

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
23rd Day

Tuesday, April 13, 1976.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B. M. Dyck (Saskatoon Mayfair): — I am very delighted to introduce to you and to this House 110 Grade Seven and Eight students from the Mayfair School in Saskatoon from the Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. I want to welcome them to this Assembly this afternoon as well as their teachers, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Street, Mr. Rak, Mr. Reddecopp and Mrs. Kindzierski. I hope that they have an interesting and worthwhile afternoon in the House and I will look forward to seeing them for a few moments in the area of the rotunda shortly after three o'clock.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. E. Blakeney (Regina Elphinstone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleague in welcoming students to the Legislature, on this occasion. They are 26 Grade Five students from Kitchener School. They are in the Speaker's Gallery and they are here with their teacher, Mrs. Ellis. They are here to see how our Legislature operates and I am sure they will be suitably impressed. I hope to have an opportunity to meet with them a little later before the end of the Question Period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a school that is in attendance today. I don't know if they are in the gallery or not, Princess Alex, yes, they are. They are 29 students and two teachers. I hope I have the teachers and the names right. Mr. Lozinsky and Mr. Kraus. They are Grade Seven and Eight students. Princess Alex is one of the oldest schools in the city of Saskatoon and I think one of the very best schools apart from the fact that my school, Westmount, used to beat it regularly in hockey.

I welcome the students here and hope to have a chance, if time permits and House business permits, to see them at 3:15.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Katzman: — I should like to join with the Hon. Member in welcoming Princess Alex school, since I took all my elementary schooling there, and Roy we used to beat you more than you ever beat us.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to welcome the students and pupils from Princess Alex School. I believe some of the students reside in Saskatoon Centre constituency. I certainly hope you enjoy yourselves today in the House and in Regina, and have a good trip back.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Employment with Potash Corporation

Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South): — A question to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation. Has the Government or the Potash Corporation approached Jorge Caso who was an official with the Chilean Government of Allende about employment either with the Government of Saskatchewan or the Potash Corporation?

Hon. E. L. Cowley (Minister in Charge of Potash Corporation): — Not to the best of my knowledge but I will take it as notice if the Member can send me across the proper spelling of that name.

Mr. Cameron: — A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. The proper spelling is Jorge Caso. Has that gentleman been recommended to the Government of Saskatchewan by anyone for employment with the Potash Corporation or the Government generally?

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure because I have had many letters come across my desk from various sources with either individuals offering their services or other people offering other individual's services which I have referred to the Potash Corporation. I will take that notice and indicate to the Member whether or not that particular name has been suggested to me providing that that individual has not indicated that he is applying on a confidential basis because of his employer or some similar consideration.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps by way of supplementary I may indicate to the Minister I am also interested in knowing whether either the Government of Saskatchewan or the Potash Corporation has sought this man's advice with respect to contact with an organization called the Second International or with respect to his advice in connection with the potash takeover?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the Member will agree with me that is a question that would tend to require a detailed examination because the Member has asked whether it is the Potash Corporation or the Government of Saskatchewan. That is similar to the last question, therefore, I would ask for the next question. The Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Powell River Lake

Mr. R. E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — I should like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment in the absence of the Minister in charge of SPC. The Minister is aware of the barbed wire being left in the Powell River Lake. Is the Minister of Environment aware of the farm buildings being left out in the lake, also the telephone pole with the wire as well as the power poles and the power wire being left in the lake water?

Hon. N. E. Byers (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the Hon. Member's question is I am aware of it on the basis of the information that he has brought to this House and by a few pictures in the daily papers. This is an unfortunate situation we admit due to the very heavy snowfall and a very heavy run off this spring. The amount of water trapped into the reservoir is considerably more than was anticipated and that is the major cause for these unfortunate problems.

Mr. Nelson: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware of the large hold as big as this Assembly that is being dug to try and bury the few buildings remaining on the shore. Does he not agree that this is very expensive when a one cent package of matches would cure the situation?

Mr. Speaker: — Next question.

