

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**32nd Day**

**Friday, April 4, 1975.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. E.F. FLASCH:** (Maple Creek) Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce a group of students in the Speaker's Gallery. They are 11 in number and are members of my own Grade Eleven class from the Mendham School. They are accompanied by Mr. Glen Ehnisz. They came to the city last night and have visited a number of places of interest this morning.

I know that all the Members will join with me in wishing them an enjoyable and educational time here this afternoon. I don't know what to say about the trip home because the weather forecast is not good. Maybe they'll have a few extra days stay in the city.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**STATEMENTS**

**IRON ORE FROM MONTANA**

**HON. K. THORSON:** (Minister Of Industry And Commerce) Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement to the House in response to a report in yesterday's local newspaper regarding the possibilities of obtaining iron ore from Montana to supply western steel manufacturing requirements.

May I say that the article is extremely misleading and a distortion of the facts. It is written to convey the impression that domestic ore supplies have been ruled out and that IPSCO is rushing to obtain iron ore from the United States. That is not the case at all.

The best source of iron ore is likely to be Canadian. Ideally, a Saskatchewan-based steel complex should be fed by a secure, long-term supply from within the province. Failing this, a supply from other parts of Canada should be secured.

With respect to our own provincial sources of iron ore, I am pleased to report that the initial results of drilling on the Kelsey ore deposit are very encouraging. The Kelsey Lake deposit in Saskatchewan is located 22 miles from the Choiceland Iron Mines Ltd. property. The Saskatchewan Government has exclusive rights to the Kelsey Lake property. It has been estimated that the Choiceland deposit contains 150 million tons of 28 to 30 per cent ore at a depth of 2,000 or more feet. Preliminary drilling in the Kelsey Lake deposit indicates the ore is of higher grade and several hundred feet closer to the surface. Further drilling is being done now to determine the extent of the Kelsey Lake iron ore body. At this time I can say that detailed drilling will proceed as rapidly as possible so that we are in a position by the end of this summer to know as much about the Kelsey Lake deposit as we know about the

April 4, 1975

Choiceland deposit.

Associated with the drilling investigations will be a number of economic feasibility studies to determine the costs of development, mining and processing. I discussed this matter this morning with Mr. J.N. Turvey, President of IPSCO. I am confident that all of the necessary feasibility studies will proceed in co-operation with IPSCO.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, a decision by a western Canadian steel manufacturer to base future developments on foreign ore supplies would be a hasty and unwise move at this time in view of the strong possibility of obtaining adequate supplies of high grade ore here in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A.R. GUY:** (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, in regard to the comments made by the Minister, I believe we are entitled to reply to statements made by Ministers. We are certainly pleased to hear that the Minister is putting Saskatchewan first. We regret that it has taken him four years and again it may be a death bed repentance at the time just prior to an election because he had the opportunity in 1971 to put Saskatchewan first. We had invested some money in the Choiceland deposits and that was cancelled by the Minister or his Government almost the day after they were elected and nothing has been done for four years. He says that to date the feasibility studies of Kelsey Lake are encouraging but he certainly left the impression that not enough has been done to make a decision for a long time to come. Time is getting short, if Saskatchewan doesn't get their development very shortly I am sure that another province in western Canada will get it and then there will be no development in Saskatchewan. So, while the Minister is so proud of what he is doing, I think that the people of Saskatchewan and certainly we, on this side of the House, are disappointed how slowly they have moved, because it was a decision of the Liberal Government to proceed with investigation or the Choiceland deposit and you know they cancelled it. This hasn't been good for the people of Saskatchewan.

He really did not answer what was in the Leader-Post yesterday because the question that I was going to ask him today was, have any negotiations or have any discussions taken place with the companies that are mentioned in that article? Of course, he has not answered that, he has merely put forward a proposition which we certainly support, Saskatchewan interest should be investigated first. He has not told us whether discussions and investigations and negotiations are going on with companies outside of Saskatchewan regarding ore deposits outside of Saskatchewan. So he has missed the point that is being made in the article in the paper, that the province is interested, IPSCO is interested in outside development. The fact that they are looking at Saskatchewan first doesn't answer the question whether these other negotiations are going on.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL COVERAGE FOR SOUTH VIETNAMESE AND CAMBODIAN CHILDREN**

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement on behalf of the government. Yesterday I received a telegram from the Hon. Robert Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration asking whether Saskatchewan was prepared to extend immediate hospital and medical coverage to South Vietnamese and Cambodian children who have been adopted or are in the process of adoption by Saskatchewan families. A second telegram received today asked whether the Saskatchewan Government would be prepared to undertake the temporary care and maintenance of orphan children from these southeast Asian countries when the children are not destined for adoption by any specific Canadian family, until we are able to arrange for adoption through our own program.

Mr. Speaker, a joint reply has been sent from the Minister of Social Services, the Hon. Alex Taylor and myself, stating that the Saskatchewan Government will co-operate fully in this program and will accept responsibility for the care and arranging for the adoption of our share of these children. In addition the Government will provide immediate health coverage upon their arrival in the province.

We have no information on the number of children, if any, who may be destined to arrive in Saskatchewan or when the children might arrive. We are attempting to obtain this information from the Government of Canada. There are no adoptions of South Vietnamese or Cambodian children by Saskatchewan families under way at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the House may be interested in the exact text of the telegram that was sent to Mr. Andras. It reads as follows:

The Saskatchewan Government wishes to assure you that we will co-operate with your department in assisting to settle orphan Vietnamese or Cambodian children who may be released for settlement in Canada. The Department of Social Services is prepared to offer temporary care and maintenance of south Asian children who have not been designated for specific adoption homes. We can assume Saskatchewan's share of any such number of children and will be responsible toward the eventual adoption of such children if and when they become legally free. On arrival in Saskatchewan the children will be eligible for benefits under all provincial health programs. It would be appreciated if you would designate one of your officials to act as liaison to work out procedures and technical details.

Signed by myself as Minister of Health and Alex Taylor, Minister of Social Services.

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD:** (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, just in response to the Minister, first of all I want to congratulate the Government of Canada for taking the leadership in this worsening situation in southeast Asia. I think the Minister is aware — he says he doesn't know the number of children — that the Province of Ontario has agreed to take 300 Vietnamese children, the Province of Quebec has

April 4, 1975

agreed to take something in the neighborhood of 200, the Province of Nova Scotia has agreed to take 100 and I would hope that the Saskatchewan Government, in view of the situation, would also lend all possible assistance through their adoption agency as the Minister has indicated and take a goodly portion and certainly see that Saskatchewan takes their full share of the responsibility of not only Canada and the other provinces of Canada but perhaps the whole western world in providing some method in attempting to alleviate this very, very difficult situation in southeast Asia.

