have several statements throughout the Committee on his particular bias with regard to local preference and I refer in particular.

An Hon. Member: — What did . . .

Mr. Lane: — I am not talking about comments, I am talking about speeches that were made. He went on for about a page, page 12 of the Regina meeting, September 15, 1972, where he gave a very long speech about how he stands on local preference. E didn't listen to what the business man said. That particular Committee member gave his opinion, his impressions. I am not saying I agree or disagree with local preference but the issue here is who plays politics with this particular Committee.

We had many speeches from the Member from Regina Wascana made on Monday closing, these speeches ran throughout the Committee meetings and his particular stand on Monday closing. But he, too, told what the Government legislation was going to be when we turn to the Saskatoon meeting. Page 11, where he states with regard to the matter of business reps.

What I think we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, and I think this has been brought out at each meeting that the idea of course is to have business representatives under the department looking after this sort of thing. You would have greater communication and so forth. I think the idea is that we are recommending, and it will be done, and I think it has been pretty well planned already. I think Saskatoon should have representation, no question.

That from the Member from Regina Wascana who was on the Committee. I ask did the chairman recommend that to Cabinet prior to the Budget Speech without going through the usual committee procedures?

We then turn to the Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) who made several speeches on rail line abandonment which was purely political and purely attempting to take advantage of a political issue. I am going to refer again to the Regina meeting on page 53.

An Hon. Member: — We'll take it as read.

Mr. Lane: — You're not going to take this as read, you are going to sit and listen to it because if you had taken it as read in the first place we wouldn't have had the allegations that the chairman made in this House on Friday afternoon.

Here is what the Member from Gravelbourg has to say:

We are part of a big dilemma and I think the dilemma is going to get larger in the future. Our railway companies are right now advocating rail line abandonment. They claim that by 1974 and up to 1976 and 1977 they want to pull up stakes in more than 500 communities. Of these 500 communities about 200 will literally die and a lot of them are located in your area. There was a map in the Eastern Producer that showed some of the ideas and some of the planning of our railroad companies, Canadian Pacific and Canadian National and it is something that we are all going to be facing.

Notwithstanding that was brought to his attention knowing full well that the Prime Minister shortly before this period of time had said that there will not be any rail line abandonment until after 1975. He insisted on making this statement in this speech at that particular time. It was brought to his attention that the Prime Minister had made that statement. There was no apology for his error, he merely said, "I said 1974 I am sorry I was out one year".

Now we can go to further speeches made and I am going to refer to the Lloydminster meeting, at page 14 where the Member from Gravelbourg showed how non-political Government Members were, how he listened to the business community when he said on brief number 232 in his comments:

You say the Government should have less control in terms of legislation for dealers and yet some dealers are being squashed by parent companies and in that case I would suggest that we had better start bringing more control in for the protecting of dealers and I am talking about machine dealers. Would you favor or would you think there was any rationale in having Government controlling or looking after contracts that save parent companies, Massey Ferguson, John Deere who have to register with the Provincial Government, each contract with each dealer so that if they do squash them out which is happening in my area in the last year where six or seven have been squashed out, do you feel we could get into that area?

That's the approach that was made by Members opposite. They weren't listening to the business community, they were telling the business community and that was evident in the Budget Speech.

The Member from Gravelbourg attacks those who oppose the minimum wage legislation and these are documented throughout the transcript.

We can then turn to the Member from Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) who get involved in this same type of practice.

April 10, 1973

An Hon. Member: — He wasn't even on the Committee.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Dyck, who ever he represents, City Park.

An Hon. Member: — Are you mixed up?

Mr. Lane: — Page 33, if you think I'm mixed up read the transcript and you'll find the evidence piling up beyond your own belief of who was playing politics on the Business Committee.

Now the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Dyck) stated:

If I could interrupt here I think again, SEDCO has changed their policy with respect to retail and service industries. Loans are now available to retail and service types of industry and it doesn't have to be an industrialized operation.

Why is it proper for that Member to advise the public and those who appear before the Committee of Government legislation but it is wrong for us to talk about closing down business for five days. There is no difference in principle and I think the Members know it. He referred to SEDCO again on page 161 of the Regina meeting of September 25th. Just to show the political implications he is asking a Mrs. Norman, "Have you made any contact with SEDCO." And then he states, "Which is a Provincial organization."

An Hon. Member: — What's the matter with that?

Mr. Lane: — Oh, there is nothing wrong with that, but if it is politics for us, it is politics for you people and that is precisely what you were doing on this Committee. You played politics from the day that this Committee started and you kept it up until the day of the last hearing. You went too far when you accuse us of playing politics when you accuse us of playing politics by talking about the Consumer Affairs legislation in closing down any business for five days. Every meeting had an introduction by the staff advising the people of what the new rules, the new Government legislation, the new Government proposals were for SEDCO. Every meeting, a decision made by the chairman that we're going to give this information. I have no objection to giving out information, none whatsoever. But again why is it politics when we do it but not when you do it? There is no difference in principle.

Mr. Mostoway: — Corruption with a capital C.

Mr. Lane: — We will talk about corruption in a minute. We then get into the Kindersley meeting where the Member from Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) gave legislative advice particularly to repair shops, particularly in this industry they are prepared to look very favorably on the exemption from the 40 hour work week because they recognize the fact that particularly during harvest time and spring time seeding, this is after

Government legislation that was not wanted by rural Saskatchewan, was passed, because they recognized the fact that particularly during harvest time and spring seeding time in order to provide service to the farmers you do have to be open eight hours a day and more because time is of the essence to the farmer and he needs some servicing. So I think particularly in that industry they looked very favorably on the exemption from the 40-hour week, in other words extend the number of hours work without overtime pay. He did it again in Saskatoon, he made the promise. There was no request, there was a promise by Government Committee members to have business reps all resulting from the New Deal for People proposed prior to the last election. Not as the Minister of Finance has said did it come from the Business Committee, it came from the New Democratic Party.

But the chairman himself when he has accused us was not above this sort of thing and again he got extremely political. When the Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office (Mr. Romanow) came under attack because of his policy of canceling tendering for wrecked cars, a policy that was on the verge of being ended and there were representations to the Committee by concerned dealers that the policy be continued. So attempts were made by Committee members to have the Government justify this policy decisions to end this practice when all evidence indicated that the practice was a good one. We attempted to get information from SGIO and by and large we were unsuccessful.

Mr. Faris: — Too bad

Mr. Lane: — Too bad, he says. I think it is unfortunate that the Business Committee is not listened to and that attitude is particularly the attitude from the Government opposite when they say, too bad. It was a legitimate concern and a legitimate complaint and they needed an answer. Certainly the Committee did call people from SGIO and they attended but we didn't get answers because those who did appear didn't have any answers. So the questions started about ensuring that we get answers for these people who needed an immediate answer and there was some urgency, so we attempted to get the Minister-in-Charge to give us the policy. And he goes on, on page 129, he starts out his premise:

I would like to resolve this without making a big flash of this, hitting the papers real good and when it has cooled off nobody has to apologize.

Protecting the Minister-in-Charge on a legitimate concern that business men and brought before the Committee. He wasn't above the cheap political approach himself.

At the North Battleford meeting we have evidence on page 12 that the chairman himself gave information on Government programs. Again wrong for us to do it but so, so correct when the Government opposite did it. And there it became very clear that the Government opposite when it distributed Government information, did it on a very regular basis, did it practically every meeting. He goes on:

We really appreciate this because at most of the meetings where SEDCO was mentioned they have said if SEDCO was any good, you know we don't need that kind of

April 10, 1973

help, but perhaps Al (referring to the research officer) could outline SEDCO's terms of reference for your information.

He goes on:

SEDCO has changed its terms of reference since the 1st of August . . .

And the research officer at that point did give the information. But above all we have the statements of the chairman and why his credibility is in question. His statements of Friday afternoon. He gave the example of myself, referring to a question in Lloydminster and he goes on and he quotes verbatim about the question:

Could I raise just one other piece of legislation.

This is a question that I asked and I referred to the Department of Consumer Affairs, "and the power of the Government to close you down for five days and I am referring to the Provincial Government Legislation. Will that have any effect on you?" Now he goes on and we were at that point listening to a very good brief that was presented. He's a manager and he goes on to explain and then he says about my raising the question and he goes on to the answer that was given:

But the answer was really cute and I think the Members will really be interested in the answer (and I am quoting). I am not fully aware of that I am aware of some others that are coming at us from the West.

He thought that was really a cute answer but he made a comment on my question. He said: "I read through the whole Report and none of us made a comment on that, nobody else made a comment on that particular question." But let's look at what the real facts were at the Lloydminster meeting where we have either a deliberate or unintentional misstatement of the truth, because he goes on about the Business Committee and about the Consumer Affairs legislation. He says on page 33, November 14th:

I am going to make one comment on that and I think this is the only reason Mr. Lane brought this item up, that is consumer protection legislation we are talking about jointly administered by the Minister of Consumer Affairs for the province and the Federal Consumer Affairs.

A blatant untruth when we discussed the very thing that he was criticizing Members of this side for. Complete distortion, utter distortion and an utter untruth. He goes on "and for a return he wants to prove that he is a successful attorney he should handle all the cases that come up or we close the business in the province. We will pay for the advertising of these business places, the names, the reasons why they were closed up." He goes on:

I would like to suggest that (it is page 35 for the information of the Member) I haven't run into a business yet that had this Act, that Mr. Lane is suggesting, is one section out of the Consumer Protection Act. This Act is not solely part of Saskatchewan's laws.

That is not true. It is solely part of Saskatchewan's laws. He says:

This is a Dominion Act, (which is not true) and the relationship with the Federal Consumer Protection Act, and Mr. Lane can deny it as long as he likes (and he denies it again today because it was not true).

That is the type of politics that went into the Business Committee.

These were the remarks of the Member on Friday afternoon when he talked about Liberals playing politics with the Business Committee. The statement alone, the untruth or distortion in Lloydminster trying to back pedal and defend Government legislation when Government legislation was under legitimate attack by the business community which he did throughout these hearings, justifies his resignation as chairman. We have only chosen a few examples of Members opposite on the Committee. We make no apologies in the Opposition for bringing Provincial Government legislation to the attention of the business community whether the Government likes it or not. We fail to see how this action constitutes playing politics unless the Members opposite feel that it is wrong for the Opposition to criticize Government legislation.

The rule that members of committees cannot criticize Government legislation is another example of the NDP Government trying to muzzle the Opposition. Government Members of the Business Committee deliberately contributed to these attempts to muzzle us. The action of the Government Members of the Business Committee proved that the committees can be political tool for the Government opposite. It is a very sorry situation when Government Members attempt to state that the role of the Opposition in criticizing the Government is politics. You are usurping the democratic process when you make such a statement.

The Government's attempts at bringing Government legislation to the attention of the people of those affected, the statement that when that is done is wrong, is typical of your arrogant Government's attitude. The statements that bringing Government legislation to the attention of those affected is partisan politics. It's typical of your attitude toward the House and the committee system. You have destroyed the effectiveness of the committee for cheap political gain. You allowed your party campaign strategy to overrule the activities of the committee. You have tried to stop the Opposition from criticizing the Government.

We have had remarks indicating a bias by the Member from Saskatoon City Park. I can go into statements of the Committee about how promises had been made by the Premier on provincial preference and I think that the Members opposite if they want to open up that discussion know exactly of what I speak.

You talk about corporate board rooms and where the Liberals would rather be. We contributed to that Committee and we contributed very well to that Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — But you have now put that

Committee on the verge of destroying that very Committee by your actions. If you want to keep up the cheap partisan political approach, we are prepared to do so. We can carry this debate on for a long, long period of time. But it is you people this afternoon who are going to decide whether or not this partisan political approach is going to continue. Because you are the ones that brought this Committee into the political arena. You're the ones who tried to justify your own campaign platforms attributed to the Business Committee which was wrong and unfair. It was you that brought your Party platform to Business Committee meetings and suggested it throughout this province. Which was unfair and which was wrong. And you people have brought this Committee into the political arena. We are prepared to continue this debate for as long as you want. But the decision to kill this Committee by political allegations which are untrue and false, the decision is yours.

Mr. W.A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana South) Mr. Speaker, I should like to preface my remarks with a thank you to the staff members of the Committee. They had a very difficult task. There were serious problems, one of the major problems just sat down. This was clearly evident throughout the hearings. When the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) says that we on this side were critical of the Opposition Members, I should like to correct him. I am not critical of the other Opposition Member and I in no way would be critical of the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), I think he conducted himself well in terms of those hearings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I am sorry I can't say the same for the Hon. Member for Lumsden.

Mr. Speaker, I should like as a Committee member to speak on the Interim Report and the work of this Committee. It, Mr. Speaker, as outlined by the chairman, has had its problems. As I said before, one of them just sat down. However, we did have 22 meetings throughout the province. Those meetings were, in the main, well attended and well accepted.

Mr. Speaker, it was evident that business people really appreciated the opportunity of appearing before the Committee and presenting their views. In that respect alone the Committee performed a usual function and merited its origin.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way interested in whether the business community is in agreement with my views or not. I was interested as a Committee member to hear their criticisms and there were criticisms. To hear their problems and there were problems. And what the community felt were probabilities and possibilities in relation to answers or solutions.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we had 275 briefs and some 80 direct oral presentations. No one could contend that the willingness of the business people to appear before the Committee was arranged.

Mr. Speaker, the sole motivation of the Committee and I feel certain this was general amongst Government Members on

that Committee was to find ways and means of increasing the viability and the stability of the independent entrepreneurial sector of our society. I do feel one member from the Opposition did quite clearly indicate a political motivation during the hearings. We have heard it all again today. I did not feel that was the case with the second Opposition Member.

I do not believe that business people who appeared before the Committee expected instant answers. They were concerned about their problems and their probabilities, as they should be and as we should be.

The Committee found out a number of things. I suspect many Committee members knew generally what the problems would be. Financing both in terms of fixed asset capital costs and working capital, credit extension and managerial and accounting problems. Transportation costs and associated problems were generally expressed by those appearing before the Committee as major problems to the business community.