Labour Relations Board

Hon. R. L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — A question directed to the Premier. In light of the current negotiations with the registered nurses and other labor difficulties, within the last few months did the Premier meet with the managing director of Federated Co-operatives, Mr. Bill Bergen, at which discussions arose pertaining to the Labour Relations Board of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the answer I believe is, yes. I certainly met with some officers of Federated and I believe they included Mr. Bergen. We discussed a number of subjects and I believe the operations of the Labour Relations Board was one of the subjects. It certainly wasn't by any means the only subject or the main subject but it was certainly one of them.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that Mr. Bergen expressed serious concern that the Labour Relations Board was biased in its decision toward labor unions to the detriment of efficient operation in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think what Mr. Bergen said to me in private conversation in my office is not for me to reveal. If Mr. Bergen wishes to give his views on the matter that is up to him but I will not repeat what he told me in my office.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the Premier was informed or has been informed that unless a material change in the makeup of the Labour Relations Board occurs in the very near future that Federated Co-operatives is considering moving its head office out of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Blakeney: — No.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier planned any changes whatsoever in appointments to the Labour Relations Board and if so what are they?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the staffing of Government agencies is always under review. We do not find it helpful to indicate when we are considering action. We do not find it helpful to indicate that but rather to indicate the results of any consideration. Accordingly if there are to be changes they will be announced in due course.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier saying that there have been no changes to this point in time in the Labour Relations Board?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question.

Mr. E. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Premier consider the Labour Relations Board to be a government agency or a quasi-judicial tribunal operating in this province. And does he consider it proper to discuss the operations of that tribunal with an independent person?

Mr. Blakeney: — The answer is, both. I consider the Labour Relations Board to be a government agency and also an independent tribunal in the same way that the Magistrates' Courts are a government agency and also an independent tribunal. The appointments to the Magistrates' bench are made by the Crown. The administration of the courts is certainly thought to be a matter for public discussion as a government agency similarly with the Labour Relations Board. So I would say to those first two questions, yes, yes.

Mr. Malone: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier not consider it highly improper to discuss the decisions of a Magistrate with a person who could be affected by those decisions and in the like do you not consider discussing the decisions of the Labour Relations Board with a person who could be appearing before that Board or was likely to appear before that Board in the future?

Mr. Blakeney: — No, I wouldn't. I wouldn't see anything particularly wrong with discussing with an employer or a group of employees or a union a decision of the Labour Relations Board which has been made. And to discuss whether or not it represented an appropriate application of the law and all of that sort of thing, I do that with great frequency with my fellow lawyers, discussing

the decisions of Mr. Justice so and so and the shortcomings of that decision. I don't see anything wrong with discussing the decision once it has been made and when clearly the judicial process insofar as that is concerned is over.

Mr. E. F. A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I take it that the Premier would agree that this conversation was, in your capacity as the Premier of the province, and that the representations were made to you in your governmental capacity and not in a private capacity when Mr. Bergen spoke to you.

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh, yes, I suppose he obviously spoke to me because I was Premier, not because he knows me. I would point out that many conversations that people have in the office of a Premier are clearly not meant for publication. To that extent I respect the confidences of people who come to my office. If they wish to reveal their positions that is up to them but not for me to reveal the positions which they outline to me in a private conversation in my office.

Mr. Merchant: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think the Premier would agree that Mr. Bergen makes no games about the fact that he believes that there is bias in the Labour Relations Board, and if those representations were made to you in your capacity as a government official, I wonder then, why you would choose to refuse to indicate so to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Blakeney: — If they were . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question. It is out of order. Member for Moosomin.

Provincial Government Collect Own Income Tax

Mr. L. W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the Minister aware that there could be plans afoot in the Federal Government to cease collecting provincial income taxes and result in the provincial government in having to collect its own?

Hon. W. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite get the question.

Mr. Birkbeck: — I will repeat the question. Is the Minister aware that there could be plans afoot for the Federal Government to cease collecting provincial income taxes and result in the provincial government having to collect its own taxes?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the matter of tax fiscal arrangements and the collection of taxes is an ongoing discussion with the Federal Government. Certainly the Federal Government has not served notice on the provinces that they would refuse to collect

the income taxes whether it is Saskatchewan or any of the other provinces.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If this became the case, would the Government go along with this procedure, the provincial government?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, that's really a hypothetical question because we are not in that kind of a position at the moment. We are meeting on tax fiscal arrangements as well as collection of taxes. I submit that is strictly hypothetical.

Mr. Speaker: — Next question, Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

Mr. Collver: — Are there any contingency plans by the Government of Saskatchewan to collect income taxes in the light of possible Federal Government stopping doing it?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, again it is a hypothetical question. If there are going to be different arrangements, I am sure that there will be sufficient notice whether it is our province or any other province. At the moment the only province that collects its own income taxes is the Province of Quebec. That is worked out through a period of time with sufficient time given to provincial governments to set up their organization for collection of their taxes.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Rosetown-Elrose.