Once again I am very pleased that the Government will respond to the request of the Government of Canada. I do once again congratulate the Government of Canada for the inspiration and the leadership that they are taking in providing an opportunity for children from southeast Asia to receive an opportunity for a home, security and stability in a life as a Canadian citizen.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **ENERGY SECURITY FUND**

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD:** (Cannington) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. In today's paper under the headline, "Blakeney Urges Fund to Seek New Oil and Gas," the first paragraph says:

Any increase in the \$6.50 a barrel domestic price of oil should go into a Canada Energy Security Fund to finance oil exploration and find natural gas reserves within Canada, Premier Allan Blakeney said in Regina.

This is an announcement of the NDP policy the Premier intends to pursue at the Energy Conference. The question I wish to direct to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley) is; is the Minister of Mineral Resources aware that if the Premier were to be successful in bringing about a \$2 a barrel increase in the price of oil and this money was all put into the Energy Fund, is he essentially saying that the consumers of Saskatchewan and particularly farmers who are high energy users will indeed be paying the full increase of \$2 when that increased price for all Canada goes into effect?

**MR. CODY:** What did your leader say?

**MR. WEATHERALD:** Well, if he wants to know we said we would rebate a certain portion of that money to the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order! The Member for Cannington has the floor and asked a question of the Minister of Mineral Resources and as chit-chat across the floor I can't accept this part of the question.

**HON. E.L. COWLEY:** (Minister of Mineral Resources) Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Cannington's question, it is quite obvious to me, as I am sure it is to

every other Canadian, that if the increase in the price of oil is \$2 a barrel then the consumers in Canada, in all provinces of Canada would pay somewhere around seven cents a gallon extra for gasoline. Obviously, this would happen in every province unless provincial governments took some action to alleviate the increase in price to consumers. In the case of Saskatchewan, I am not in a position to announce any government policy; that will be announced in due course. The Member will be aware that when the price of oil increased the last time the Government of Saskatchewan lowered the gasoline tax and in the case of purple gas provided a rebate to farmers.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The question I am trying to direct to the Minister is: That this time the Government opposite has announced precisely what they are going to do with the \$2 increase. In actual fact they will have no money to rebate the consumer. The \$2 you are suggesting will go into an energy fund to look for new gas. So I think consumers in Saskatchewan should be aware that from the answer just given, there will be no rebate to consumers in Saskatchewan if the Canadian price of oil goes up.

**MR. COWLEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Cannington makes the assumption that no alternative sources of funds would be available. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a Liberal Government, even if the government got the \$2 a barrel, they wouldn't have any funds available to provide any assistance to consumers. I think one only needs to look at their record from 1964 to 1971 when they cut back all of the services in this province and they still had to increase all of the taxes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

#### **WILL INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS GIVE INFORMATION TO PRICES REVIEW BOARD**

**MR. J.G. LANE:** (Lumsden) Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In light of the announcement that the consumers of Saskatchewan are not going to get any saving under the Premier's policy announcement, is the Minister of Consumer Affairs aware that, Canada Safeway Limited has announced that it will supply its profit data to the Food Prices Review Board investigating beef marketing in Canada, is he prepared to assure the Legislature and the public that he will guarantee that Intercontinental Packers where the Government participating in the beef industry, will give full disclosure of its buying and selling practices and its pricing and marketing practices to the Food Prices Review Board Investigating Committee investigating into beef marketing in Canada?

**MR. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Minister of Consumer Affairs) Well, I am in no more position to guarantee than the Member is in a position to know that Safeway will in fact provide that information. But, yes, I am aware that Safeway of Canada has indicated it will provide the information the Member speaks of to the inquiry into the meat marketing system. I also want; to indicate to the Member that after long urging by the Saskatchewan Government and other provincial governments, we are pleased to hear that there was a federal inquiry into

the meat marketing system set up. I immediately after that wrote to all of the meat packing companies who are operating in Saskatchewan urging them to provide all of their co-operation and assistance to this inquiry. I have received replies from all of them including Intercontinental Packers in which they indicate they would be most willing to do that.

**MR. LANE:** By way of supplementary, we of course assume that the Minister will table the letters and the replies. Would the Minister not be prepared to admit, however, in the lack of action that has been taken by the Province of Saskatchewan, would he not be prepared to admit in light of yesterday's tabling of the White Paper on warranties and representations when in fact the major problems in Saskatchewan are the high cost of farm machinery and the high cost of food, that, in fact, the Government has done nothing and that its priorities are in fact warped when it comes to the matter of consumer affairs . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! A supplementary question is supposed to be based on the original, not asking a fresh one.

### **REMOVAL OF NONDEDUCTIBILITY PROVISION**

**MR. J.G. RICHARDS:** (Saskatoon University) Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to address a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources concerning the Premier's announcement of a Canada Energy Security Fund. The amount of that fund would amount to approximately \$1.5 billion. My question to the Minister is: Is the Provincial Government still pursuing a policy of calling for the removal of nondeductibility which would result in turning \$400 million 1974 income taxes back to the oil companies across the country? Whereas I find it admirable that the Province of Saskatchewan has separated its position from that of Alberta and is arguing that any price increase should go entirely to the public sector, is the Province of Saskatchewan still arguing for the removal of nondeductibility and envisaging that the \$400 million tax reduction to the oil companies would remain with the oil companies?

**MR. COWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan is indeed arguing that royalties should be deductible as part of this package. In terms of what would flow to the oil industry, I think that would depend entirely upon the actions of various provincial governments, in terms of how they might adjust their royalties in the light of those royalties being deductible. The Member for Saskatoon University will be aware that in September of last year the Alberta Government changed very substantially some of the royalties as a result of nondeductibility. I am in no position to provide the Member with any information as to what the Government of Alberta might do in the light of royalties being deductible, as to whether there would be any change in their royalty policy. The Member for Saskatoon University may wish to contact Mr. Getty, who is the new Minister of Energy in Alberta.

**MR. RICHARDS:** The obvious supplementary to that question is, it is all very well to talk about not knowing what the Government of Alberta is going to do. What about the Government of Saskatchewan?

Is it the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan were there to be deductibility as has been argued by the Government of Saskatchewan, would the Government of Saskatchewan allow part of that \$2 increase to go to the oil companies because of deductibility or would the Government of Saskatchewan guarantee that there will be no more money flowing to the private oil companies in Saskatchewan?

**MR. COWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the \$2 in the proposal put forward by the Premier, obviously none of it would flow to the oil industry as it would flow into this special energy security fund. In terms of the oil industry and what would be our position in terms of the oil industry in Saskatchewan if deductibility was restored, our position would be, Mr. Speaker, that we would design, as best we could, in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, a system of royalties which would leave for the industry a reasonable rate of return on its investment and would leave to the industry for investment in Saskatchewan a substantial amount of money that would allow them to carry on exploring for oil reserves in this province.

### **SASKATCHEWAN TAXPAYERS FINANCE OIL EXPLORATION FOR DOMINION**

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD:** (Milestone) Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask a question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** We have had three questions, is the House prepared to permit another question?