A number of people intimated they had problems with the institution of the 40-hour work week and that came out very clearly in the Committee hearings. Some expressed criticism of The Occupational Health and Safety Act and that came out very clearly in the hearings. Smaller independent businessmen did express some need for uniform store hours.

One of the new things that appeared before the Committee was the suggestion for formation of a Saskatchewan innovative corporation. Many Saskatchewan residents exhibit a great deal of ingenuity in inventing things. There is however, all too often, no way that the individual can test the feasibility in terms of economic development of his idea. The Humphrey Report states very bluntly, "If Saskatchewan is to prosper in an industrial sense, we must innovate. If Saskatchewan industry does not or will not government must." I think this is a significant proposal which came before the Committee.

As I said before, realistic business people do not expect instant answers. They do, Mr. Speaker, expect to be heard, they expect their presentations to be weighed and studied and they expect practical suggestions to be realistically implemented.

I support the Legislative committee for small business as a serious attempt to pinpoint problems and effect practical solutions to some of those problems. I repeat my contention that the Committee should complete its work expeditiously. The final report should then lead to specific actions to assist business enterprise in a manner with which the business people have some general agreement taking into account all relevant implications.

I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the Hon. Member for Lumsden's remarks. His statements that the Government Members arrogantly and arbitrarily told the business community what they should talk about is nonsensical balderdash. It is a "Lane-brain" approach. This is quite clearly evident if you read the evidence of the Committee. His argument that we had contact with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) or the Premier (Mr. Blakeney), I deny categorically. I had no contact with those Ministers. No one is going to tell me what I should say on any committee or what I should ask. When I presented questions with respect to business representatives, I did it

April 10, 1973

because it was part of the program on which we were elected. When I made a statement that Alberta would be having a sales tax I stated that that was my opinion. Since they have had deficits of some \$600 million in the last three years, it is clearly evident they are going to have to find some revenue shortly and that is very likely to be one of their major approaches in meeting that problem.

I deny categorically that I had any intention whatsoever at any time of making political capital of the Business Committee. I deny that I had anything to do with what the Minister of Finance put in his report and I think it is nonsensical that the reservations interpret that that situation existed or occurred.

The briefs which have been presented to the Special Committee on Business identify several basic improvements which are required to enable the businessman of this province to develop and expand his operation. One of the most frequent requests is for management advice and consultative services.

Although the Committee has not yet presented its Report, we believe that immediate action is required to assist the businessmen of this province.

You will be asked to provide funds for program additions to the Business Assistance Branch. A field organization will be established to provide consultative services on a regional basis.

These field representatives will provide the necessary link between the Department and the business community, establishing communication on a two-way basis.

Who said that that was the major priority? No one said that was the major priority. It was simply something that the Government had worked on, it was in our program and it was not illogical to introduce it. I deny that I had any contact with the Minister of Finance or any other Minister with respect to what would be instituted in terms of the Business Committee Report.

I contend that the Member from Lumsden was the one person who really showed political bias in terms of those meetings. If he will change his attitude we will improve the atmosphere and the situation with respect to that Committee as it concludes its findings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Gross: — (Gravelbourg) Mr. Speaker, we have listened starting around 11:25 o'clock, and we have listened this afternoon to some totally unconstructive criticism of the Committee from the Member for Lumsden. I have decided to take the opposite for the time being and go through the Report and produce some constructive programs of the Committee. We received something like 275 written briefs that were submitted to the Committee, hardly a Government against business or declaring war on business. We have seen something like 87 people submitting briefs off the cuff in oral presentations. The main observation the Committee made in their interim report was that businessmen expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to outline their views on the problems and

prospects of business firms in Saskatchewan.

And this, Mr. Speaker, was one of the things we heard over and over for the first time in the province's history that the business community had an opportunity to submit their problems and prospects for business opportunities for the future.

Mr. Speaker, there were several other things that we noted in the Committee. The first one was tourism. The business community felt that there was a general need to boost the tourist trade in Saskatchewan. One that we accepted. They of course went into a little more detail and outlined the reasons why they thought there was a need and what could be done to speed that up.

Their second point and I think their clearest point that they made was the fact that financing was not available at all times and was not available at the amounts and the required term to pay it off. They claimed the cost of financing today at 7, 8, 9, 10 or 12 per cent is way too high and they require some kind of assistance in this area.

They also indicated to us that the term that businesses are subjected to – 5, 6, 8, or 10 years is not long enough for them to adequately get their show on the road.

They also indicated to us, Mr. Speaker, that they felt it was high time that the Government get into this kind of program. They indicated if any help was coming to please speed it up and do everything in our power to get some kind of financial assistance program underway.

One other program that the business community outlined very clearly to us was the fact that they did not require nor did they want any kind of grant program to be provided to them. They felt that if a business was viable it could do it without a grant program, if indeed, there was a grant program.

They also indicated to us, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous need for managerial and business support services in their operation. And quite contrary to the Member for Lumsden, they would recommend and they would support a program of business reps in the province similar to what we have in ag reps.

They also went on to report on transportation and freight rates. They felt that the freight rates in Saskatchewan were totally discriminatory and by no means were aiding industry coming into Saskatchewan and were in no way aiding business in Saskatchewan.

They also recommend that our Government take fast action and do whatever possible in terms of halting rail line abandonment. They went on, Mr. Speaker, with many problems that they experienced with the rail companies and indeed the trucking companies in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the fifth recommendation was innovation and research. The Saskatchewan Research Council produced an extremely fine brief for the Committee. I believe we visited them twice and they pointed out to us very adequately the need for an innovation corporation for the province which they felt would indeed assist and bring new industry into the province. They outlined many projects that they had been studying, that they were looking at and what could be done in terms of even

market research.

In terms of employment and training programs there was some very valid criticism with some of the labor legislation we presently have on the books. A lot of it, Mr. Speaker, was deeply misinformed. Of course, I guess we can understand where that comes from. We had our experience with the Hog Marketing Commission and we also have had it with the labor legislation.

Mr. Speaker, all in all, the people in the Province of Saskatchewan were very happy to see the Government moving in this direction by having a committee tour the province and have this chance constructively to lay out their problems that they see in terms of the business world.

Mr. Speaker, a little bit more on the unconstructive side. I should like to outline some of the comments made by Mr. Lane from Lumsden. He said the Committee was not listened to by the Government. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, this Report is not a final report. It is simply an interim report, the Government in no way has to listen to or even consider at this time the interim report. We are merely reporting that we have gone out to the Province of Saskatchewan listened to the business community and these are our findings. In no way is the Government subjected to listen to this Report, it is not a final report and therefore I find that his criticism is unfounded.

He also went on to say we are playing political football with the Business Committee that we were not listening to the business community and that he thought it was poor politics to go out and talk and listen and discuss the problems of business with the businessmen, then from that make a final report, I would advise the Member from Lumsden if he is up-tight about the fact that we did set up a committee and we did send it out in the province and that it did a fairly constructive job of listening to and discussing, the pros and cons of new or proposed legislation for the best interests of the small business community then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he has got a real problem. This Committee, I would suggest to him was good politics and it is good for the province to go out and hear the views of the businessman and this we have done.

Mr. Lane also commented that he felt the Government was trying to destroy the Committee by some of the statements by the chairman. I cannot see for the life of me where he could get that kind of an impression; I would imagine strictly from his reactionary standpoint and view on life, that is where it is coming from, and this in no way is this Government trying to destroy the Committee. The only person trying to destroy this Committee here in this House and out in the province is our hon. Friend from Lumsden.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gross: — Mr. Speaker, it is with those remarks that I will support 100 per cent to see that this Committee's Interim Report recommend a final report and that the Committee go on in the future to bring forth a final report and advise this Government on some of the problems our business community is facing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. F. MacDonald: — (Moose Jaw North) Mr. Speaker, I was a little disappointed in the remarks by the Members for Notukeau-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) and Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck). I have been accused of politicking on the Committee and obstructing progress and effectiveness of the reporting of the Committee. I cannot accept this accusation, I don't think it is a fair and I don't think it is a just accusation. It may well be that at some time during the hearings I have indulged in some action or some words that might be interpreted as being political, after all I am a politician. But I would defy any Member to show that I went out of my way to introduce politics into the hearings or Committee meetings. If there is any such case I am not aware of it. I have also been accused of opposing the Committee method of study and reporting. I have been accused of being contradictory by on the one hand being opposed to legislative committees, then on the other hand asking for Bill 50 to go before a Standing Committee. I am not opposed to the concept of committees, but I reserve the right to be critical of some committees. I think for example that the Liquor Committee and the Welfare Committee have done a good job and have made an honest effort. I do not think the same about the Agriculture Committee that studied The Family Farm Protection Act and Crop Insurance; that committee impressed me as being nothing more than a political committee with a political purpose. I believe that the recommendations basically came from Cabinet. I am also inclined to believe that this is the same case with the committee to study Foreign Ownership. Time will tell. I think this committee was constructed because the Minister of Agriculture made a boo-boo and the Government had to find some way of drawing back. I expect the report of this committee to come through Cabinet, time will time this.

I am quite will to participate wholeheartedly with committees that are set up like the Liquor Committee, but I do not want to be a stooge for the Government on politically motivated committees like the Agriculture Committee. I also have every reason to believe that the Committee on Businesses was formulated by the Cabinet for political reasons.

Cabinet was reacting to a problem, they recognized that the business community was not happy with this Government. They further recognized that businessmen were justified in this feeling because the Blakeney Government has been rather harsh towards them. Many legislative changes in the first year of office have created hardships for the businessman. One year of power has demonstrated a negative attitude toward the private sector and business people in and out of our province had no confidence in the Blakeney Government. These are the reasons that prompted the Premier to formulate the Business Committee. I am sure the idea cam from a group of planners. The rationale is that if the Government gives the appearance of being interested then it might take the edge off the hostility of the business sector. It is thought that the Committee might give business the opportunity to blow off a little steam and therefore not be quite as effective as a political enemy. This I think was the rationale for establishing the Committee. I think it is safe to say that the objectives of Cabinet have been fulfilled to some degree, it is safe to say to this date the Committee has to a degree been politically successful for the NDP. I think that the charge of politicking and obstruction that was made by the chairman of this Committee should be answered, his charge should have been made to his own Members, as much as to myself.

It was Members from his side of the House who did the politicking.

It was my understanding that when we conducted hearings we came to listen and to hear. At the Business Committee this was not the case. I give you examples like the business reps. These are the same business reps who were announced in the Budget. Before we started on the Committee, the NDP had decided they were going to institute such a program. From the first day of hearings the NDP Members on the Committee were out to sell this idea of business reps. It would be unfair to suggest that the private sector requested such a program. In almost every case at hearings Members opposite brought up that question. It appeared obvious that the Business Committee was being used to justify a program of the Government. As I said, the purpose of hearings was to listen, but I would ask the chairman if he has any idea how many times he had to call his own Members to order? How many times did he find his own Members making speeches, giving their views instead of listening? I ask the chairman how many times he felt it necessary to call me to order for any reason? I suggest there was not one single occasion.

I should like to cite one example of politicking and obstruction that took place in Moose Jaw, this was also an example of extremely poor taste and bad manners. A gentleman was giving a brief, he was being critical of the Government which apparently has become a sin. However, I think that it was his right. After some time and after considerable arguing I interrupted the proceedings and asked for Committee members to stop challenging the gentleman and let him tell us what he thought. The chairman agreed. However, as proceedings went on one of the NDP members felt obliged to accuse the gentleman of being on the Liberal executive in my seat. And by this ploy attempted to discredit the criticism of the gentleman's brief. The proceedings went further along in the vein until finally a member of the audience felt it was necessary to comment on the rudeness of the Committee. I should like to quote from the transcript of the proceedings, page 54 of the Moose Jaw hearing: Mr. Docken came forward from the audience and I quote him:

This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I would have quit right in the middle if I had been badgered like Mr. Sagal has been. I think there would have been a complaint raised if you had forced me to change what I was going to say. Instead of listening to what he wants you to say, 'We're going to control you, now how much money do you want'. So he lost his train of thought because you have taken these things right away from him.

We have numerous other examples. Many times when businessmen expressed their views on minimum wage and hours of work, a member of the Committee would badger and belittle the comments, and engage in an argument as to the pros and cons of such. This was not or should not have been a function of the Committee members. On many occasions when the question of the adverse effects of estates tax came up NDP Committee members felt obliged to argue the point with the person presenting the brief, or at least to try and justify the Government's position. Again I say that the honest purpose of the Committee was to listen and to justify Government measures.

Members opposite used the Committee to express their political views. I give you the example of rail line abandonment.

This was a question seldom mentioned by the people submitting briefs, but the question was posed by Members opposite at nearly every meeting. A speech accusing the Federal Liberal Government of wanting to tear up all the track preceded a supposed question to the audience. Usually at every hearing we would have an attack on corporate welfare bums and especially the machinery dealers. There was in these cases an obvious attempt to create animosity and friction between groups in the business community and between business and consumer.

The remarks of the chairman the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) introducing the Report were in my mind unfair and unfortunate. Ninety per cent of the politicking and obstruction came from his own Members, and yet he accused me of these charges, charges that I am not willing to accept. I think the chairman has done a disservice to the Committee. The suggestion by the chairman that the research officer resigned because of any action by Liberal Members is completely unfounded and untrue. The resignation of the research member was an embarrassment to Members opposite. There are two reasons which I feel are reasons for his resignation. First, was for the political motivation of the Committee and second, that Members opposite on the Committee on many occasions used as a scapegoat the Department of Industry and Commerce and the civil servants of that department and also SEDCO. The member tried to excuse their party's failure or shortcomings by blaming the department, this happened on many occasions. It is no wonder that our research officer who worked for the Department of Industry and Commerce felt obliged to resign.