Grasshopper Control

Mr. R. H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the Minister through his Department have all the necessary chemicals and equipment stored throughout the province for the suspected rather severe grasshopper hatch which could well come early with the unseasonable warm weather?

Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture): — Yes, I think that we can assure the Member that we have sufficient supplies on hand and we have a fairly heavy supply of all chemicals on hand and what we think is plenty to meet the needs of this year.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister's Department have any plans on subsidizing the cost of these chemicals?

Mr. Kaeding: — No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister completed negotiations with the rural municipalities to ensure that all farmers, a plan in which all farmers have to participate in grasshopper control.

Mr. Kaeding: — The same procedures are available to them which have been available for a number of years, whereby they can get their supplies from the central depot. I am sure they are quite aware of the method by which they get those chemicals.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The question as I understand it was, let me rephrase it as my last supplementary, Mr. Minister. Does your Department favor the reinforcement of total participation by the farmers in the control of this particular type?

Mr. Kaeding: — Certainly we want to see as many RMs as possible included in the program of grasshopper control and all of them are urged to do that. I don't think that we should have to provide the incentive for them to do the things which they are required to do or which they should be doing for themselves. Certainly we are providing the chemical for them at cost and I think that is a pretty substantial contribution.

Municipal Road Load Limits

Mr. W. C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to feel like a track star on a starting gate.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Some time has elapsed since the Minister's announcement on load limits in rural Saskatchewan that threw chaos into the trucking industry and SARM. Since there was some conflict between the statements shortly afterwards between the Minister and SARM, have subsequent meetings been held with SARM to further clear up the situation?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House some time ago when the Member was absent that I would be meeting with SARM tomorrow night.

Mr. Thatcher: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister would agree that quite some time has elapsed since you made that announcement and in the intervening period of time farmers are unable to make plans for their seeding operation, they are unable to purchase their trucks that are in accordance with their coming needs because of the uncertainty about your load limits. The time has now come when the Minister should make some statement that is positive and definitive.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question. Member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, what was wrong with . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Member can ask that question under Orders of the Day.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not looking

for a hassle with you today, but if you're looking for one with me . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm not looking for a hassle with you today either . . . You're out of order. The Member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Thatcher: — When shall . . .

Mr. Speaker: — When is the Member for Thunder Creek going to sit down and get out of the position he's in, namely out of order? The Member for Qu'Appelle. Order! The Member for Qu'Appelle.

Agreement with Dental Nurses

Mr. J. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In light of the proposed cutback in the provincial Dental Program, it's well known that dental nurses must sign an agreement prior to commencing training that they agree not to work elsewhere and agree only to work for the Provincial Government Dental Program. In light of the fact that the staff at the institute of Applied Arts and Science here in Regina have indicated that not all students would be employed because of cutbacks in the dental program, why does the Government refuse to release these dental nurse students from the agreement that they are required to sign before they commence studies?

Hon. W. A. Robbins (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice and check it out for the Member.

Mr. Lane: — By way of supplementary. Will the Minister, if the situation is such, immediately announce that these students will be released from this indenture or this agreement being imposed by the Government, so that they will be able to find jobs elsewhere in the dental profession?

Mr. Robbins: — I said I would take it as notice and I'll let you have the information as soon as I get it.

Women Judges in Family Court

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Hon. Attorney General. I notice that today there's an announcement in the paper regarding the appointment of Raynell Andreychuk. I wonder if the Hon. Attorney General would not agree that it's curious that we have had three women appointed as judges to the Magistrates' Court over the years and your department has on each occasion hired them into the family court, as though you've got a sex pairing in the family court?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Member is way off base as I must say regretfully very often he is, because the decision as to the nature of the functions of Raynell Andreychuk have been determined by the Chief Judge, Judge Boychuk.

Mr. Merchant: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney General aware that part of the problem that the family court has had in British Columbia has been that the Attorney General's Department there or people comparable to you I suppose, have similarly packed that court with women and the effect has been to have an almost sex pairing into our family court.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That question is out of order. Next question.

Taking Over Saskatoon Pension Plan

Mr. Katzman: — A question to the Minister of Health and I understand responsible for the pensions. Is it true that you are meeting with members of city council from Saskatoon re the possibility of taking over their pension plan?

Mr. Robbins: — It's true that I'm meeting the people in Saskatoon and it has nothing to do with taking over their pension plan.

Mr. Katzman: — Is it also true that today there is a meeting with some of these people and your officials on the same possibility?

Mr. Robbins: — I'm simply meeting with them to discuss their pension problem.