**MR. MacDONALD:** The Minister is aware that the Premier of Saskatchewan has, in this statement this morning, indicated that he wants the Saskatchewan taxpayer by putting all of the \$2 a barrel increase to finance the oil exploration for the Dominion of Canada. I find this a very strange position for the Government of Saskatchewan to request . . . I am just prefacing it as briefly as I can, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister in agreement with the Premier's position that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan should finance all of the oil exploration for the Dominion of Canada out of the \$2 increase per barrel, or is he not suggesting that the citizens of Canada have some responsibility for off-shore drilling, the Arctic drilling and so forth. This \$1.5 billion from the producing province is merely suggesting that here, the Province of Saskatchewan will finance the oil exploration for the rest of Canada. I think it is a very weak and very poor position for the Province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. COWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is, that part of, not all of, but part of, the costs of exploring for future supplies of oil in this country would come by way of this fund.

As the Member may be aware the Canadian Petroleum association has suggested that the petroleum companies need a price in the range of \$11 a barrel and they need a net return in the range of 50 per cent of that or \$4.50 a barrel in order to carry out the exploration that is necessary in order to have security of supply in Canada.

The position I gathered from the past statements of the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan is that there should be a \$2

April 4, 1975

increase in the price of oil and that it should flow to the oil companies so that they can then carry out the exploration in northern Canada and off-shore. I think, Mr. Speaker, the costs will be borne by the same people either way and the suggestion put forward by the Government of Saskatchewan is that the special fund be set up in which all Canadians would in a sense contribute by paying higher prices for petroleum products and in which the share in this fund would be a split 50 per cent to the Federal Government recognizing to some extent the contributions of all Canadians, 50 per cent pro-rated amongst the producing provinces, recognizing their very significant and substantial contribution, tied to this would also be the re-introduction of deductibility of royalties; which would be a substantial advantage to the producing provinces.

**MR. MacDONALD:** Just a supplementary question, would the Minister admit that all of the \$2 a barrel increase to the \$1.5 billion will come directly from the Province of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the majority of it from the producing provinces and a small portion from the province of British Columbia?

I would also like to very clearly state that it is the portion of the Liberal . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order! I don't think we can get into a debate on this. The Member has the right to ask questions but we can't debate it.

**MR. MacDONALD:** Is the Minister aware that it is the position of the Liberal Party that because of the policy of the NDP that oil exploration in Saskatchewan has virtually come to a halt, we have now no exploration and I would hope that this policy that the Minister is suggesting is not going to have the same kind of results as that policy of the Minister in Saskatchewan. Will the Minister admit that the \$1.5 billion will come from Saskatchewan and Alberta primarily?

**MR. COWLEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to answer both of those questions. In the case of the \$1.5 billion, it would come from the increased price of oil which indeed one could argue, and I think very legitimately, is a very substantial contribution on the part of the producing provinces. With respect to the policy of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, the last time I was able to get a grasp on the policy of the Liberal Party was the one they brought out in 1919 which they still haven't implemented. Since that time, and I haven't had many years really to watch the Liberal Party in action but in the last 15 to 20 years which I can recall, I don't ever recall having seen the Party opposite in Saskatchewan have any policy on anything.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTION NO. 14 — CONDEMN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Wiebe (Morse):

That this Assembly condemn the performance of the Minister of Highways and Transportation for the deterioration of the highway system and his lack of concern for providing efficient and safe highways in Saskatchewan.

**MR. J.K. COMER:** (Nipawin) The other day listening to the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) when he introduced this Resolution you would almost think that there's only one highway in this province, No. 1. It goes by his own ranch, I guess. I don't know if it goes by the pig barn or through it. I think the concern shown by the Member for Morse is indicative of the concern that the Liberals have about highways in this province. If you can't four-lane it, forget it.

You know, the Member for Morse was concerned that we hadn't done further or even more four-laning along No. 1. or any other highways. In a sense I guess that's what he's condemning the Minister of Highways for the fact that we didn't have more four-lane divided highways.

You know, when I first read the Motion I thought maybe the Member was mistaken, maybe he meant to congratulate the Minister for the job he's done in highways but when I listened to his talk it was obvious that he did mean to condemn him, he did mean to condemn him for not doing more for four-laned highways, he talked about No. 1 and he said it's for the tourists. There are over 900,000 people in this province, they need highways too. I think that all fair minded people in this legislature and in this province will. congratulate the Minister of Highways.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** Will congratulate the Minister of Highways for upgrading substantially highways all across this province, will congratulate the Minister of Highways for implementing an imaginative and an appreciated program, Operation Open Roads and Operation Mainstreet, a program which has brought dust free all weather roads to 496 communities in this province. I know that the Opposition didn't like this program, the then Member for Wilkie got up in this House and talked about the fact that out in the country it was a bad road policy. It's interesting that the Member for Wilkie departed, he didn't dare face the provincial election again.

I think we should congratulate the Minister of Highways for extending the highway system by over 1,000 miles through the take-over of grid roads, grid roads which the municipalities found impossible to maintain because they'd become minor highways. I guess we can only assume that the Liberal Party is opposed also to this extension of the highway system. I think we should congratulate the Minister of Highways for the extensive improvement in the highways in northern Saskatchewan and the expansion of the highways in northern Saskatchewan. Again

April 4, 1975

I guess we can only assume that the Liberal Party is opposed to that. It's obvious that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is afraid of it, he's never stopped running since they started it.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move that Resolution No. 14 be amended be deleting all the words after the word Assembly and the following be substituted therefore:

Congratulate the Minister of Highways for the development of a highway system which brings good roads within easy reach of all the people of Saskatchewan and especially for instituting Operation Open Roads and Operation Mainstreet which brought all-weather, dust free roads to 496 communities and for the extension of the highway system by the taking over of 1,023 miles of grid roads.

Seconded by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris).

**MR. D. BOLDT:** (Rosthern) Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on this amendment. To congratulate the Government on the highway program is really an understatement. When we were the government we were noted as promoting good highways. I remember 1971 when the now Premier got up and spoke in public that he congratulated the Liberal Government for having a good highway program. That is a fact. Today when I go around the province I am always reminded and told that we wish we still had a Liberal Government because then many of the highways that are not completed today would have been completed.

The fact is that we got tremendous criticism from the then Opposition. They were going to take \$20 million out of the highway program. We had a construction program of \$45 million, the NDP promised the people of Saskatchewan they would take \$20 million out of the highway program and put it to some other use. The result is that that has backfired. You didn't go along with the highway program as you should have done. the result is that today you are paying more for highways, the cost is three times as much as it would have been in 1971.

I will have more to say about this amendment and I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

### **FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND SAFETY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino) that **the Final Report of the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety be now concurred in.**

**MR. D. BOLDT:** (Rosthern) Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words regarding this Highway Safety Report.