I think that if this Committee is to table a meaningful final Report, it must take several things into consideration. We must realize that in general the business community is reluctant to talk in public about their problems and concerns. This is shown in the example of Moose Jaw. After all the advertising and after a letter was sent to businessmen in Moose Jaw inviting them to submit a brief, not one single business or agency indicated they were prepared to meet with the Committee, not one single person or agency. The chairman then made several phone calls in order to make a hearing possible in Moose Jaw. I think that holding meetings in union halls proved to be less than ideal. Some businessmen didn't feel exactly at home in union halls, possibly meetings should have been held in the hall where the businessman felt at home and at ease. I think we made a problem in that respect.

I think we must realize that the business sector is reluctant to talk openly and freely with any government, most businessmen are hesitant to be openly critical of any government in power. In Saskatchewan this case is even more pronounced. Businessmen realize that the NDP are not very sympathetic with business in general. Most business people have a philosophy of free enterprise and of course the government in power decries the free enterprise system and favors the socialist system. The business people are therefore generally unwilling to talk to the Committee of a socialist government. A good many of those who did submit briefs have tempered their remarks so as not to upset the NDP almost to the point where they will tell the Committee what the businessman thinks the Government wants to hear and won't be upset with it. This point was brought home to me on a number of occasions by various people. If the Committee is bringing a meaningful report this fact has to be taken into consideration because it is a fact of life.

Regretfully so, but a good proportion of the public and especially those of the business community that feel they might have dealings with the Government are afraid of governments and especially a Government that is opposed to the very philosophy by which they live. I believe that if the Business Committee can bring in a report that is meaningful and useful, it will require all members to examine the needs of business people with an open and understanding mind. It will require that members of the Committee must be prepared to understand the reluctance of businessmen to fully express their true concern. There are many avenues of assistance which can be made to business in Saskatchewan, there are many problems to economic expansion in Saskatchewan. The Government opposite has been successful as far as the political purposes of the Committee and hopefully this part of the Committee work is now behind us. The Committee should now have established the problems and their priorities and should now be in a position to prepare a meaningful and useful report. If we follow the lead of committee members of the Liquor Committee which I feel is truly an unpolitical committee then hopefully we will be able to table a document which recognizes the concerns of the business community and suggests solutions that can be favorable to economic expansion of our business community. These recommendations can be debated in this political forum according to our conflicting philosophies of our two political parties. This Assembly is the place for political debate on a legislative committee, and not during the hearings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. P. Baker: — (Regina Wascana) Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to get into the debate on the Small Business Committee Report when the recommendations will not be forthcoming until in the next few months. I had thought that this was an interim report and was not supposed to deal with any specifics. All we have done is give areas of observation. As we went along with the Committee work we did suggest to departments that certain things be done. Some of these are in the area of our observations. But to have Members come in here and criticize something that we haven't completed, I am somewhat surprised. I should have thought after the speeches made by the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) that they would have submitted their resignations, perhaps this is still coming. We will really be operating under a cloud from here on in, a cloud that I didn't expect.

I realize that at these Committee meetings we did ask questions, we made statements and we answered questions. That is the only way you are going to get information from the people who present briefs, and they were fine briefs. I didn't agree with some, neither did the Opposition Members, but in the main they were good to have on record. From them we shall be able to disseminate the information and pass it on to this Legislature and not for the good of us politicians. I am not on there as a politician, I am on there as a legislative member to do something for the rural community. The towns and villages are dying and from the speech from the Member for Lumsden this afternoon, he is not only trying to see that these businesses die, but he is trying to bury them. He is not interested in business and that is the only bastion left for him in political support and he destroyed it today. I am surprised at that young Member, I thought he had possibilities, I really did.

We went out into the country, he is quite amicable when you sit at a table, but I am going to be very afraid to sit at the same table, but I am going to be very afraid to sit at the same table from now on, because I am apt to say something in a jocular vein which he may take out of context and put it on record. I don't think these are the kind of people we want on committees. I like arguing and discussing matters and why shouldn't we. I am sure the other committees do the same. We can argue and disagree, but to me this episode today was an insult, to members of this Committee, and to everyone of the Committee. I don't recall what the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) said, but I can now realize why he said some of the things he did because of the reservations at the end of the Report. I want to tell this House that my transcripts are locked up in my file at home. I don't think the Member for Lumsden had any business bringing them in the House today. They are not for public information yet, as I understand the make-up of the Committee. I don't know. He could have read excerpts out of the Leader-Post as most of our reports were printed in the Press. The briefs were also printed in the Press. No one got them from me. I'm a bit upset about that because mine are at home, and I should have liked to have had them here this afternoon to refer to them too, but I didn't think I needed them.

But I want to continue on and say to the Member from Lumsden that I am really surprised at him because I really did think he had possibilities in the political field. I want to tell you today that I will take MacLeod, McPherson, Wiebe and Tommy any day. Any day! If these are the tactics he will continue in this House, he'll never be back in this House again. I think I know a little about politics. I've had defeats and I've won and I've lost but these sort of tactics are a discredit to himself and to this Legislature. He takes us to task for nothing at all. Sure I made remarks in these places and I am not ashamed of them and I'm going to refer to them later on in the information we have printed in the Area Observations.

I know why he is objecting to this Committee so strongly because this is the Committee that is going to make Saskatchewan. It is also going to make this side of the House for next election and he knows it. I don't blame him for being an obstructionist. We know we must save the rural community. All the Members over there I am sure must understand this too. The farm Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) and from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), I'm sure they realize what is happening and I am sure they want to save their towns and villages. I live in a city seat but I am just as concerned for the whole of this province. The agriculture industry ties in with the rural area and if we don't save small business we ruin the agricultural areas too. The legislation that we put on the books here for the farmer in the past two years is second to none in this country, and we know we are going to solve the agricultural problems. Now we have got to solve the urban problems in the smaller areas. This is what this Committee is for and that's why I went on it, in fact I wasn't going to go on it at the outset. I said I had enough to do but I am glad I did because I found at first hand what is really happening to these small towns and villages and to the businesses.

He mentioned a lady by name of Mrs. Norman who has a loan from the Industrial Development Bank and is going broke. She came to us with her problems and pleaded with us for answers.

We tried to help her and I don't know whether SEDCO did or not. We referred her to that organization. We weren't playing politics, that poor lady was asking for help, and we had many more like that. And he's condemning this sort of thing. I don't think he is interested in people at all. I am really surprised at you, Mr. Member from Lumsden, because I did have a lot of respect for you and I don't know if I will have much after this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I am sorry about it because I no way do I want to hurt you or you hurt me. We argued in Committee. That's all right. We walked out and discussed other things but in no way was I trying to condemn you there or here. I am not trying to condemn him today but I am really disappointed in him.

The Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) made a few remarks with regard to his meeting in Moose Jaw. Whenever we had trouble the Liberal Party seemed to have been drummed up to be at a meeting to present a brief. I asked the two men whom he spoke about at the Moose Jaw meeting who they were — that gave us all the trouble that night. One was his president and I think the other was a member of his executive.

An Hon. Member: — Dirty politics.

Mr. Baker: — Yes, one was the president. Maybe I am wrong but this is what came to me.

Mr. MacDonald: — As usual you're wrong.

Mr. Baker: — Well that's fine but they are good Liberals and the one is a president of your seat or one of the other seats. He told me himself, by the way, after the meeting. But anyway, that's fine, I'm not saying they shouldn't be there. If they are Liberal or NDP, let them come.

Mr. MacDonald: — Don't lie about it.

Mr. Baker: — Don't call me a liar, I'm not lying. Mr. Sagal when he came before us was most abusive. Most abusive, and you agreed with him. What did I say to him? This is what he said about the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) because he gave the poor people \$1.75 an hour:

Old Mr. Snyder, the Member from Moose Jaw, his hands are now dripping with blood, because he gave the working people \$1.75 an hour minimum!

And I answered him this way:

Look, Mr. Sagal, you may say that, but by golly in doing this, we filled a lot of stomachs in this province.

We filled a lot of stomachs. Mr. Speaker, I don't speak very often in this House but when I do I mean what I say. What did they try to do at all these meetings on the minimum wage?

They tried to stir up enough trouble so that the minimum wage would never be raised again but would be cut. It's too low now and I say again it should be higher. When the right time comes we should raise it. You wouldn't want to work for \$1.75 per hour. I wouldn't want any of my family to. Mr. Speaker, I think it is so important that this Committee continue because it will be the salvation of our small businesses. If you want to look at it politically fine, it is good for any political party, but it has to be done, it's a must if we are going to bring back the economy of these rural areas and keep the people in those communities.

Turning to the observations or first of all I should like to turn to the back of the book where they have their reservations. They listed the priorities and we agree with these priorities but I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is our job to bring in an interim report with recommendations because we haven't finalized our hearings. All we have done is mention the areas that are for observation and for recommendation. They are spelled out very well.

Take tourism for example. We're telling you what they told us and I don't see anything wrong with that, that's not political. In general, tourism was a sphere that was given much emphasis by business. I agree with them. Suggestions such as better tourist booths, and special grants for community projects that would be of historical value, were given to the Committee. Tourist operators especially mentioned highway signs and we agreed with them that they are not good as set up. We ran into many places and occasions where this was a really sore spot.

Then the Member mentioned something that I was continually talking about, hours of work and I don't mind that one bit. The briefs we received from these communities all asked for store hours to be set across the province with mostly a two-day weekend, Sunday-Monday or Saturday-Sunday. This is what we found in all the communities. They either had Monday closing or some of them had Saturday closing. Regina has Monday closing and this is one of the finest things in this city. Saskatoon came to us with briefs asking and begging for Monday closing. Yes, begging for it, all the small businessmen there. These gentlemen in Opposition sort of pooh-poohed it when they came before us. Sure I made remarks that I am all for it, because I was the one who brought it into the city of Regina some 15 years ago and I'm proud of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I intend, Mr. Speaker, by the next winter session, hopefully, to have a bill here that is going to set these hours in some way so there is some semblance of consistency throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. Yes, a two-day weekend, back to back with Sunday. This is what the people are asking for. They didn't condemn us for it at all. I don't remember any condemnation.

Statements were made with regard to financing. We know that's a real problem and SEDCO got a raking over the coals by people presenting briefs. I even raked SEDCO over the coals and I am still going to rake them over the coals, because they are not doing their job for small business. I told the Minister

the same thing and I will mention it in the Report as well. I said it right in the transcripts. However they did make some changes by starting to give loans to smaller businesses because of our efforts and advice. The people are looking for working capital or operating capital, if you want to call it that, capital to purchase equipment is needed, money to finance inventories so that they can carry on an operation from year to year. This is a must. Most of them complained about the high interest rates and I agree with them. We've got to do something about interest rates when we lend money to these smaller businesses and have forgiveness features as well.

Another point with regard to finance that they spoke of which I have suggested on many occasions and asked questions. How do you think this money should be borrowed if you go to SEDCO? Would you prefer SEDCO to underwrite your loan so you could borrow it from the local bank or credit union? Most of them preferred to make an arrangement with their local bank or credit union. I think that's good and that will probably be one of our recommendations. We couldn't finalize it yet because we didn't have the complete information from every area and we may want to visit other provinces to see what they are doing. I think we should find out exactly and learn by some of their mistakes too if we can.

Preference buying at every major centre came up. Contracts were being let by local communities, municipalities, cities or local establishments to outside contractors. I criticized the former Government for letting our highway contracts go out to Manitoba and Alberta while our construction firms were going broke. The service centres were going broke. I brought this up in caucus in my own group and hopefully the Minister of Highways will see that these contracts stay in Saskatchewan with a preference feature involved, whether it is five per cent or six per cent or ten per cent, depending on the size of the contract. I am sure all of you agree with that. The two Opposition Members agreed too with tongue-in-cheek. Today it sounded as though one was ridiculing me on it because I brought it up and I think it is an excellent point for this Legislature to approve. A lot of good did come out of it because of our meetings.

He mentioned that the Premier was giving us direction. I didn't even talk to the Premier all this summer with regard to business meetings.

Mr. Guy: — Didn't talk about anything.

Mr. Baker: — Well that's fine, maybe I haven't got anything to talk to him about. That's my affair. If I want to talk to him about something really important I'll make sure I will. The Premier didn't give us any direction, we've had no direction from anybody. And I say that is all true, nobody has given us direction. To have the Members stand up and say that we are getting direction is an absolute fallacy.

We go on and we can talk about transportation and freight rates. We've talked about that for days in this Legislature. In practically every speech made here by rural Members matters came up with regard to some commission or Land Bank, rail transportation and abandonment. This is good and everyone expressed their views in a sincere way.

Innovation, research and information, we got some important information from the Research Branch at the University of Saskatchewan. We had a very fine discussion with these men and I am sure out of that will come good recommendations for this province and for this Legislature to approve.

Training of people, we got a lot of advice and suggestions from local towns, businessmen, electricians, plumbers and so forth, who asked that we put students or people on the job right with them as part of their training or learning course. This is a good idea. I didn't think of that until we got to these communities. Others have to be sent to technical schools or vocational schools for more involved courses. A Nipawin contractor said, "I can't keep men here because we haven't the facilities you have in larger centres". He was telling the truth. I made the remark to this businessman that it was an excellent suggestion and I would certainly see that it gets into a recommendation or gets to the right department. I believe that this is one way that we could establish a training program to save these small towns and communities by putting learners on the job and even subsidizing their pay as apprentices or otherwise.

The Housing Corporation is mentioned under the heading, Other Recommendations, the need for better housing. We are setting up a housing corporation at this Session, we're right on top of it. This, of course, would have been our recommendation.

I could go on to many other points. We talked about uniform hours. But I see in all this discussion, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that the Member for Lumsden knows full well that this Committee is going to be successful. It is going to be successful even if you want to look at it politically. I don't care. I am looking at it not in a political way but to save rural towns and villages because they are dying.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — You have put a nail in their coffin today to help have these communities die or bury them. This will follow you the rest of your days for condemning the small communities. You condemn these small businesses because they want to be heard and they have spoken with a loud voice. I am prepared to listen to them and I think that we have got to listen to them in this Legislature. The Government on this side has got to listen if it wants to be returned in 1975 and '76.