Assistance for Flood Damage

Mr. E. A. Berntson (Souris-Cannington): — Question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the fact that in the last four or five days there has been severe flood damage in southeastern Saskatchewan where literally hundreds of roads have been washed out and dozens of bridges have been washed out and two dams that I know of, and in light of the fact that the President of the United States is going to announce six counties bordering this area, as disaster areas, will there be any financial assistance forthcoming to these RMs which have suffered this flood damage?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, there has been a program for flood damage through the Department of Municipal Affairs in the past. We'll be announcing our policy with respect to this year's problem in due course.

Mr. Berntson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This problem is not a new problem, it's happened three out of the last five years in southeastern Saskatchewan. In light of this fact, will there be any immediate survey to alleviate this problem through better engineering for highways and grid roads, etc.?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated to the Member that there has been a policy under which the municipalities have been paid in the past years of flooding. I indicated to them that we would also be making an announcement in due course with

respect to this year's problem.

Mr. Berntson: — Would the Minister not agree that proper engineering to grid roads, highways, etc. would in the long run be far cheaper than paying flood damages year, after year, after year?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question.

Representations by Yorkton for PCS

Mr. Lane: — I'd like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Potash Corporation. In light of the newspaper reports from the mayor of Yorkton saying that Yorkton looked like a fool in light of the decision made by the Government and seemingly the fact that the Government was trying to play one community off against another, and also the comments from the mayor of Yorkton that they seemingly have elected a loser, what representations did the Minister have from Yorkton with regard to the appointment or making Yorkton the headquarters of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

Hon. E. L. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect to all the communities involved the representations were made by the communities, not at anybody's particular request, but on the basis of their interests in having a head office there. So the Government's decision was based on looking at these all, after they had been taken into account. With respect to Yorkton I met with the mayor once when I was at another function in Yorkton. There was a written brief from Yorkton. I had a meeting in Regina with the mayor, I believe the mayor wasn't there, but some aldermen, the mayor was away at the time, and some other individuals from the city of Yorkton. I met with several groups in Esterhazy at their request and I met with some people in Saskatoon and in some other communities as well.

The meetings which I had, came at the request of the communities.

Mr. Lane: — By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister not admit it somewhat strange that he would choose a city over the objections of some of the Members of the Treasury Benches and as a matter of fact over the opposition to the appointment of Saskatoon by the Minister of Social Services and seemingly reject responsible representations from Esterhazy and Yorkton?

Mr. Cowley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I don't agree with the Member's facts and secondly, I want to say that the decision with respect to the location of the head office was made on the recommendation of the Board of the Potash Corporation and myself to the Government. It was accepted in the light that our judgment being the best location, all things taken into account, of the many excellent locations which were offered.

Mr. Lane: — By way of supplementary. The Minister says he doesn't

April 13, 1976

accept my facts, are you denying that the Minister of Social Services voted against placement of the Potash Corporation in Saskatoon and that the Deputy Premier refused to take a stand?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Next question.

Answer to Question on Palliser Hospital

Mr. D. M. Ham (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Health put me on notice on a question regarding the Swift Current Palliser Hospital and I am wondering if he has an answer now.

Mr. Robbins: — I haven't got it yet.

Rat Control

Mr. R. A. Larter (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Health. Alberta has done a fantastic job of getting rid of their rats and controlling their rats. In view of the rat infestation in Saskatchewan, and I can assure you that they are all over this province, has your Department any immediate plans for going after and destroying the rats in this province?

Mr. Robbins: — I will check the question and get the information.

Mr. Thibault: — I should like the Member to repeat his question because I just couldn't hear it.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Member has given his question and the Minister has answered it, I believe, so I don't wish to go over the same ground again on that particular issue.

Introduction of Toby Nollet

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce, just behind the rails today, the Hon. Toby Nollet.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I asked a question — and you can groan over there if you want — but I did mean sincerely, with all due respect, I asked a question which I still feel very strongly was within the guidelines of the new question period and I was ruled out of order. I should like to know why.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the Member, in this particular instance, give me an opportunity to peruse the record of what occurred, I believe I can substantiate the reason for ruling the Member out

or order at that time. However, I want to check the records.

Mr. S. J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I really want to ask Mr. Speaker the reason for his ruling yesterday. I asked a question about what programs additional money sought by the Minister were allocated to and Mr. Speaker ruled the question out of order. The note is, if it isn't possible to discuss the allotment of funds which were not received for all departments or agencies, therefore it is not possible to ask in respect of one.

Where does one find the authority, Mr. Speaker, for ruling a question out of order of the kind that I asked?