I want to express my general agreement with the tone and intent of what we are trying to accomplish. As my colleague, Mr. Grant, stated in his remarks that no doubt all Members could disagree with some aspects of the Report and I certainly am no

exception. I believe we have gone as far as the general public would want us to go and generally that is not very far. Law and order do not appear to be accepted by a good number of our citizens in this day and age. However, there are a large number, hopefully the majority, who are and will remain law abiding citizens.

The Report emphasizes speed limits, seat belts and dealing with the impaired driver. I believe the speed limits should be reduced to 55 miles per hour. I don't believe we would have any trouble enforcing it. The Minister of Highway, has stated it would be foolish to implement a lower speed limit when police are unable to enforce the present speed limit. I want to tell him that 90 per cent of the people would obey this law. Those that do not will be much easier to detect and will really stand out if they insist on driving 70 or over. It appears that our problem now is to convince some legislators to implement our proposals and I hope the new government will have that courage.

I support much stronger legislation and regulations regarding the impaired driver then our Report indicates. However, I did not want to put in a minority report because I believe in some manner it maybe doesn't strengthen the Report, but member of the Committee are well aware of how far I felt we should go and I need not reiterate all the proposals I have suggested. Most of the briefs that were presented to the Committee had something to offer regarding the impaired driver.

Education, I believe, will help some, but it is not the answer. Some personnel, some very sincere, serious people that brought a delegation stressed education. My answer always was that we have all the education and statistics regarding smoking and yet these very same delegates that brought these reports to us were lighting up continuously. So education really didn't help those people that were emphasizing that education would do it.

Alcohol is the leader in the field related to vehicle accidents. The use of alcohol will become much greater than in the past if we don't do something about it. If the Government will not legislate these people off the roads it will be virtually unsafe to travel on our Canadian highways. A continuously impaired driver getting involved in a fatal accident is considered by me to be just as serious a crime as a criminal robbing a bank, shooting the manager or police in his escape. Surely at some time the impaired driver is sober. When he is sober he recognizes the law and the law states very clearly that nobody is to operate a vehicle when impaired. If a person wants to drink that's his business, but he must also control himself from driving if he does. That decision not to drive must and can be made when he is sober. There is no excuse for him to plead impaired after the fatal accident and the courts set him free because of it. The time will come and it's not too far away when the Government will have to recognize this act as premeditated murder and the penalty should apply.

I would suggest that an impaired driver involved in a fatal accident should be put in an institution for life. No other penalty has proven to be satisfactory. All this pleading, what about his job, his wife, his family, should only receive second rate consideration. He has already perhaps taken a husband away from the wife and family for which he had no consideration. The onus is on the individual, if he makes that decision, he makes that decision on his own, not the court nor the government.

April 4, 1975

He knows that if he drinks and drives he could be put away where he would have lots of time to consider how different it would be if he had not indulged.

This might be considered by many as too drastic. I am confident that the people who have lost a loved one because of someone being impaired don't feel that way. To those who are opposed to this kind of legislation I can only ask them to inform me when one of his or her friends is a victim to an impaired driver and then let them express what should happen to the driver.

Our vehicles, our highways, our engineering and signs are all aimed at safety and comfort and I congratulate all governments in every province for this kind of program.

If the human element would only use common horse sense almost all accidents could be avoided.

This Committee has spent a good deal of time, many delegations have taken time off at considerable expense to themselves to present briefs. The taxpayer has been asked to pay the cost of this Committee which is considerable. I hope that the new government would have the courage to implement our major recommendations in the Report. I can only assure them that they will be surprised as to the support they will get from the public.

In closing, I just want to make a few remarks regarding the action and the performance of the Committee. I want to thank Mr. Thibault for the consideration he has given all members, the co-operation, I enjoyed being on the Committee. I can say on behalf of everyone that everyone was serious, everyone tried to help to stop the slaughter on our highways which is reaching alarming proportions and I hope that whatever government is elected that they will take this Report seriously and implement these suggestions we have made.

The speed limit 55 miles an hour, the seat belts and the penalties that should be applied to those that are involved in a fatal accident when impaired. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK:** (Redberry) Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Intersessional Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety, I wish to add a few words in respect to the final Report tabled by the Hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) the Committee Chairman. The interim Committee Report tabled at the fall session is detailed more fully and precisely in this, the final Report.

This Report, Mr. Speaker, on Highway Traffic and Safety culminates from many meetings, deliberations and public hearings over a two year period. This, Sir, involved many interested and public minded citizens and organizations who appeared before the Committee and presented their views and opinions on the problems respecting highway traffic and safety and other related matters.

With each passing year, Mr. Speaker, the number of fatal accidents on our highways and roads increase. In 1974 some 318 people were lost from our midst. This should cause alarm and concern to us all. Add to this, Mr. Speaker, thousands of our citizens are injured while many more are crippled and maimed for life. It is roughly estimated that approximately \$35 million or

thereabouts is the monetary loss involved in these tragic accidents. Statistics bear out the fact that our traffic accidents are the single largest cause of death, in the under 30 year age group. Could we, Sir, as a society tolerate this loss and ignore the ultimate consequences if no steps are taken to rectify this rather unfortunate situation?

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) in the course of his remarks a day or so ago, stated that this was the only intersessional committee he had acted on since his election to this House. I too, Sir, find myself in this rather enviable position and situation. As one of the Government Members I must admit that my purpose and the sole purpose in accepting the task was the concern I had and have to the ever increasing problems created by a society which is totally dependent upon the automobile.

The solutions to the ever increasing problems of traffic and safety are not easy to suggest. There are no quick and easy solutions. Driver education, driving attitudes, public awareness, the addition of new drivers to the driving force, driving while under the influence of alcohol suspended drivers, are areas that require close scrutiny. The Committee was aware of this as I am sure that the Members of the House are. Each of the mentioned aspects could be discussed individually. However, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a co-ordinate approach to the problem must be made to be effective.

This Report, Sir, recommends the establishment of a traffic safety co-ordinating committee and that the housing of all government departments and agencies concerned with traffic safety, be housed in one traffic safety building.

Safety attitudes could only be achieved through education. It is the opinion of the Committee, as it is mine, Mr. Speaker, that traffic safety driving attitudes could be developed from a kindergarten through Grade 12 safety teaching programs, to include first aid training in our classrooms. The Report further recommends, Mr. Speaker, that driver training be a credit course in high school. That drivers tests be made more exacting and comprehensive and that drivers who have reached age 65 be re-tested every five years. Some of these may help to decrease the death on our roads.

In the opinion of the Committee, the Report recommends that first driver's licence applicants be required to furnish proof of having taken a driver-training course, and that a licence be granted on a probationary basis for a period of two years, and that a prerequisite to an operator's or a standard licence be a defensive driving course.