You know I thought we had done extremely well and I still think so. We are trying to get the economy of this province on the rails. I believe we have done part of it through the agricultural Acts that we have put through, once they become really known and approved by every locality. We've got to do the same for our rural communities, as I have said, for the business people, because that is the life blood of rural Saskatchewan. I am surprised at the Member for Moose Jaw North, attacking this Committee. He said we should do like the Liquor Committee and I believe it was last summer as I remember reading his statement, that he attacked the Liquor Committee. Now he is saying it is good, we should be like them. I am glad for the report they brought in and I appreciated how the Member spoke on that side on that report. I should have hoped that we could have done

this with our Committee in the interim report. I want to tell the Member from Lumsden, I was the only one on the Committee who objected to bringing in an interim report. I was the one and he agrees with me. I said, what's the good of bringing in an interim report when we haven't any recommendations, and I think it made good sense. They all wanted the report, including him. That is why I didn't prepare to speak on this, but after listening to what took place today, I feel justified that I must speak about it, and to put the record straight for the Members on that side of the House, and on this side as well.

I believe I have covered most of the points. I said earlier, I am not the kind of person who wants to be nasty to people, that's not my way of life, but today I had to make these statements, not to be nasty, but to put the Members straight, from Lumsden particularly. This could do him some good, because he is still a young man. Perhaps he will repent and do better. But I tell him now that if he keeps up with this sort of an attitude on our Business Committee it might be best for him to resign. I invite the Opposition Members to stay on, I'm not saying they should get off, but I fully thought they would resign today. Perhaps the other side would put on the Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) and the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I am sure we could get along with them. We have our differences but I am sure we shouldn't have gone through this criticism as we have today. This is wrong and to sue the transcripts that are not for public use as yet, I think, Mr. Speaker, he should be chastised for doing that. Maybe I am out of order, perhaps it is done this way, however I was told that this was a private document. I have mine locked up and no one will get it until we have finalized the Report.

I really hope that this Committee will continue because it is the Committee that will help save Saskatchewan just as the farm legislation is doing for rural areas. I should hope that if they want to stay on, they do so, but certainly not with that sort of obstructionist attitude. It is not going to help those people out in the country. We can debate here all we want, let's not destroy rural Saskatchewan because it is dying. Some of us in the larger centres haven't been out as much as rural Members but the rural areas are in bad shape. If this Government doesn't do something about it we won't be here either after the next election. That's why I say this and the Member from Lumsden knows that this is the key responsibility for any government. They missed the boat during their seven years. Even some Members of my party perhaps didn't do enough before 1964, in this I am being honest. We weren't faced with the same conditions then, but in the last few years problems have compounded. If we do something now we can save rural Saskatchewan and we can keep our population here, it will not diminish but grow. I want to see the population grown in this province and I think if we set up the proper economic climate we shall bring our people back who left us, and others will come here as well. Hopefully our economy will boom to an extent where we can put out a call and bring all of our Saskatchewan people back home.

Mr. Speaker, I will support receiving the brief.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. R. Guy: — (Athabasca) No, I wasn't on the Committee and I spoke on another committee that I wasn't on and I had some comments to make at that

time and I am going to make a few more today about the interim report. I think what we've seen here this afternoon bears out what I said a few evenings ago about another committee that brought in an interim report. There are two reasons why interim reports have to be suspect, one is the political aspects that are involved in it and we have certainly seen enough of that this afternoon from both sides of the House. Also the fact that by bringing in interim reports you often give the Government of the day the excuse for not proceeding with badly needed legislation that is needed at this time.

But I want to say a word or two first of all about the Member who has just taken his seat and I hope that I didn't misunderstand him this afternoon. We brought a report into this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and whether it is an interim or a final report doesn't really matter that much, but we brought a report in here that was to be discussed and the reason for tabling the report, is to give everybody an opportunity to say what they thought about what was in the Report and also the way the Committee handled itself during its tours around the province or out of the province or wherever it might be. I got the impression from the Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker) that he doesn't think that the members on the Committee should criticize anything that happened during the Committee meetings. Well if you are going to send out a rubber stamp committee which has a majority of Government Members in this case, five to two, when are the Opposition Members going to have an opportunity to make their feelings known about the handling of these legislative committees. Now I want to commend the Member from Lumsden and the Member from Moose Jaw North. I think they did a credible job of showing exactly how much this Committee accomplished. If you look at the Report they didn't accomplish very darn much. You know the Member who just took his seat said, we want to save rural Saskatchewan. Well one of the ways to save rural Saskatchewan is to bring in some legislation that will help the small towns and the small villages. How are you going to bring in legislation if you haven't got the guts to bring in a final report. You sit around with an interim report today and then you want to go another year and the Member said he wants to go outside of Saskatchewan. He wants to go I suppose to Montreal or Toronto, maybe even to Honolulu or somewhere to study the problems over there. I'll tell you the solution to Saskatchewan's rural community can be found here in Saskatchewan. It's not going to be found outside these borders and if that's your excuse for not bringing in a final report that you want to get outside the borders on a free holiday, well it's not good enough Mr. Member from Wascana.

If you want to save the rural community you'll bring in the final report of this Committee, the Government will sit down and study it and in their wisdom they will bring in the legislation that is required. If you do that you will get the support of Members on this side of the House but if you don't do it, if you are going to procrastinate month after month, week after week, year after year, you can be sure we're going to criticize this Report. In fact our responsibility to the public of Saskatchewan is to criticize you for your procrastination in this regard.

You say people asked for help. How are they going to get help until the Report is finalized and the Government finalizes its program of helping small rural communities. That's when the lady that you mentioned is going to get help, when the Government

determines programs that will help that particular person in that particular need. The only time that that is going to happen is when you have filed your final report, the Government and the Cabinet have studied it, they have proposed legislation, they have brought it into this Legislature, we have debated it and it becomes the law of the land, then that lady that you referred to will have an opportunity to get the help that she so badly requires.

You said that you didn't think we should have any recommendations. Well, the same reply has to be in regard to that. Without any recommendations how do you expect the Government to act. I am not blaming the Government for not acting because I know for other reports when we were the Government, we were criticized because we acted before the reports were finalized. They said, why don't you wait for the report to be tabled. All I am saying to you is that as long as you keep an interim report going, and as long as you keep committee meetings going, you are giving this Government or any government the opportunity to procrastinate and hold back and not come through with a program that is in the interest of the very people who told you what they needed. You had enough meetings to find out what the problems of rural Saskatchewan are going to be or are. You didn't need meetings to find out but there is nothing wrong with going out and listening to them, as long as you listen to them and then act and act quickly. Don't put it off from year to year and, hopefully, until after the next election but I'll tell you if you do that you won't be here to bring in any legislation after the next election.

I sort of laughed when the Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker) said, you know we are waiting so that we know what to do. We had \$100,000 under the Department of Industry and small businesses and small communities. I asked a question on the Order Paper and it took a long time to get it off the Order Paper and it is taking longer to get an answer back. I'm afraid that they haven't spent any of this \$100,000. Here was a program that they agreed upon, money was voted for and there still hasn't been action. I suppose one of the reasons is, they are going to say, well we are waiting for the Committee on Small Business Report to see that we are going in the right direction.

Well then the Member for Wascana went through his report and pointed out that some good suggestions had been made in regard to tourism. There had been some good suggestions made in regard to financing. There had been some good suggestions in regard to innovation, research and information, employment and training programs. I want to remind the Member again, we did have a pretty good training program and employment program last summer for small businesses but what happened this summer. Even before the Report was tabled you eliminated this businessman from the summer employment program and you say, that's how you are going to save the rural community. I think that you had better get in touch with your Government before you stand up in the Legislature and make the statements like you did this afternoon. You criticize our Members for making statements that do not make sense, you had better just look at your own. If there had been one program that did provide some help to the business community, the rural community of Saskatchewan it was a summer program where they could employ students, not only in the small towns but on the farms. And what did you do with it, you scrapped it, that's how you helped the small businessman, you scrapped the program. Then you stand up here

and say, there's lots of time, we have to save rural Saskatchewan. You tell your friends opposite that you want to save rural Saskatchewan because there are dozens and dozens of examples that I could quote here this afternoon where you have done everything to destroy rural Saskatchewan rather than to save it.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion is that this Committee first of all should have brought in a final report. I criticize my own two Members as well as the Members on that side for not insisting that a final report be brought in at this Session. You had the information, you met the business community, you met all those involved and you have absolutely no excuse for not bringing in a final report at this date. The business people of Saskatchewan should condemn that Committee for not bringing in a final report and if there is any one group of people in Saskatchewan that need assistance now, not a year from now, not after the next budget, but in this Budget, right now it is the business community particularly in the small towns and villages of Saskatchewan. You had an opportunity to do it if you had brought in your final report. Then you could have had your legislation. Instead you are raising the taxes, you're eliminating the assistance to the rural and urban summer programs, and then you say you want to save rural Saskatchewan. If you want to save rural Saskatchewan you had better start showing it. You haven't shown it in this Session and your Committee certainly hasn't shown it by bringing in an interim report. The sooner you get at it and get that report in here, get the legislation in at the next session of the Legislature, then the business community will see how sincere you are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. W. Engel: — (Notukeu-Willow Bunch) Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this House and listened to the Member for Athabasca on many occasions but today was the first time that I must say that I really enjoyed his remarks. I think he hit the nail right on the head. One of the things that I want to pick out in one sentence I wrote down here and maybe he will nod his approval that he did say it just like this. He said, "Once we get some Government action on the recommendations then the Members from this side of the House will support those actions." Isn't that what you indicated?

Mr. Guy: — If it's good legislation.

Mr. Engel: — But you didn't say 'good' at that time. The basic discussion about what was political and the whole basic discussion about what the reservations were centered around the one line, "that the Government did act". The Members get up in this House and they talk about the Government not listening and then, now they write a reservation because the Government did listen. I wish they would make up their minds what they are going to do. He talked about procrastination, he talked about this whole aspect as an excuse for not proceeding with legislation. That's what the reservations are all about, because the Government is proceeding with legislation.

I want to say today that our Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) listened and according to the Members opposite he listened very

carefully.

Mr. Lane: — Who told them?

Mr. Engel: — “Who told them?” he says. Does he have any confidence in the Press at all? Every meeting we had was open to the public. You could take Leader-Post or any of the papers, the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, you could read the comments and the briefs and summaries of the briefs that were there. Our Government is listening to what’s happening, they don’t have to wait for a final report. They got this information and they came by it honestly.

The Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), Mr. Speaker, accused the Members from this side of being hypocritical. I am wondering what the Member from Athabasca who is just leaving now really thinks on this aspect of “what is being hypocritical”. He says, on the one hand that if we had had a recommendation then the Government would act. The other Member says that we made these recommendations to the Government and they did act. I can’t follow them, Mr. Speaker. Their actions don’t add up. I am saying that the recommendations that were printed were in there and you accused them of acting on them.

The one other thing I wanted to comment on from the Member from Athabasca is, there must be a very serious breakdown in the communications in their own caucus. We were unable to have enough meetings because of pressure of business and pressures that they couldn’t attend more meetings and so we decided that we would go with an interim report. We just didn’t have the time at that late a date before the Session started to come up with a final report.

We were being accused of informing and relaying this information to the Members of our Government, Treasury Benches, before it was tabled in this House. I, too, want to stand up beside Mr. Baker and categorically deny that statement. I again will repeat that our Treasury Benches know what is going on in Saskatchewan. They have their ear to the ground and they realize the problems that businessmen are facing. If you study the whole content of our hearing and everything that was said, the related problems, basically the business man is looking for information. Basically, the steps we were taking at instituting a business representative program I think was a good one. Members opposite know it was a good program and basically that is why they are so strong in opposition to it.

The Members on this side of the House who are on the Committee were also taken under attack. I should just like to take a little time to talk about these Members and their backgrounds and their experience and to say how very much I appreciated all these Members on the Committee. The first member that the Member for Lumsden discussed was our Member in this House who has the business knowledge and the mathematical ability that this Member has. The frustrations that the business community face and the questions that came before our Committee, the Member from Saskatoon Nutana went out of his way to answer these questions. They persisted on information and he was willing to give and share that information with them. I appreciated him doing that.

The second member he discussed was the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker). The same kind of a situation as we had here in this House today, Mr. Speaker, existed in many of our meetings. They would have this stirring up taking place within the group and with the people who appeared before our Committee, everybody was riled up that this was such a terrible thing, namely the legislation that this Government has at their fingertips and the power that the various Ministers have and in particular our Minister of Consumer Affairs. There is so much power there that the Minister is going to close down businesses. Why have they said this was political, Mr. Speaker, and the point we are really trying to make, the Members on this side did not talk about Government programs. They did talk about information and everything was available but they weren't using it as obstructionist tactics and scare tactics. The Opposition Member reminded me of when I was just a little kid and was aware of politics and I saw them wave flags and papers about how we were going to take over the land. They had papers from Australia and what's going to happen to our beef prices. I can remember that from when I was a kid. I still have some copies of that kind of literature. That's the kind of tactics these Members were using at those meetings. When our Members talked about Government programs they were talking about these programs to answer a problem that had been created and they were talking about the solutions that were available and were informing them of these proposed solutions. I think they did a very good job.

The Member from Regina Wascana today demonstrated his diplomacy and his ability to explain the situation and how he solved these tense situations and how he came up with the right answers. And I appreciated him at many times and I appreciated his comments again today.

Mr. Lane: — What about rail line abandonment?

Mr. Engel: — He questioned the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) and talked about rail line abandonment. The Member answered the problem, he answered questions and they discussed it, and I think he did a good job and he fulfilled that role. The Member for Gravelbourg also fulfilled the role as being involved in discussing labor legislation and documenting answers to that kind of a situation.

The Opposition Members accused the Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) because of his involvement and about mentioning and advising the public about SEDCO. If somebody would come before us and say, "We're unable to obtain funds, we applied to SEDCO and we couldn't get a loan approved", then he would mention that SEDCO's terms of reference were changed and it had just happened within a month or two. And the Member called that playing politics.