The wearing of seat belts, while driving, demonstrates as is evident by statistical data where the mandatory use of seat belts was legislated, that injuries were reduced anywhere between 20 and 30 per cent. It was, therefore, recommended, with reservations by several committee members, that wearing of seat belts on the public highways of the province be mandatory, with a further proviso that a public education program be undertaken for one year prior to the enactment of this legislation with an additional one year delay in which period only warnings would be issued. The Report, Mr. Speaker, recommends that highway speed limits be lowered to 55 miles per hour on Saskatchewan provincial highways for a one year trial period, and that this

April 4, 1975

province co-operate with the Federal Government in establishing a 55 mile per hour speed limit on the national scale.

The energy crisis in the United States, Mr. Speaker, conclusively demonstrates that the imposition of a nation wide 55 mile per hour speed limit led to a dramatic decrease in fatalities in most of the States of the Union. The National safety Council in the United States estimates that about an 11 per cent reduction of fatalities could be attained by reducing the driving speed to 55 miles per hour.

The presence of alcohol is the greatest single factor involved in accidents. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) has alluded to that and I agree with the statements that he made. Legislation enacting .08 alcohol impairment has lost its effectiveness as it did in the initial stages of its enactment, so that more stringent and harsher legislation must be adopted in order to control and reduce alcohol related accidents and fatalities.

Under the .08 law, Mr. Speaker, the police officer must have reasonable and probable grounds to believe that a person is impaired before he can legally demand that a breathalyzer test be taken. Because of this somewhat shady area of probability the Report recommends that the federal law be amended to allow police to demand a breath test of a driver where they have reason to suspect a driver of having alcohol in his body, or of having committed a motor traffic violation, or where a motor vehicle accident has occurred, except where the driver has been hospitalized. Further, Mr. Speaker, the Report recommends that police be allowed to demand that a blood sample be taken where a driver has been hospitalized, even if he's in hospital, except where in the opinion of the attending physician this would prejudicially affect the proper care of the patient. Then no one gets away when he is at fault and driving while under the influence of alcohol.

One further recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is that roadside breath testing devices, such as the alcolimeter, be used as a screening device to determine whether or not a driver is likely to have a blood alcohol content in excess of legal limits. Drivers, likely to be impaired should be required to take a further breath test.

It was evident to me, Mr. Speaker, during the Committee's visit to Phoenix, Arizona, that some form of driving while intoxicated courses be made available that would assist in the education and the re-training of drinking drivers. This would be of assistance to a driver in avoiding further convictions for driving and drinking.

Problematic as drinking drivers are it was felt that the Criminal Code be amended to give judges a wider range of options to deal with drinking drivers, so that the judge at his discretion may assess penalties, rehabilitative measures, or suspensions. First offence drivers may, at the discretion of a judge, be sentenced to rehabilitative measures, while on the second offence, the judge may involve rehabilitation and suspend the driver's licence and vehicle licence plates. And, of course, if the offender persists, Mr. Speaker, to commit violations for subsequent offences, his vehicle be impounded and his driver's licence be suspended for a period assessed by the judge.

Motorcycling, Mr. Speaker, and the use of motorcycles by more people particularly in the younger age bracket, the 16 to 25 age group, has been on the increase. Motorcycle use, although mainly seasonal, is hazardous among automobile drivers, who may not give due regard to motorcyclists in their midst. Mr. Speaker, if motorcyclists are not tested under traffic conditions in which they will be driving it may leave them in precarious driving situations after being licensed. The Committee felt that the learner's licence be made available for those who learn to drive a motorcycle. Further, that a comprehensive system of training, testing and licensing be based on the training programme which has been developed by the Canada and Saskatchewan Safety Councils.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Committee felt that certain specific modifications to motorcycles be disallowed and that motorcycles have standard equipment such as front wheel brakes, brake lights, rear view mirrors and a means of noise suppression.

Mr. Speaker, because of the extent and importance of highway traffic and safety, one could enumerate scores of important aspects detailed in the Committee Report.

The final Report tabled, no doubt, will be controversial, if not in its totality then certain recommendation put forth for consideration definitely will be contentious. Might I add, Sir, that those recommendations are merely guidelines for a future government to act on. As a committee we are cognizant of the fact that the restructuring of the whole approach to this vital problem of public safety and traffic will not be carried out by a stroke of a legislative pen. Important as changes and new approaches are, the ultimate solution rests with the drivers and the motorists. Education, driving attitudes, self-restraint and a respect for the law as it exists are important. However, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the drivers and drivers alone will reflect the effectiveness of this Committee's work by their driving records and their attitudes towards driving and safety which the Report relates to.

All the Committee would do is to recommend the statement probably known to all that "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink" in this instance is very applicable. Likewise, society allows or grants a privilege to its citizens to driver, however, how they drive rests with each individual driver.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to thank the Members of the Committee for the co-operation each displayed during the deliberations. The Hon. Member for Rosthern and I, who over a 15-year period had some disagreements in this Legislature, were able to concur and agree on most or practically all the recommendations in this final Report. This, Mr. Speaker, is to the credit of each Committee member. I initially mentioned that this was the only intersessional committee I acted on during the period I spent representing the constituency of Redberry.

Hon. Members are aware that when the Premier calls the provincial election I will pull up stakes and reserve my seat for a new occupant.

I hope and trust that Redberry constituents would use the good judgement they established some 15 years ago.

April 4, 1975

Once again, I thank the Chairman for the courtesy extended to me and to the Members of the Committee. Further, I wish to thank the Government for giving me the opportunity to contribute in some small measure to the Report in its final form as it was tabled by the Chairman a week or so ago.

**MR. F. MEAKES:** (Touchwood) Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of satisfaction and feeling of accomplishment that I speak today in support of the Highway Safety Report brought in by the select committee chosen nearly two years ago. I have enjoyed the work and companionship of the committee. My first words are to congratulate the Chairman, the Member for Melfort-Kinistino for his able chairmanship. With his delightful humour he was able to keep the rest of us working harmoniously together. No small job to keep nine politicians from one another's throats.

My second "Thank you" goes to all Members of the Committee who worked diligently together, with all the given and take necessary to make the Committee a good one and I believe it was a good one.

Thirdly, I personally want to express my thanks to the Committee staff for their work and their research. Without that the Committee would have been worthless. They did a fine job and at times, under some pressure from the Committee. I consider that it is their report as well as ours. All in all we worked as a team, and in my opinion we came up with a meaningful, worthwhile and far reaching report.

As my Hon. friend for Redberry said just a moment ago, certainly none of us can cover all aspects of the Report, it would take too long to do and so the things that I'm mentioning are in a sense the items that I felt were my priorities. I'll be surprised if all Members of this House will agree with all the aspects of the Report and I think this is as it should be. I'll admit that I went on the Committee with some preconceived ideas, some of which have been changed after hearing all the evidence and witnesses we did.

Nevertheless, society, whether in Saskatchewan, Canada, U.S.A. or Europe or where have you, are facing a serious problem. This problem seems to grow and grow. The problem is the needless slaughter and indeed the murder on our highways and by-ways that continues to increase. In 1973 there were 268 killed on our highways and in 1974 that increased to 318.