Today when he talked about obstruction and scare tactics and threats, that's what I call cheap politics. When we answer questions when people are asking for some solutions, that isn't scare politics, that's what the people were asking for a that's what they wanted and that's what they got. If he could have accused any of the Members on this side of slander or reference of any kind to the former administration I wish he would have done that. But he didn't do that. We never once mentioned the seven bad years the businessmen were faced with and how

many businessmen went broke during that time. We never talked that kind of politics. The Member from Lumsden never mentioned that and he would have mentioned it if we had been involved in that kind of politics.

I want to talk about one more thing because he mentioned this area of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance and the auto wreckers. Mr. Speaker, one of the first meetings we had here in Regina, three members that call themselves the Auto Wreckers Association here in Regina came before our Committee. We sat down and we listened to their problems and basically they were saying that the Government was going to take the right of tendering away from them for wrecked automobiles. Our terms of reference and they were spelled out very clearly were to write a report and to report back to this Legislature. But when a motion was made, and I'm not going to accuse any Member or whoever made it, but we followed through with that and the whole Committee were going to call in somebody from the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. We called in Mr. Fox. Mr. Fox happens to be the General Manager. The Member for Lumsden said that we didn't give him a good answer, we went away beyond our terms of reference, and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance agreed to continue tendering. I sat beside that same Mr. Fox, Mr. Speaker, at the SGIO convention here this spring. I said to Mr. Fox, "How are the tenders going?" And he told me in the last 11 tenders they set up, they got the cars together, they tagged them, they brought them into a separate compound and they kept them there, all the expense of doing that. Then they called for public tenders 11 times and only once did they get a bid on those vehicles. Out of 11 tenders that were set up they only got a bid once.

Mr. Lane: — What has that got to do with it?

Mr. Engel: — That's got lots to do with it. That's why they were discontinuing that method of selling the cars. But we went beyond what was actually happening and why the problem arose. We called in Mr. Fox and we said tell us what's happening. He gave us his side of the story and we recommended to him a committee that they continue tendering. So they went beyond their October date to continue tendering till this spring and they set up 11 tenders as I said before and they only got one bid. So this is what we're saying. We went the second mile to please the Opposition. We didn't try to politic and we gave them every chance we could and went way beyond our terms of reference and for that I'll apologize.

And the Member for Lumsden continued calling it playing cheap, political, party politics. I think I've made the point quite clear. I like the words the Member from Lumsden used when he summed up his remarks today and I'll quote him. He says:

It's untrue and false political allegations.

I think he's nailed it exactly right. The political allegations that he made against the Members on this side weren't founded and I don't find much room to support him. I think he will still come up with a statement indicating whether he will continue on this Committee like Mr. Baker suggested that he decide whether he is going to be with it or against it. That's the

decision we're waiting for.

Now I want to make a few remarks on the comments that the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) mentioned, and I want to tell him that I never accused him of this kind of politicking. His name was signed to reservations and I said in my opening remarks that I was sorry for the fact that they did have to make reservations in an interim report. In my opinion an interim report should indicate how far we've come as far as a committee's hearings are concerned. We indicated what we had heard, we indicated the problems as the businessmen saw them and that's what we reported. Not one of the members on this Committee saw the reservations or had a meeting to read them. I asked for competent legal advice, on that side of the House, as to what he felt a reservation was, during the noon luncheon today. We agreed that a reservation should deal with the material in the report. And I'm still saying we spent the taxpayers' money to print some cheap, political propaganda that those Members on that side were trying to include.

The Member for Moose Jaw North did make one statement that I want to challenge. I was on that Agricultural Special Committee that looked into The Family Farm Protection Act. He's holding the Members in this House in contempt, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to challenge him to give us some evidence for the statements he made. Unless he has the evidence he'd better not make irresponsible statements in this House about committees and committee work and the rationale for setting up committees and for what committees did. He also said it was unfair to suggest the private sector was asking for business reps. I question that. He made this comment about badgering the witness in Moose Jaw. Mr. Baker already referred to that one illustration I was going to mention. And we asked him, what do you call badgering a witness is, when you say that one of the Government Cabinet Ministers, his fingers are dripping blood, then I think as a chairman, you should challenge that kind of a statement and ask whose lives we're responsible for. If he's accusing him of being responsible for lives, and I think Mr. Baker explained this very well. When the question was finally asked about the minimum wage, the lowest wage he was paying was \$2.50 an hour. It's unfortunate that they brought in such people to present briefs. They didn't have intentions of being realistic and suggesting what the problem was.

Now the only question I'd like to ask as I sum up my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, is what are the Opposite Members' intentions? Are they going to go along with what we say in the Report? The only recommendation we made is that we sit down and we write a final report, and that we agree to table a final report. Are they prepared to sit down with us and do this final report or aren't they? The kind of accusations and the kind of criticisms that the Member for Lumsden raised, I'm not so sure what his intentions are. I'd really like to challenge him here in front of all these Members. If he wants to distort the work, if he wants to be an obstructionist and if he wants to get involved in politicking with the work of this Committee and its final report, I really wish he'd have second thoughts about acting on this Committee. I really wish he would. If he's sincere, he's been asked before, has he repented of his ideas. I suggested in my opening speech that he had a complete change of heart. He talked for close to two and a half hours on the value of committee work and today he got up and said, I wasn't saying that at all, I was just quoting from the Attorney

April 10, 1973

General. Now he telling the truth or isn't he?

An Hon. Member: — Are you?

Mr. Engel: — I am. If the Member for Lumsden is sincere, I'll be really anxious to work with him. We'll go back and bend over backwards as we did before, we'll go the second mile to co-operate and we'll work at presenting a final report that will change the face of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) moved second reading of Bill No. 37 – An Act to amend The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we've waited quite some time for second reading of this Bill. However, we have had . . . I notice the Minister who's involved with this particular Bill isn't in the House today either, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

Mr. Messer: — He got tired of waiting.

Mr. Guy: — Well, I guess we all do. However, I don't know that there's anything wrong with it because the department was established about one year ago within a matter of a few days. It's one year old, we've had time to judge the success and/or the failures of the new department. The purpose of this Bill is to help the Government carry out the commitment that was given last year when the department was established. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, there were two commitments given at that time. One was that there would be local participation in developing policies and that there would be consultation with local people. And I'm sorry to have to advise this Legislature that these promised have not been kept. Certainly they have not been kept to the satisfaction of the people of northern Saskatchewan. They are still promising it but you will notice there is really no machinery in the Act that was passed last year that would carry out these commitments. And that's why I'm moving these amendments to The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act this year so that there will be the machinery to carry out the two basic principles that we agreed on last year. I think the Minister agreed, the Members opposite agreed and we agreed on this side of the House that if this department was going to be successful there had to be local participation in developing the policy of the North and there had to be consultation with local people. My amendment, as I mentioned provides that machinery.

Just to refresh the memories of those in this Legislature, we had a northern advisory council set up. Now this northern advisory council, contrary to the beliefs of some people, is not a requirement of the Act. In other words, this northern advisory council could be abandoned today or tomorrow or a month from now. And it hasn't proven to be satisfactory and I pointed out in earlier debates and I pointed it out last year that I didn't think it would be satisfactory, for two reasons. One, it was established by Order-in-Council without consultation with the local people. And two unfortunately, and

I say this sincerely, unfortunately it was politically oriented. I showed that during the Throne Speech Debate, I guess I can't refer to that, but an earlier debate in this House. Two members of that committee, Mr. Mike and Mr. Thompson, actively campaigned during the Athabasca election campaign, both before, during and since that time, and they are basically one of the reasons why the northern advisory council has not been accepted by northern people.

I moved an amendment last year and it was turned down by Members opposite, and I think that if they will admit the truth, it was turned down basically because there was going to be a byelection in Athabasca. We were all pretty sure of it at that time, and it was turned down for political purposes. But the byelection is over now so I hope that today you will consider the amendment that I am placing before this Legislature as to whether they are or aren't in the best interests of northern people.

Now under the amendment I am proposing that a northern council be established that will truly represent northern people. There will be a representative, not appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to represent this area or that area or another. As you know, the area covered by this Act is a large one. But this is a council that would represent every northern community and they would be elected representatives. It would provide for the membership of every Indian band, and the chief of each band, of course, is an elected official. The local community authorities that have been established are elected bodies and the chairman of that authority would serve on this council. The mayors of LaRonge, Uranium City and Creighton who are elected officials would serve on the council. And in areas where local community authorities or Indian bands and so on are not prevalent, then the local people would hold an election and determine whom they wish to have represented on this northern council.

I know that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has from time to time made some suggestions that they are going to have elected officials from northern communities on this council. However, they say, we are not sure of the procedure to follow, and I can see that there would be some difficulty in determining the proper procedure and I suggest that this amendment that I am introducing is the proper procedure for this reason, that if you go out and elect officials to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan Advisory Council who are not members now of the Indian band or the local community authority or the town council, that you are going to create a conflict of interest. The elected bodies of these communities will now have another elected representative on a provincial body, and I think there is room and in fact I would be very surprised if conflict did not develop. That's why I'm suggesting that membership of this northern council should be made up of people who have already been elected to an elected council in that community whether it's a band council or what have you. I think that would solve the problem of conflict and it would also provide elected representation on this Northern Advisory Council.

Now I realize that this would be a large council and from that point of view it would probably only be possible to meet two or three times a year with the Minister, the Deputy and the officials of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. They

would meet with two main priorities, to set policies and to set budgets.

Out of this northern council and I think my legislation here provides for it, there would be an executive committee selected by the members of the council whose responsibility it would be to see that these policies are carried out. They would approve appointments, thus eliminating any possibility of politics and so on. They would approve contracts; they would approve the spending priorities in the Estimates. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a better approach than this one. There may be other approaches. I am not suggesting that this is the answer to all the problems in northern Saskatchewan. Many of them have been there, not only this Government, but our Government and the Government before and so on.

I think that we have to make a start and I suggest to Members opposite that these amendments no way hamstring the power of the Government if they wish to keep that power. The Minister still has the power under this Act that was given to him last year, which I criticized at that time as being too much power, however it is there and we are trying to live with it.

But this will put into legislation an advisory council which is not there today, which will satisfy the two problems of having local participation and local consultation.

We have two problems today and I pointed them out in earlier debates in and out of this House. The upper level today of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan unfortunately are not northern people. They are doing one of two things and I am not sure which it is. I don't think that they are sure of which they are doing. They are either setting up a southern bureaucracy in the North, or at best they are trying to set up an instant northern bureaucracy.

All you have to do is to look at the sheet of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan organization to see which I mean. I will just take a minute or two to read out some of the names here: Mr. Bowerman the Minister; Executive Assistant Mr. Scott who is from Regina and was with the Indian and Metis Department before; Deputy Minister Mr. Churchman, who came after five or six years from Ottawa; the Director of Policy and Planning, Mr. Brian Hill, who also came by way of Ottawa and the Premier's office and then finally into LaRonge.

Mr. Messer: — Where was he born?

Mr. Guy: — I don't care where he was born. Because I will tell you one thing, the Minister of Agriculture was I guess born in the Tisdale area, but he has only been out of that area for two years as a Minister. And the people up there tell me that he has lost complete contact with them. So surely if these people have been out of the province and been out of the North for five, six or seven years, particularly during the seven years of the Liberal Government when things changed so rapidly in the North, there is no question that they are out of touch with it.

And then there is the Northern News Service, Mr. Cousins, who came to LaRonge by way of the CBC. Then there is the Assistant Deputy Minister, Art Towill. He was here, left for five or six years again and then came back by way of Edmonton.

Then the Director of Administration, Mr. Morley Wood, came from Regina, worked for the Government for many years. But again not in the northern atmosphere, not even with northern people or northern problems. I think he was with the Department of Finance if I remember correctly. Now he has moved to LaRonge as the Director for the Administration of the North; Director of Personnel, Mr. Morgan, who came from Regina and before that he came from outside the province. Again, he may have been born here but that is neither here nor there. In Education we have Mr. Ed Breeze who was with the Department of Education in Regina and I have known him for many, many years. He is very talented, very conscientious but he left Saskatchewan and went to Ghana for awhile. Now he is back and moved to LaRonge and in charge of Northern Education. Glen Lingren, LaRonge, is the only one of the ones that I have mentioned . . .

An Hon. Member: — Nothing wrong with Glen.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, there is nothing wrong with Glen. I have known him for many years. We were fellow teachers and we sat side at the negotiating table for the Department of Northern Education on many occasions. He is the only true northerner that I have mentioned out of this list of almost ten or twelve.

I think that I have just pointed out that at the top level of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan they are not northern people. I am a little surprised at the Members opposite making comments about this because I have a clipping, I just happen to have a clipping here from the last NDP convention.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the Member is getting away from the Bill and I don't think we can range over a wide debate.

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will show you, if you will allow me to continue, that the people whom I have mentioned here as being part of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are one of the major problems as has been pointed out in this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to bring to the Member's attention that your Bill does not propose to displace those people on that Advisory Committee and I should like to keep the debate on the Bill.

Mr. Guy: — All that I am trying to do through this Bill, and I think that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, is that there has to be an alternative to the present administrative level, because as I am trying to point out, that this administrative level is not in touch with northern people and this is one of the problems. And this is what I wanted to point out here. That a Resolution from Athabasca says that the vast majority of the hierarchy in the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan are not northerners. And this is what I have been saying this afternoon they are not northerners. And the Resolution calls on the Government to award future appointments and replacements to northern residents. And this is what my Bill does, it brings in a northern Advisory Council which would have the power to at least recommend people who would fill these positions when they become vacant.

April 10, 1973

And the same Athabasca constituency also urges that the present Deputy Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan be replaced with one who is in sympathy with the aims and aspirations of the northern people.

Now that is not a Liberal talking, that is not a Liberal Members from up there talking. These are people from LaRonge, people of the same political persuasion of the Members opposite who are concerned enough to take it to their provincial convention. I give them full credit for being that concerned and I ask the Government to act.