Before I deal with the Report itself I want to deal with special committees. I believe the use of select committees is useful and beneficial. Now just to have something for MLAs to do, not to give them extra money or trips, but because I know that when a group of MLAs sit down to study a given subject, it can be for the good of the province, for the good of the MLAs and for the good of the government.

I personally don't care what this Committee costs the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. If, by our efforts, we can find ways of saving human lives and property damage, then the expense has been worthwhile. I can truthfully say that in this Committee politics was not played. Sure, there have been disagreements but not from a political viewpoint. Older Members of this House, I'm sure, will find it hard to believe that the Hon. Member for Athabasca and I could agree on anything. This has



happened in Committee many times. I suppose what it is we both found out that we are human beings and my appreciation goes to all Members of the Committee. I have enjoyed my association with them.

This committee work is relatively new in this House. I suggest it should be increased. Many real problems could be turned over for further study. I believe that government can be improved by its use.

Let me turn to the Report. as I said a few minutes ago, I'm sure there will be some disagreement be some Members on both sides of the House. Some may say we have gone too far, others may say not far enough. Within the Committee itself, I'm sure there are Members who cannot agree with every word. I do believe that the Report should and will create discussions both in the House and out of the house on this extremely important subject of making our highways a safer place to travel on. I believe that we have been reasonably specific. I'm sure that some of our recommendations could be acted on very soon, some will require further study and time to act upon them.

As the Report said, we travelled to Phoenix, Arizona to study the driving while intoxicated program know as DWI. We all learned a lot from the experiment that was being carried on there. In my opinion the cost of that trip was money well spent and the Report is more meaningful because of it.

Some of the Committee attended the International Conference on Drugs and Alcohol Relating to Traffic Accidents. Here authorities from all around the world attended, sharing their experience and knowledge. I personally learned that here in Saskatchewan and Canada we're years behind many other countries. We have a lot of catching up to do. I suggest that delegates be sent to the next Conference to be held in Australia in 1976.

One of our first assignments was to attend a traffic court. What I have to say in this regard, I want to emphasize that it is in no way a criticism of either our judges or our policemen. Rather it is a real criticism of the judicial system that we, as society, operate supposedly to teach offenders that it is neither worthy nor morally the right thing to do to flaunt our laws.

In this regard it seems to me the system completely fails. I watched 32 cases go through the docket in 30 minutes to which two pleaded not guilty and were set over for trial. To say that their 45 second appearance before the judge. After talking to judges, policemen and citizens of Phoenix and after studying the North York experimental program in Toronto, I, along with other Members of the Committee, am convinced there should be a separation of the traffic offences and other crimes against society. Judges and officers should be especially trained for the job. The Traffic Court should be a learning process. the judges should be given more latitude in assessing penalties. They should be able to sentence them to a classroom where a sentence of two hours of study could be taken, to a cancellation of driving licence privileges and taking away the care licence, and if deemed necessary that the vehicle be impounded for a period of time. There should be way of earning a remission of the penalties by the guilty one.

April 4, 1975

We also came to the conclusion after the study of SGIO statistics plus evidence from other areas of the world that some way must be found to stop the deaths of so many of our youths. We have come to the conclusion that a driver's licence is a privilege not a right. There should be a training period for driver learning and good behaviour should be rewarded. We are convinced that people learning to drive for the first time should have an interim licence and for good behaviour then get a permanent licence at the end of two years. Any penalties they have levied on them during those two years should be deducted from them in terms of one day for every dollar of fine.

All the Members of the Committee took the defensive driving course. I am convinced that before anyone gets a permanent licence he should have to take that defensive driving course. I had considered myself an excellent driver. The course showed me that I had plenty of bad driving habits.

Saskatchewan Power Corporation was able to cut their accident rate down nearly 50 per cent in the first year after having all their drivers take the course. The manager of a trucking firm in Saskatoon said his insurance rates were as high as they could get. He gave his drivers the two day course and after a year his rates were cut in half and we are personally convinced, I'm personally convinced it is a must for all new drivers. Now I want to suggest to the Government that as a start, all Government employees who drive be asked to take the course.

Let me turn, Mr. Speaker, to speed limits. At one time, I was of the same view as the Minister of Highways. Then I became enlightened by what was happening in the United States. I read many figures of the reduction of accidents and deaths but it was only when I went to visit in Los Angeles this last winter, January, that I really realized what was happening. The traffic was moving at 55 miles an hour on the freeways. There were less accidents and yet things went on. It was and is only a mental attitude that we must speed. People still get to work in Los Angeles on time and lives are being saved.

Prior to my visit, I was one who said, "Yes, that's fine for them, but that's not Saskatchewan, it can't happen here, it's too big." I had made it clear that I would not support any reduction in speed limits. I came back convinced that we should try a reduction in speed for one year and I'm also convinced that at the end of a year most people will be satisfied. I repeat again, it's only a mental attitude.

Mr. Speaker, let me just quote a few figures for 1974.

Motor vehicles and drivers in the US increased by over 3,000,000 in 1974 yet the death rate dropped by 16 per cent over 1973. On turnpikes, fatal accidents were down 48 per cent and accidents by 30 per cent and property damage by 27 per cent.

And I'd like to put on the record some of the statistics state by state, and these statistics are for the reduction in accidents from '73. Utah reduced theirs by 37 per cent; Missouri by 29 per cent; Kentucky — 29 per cent; Louisiana — 28 per cent; Mississippi — 28 per cent; Rhode Island — 26 per cent; Arizona 25 per cent; Indiana — 24 per cent; Alabama — 24 per cent; Connecticut — 23 per cent; Arkansas — 23 per cent; North Dakota — 23 per cent; Ohio — 22 per cent; Wisconsin — 21 per cent;

New York — 20 per cent; Georgia — 20 per cent; South Dakota 20 per cent; California — 19 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I could go down the list. The least was Washington with only three per cent reduction, but not an increase like Saskatchewan has had.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at two states with much the same conditions as this province. Both North Dakota and South Dakota have large spaces, long roads and sparsely populated areas. North Dakota had a reduction of 23 per cent and South Dakota a reduction of 20 per cent in 1974. Comparing Saskatchewan figures with North Dakota, with only the 49th Parallel between us, if we are to have a 55 mile an hour speed limit, our deaths might well have been only 245 people killed, a saving of 73 lives. In the event of us being like South Dakota, there might have been only 254 deaths instead of 318 or 64 lives saved. I suggest to people who say it isn't realistic to reduce speed limits in this province, to take a look at those figures. Surely the saving of lives is worth trying a one year speed reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak much longer. Other Members will be commenting on the Report as well. There are two other things I should like to mention before sitting down.

The first is that of the compulsory seat belts. All the evidence indicates the fact that seat belts can save lives. Some may say that if I want to kill myself by not wearing seat belts that's my business. I cannot really agree. Yes, if there were no dependants, I suppose it is up to me, but in most cases there are dependants. If those dependants should become a burden on society, then it is our business, and I feel that we should have the right to say so. It is estimated that nearly 50 per cent of our last year's deaths by car accidents in Saskatchewan could have been saved if the people had been wearing the seat belts. People were thrown out and were killed one way or another.

Australia has had a compulsory seat belt law now for some time. In the first year of the law in operation the death rate from vehicle accidents dropped by 35 per cent. They passed the legislation but did not proclaim it for a year. During that year, there was an intensive media campaign pointing out the necessity of seat belts. The Act was then proclaimed, but for several months the police only warned drivers of the possible fines. In a survey taken a year after the proclamation, it, was estimated that over 80 per cent of the drivers were wearing their seat belts. I believe that if a really good educational program is evolved, the Saskatchewan people will see the need of wearing seat belts too.

The last point I want to deal with is known as the .08 law. I was one of three guinea pigs who agreed to test the validity of .08. I quit drinking at .065 and I know that I was not fit to drive a motor vehicle at that time. Under testing, my reactions were inadequate. My record of mistakes on the typewriter increased greatly as on the driving simulator. But I want to say this, that until we are able to catch those driving presently over .08, I see little sense to lowering that figure. The average of Saskatchewan drivers being picked up for alcohol testing last year was over 1.75.

Legislation must be changed at the federal level to allow police to make spot checks. There is now a new tester that is within two per cent right as my colleague mentioned. This could

April 4, 1975

be used not as evidence but rather as a test to tell the policeman whether he should request the driver to come to the police station for a breathalyzer test.

Mr. Speaker, the two great killers on our highways are alcohol and speeding. I am convinced that if we can find the solution to those two problems, we could drastically reduce the deaths on our highways. The Report, I believe, is a good one. It is one that I am convinced could be implemented within the next three years. I am convinced that if the recommendations are carried out that we will find that our highways and byways will be safer, and we will have saved a lot of human lives, and that our province will be a better place in which to live. I will support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D.L. FARIS:** (Arm River) Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety has, in my opinion, done an excellent job. I want to commend the chairman for his long-term concern about this problem and I am sure it is very much due to his efforts and consent that there was this Committee at all. I am sure the experience of the Members of the Committee was similar to that on the committee on which I served and that was that this was one of the best experiences in the Legislature to work together around the table, around the problem where party lines are forgotten. The importance of the subject they studied is well expressed in the following words from the Report:

Every year in Saskatchewan some 250 or more people meet their deaths in traffic accidents. Thousands more are injured and some are maimed for life. Traffic accidents are the single largest cause of death in the under 30 age group and, as a result they are also the largest cause of lost productive years to society. even if society can tolerate the hug loss in terms of dollars and cents which this slaughter of our youth represents, the human suffering and anguish which traffic accidents produce cannot be ignored.

In 1974, 318 people dies in Saskatchewan traffic accidents. My concern is that some 47 per cent of those fatalities involved alcohol.

We should not be surprised by these figures. Alcohol consumption is steadily increasing in Saskatchewan. It has increased on a per capita basis by 100 per cent in the past 20 years. It has increased by some 30 per cent in the past four years. The rate of increase of alcohol consumption in Saskatchewan has been 50 per cent higher than the Canadian rate in the past four years. Twenty years ago Saskatchewan had a significantly lower alcohol consumption rate than the rest of Canada. 1975 will likely be the year in which the Saskatchewan drinkers will achieve or surpass the Canadian average of alcohol consumption.

Increased alcohol consumption has undoubtedly been reflected in increased drinking and driving. A 1974 national Canadian roadside survey showed that 16 per cent of drivers from 10 p.m. to midnight on Wednesday through Saturday nights had been drinking. On these same days of the week from 1 a.m. to 3 a.m. 33 per cent of drivers had been drinking, one out of every three cars

you passed. During the 10 p.m. to midnight hours over 20 per cent of the drinking drivers were over .08 and by the 1 a.m. to 3 a.m. hours this had increased to 30 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee came to the conclusion that the .08 legislation has lost its effectiveness. I agree. The recommendations that we lower the blood alcohol level to .06 and have stricter enforcement including the roadblocks and roadside testing will have my support.

Another recommendation that I strongly support is that courts be given the option of sending drinking drivers to alcoholism rehabilitation centres. This has already been done in United States with great success. New Brunswick has already moved in this direction. When you consider that some 40 per cent of the people who lose their licences are losing them for the second or third time in a five year period, it is obvious that our present laws are simply acting as a merry-go-round. Recommendation No. 7 proposes that rehabilitation centres be established in Saskatchewan by the Provincial Government using available facilities where possible.

Rehabilitation facilities in Saskatchewan are woefully inadequate. The waiting lists are pathetically long. We have no in-patient facility in Regina to this date. This year's Budget included a 14 per cent increase in the budget of the Alcoholism Commission and unfortunately that is just enough to look after inflation. With total net provincial profit and tax revenues of over \$60 million from alcohol sales, surely we can do better.

The recommendation is that available facilities be used. May I suggest that there are suitable facilities available. There are some in the Qu'Appelle valley. There is also in my own area the Cutbank community which has living, dining, teaching, and recreation facilities available for an in-patient accommodation of anywhere up to 80. With the new highway No. 219 it will be only 60 minutes from Saskatoon. Those who have had the privilege of visiting the rural setting of the Hazeldon facilities will be impressed by the possibilities at Cutbank.

Recommendation 12 states:

The Committee recognizes the danger which the use of prescription and non-prescription drugs present in their effect on driving ability, particularly when taken in combination with alcohol, and urges that a publicity campaign be undertaken to make the public aware of these dangers.

Multi-drug use, either intentional or accidental, is increasing in our society, and its effect on driving is bound to show up. The fact that the intoxication effect of alcohol is dramatically increased by its combination with tranquilizers, barbiturates or even antihistamines is extremely significant in our society. For one thing it means that breathalyzer readings as an indicator of intoxication becomes meaningless. A multi-drug user may have a reading of .03 and an intoxication effect which would be .12. This is one reason why the allowable blood alcohol level should be lowered. It is also an additional reason why the drinking-driver advice of such education programs as AWARE are so dangerous. One drink per hour plus another drug will spell disaster.

I am concerned with the way the AWARE Program is being presented to the public as a new, unique experimental type of

April 4, 1975

program. In December I had the honor of being one of five persons from outside the United States to participate in the three day "Expert Conference on the Prevention of Alcohol Problems", in Berkley, California. I want to point out that I was not sent by the Government of Saskatchewan, I was invited by the State of California, and the Opposition will be pleased to know, at California's expense.