I am giving the Government the opportunity to act this afternoon on the basis of what their own people, in the North, have asked them to do on an earlier occasion.

One of the other problems, of course, as I mentioned earlier, is the political activities of some of the Members up there. I mentioned the two that are on the Northern Advisory Council today, who no one has every denied, even Members opposite have not denied, that they participated in the byelection to a total extent. And the head of the Policy and Planning Branch, Mr. Brian Hill, attended a Saskatchewan New Democrat convention.

Now if he is going to be a civil servant, working on behalf of all the northern people of Saskatchewan, surely it is poor public relations, if nothing else, to attend the convention of any political party. I don't care whether it is NDP, Conservative, Liberal or anyone else. I think it is just poor public relations and it isn't in the best interests of the people. Particularly when he is going there as a southerner to begin with and he has to move into an area where he is not known and the problems that he is going to face are considerably different. He has a very important position there as he is the Director of Policy and Planning. I just think it isn't in the best interests of the people in the North or of the Government opposite to have one of their very senior employees, the Director of Policy and Planning, attending a New Democratic convention.

And this is just one of the other things that has led to some of the distrust and some of the fear that they have. They need some way of getting local input into this Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

We have also seen some overlapping of services during the Estimates that we have covered so far. There are still some areas where it doesn't appear too clear whether the Department of Highways, or the Department of Education or Government Services or so on have authority. Again, I am not being extremely critical of that because I recognize that in one year you can't do everything. I am not going to comment anymore on it other than there is a problem in that regard and I think that this Northern Advisory Council would be able to help sort out this problem, because they would be right on top of it.

I am hopeful that it will improve as the years go by and the opportunity is there to separate the lines of authority which I recognize you can't do in a year. But I think this Northern Advisory Council could certainly assist to a great extent the local input into what should be handled by another department or what should be handled by the Department of

Northern Saskatchewan.

You know one of the weaknesses of the former Northern Advisory Council, of course, was that there was no Metis representation on it. The Metis representatives refused to go on the Committee and for one of the reasons that I mentioned this afternoon. They felt that there was not enough local input from their organization. Again, I have clippings here where it shows that better liaison is sought between the Metis Society of Saskatchewan. It is concerned with the lack of understanding and education between itself and the provincial Government. They called a meeting of the executive members in an effort to solve this problem. This is an ongoing problem and I am not saying that it is one that is created overnight, but I think it is significant that the Metis Society did not put a member of the Northern Advisory Council from the time that it was first established about 18 months ago. Showing that there is a breakdown in communication.

This Council that I am suggesting is an approach to providing the local participation and the local consultation that I think would go a long way to providing the Metis Society the assurance that they will have an opportunity to be heard from the local Metis communities in northern Saskatchewan.

I must say that I was somewhat amazed when I saw the last copy of the "New Breed", put out by the Metis Organization where people who hold high ranking positions with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, had written a letter to the representatives of the Aglala nation at Wounded Knee and sent some money.

There was Jerry Hammersmith, Brian Morgan, Art Towill and Brian Hill. I would just like to suggest to those people that perhaps if they would spend a little more time trying to get the Metis and Indian people of northern Saskatchewan working closely with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, that their time would be better spent.

We all recognize that the Indian people in the United States have similar problems to what we have here in Canada. And it is very nice that they see fit to provide them with help, but it seems strange that they are providing assistance to the Indian Nation in the United States when they have the problems that I mentioned here, where the Metis Society in Saskatchewan are asking for closer liaison, better understanding and more consultation.

You remember that earlier this year I asked the Government if they would be prepared to carry out an inquiry because of the concern that had been shown from people in northern Saskatchewan – school teachers, local people and so on. So far there has been no comment either by the Minister or by the Premier as to whether such an inquiry will be held. I am not going to belabor that point this afternoon because I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this amendment is adopted that it will provide the local people with the opportunity to enquire and scrutinize the work and the policies of DNS and I suggest that that would be far better than having the Members of the Legislature, or any outside body doing it. If you have the machinery built into the Act, then the local people can determine how successful and how unsuccessful whichever the case might be, certain policies, certain actions of individuals and so on, are within the department.

April 10, 1973

If this amendment is adopted I would feel quite sure that the interests of the local people, to a large extent, will be looked after. And the idea of a public inquiry I certainly wouldn't push it at this time. I would be prepared to give the Department of Northern Saskatchewan additional time, hoping and knowing, that northern people would be able and be prepared, and would do a good job of scrutinizing and inquiring into the work, the practices and the policies. In fact, to help form the policies of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

So, I would suggest to Members opposite that there is nothing for them to lose in adopting these amendments. All we are doing is asking the Government Members to put into fact what they are in fact saying they intend to do. This gives them an opportunity to show that they do want increased consultation with northern people, that they do want participation from the local community.

If they don't support this amendment, then of course, the motives behind the comment of the Minister and the Premier and others who have been up in that area, I suggest, would have to be somewhat suspect.

So I do hope that all Members of the House will support these amendments. As I say there is nothing to be lost by it. It gives the local people the opportunity to participate and be heard, to have some say in the personnel and the budgeting and the priorities. It doesn't in any way take away from the Minister's power, which would be overriding of course, this would only be an advisory body. The Minister and the Government would still have the powers that they have today. But surely if we believe in the principles of local participation and getting people involved in the northern part of the province, particularly our Indian and Metis people, we can't object to the amendments that have been placed before you. That is why I tried to word these amendments in such a way that they would gain the support of Members opposite.

We have said in this House before and we haven't always followed it out, and I must admit that I am as guilty as anyone else. However, I think that it is fair to say that for the most part, on both sides of the House, both now and when we were in Government, we did try to keep away from politics as much as possible when we established the new Indian and Metis Department. There was disagreement as to how it was done and whether it should be done. But most of the arguments and most of the debates were carried out refraining, at least trying to refrain, from too much politics. It creeps in from time to time and as I say I am the first to admit that I am as guilty of that as anyone else.

Now, the second amendment merely clarifies the area over which the Act has jurisdiction. You will recall that when the Bill was passed last year, we pointed out that the final clause – I forget the exact wording of it – would give the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the power of including any area of Saskatchewan under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I don't think that it is that clear and my amendment clarifies it only to the point that before any new territory is included, under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, it wouldn't be by Order-in-Council, but would be through the Legislature, through an amendment to the Act. I don't think

anyone can object to that.

So, in conclusion, I just ask again that all Members consider very carefully, the amendments that I have provided. As I said there is no loss of power for the Government, but there is an opportunity to provide the northern people with the opportunity to participate, to be heard and to have at least some say in the destiny and development under the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I therefore, move second reading of Bill No. 37.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make just one or two brief comments with respect to this Bill as proposed by the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I very much appreciate his calm logic and his persuasive approach today in the debate.

Mr. Guy: — It doesn't happen very often.

Mr. Robbins: — No. It is quite different, quite frankly from what we usually get.

I noted his comments about civil servants in the North attending political meetings. He was very persuasive in his approach. He said – from a good public relations point of view – these people should not be attending political meetings.

I noticed recently that a fellow named George Leith, whom I think he should know and remember, who used to sit on this side of the House not far from the Hon. Member for Athabasca, was recently out to a meeting near Yorkton, a Liberal meeting near Yorkton, as reported in the Yorkton Enterprise. I am sure that the Hon. Member from Athabasca must have reasonable influence over Mr. George Leith, who is currently a civil servant and therefore, he can think of 171 reasons why Mr. Leith should not attend political meetings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. K. Comer: — (Nipawin) Mr. Speaker, I had hoped at first when I saw this Bill that we could unanimously pass the Bill. Some of the ideas put in it seem fairly good. And yet listening to the Hon. Member for Athabasca, it is obvious that he has some ulterior motives in this Bill.

What did he talk about? He talked about the NDP Convention. This apparently had something to do with the Bill. He talked about whether or not certain – this Bill wasn't even around then how could they support it. He talked about the civil servants in the North. It is an attempt by the Hon. Member for Athabasca somehow to set up an advisory board, so-called advisory, it doesn't appear to be advisory by what he says about the Act. It appears more to be a controlling board. A board to get rid of civil servants. A board to get rid of civil servants who are now active in the North. Civil servants who have the support are now active in the North. Civil servants who have the support of the Federation of the Saskatchewan Indians and of the Metis Society, in favor of the type of patronage civil servants that

April 10, 1973

the Liberals ran in the North for years and years.

You know it is funny, he mentioned Ile-a-La-Crosse. I have talked about Ile-a-La-Crosse a number of times in this House. He talked about the problems they had with the school. He wanted those people to have an input. According to the Metis Society and to the local school committee they are satisfied with the input that they are having on the development of that educational institution.

It is someone in a religious order in Saskatoon who isn't satisfied. And I think we have to put our priorities, we have to develop whom we are going to develop priorities for in the North.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak on this Bill. I have more that I should like to say later. I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. D. L. Faris (Arm River) moved second reading of Bill No. 53 – An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate an Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill will establish a subsidiary of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society. This subsidiary will be known as the Saskatchewan Co-operative Financial Services Limited. The purpose of the company as set out in the Act is to assist in meeting the housing agricultural and general financing needs of members of credit unions in co-ordination with credit unions and co-operatives operating in the province and generally to promote the economic and social progress of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Its powers will include investment in housing, agricultural, commercial, industrial and community undertakings. This subsidiary will serve as a central pool of the resources of local credit unions. This money will be pooled through the central agency and will be made available in conjunction with these same credit unions to projects in the local communities.

It should be noted that this development is a sign of the growing strength of the credit union movement. It is now the largest single banking facility in the province. Last year the investments other than loans in Saskatchewan credit unions exceeded \$200 million. In addition the Co-op Credit Society had investments other than loans of over \$126 million.

Saskatchewan credit unions already make a major contribution to this province. They are owned and controlled by Saskatchewan citizens. And it is appropriate that they should develop this instrument to participate in the economic development of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 53, An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate An Act to incorporate Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited be now read a second time and be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. R. MacLeod: — (Regina Albert Park) Mr. Speaker, I just want a word in support of the general intention of this Act. I am very pleased to see this type of thing going ahead and wish to comment only on the general continuing strength of co-operatives and particularly the credit unions in Saskatchewan. They are now developing what amounts to a tremendous financial muscle. I notice many towns now have the benefit of both a bank and a credit union. It does seem to me that they have done each to the other a pretty good service. A well rounded community is one I think with full banking facilities provided by credit unions and by the banks.

The credit union by this amendment – the credit union structure now intends to advance into an area supported by its credit unions and the Co-op Trust Company in Saskatchewan.

The reason that I am pleased with this is that as a citizen and as a solicitor for a few credit unions, I am very pleased to see this as an extension of the kind of service that is developing in the credit union movement, if I may use that word, although I don't like it. I support the general tone and intention of it. And when it comes to the Committee referred to by the Hon. Member of which I am a member we shall be pleased to scrutinize the clauses individually.

I support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. Robbins: — (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two brief comments if I may. I have had a long association with the credit union and co-operative movement. I actually was employed by them for 31 years. I had a long association particularly with the Saskatoon Credit Union, being in on the initial stages of development of that Credit Union.

I just want to briefly say that that particular credit union has grown from \$100 only in assets after its first year of operation to in excess of \$39 million at the end of the last month.

I am pleased to see the introduction of this type of Bill which will widen the scope and capability of the credit union movement in meeting the needs of people. I am pleased to support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. J. G. Richards (Saskatoon University) moved second reading of Bill No. 58 – An Act to amend The Chiropody Profession Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I trust Members opposite will pay close attention to this revolutionary piece of legislation. It is the first maiden piece of legislation I have had the privilege of bringing before the House.

Mr. Speaker, The Chiropody Profession Act was first enacted in 1943. There have never been a large number of chiropodists

actually engaged in its practice in this province. It is believed that at the most six chiropodists have been engaged in practice in any given time. It is also understood that these chiropodists have always practiced in either Saskatoon or Regina. In recent years the number of chiropodists in this province has decreased, so that at the present time there are only two chiropodists registered under this Act, they are both practicing in Saskatoon.

Chiropodists perform a most useful purpose in providing foot care services. And the lack of chiropodical services in the southern part of the province has created difficulties for persons requiring these services.

The Act presently states that in order for a person to be eligible to be registered under the Act, he must be graduated from a college or university providing a four-year course in chiropody. It is believed that the required length of course is too long in relation to the complexity of the services being provided.

In the United Kingdom a person is eligible to be registered with the Chiropodist Board of that country and to receive payment under the British Health Services Plan for services rendered if he has successfully completed a three-year course in chiropody. This three year period appears to be much more realistic in relation to the kinds of services being provided by chiropodists.

The requirement that an applicant should have successfully completed a four-year course in chiropody has therefore been deleted from the Act.

The section of the Act setting out specific qualifications for registration has also been revised with it being provided that a person registered with the Chiropodist Board in the United Kingdom would be eligible for registration in the province. The registration qualification providing for the registration of persons from any other country in the British Commonwealth of Nations or any State of the United States of America, if the province, country or state has qualifications for registration equivalent to those fixed under this Act has also been broadened.

Reference will now be made to persons registered in any other country rather than in any country of the Commonwealth of Nations or in any state of the United States of America.

There seems to be no good reason why a person registered as a chiropodist in any country should not be eligible for registration in Saskatchewan if that country had standards for registration equivalent to those of this province.

This clause was also revised so as to remove the reciprocity proviso. The Act is being amended in the hope that well qualified chiropodists from the United Kingdom or any other country may decide to come to Saskatchewan for the purpose of commencing the practice of chiropody.

Since the Act is being amended because of the concern for the limited number of chiropodists presently practicing in this province, it would seem to be ridiculous to retain the proviso that well qualified persons from some other country would be eligible for registration in this province only if a chiropodist

from Saskatchewan would be eligible to be registered in that other country.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I move that Bill 58, An Act to amend The Chiropody Act be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. F. MacDonald: — (Moose Jaw North) Mr. Speaker, I have been practicing for some time to be able to say chiropodist and I hope that it comes out all right. I think that this Bill has been introduced because of a problem that arose in Regina where a person calling herself a chiropodist, set up office and put out a shingle and advertised in the paper. As I understand it this person had a two-year training course. Therefore, she wasn't able to be registered under the Chiropody Professions Act.

I understand that this Bill still does not allow this particular person to practice chiropody in the city of Regina. I also understood that the training for chiropody was five years. The Member from Saskatoon says it is four years.

The one concern I have about this Bill is are we setting a precedent, and my question is and I would hope that the Minister of Health would possibly comment on this, are we changing the requirement from a four-year or five-year training to a three-year training simply because we cannot get the four or five-year trained person or are we changing it because the Minister of Health feels that the three-year trained person has the equivalent and as good a standard of expertise as a four-year trained person? I think that if we are down-grading the profession and accepting people of lower qualifications, I think possibly we are doing the wrong thing. I think that we should have an Act set up where people with three years be able to practice possibly under a different name.

I am in favor of the Bill as long as it is not simply diluting the quality of the chiropody profession just simply because we haven't been able to obtain chiropodists in this province.

Hon. W. E. Smishek: — (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has directed a question to myself. My understanding is that the kind of people we need for this purpose are trained in Britain where a three-year course is provided and it is considered to be an adequate course which will provide a high standard of care.

My understanding is from my officials that have examined this that certainly in the national health service in Britain, three-year trained people are doing excellent work in meeting the needs particularly of the senior citizens.

In terms of lowering the standard my information is that south of the border in the United States they have recently increased the standards to the point that it is now a six-year course. Chiropodists are not only cutting toe-nails, trimming

bunions and so on, but they are now doing surgery on the feet. We feel that some of the work that the chiropodists in the United States are undertaking should really be done by physicians. I don't know if I answered the Hon. Member's questions but I am assured by our people in the Department of Public Health that while it is true that we are lowering the period of time, the training that is provided in the United Kingdom is adequate training. It is hoped that as a result of the proposed amendment we may be able to recruit more people because we only have two chiropodists in Saskatchewan. Both of them are in Saskatoon.

It is true that the person who has come to Regina will not be able to qualify because she only has a two-year course. I think she is from Holland. People are concerned that perhaps her qualifications are not good enough, not high enough.

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) on a tremendous speech. I also want to say that I am very glad to hear that there will be easy transfer of those people trained in the Commonwealth of Nations into Saskatchewan.

Mr. F. Meakes: — (Touchwood) Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members are going to be surprised that I rise to speak on this. It so happens that I know just a little bit about chiropody or as it is called in the United States podiatry. It so happens that my brother is one, he has practiced for 15 years in the city of Los Angeles. This may sound like boasting but he was the first podiatrist to perform surgery in a hospital on other than corns. This was done by an agreement between the Podiatrist Association and the American Medical Association. This was a matter of about eight years ago and now there is quite a number of chiropodists who get referrals from the medical profession.

To remark on the comments of the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), the original course was a three year course. My brother took it at the University of Chicago, but before he could perform as he does now, he had to take a number of further courses. I am not sure how long it was but it is a profession that is now becoming more and more accepted in the United States by the medical profession. I say again I know this is because of the personal situation.

Motion agreed and Bill read a second time.

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North) moved second reading of Bill No. 73 – An Act to amend The Trade Union Act, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it was less than a year ago that this House passed The Trade Union Act, 1972 and at that time we in the Opposition brought forth some objections to the Act both on second reading and in Committee of the Whole. It may be significant that about eight amendments were made to the Act before third reading as a result of constructive criticism from this side of the House. There were many other amendments which we thought were desirable which were not included during third reading last year. This Bill before us today, therefore, contains a couple of very major amendments that we should like to see included in this Bill.

The adoption of these amendments will not make the original Trade Union Act perfect by any means but the amendments illustrate a very important principle. Other amendments that I should like to see adopted are not included in this Bill for a specific reason. Given the attitude of the Government I would not think they would pass the amendments that I would suggest. I am certain that they have to agree with the principle of the amendments which are introduced in this Bill. Therefore rather than complicate this Bill with changes that involve other principles I have limited this Bill to one very basic and important principle. That basic principle involved in this Bill is freedom for the individual.

We, in the Liberal Party, feel that individuals must be given the maximum possible amount of individual freedom and that this freedom should be guaranteed by law. This is the basic philosophy of the Liberal Party and individual freedom is the deepest concern that we carry. There is nothing, in my judgment, more important than the individual. This is likely the important difference between the NDP and the Liberals. The NDP feel that the individual should serve the state or the organization and that this state or organization is the important objective, that the individual is only as strong as the group. The Liberals believe the opposite, that the state or organization should serve the individual and that the individual is the important objective, that the state or organization is only as strong as the individuals that comprise it. In fact I think that the definition of Liberalism could well be a belief that people should be given the maximum possible amount of individual freedom which is guaranteed by law.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — In introducing this Bill I want to assure all Members of this House who may not yet have studied this Bill that this principle of individual freedom is the only principle involved in this Bill. I want to make this point very strongly especially to the newer Members on the Government side. I find looking back at old debates that the older Members opposite and especially those in the Cabinet always use one method when debating Trade Union legislation. This tactic is to immediately attack the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker: — I think we are getting away from the principle of the Bill. We are getting into a political debate which I don't wish to see and wish the Member would please stay to the Bill which is before us.

Mr. MacDonald: — As I said, in introducing this Bill I want to assure all Members of this House who have not studied the Bill that the principle of individual freedom is the only principle involved in this Bill. I find looking back — I'll skip that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I should like to comment on the debate we made last year on The Trade Union Act. When I had finished speaking the Attorney General rose and said that I had raised points that certainly bear very serious consideration. Then he went on and

April 10, 1973

I'll quote the Attorney General from page 2045 of the Debates and Proceedings, 1972:

But on the whole the basic criticism of the Member from Moose Jaw North has reflected the predominant feelings of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan against strong Trade Union legislation.

That then became the form of the debate and the points that the Attorney General agreed should be given consideration were obscured by the tirade against the Liberal Party. This is the same method employed by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Health. I ask the Members opposite to check my debate last year to see if my speech was anti-union. It was not. The Government opposite refused to realize this. Therefore, I ask the back benchers opposite to listen to my part in this debate and to study the Bill but not to be influenced by the old guard who are not prepared to listen.

You will find that this Bill is not anti-union, that it does not weaken The Trade Union Act. You will find that this Bill is pro-people and that it is proposed to offer fair treatment and freedom for the individual. If the Members opposite are not in favor of fair treatment and individual freedom then they can vote against it just because it is a Liberal idea.

As I said the principle involved in this Bill is freedom of the individual and a vote on second reading is supposed to be a vote on principle. However, as this is not a Government should like to explain this Bill a little more specifically than might be normal on second reading.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to go into specific examination of the Bill.

Section 35 of The Trade Union Act provides that:

where membership in a trade union is a condition of employment and an employee is denied membership in the trade union or his membership is terminated for reasons other than the failure to pay dues, then if the employee tenders payment for dues he shall be deemed to maintain his membership in the trade union for purposes of this Session.

That is he would be able to maintain his job. However, subsection 4 of Section 35 goes on to say that:

This provision will not apply to an employee who has engaged in activity against the trade union.

This is a vicious kind of a law to have on our statutes. It means that an employee who must belong to a union in order to work can be expelled from that union and thereby lose his job if he undertakes any activity against the union. He is not, under this Act, even allowed to speak against his union. He does so at the risk of losing his job. This law grants the right to a trade union that isn't given to anyone else in our

modern society. It is contrary to the right of free speech. This law gives the trade union the right to expel a worker from his job if he exercises his right to free speech.

The largest corporation in this land doesn't have that right nor should they. I think of a former New Democratic MP who worked for the CPR, he criticized that company on every opportunity. He has the right to criticize the CPR and he has no fear of reprisals because the laws of this land protect him, as they should. Governments don't have this right. Any employee of any government can speak critically of his employer without fear of losing his job because of the laws of this land which protect him. Any citizen of this country can exercise freedom of speech and be critical of the government of the day without fear of reprisals. This is the law of our land. This right of free speech is not a right of every country in the world but it is in Canada. However, in Saskatchewan we now have a limitation on free speech. Free speech still applies except within a trade union and I think that this is intolerable. An employee must be given the freedom of speaking against his own union at a union meeting. If an employee doesn't like his union or thinks they are not acting in his best interest he should be allowed to discuss this with fellow employees. Surely this is a basic freedom that should be enjoyed by all working people. Surely an employee should be able to express dissent without fear of losing his job.

The argument may be that trade unions are very reasonable and that they will allow some latitude and wouldn't exercise this power unfairly. Well, of course, trade unions are by and large very reasonable and fair minded and almost always allow a fair degree of latitude but this is no excuse for having a law in our statutes that given the right to any organization to remove the right of free speech completely. There are laws in this land so that the right of free speech cannot be abused and we therefore limit free speech by libel laws and so on. The amendment that I propose allows for free speech by employees but does put limits on it. An amendment in this Bill will allow an employee to speak against his union or to engage in activity against his union. The employee will be allowed to use his own initiative but he will not be allowed to engage in activity against his trade union if his employer or anyone acting on behalf of his employer, has instigated the activity or has participated in the activity, or has contributed financially or other support to the employee in respect to the activity. Let me add also that this amendment that I propose does not stop the union from expelling a member for whatever reason they see fit, it just implies that the employee will not lose his job as a result.

I would also add that this amendment which guarantees free speech is absolutely necessary in order to allow an employee to take procedures to have a decertification order. Under the present law any employee initiating such a procedures does so at the risk of losing his job.

The Trade Union Act was passed in 1944 and the CCF Government were very proud. A very important feature of that Act and of the present Act was that dismissal or discrimination for union activity was prohibited. This is important and it is a good law. Employees must have the right to organization and to bargain collectively and they must have the protection of the law to do so without facing dismissal or discrimination by

April 10, 1973

employers but I think employees should have the same protection extended regarding the trade unions into which they are organized. They can't be dismissed for union activity but they can be dismissed for taking what might be called anti-union activity. No matter how well a union is working in his best interest, he is not allowed to take action against that union without fear of losing his job.

The very heart of The Trade Union Act is embodied in Section 3 of the Act which states that:

Employees have the right to organize and to form, join or assist trade unions and to bargain collectively through a trade union of their own choosing.

This means to me that employees have the right to form and join a union if they choose but it also means that if they choose they should be able to get rid of a union or to replace a union or to form a new union. We must guarantee by law that employees have this right and also to have clear and easy access to achieve this right. Therefore, the other amendments in this Bill set forth a clear procedure to follow for decertification.

I would like to refer to comments made last year when I raised the question during consideration of The Trade Union Act. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) responded to my suggestions and I quote:

We will consider some of the suggestions made by the Members, one in particular as it relates to the decertification process. We are more than willing to have a look at this because I think perhaps the legislation means something other than is what it was originally intended to mean. It is our intention to assure that any trade unionist who is unhappy or if the majority of his colleagues are unhappy with the trade union to which they belong that they be afforded the opportunity to take action to replace it.

However, the Minister of Labour took no measures to see that the employees were afforded this opportunity. I think there may have been some confusion for Members opposite because when Mr. Smishek spoke in his debate he said:

The way the workers got into a union they have exactly the same procedure to follow to decertify a trade union.

He went on to say:

They can make applications to the Labour Relations Board to establish their case in the same kind of way for decertification as for certification.

To back up this argument the Minister of Health referred this House to Section 6 of the Act, and to powers of the Labour Relations Board. I would again ask Members of this House to examine Section 6 and they will find that there is not a clear method for decertification but only for certification. After reading Section 6 you will see that a decertification cannot be obtained in the same manner that certification can be obtained. Section 6, subsection 1 says:

The Board may direct a vote.

Subsection 2 is a raiding clause that enables one union to raid members of another union and this clause states that:

If a trade union shows 25 per cent support the Board shall direct a vote to determine the question.

Under these circumstances the Board is forced to conduct a vote for certification but under no provisions is the Board forced to conduct a vote for decertification. Section 6 gives rights to trade unions; the amendments that I propose gives the same rights to an individual employee or to a group of employees. The proposed amendments do not allow for a single employee who may be disgruntled with his union to force a vote. If a disgruntled employee wants to force a vote he would have to obtain the support of 25 per cent of his fellow employees. I think that this is significant number and would then be indicative of significant unhappiness with that union and the situation would clearly warrant the taking of a vote.

I should like to make this point even clearer because when I raised it last year there was some misunderstanding. I should like to quote from the comments of the Attorney General:

The whole business of, for example, the decertification of a 40 per cent vote. This is the very first point the Member for Moose Jaw raised. This is a strange principle that you should be able to decertify a union on what amounts to a minority vote.