We dealt with mass media education programs in one of the sections of Conference. We discussed there the responsible drinking approach which characterizes AWARE. An excellent paper presented by Professor Edward Blane of the University of Pittsburgh stated:

Campaigns in the United States which stress messages taken from the responsible drinking approach are supported by the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. The theme of its major mass media campaign, the first phase of which was initiated early in 1972 with television, films, radio announcements, posters and other printed materials, is that the abuse of alcohol in our society is unacceptable.

The NIAAA with the blessings and support of the American and Canadian liquor industries has been supporting the responsible use of alcohol approach for four years in the United States. It may be of interest to those who read the Time Magazine to see that a year ago in that magazine there was an ad sponsored by the Licence Beverages Industries which is a division of the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, which concludes in its advice to drivers that they should know their limits, they should have a handy chart available for their guidance and it ends, "If you choose to drink, drink responsibly." The support of the alcohol industry for NIAAA approach is as well seen in the advertisement in the Wednesday, July 10, 1974 edition of the Toronto Star where the House of Seagram offers free to anyone who wants to write in, "The latest information on Alcoholism". Now this is a booklet, by the way, which was sent to legislators across Canada, and it is the typical NIAAA approach which suggests that alcoholism in many ways has nothing to do with alcohol. In fact the official spokesman of the distilleries to our hearings of the Alcohol Committee suggested that the name of the disease should be changed.

As I said tens of millions of dollars have been spent on this sort of an approach in the United States and what has the result been? Professor Blane concluded his paper by saying that no one can really know. There simply has not been proper research done on the effects of these programs:

Evaluation research of propaganda suffers from the same inadequacies noted for research on alcohol education in public schools; faulty design, lack of control of relevant variables, reliance on cognitive — attitudinal rather than behavioural variables and failure to conduct time-series analyses.

Mr. Speaker, all of these failures apply both to the American responsible drinking programs and their Saskatchewan cousin, the AWARE Program. there was no proper pre-testing of attitudes and behaviour of Saskatchewan citizens. There was no clear and distinct statement of meaningful goals for the

program. There are no proper control groups within the province. And because there was no proper pre-testing, how can any reliable post-testing take place to determine behavioural changes?

Is the AWARE Program intended to increase alcohol use or decrease it? Is it intended to increase drinking and driving or decrease it? I ask these questions seriously. We used to be told, "If you drive — don't drink." AWARE along with the American counterparts have changed that message to, "If you drive — you can have one drink per hour." I consider that a liberalizing of attitudes to drinking and driving and as such likely, if it is listened to at all, to result in more people drinking before they drive.

I seriously question the Government reinforcing or supporting the use of alcohol. Even putting that word 'responsible' before it doesn't help because responsible means to any person whatever they want it to mean. Even a cursory analysis of drinking patterns in our society should warn us against a program encouraging the use of alcohol. If you take an average Saskatchewan group of 100 adults you will find 25 who do not drink at all. Another 25 drink infrequently, that is less than once a month. The next 25 drink moderately with no apparent problems. The next 25 have had problems due to their drinking. They will range all the way from family problems, traffic accidents through psychological dependence to long-term chronic alcoholism.

The responsible use of alcohol approach basically undercuts the position of the 25 who do not drink at all. They are already under strong social pressures to join the crowd — have a drink. Some of the non-users of alcohol take that position because they are aware of their own or a family susceptibility to alcoholism. Some are recovered alcoholics. I am personally aware of a case of two recovering alcoholics who have informed their doctor that rather than non-use of alcohol they have chosen to drink responsibly. Mr. Speaker, I suggest those two men and their families are in for an additional dose of unnecessary suffering.

How will the AWARE Program affect the 25 who drink infrequently, that is, less than once a month; I suggest that it can only encourage them to increase their alcohol consumption. One drink per hour as a responsible figure is considerably more than they have been using.

The 25 who drink regularly but "moderately" will be least affected. It will confirm them in what they are already doing. It will not, however, warn them that the prolonged "moderate use" of alcohol is a stage that every alcoholic or problem drinker has passed through. The AWARE Program virtually ignores alcoholism. If it was not for the AA advertising one would hardly know that there was such a thing as alcoholism.

This brings us to the final 25 who are facing problems due to their drinking. The Shafer Report, the American counterpart of LeDain, did a national survey and it showed that 33 per cent of respondents reported a problem due to drinking over the past five year period. This might be a traffic accident, a fight with the wife, missing Monday mornings at work, it would cover the entire range of psychological through physical dependence which leads to full blown chronic alcoholism. This group considers themselves to be responsible drinkers, indeed, who

April 4, 1975

does not, but they are headed for trouble and in fact most of them are already in it. The responsible option for them would be the non-use of alcohol. But that is not the message of AWARE or its American cousins.

I would suggest that AWARE is having undesirable effects on the attitudes and behaviour patterns of 75 per cent of the population, that is, it tends to encourage and support increasing alcohol use.

There is one more aspect of AWARE that is significant. The program admits that alcohol is a drug and then goes on to support its responsible use. It is my view that the Government should discourage the non-medical use of all drugs. If the Government supports the responsible use of the drug alcohol, what is the message to young people whose generation all too often accepts the use of marijuana, LSD or heroin? Why not the responsible use of hash? Why not the responsible use of LSD? Why not the responsible use of heroin? The governmental encouragement of the responsible use of alcohol is inconsistent with the goal of discouraging overall drug use.

Recently the Legislature of the State of New York abolished immediately the drug education program they had developed over many years at a cost of some \$20 million. Why did they do it? Because on-going research which was being done in that state indicated clearly that their program which was extremely well intentioned and had used the best resources available to them, was increasing drug use. There is not a person in Saskatchewan who can either assert or deny that AWARE is increasing alcohol or drug use incontrovertibly. What we do know is that both alcohol use and alcohol related fatalities are dramatically increasing.

Mr. Speaker, there is a naive and scientifically undemonstrated belief that you can "Teach people how to drink". In part it is based on myth., of sophisticated European drinking patterns — in part on romantic longings for the past.

Countries like Britain, France and Italy which have been held up as models of drinking behaviour are suddenly awakening to the fact that they have long ignored rapidly growing problems. Increasingly, cheap alcohol, the breakdown of traditional family and social patterns, the decreasing role of religious restraints, these are being felt around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many Members saw the CTV Friday movie a few weeks ago — "Sarah T. — The Story of a Teenage Alcoholic. I want to commend CKCK for this movie and I hope that they will show it again and advertise it to the public well in advance. I would ask Members who saw that movie, how many think that that 15 year old girl, that 15 year old alcoholic could be taught how to drink, the responsible use of alcohol? Ten per cent of the people as it said in that movie, who start out drinking are going to face the same problem as that girl. At least another 15 per cent are going to have some problems in their life due to alcohol.

What sort of society would set its children out on such a path? Surely it is time that we as a Government had the courage to discourage alcohol use; have the courage to set out public policies to reduce its use.



Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I once again want to commend this Committee for their excellent work and thank them for the opportunity they presented through raising these issues. I would, at this time, like to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:27 o'clock p.m.