That statement is a misconception. If you read this Bill you will find that there is no process involved for automatic decertification. The amendments simply state that showing at least 25 per cent support or more support then the board shall take a vote. The amendments do not contain any provisions to force the Labour Relations Board to decertify. The Board has this power but these amendments do not force the Board to order a decertification even if the employees could show 100 per cent support. The amendments simply force the Board to conduct a vote if significant support is shown to be in favor of taking a vote. The amendments provide a clear procedure for employees to take so that the employees will be free of reprisals from the union. The New Democratic Party prides itself in having within its constitution the provision that states at the annual convention, the Leadership Convention, that every member of that party has the opportunity to challenge the Leader and the leadership of that party. Surely this provision doesn't weaken the New Democratic Party just because it allows dissenters to force a vote to determine a question. In this same way I don't think that comments of the Attorney General are fair when he suggested that amendments that I propose would weaken the Trade Union Movement and that they aren't democratic in nature. Surely in a democracy the right to dissent is a basic right. As I have said the principle involved in this Bill is the freedom of the individual, a principle that is very important. The principle in no way weakens the Trade Union Movement. It helps to ensure that the Trade Union Movement will operate within a democratic process. This democratic process may in time seem to slow the pace by which we progress and the democratic process allows for dissent that some people would rather avoid. However, we enjoy the products of democracy and one of these products is that every individual will be allowed to be heard so we must be prepared to accept all parts of the democratic process even those parts that we would sooner avoid. The Attorney General

April 10, 1973

objects to those amendments on the grounds that they would allow an individual to take a kick at the cat but I think that in democracy this is the right of any individual. For these reasons and for this principle I would urge every Member to support this Bill to ensure freedom and democracy. It is with great pleasure that I move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway: — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, it given me pleasure to speak on this amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North. I want to say that he mentioned something about his party or his Members believing in freedom. I don't believe you have a monopoly on that, because I know the kind of freedom that you're referring to. You're referring to the 'dog eat dog' freedom and then after that's all over and you've got a 'dog eat dog' situation, then you want freedom, you want the laissez-faire kind of freedom. That's okay for those who have, but a lot of people in this world don't have, and that's a hollow term to those people. I also wanted to say that you had mentioned something about unions which do not allow dissent on the part of their members. Well, I well recall and know of certain other organizations in this province which don't allow dissent, and I refer specifically to the doctors during the Medicare crisis, and you certainly allied yourself with them hook, line and sinker. There's no doubt about that. I want to assure you that having attended union meetings that union members speak out. There is no doubt about that, and that is just pure gibberish.

Mr. Speaker, I could well spend a considerable amount of time today in a general discussion of the many ramifications of this proposed place of legislation which, as most of us are aware, is made to order for the promotion of industrial strife which must weigh heavily on the consciences of Members opposite. But then I can well visualize that Members opposite are obligated to employer barons, hook, line and sinker, and contributions. I could indicate something of the extent to which it will create labor management confusion in this province, to which it will actually lead to open labor relations disruption. And it reflects the hypocrisy of the Members opposite who in one breath preach their support for unions and in the next put forward a mechanism to wipe them out. I also see it as a continuation of the attempts by that group to sabotage the collective bargaining process, a move which they started in 1964 and promoted while being urged on by those who dislike the workers of this province. But I will not speak at great length on that here. My remarks would only fall on the deaf ears of those facing me across the aisle. I will reserve my general comments on the Bill for another occasion when there will be a more receptive and knowledgeable audience truly concerned with harmonious labor-management relations such as the people of Saskatchewan are.

I should like to elaborate, however, on the point that Opposition spokesmen continually speak with forked tongues when dealing with the subject of industrial relations. On the one hand we have the resolution passed at the last Liberal convention which endorsed free collective bargaining as the most appropriate means for resolving labor-management difficulties with the minimum of government intervention. This, despite Bill 2 which imposed compulsory arbitration on the working

people of Saskatchewan. This, despite the oppressive and restrictive amendments to The Trade Union Act in 1966, 1968 and 1969. And this, despite the subsequent introduction of the Bill now under discussion which will do nothing but foment labor unrest. Or is this what Opposition Members really want? To once again try to divide our people as they did during the early stages of Medicare. I plead with them to stop these odious practices.

My small contribution will involve a very brief outline of the mechanical and operational reasons for which the Bill is both unnecessary and unworkable. In the first place, the amendment specifies that an employee may apply to the Labour Relations Board for an order naming a rival union as bargaining agent for a group of employees and decertifying the existing union. Presumably, it has been hoped to sell the idea that an employee does not now have that right. This is totally false. Any employee can make such an application under the present legislation under Section 5(k). In making this provision in the amendment, however, a crucial point has been overlooked deliberately or otherwise. The new Section 5(a) does not specify as the existing Trade Union Act does that an application of this kind can be made only between 30 and 60 days before the anniversary of the effective date of the existing agreement. As a result, this new proposal could result in applications coming to the Board every day of the year from a given bargaining unit. This would cause hopeless confusion. Moreover, it would encourage union raiding practices and would lead to utter chaos in the operation of collective bargaining. Is this what Opposition Members really want? To promote raiding and all its possible ugly implications? Another clause of the amendment provides that the Labour Relations Board would have to order a decertification vote when 25 per cent of the employees have indicated their support. The senselessness of this section is pointed out by the fact that a vote would have to be taken even where 75 per cent support of the existing union could be demonstrated. Finally, the amendment would take away any meaningful disciplinary powers of unions by stipulating that action by a union member against the union must be instigated by the employer before steps against the member can be taken by the union. Mr. Speaker, society depends for its success on rules. Every organization must have the means to control its membership if it is to function in an effective and a cohesive way. The impact of this part of the amendment is synonymous with saying a man should not be fined if he goes through a red light or imprisoned if he robs a bank. It is completely out of touch with reality. And that is to be expected of Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this amendment is really meant to pit worker against worker, housewife against worker, farmer against worker, anyone against anyone, for the benefit of those Members opposite who wish to pay homage to those whom they so earnestly serve, the employer-barons, most of whom do not even reside in this province. So I say, Mr. Speaker, if it's division that Members want, if it's labor strife that Members want, if it's chaos as the Liberals promoted during the Liberal Bill. But if it's harmonious relations Members want, then they should vote against this monster Bill which only Liberals could come up with.

Mr. Speaker, I have some words for the Liberal Member for Moose Jaw North. If he is against the workers of this province

April 10, 1973

and wishes to promote employer-employer strife, he then is by implication against all Saskatchewan people who derive benefit from harmonious labor relations. Well, if this be the case, then he is working against the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, the student, and even himself. So I say to him, Mr. Speaker, there are better ways for him to serve corporate masters, and I ask him to start listening to Saskatchewan workers and farmers. They'll not bite him, and maybe he'll learn something about labor relations.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 73 is a piece of Liberal mischief whose destructive consequences would ruin the kind of productive labor-management relations which the Government has been trying to promote. Its true intent is to weaken the ability of workers to play their proper role in collective bargaining. As such it obstructs the work of this Assembly and renders a pronounced disservice to all the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

THIRD READINGS

Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture) moved third reading of Bill No. 50 – An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972.

Mr. E. F. Gardner: — (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, before we give third reading to this Bill I should like to say a few words about the Bill itself and about the proceedings. We've gone through the committee stage and we've established several very important points in connection with the Bill. We've established, for example, no vote is going to be allowed. The amendment that we proposed which would suggest time to allow for a vote was turned down by the Government so it's quite clear that they have no intention of allowing the vote. I think we've established also there's not necessarily producer control in this Commission. As we indicated, we are very strongly in favor of this throughout the second reading and the committee stage of the Bill. It's clear also, I believe, that the Government is not going to remove the reverse onus clause which not only we, but legal people, professional people, city people, country people, all throughout the province find very onerous. Many people who don't know anything about the Bill, object to this particular clause because it's a direct contradiction to the basic principle of British law. We indicated that we wished to have this removed but our amendment to do this was defeated and it appears that this very objectionable part of the Bill will remain. It's also been clearly established in the preceding debate on the Bill that cattle could be included at any time with no vote and presumably with little consultation. It wouldn't require further amendments, it wouldn't require further legislation, cattle could be included at any time, next week, next month, next year, whenever the Government felt the urge to do it. We wanted this made clear and it has been made clear to us. We wanted to make sure that we understood the Bill properly and that the powers were in the Bill and we are sure that this is there. It's also clear, I believe, that the producers can be controlled, licensed and assessed fees in cash by this Commission.

There has been some talk about the fact that the Commission only has to do with marketing. And I believe that we have

established quite clearly now that this is not the case, that the Commission also can control the producer, the production, they can license him, they can extract cash fees from him in any amount that they wish to set and we have no idea what they will be. Presumably, they will be determined to some extent by the number of hogs a person has or the number of cattle when that comes or any of the other regulated products. It's quite clear that the Commission has the power to do this. And this is one thing that we also wanted to make clear in our questioning on the Bill and this is why we were very careful to try and get this information around the province and we wanted to make sure it was correct, that producers could be licensed and actually assessed cash fees. We're not satisfied, of course, with the passing of this Bill. We're not satisfied with the fact that it may be given third reading but we feel we have at least clarified the points that were in doubt as far as the Opposition were concerned and I might say that I will not be supporting the third reading of this Bill.

Mr. J. C. McIsaac: — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, before we give this Bill third reading I think one or two points should be made clear to some of our friends opposite. My opposition to this Bill is not based on the fact that it's designed to promote more orderly marketing. My opposition is based on the fact that this legislation denies the farmers their very basic right to a direct voice in their own affairs, denies them that basic right, a voice in the marketing and indeed production of their own products. I still find this kind of legislation amazing coming from the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, because the NDP are staunch defenders of the rights of any other group to bargain collectively for their services. In the debate just a little bit earlier in today's proceedings, we had the Member for Hanley (Mr. Mostoway) talking away about the rights of free collective bargaining. And this legislation denies the farmers of Saskatchewan those very basic rights. The farmer and particularly the stockman is not given the same rights as other citizens. And I don't think, that since this Government came to power, we've seen a similar erosion of individual rights as we have in the case of the Saskatchewan farmer. We've seen them last year in the introduction of the Land Bank moving into the field of being the major landlord and I realize the Government has always been the major landlord in the province but it will be even more so now under that legislation and a perpetual landlord involved in leasing land and it makes the Government has a real estate agent and a very big factor in setting and establishing land prices. We saw last year the introduction of a piece of legislation that hasn't been proceeded with really, The Foreign Ownership Bill, which has further restrictions and again the farmer is the intended victim. And now we see this Bill, Bill 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act very much again directly involved in a further erosion of farmers' rights. Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals on this side of the House and everyone in this province do support orderly marketing but not at the expense of the farmers' rights to have a say in the form of marketing style whether it be a board or commission or anything else. And I say we're not in Uganda or Chile or Rhodesia where these government have taken away decision-making powers and denied their citizens some basic rights. I think and I'm sure the Members opposite must agree – but this legislation says they don't – that Saskatchewan farmers are capable and they're qualified and they're competent and they're intelligent enough

to make their own decisions. Surely, they shouldn't be denied the right to say in how their products are produced or marketed. That is the whole crux of our opposition and my opposition, Mr. Speaker, to this kind of legislation. Their incomes and their return from investment are entirely dependent now on a government appointed commission in which the producers have no say whether or not they want to get into such a commission and once in it, under the powers of this Bill, no say in who runs it, how it runs or anything else. That's the crux of our opposition to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I will be opposing it.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald: — (Cannington) Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my remarks very brief because the Member for Wilkie and the Member for Moosomin also summarized what would be my position in respect to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I too believe in orderly marketing for many farm products. There are many products, Mr. Speaker, but I do believe that these decisions should be decided by the farmer on an individual product basis. As I have mentioned at an earlier time, you could well find a farmer who produces eggs and produces cattle and would favor a marketing board for eggs but would be just as violently opposed to a marketing board for beef. I think that much of the concern that producers have today could have been very easily avoided by the Government had they taken a much wiser course in this regard. I think what is probably the most disturbing aspect to me as Member of this Assembly is that a precedent is being set for the first time of establishing a marketing board without the producers' decision to have it established by a vote themselves. I think that it is okay for the Government and I am sure the Government will say that things are all right and are going to turn out fine in their hands, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think in our legislative process that this is a good enough answer. The president Minister of Agriculture for any number of reasons may or may not be the Minister of Agriculture in the future, the Government may or may not be the same government in the future. The methods with which this type of legislation is used has no particular guarantee that it will be administering it in the future. Therefore it is unfortunate that the Member for Nipawin doesn't seem to understand very much about this Bill. It is unfortunate . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . it's a commission!

Mr. Weatherald: — I understand it all right. A board you get a vote, a commission you don't, that's the difference. I understand that very well. I didn't say a board, I said a producer controlled board. You haven't been here much the last couple of weeks, so I can't help that. The difference is quite obvious and it has been mentioned many times, in one you have a vote, the other you don't. The powers are basically very similar. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people who administer it may change, individuals may change and the producer has been left in the position of being more or less at the whims of whoever happens to be the administration at the time.

Therefore, I think the precedent, as I mentioned earlier, is an extremely bad one. Personally I think in all probability, had a vote been taken on this particular hog marketing commission, it might have passed. If a sensible and articulate program had

been presented to producers, I honestly believe that, that a vote would have been favorable. So I say that it is unfortunate that the Government embarked on the type of action they did and it is unfortunate because it could have repercussions for other products in the future, depending on whoever the individuals administering the government may be at that particular time.

One of the things that I think is of great concern to the producer at this time and I should like to mention it to the Government is, Mr. Speaker, the question of setting of fees as far as their product is concerned. Farmers are expressing a number of concerns and expressed these to myself on a number of occasions already because they feel that they have no direct input into what the levying of these fees will be or what the administrative expenses may well be. It is a concern of theirs that since these individual levies or expenses that will be levied against their product will not be set by themselves but will be set by the appointed board that they are expressing concern as to what this levy might be. They are expressing concern that bureaucratic abuses of the expenditure of this money may well set in for trips around on the promotion of the product that are not really necessary. I think it is the duty of the Government to clear up these matters as rapidly as possible.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks our opposition is not against orderly marketing, but it is based on the new set of principles that have now applied to it. I think that while there is a good case that can be made for many products to be on an orderly marketing basis that this is a decision that should be made by the majority of the producers themselves.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, and Bill read a third time.

YEAS — 40

Messieurs

Blakeney	Michayluk	Richards
Dyck	Byers	Faris
Meakes	Thorson	Cody
Wood	Whelan	Gross
Smishek	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Romanow	Carlson	Mostoway
Messer	Engel	Comer
Kramer	Owens	Rolfes
Thibault	Robbins	Lange
Larson	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Kowalchuk	Cowley	Feschuk
Baker	Taylor	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Matsalla	Flasch
Pepper		

NAYS — 13

Messieurs

Coupland	McIsaac	Lane
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald
Guy	Weatherald	(Moose Jaw N.)
Grant	MacLeod	Wiebe
Boldt	McPherson	

The Assembly adjourned at 10:13 o'clock p.m.