Mr. Speaker: — The purpose of the Orders of the Day and the opportunity to ask questions at this time has to do with the questions that occurred today. Now if the Member wants to discuss that particular matter with me I would be quite pleased to see him in my office at a later time and discuss it then.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 61

Mr. R. A. Larter (Estevan) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Berntson (Souris-Cannington) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 61 showing:

The detailed cost of work done in 1975 by the Department of Highways on 4.9 miles of Highway No. 18 west of Estevan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there have been many words said here on this 4.9 miles of the Highway 18 between the Minister of Highways and myself and I put this question to the House for information. The Minister suggested I could get it and it would have been on there sooner except that this portion of the highway is still not finished, so I have it on there today. The reasons I'm really interested in seeing the price is I feel this has been a very expensive training ground for the people of Saskatchewan.

Therefore, I move seconded by Mr. Berntson for Souris-Cannington Return No. 61.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I stand to be corrected but my feeling is that both Item No. 1, which the Member for Wascana stood at our request and Item No. 2 were to be non-debatable. I think that this is the first time that they are up and they floated across the way. Again it doesn't matter because on Item No. 2 we have done some work and agreed to the question as asked, but I think procedurally it is still in the non-debatable category. I think it was marked non-debate. He is nodding his head saying that is true.

Mr. Speaker: — It will appear on the Point of Order that the point is well taken because if the Items appeared in the Whites as not debatable and I would suggest to expedite the work of the House that the Members not debate them at this time. Then we can just

April 13, 1976

pass them as they are dealt with.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. P. P. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre) moved second reading of Bill No. 03 — An Act to incorporate Place Riel Society.

Mr. J. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, one of the main items in the Place Riel is whether or not there would be a pub on campus or liquor outlet. Is that under consideration in this Bill and what comments do you have on that?

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe so and I think that questions of that nature should be directed to the committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 8 — Licensing of Non-Resident Outfitters Operating Fishing Camps

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):

That this Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately change the licensing requirements of non-resident outfitters operating tourist fishing camps in Saskatchewan by making it compulsory that:

(a) at least 30 per cent of the directors of such foreign-owned companies are Canadian citizens; (b) bonding be a requirement; (c) all wages to Saskatchewan residents be paid on an account from a Canadian banking institution; before a non-resident outfitter's licence or permit can be obtained.

Motion negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 11

Stodalka
Lane
Wiebe
Malone

MacDonald
Cameron
Nelson (Assiniboia-
Gravelbourg)

Clifford
Anderson
Merchant
Thatcher

NAYS — 33

Blakeney
Pepper
Smishek
Romanow
Snyder
Byers

Robbins
MacMurchy
Mostoway
Whelan
Kaeding
Kwasnica

Cowley
Tchorzewski
Matsalla
Skoberg
Vickar
Nelson (Yorkton)

Kramer
Baker
Lange
Faris
Kowalchuk

Dyck
McNeill
Feschuk
Shillington
Rolfes

Allen
Koskie
Johnson
Thompson
Banda

Resolution No 10 — Destroyed Confidence in Gas and Oil Industry

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana):

That this Assembly strongly disapproves of the policies of the Department of Mineral Resources of the Government of Saskatchewan which have destroyed the confidence of the oil and gas industry and resulted in a decline of Saskatchewan drilling and exploration activity, while drilling continues to increase in other provinces and the Territories.

and the proposed amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Whelan:

That all the words after the word “strongly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Department of Mineral Resources of the Government of Saskatchewan for retaining for the people of Saskatchewan a fair share of the windfall gains from unprecedented crude oil price increases in the past two and a half years; while at the same time establishing in Saskatchewan by allowing oil and gas producers to recover certain expenditures made for such exploration and development from the mineral income tax and royalty surcharge.

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say about this particular motion, but I understand that the Member who has been in charge of the two Acts under second reading is anxious to get on with his speech and we have some Estimates to do later today. So accordingly I'll make my remarks at a later date and ask leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn) moved second reading of Bill No. 36 An Act to amend The Liquor Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon as I rise to move second reading to Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Liquor Act, this will perhaps be one occasion during my twelve years as a Member of this Assembly which I will well remember.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible that I stand alone. I already can sense the attitude of some Members towards this Bill, saying this will not bring about the necessary changes that we should wish to be brought about. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that my intentions are to lay before this Assembly some very serious facts to be considered by all of us. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is quite easy for any Member to rise on

the Opposition side and condemn what they believe has been a wrongdoing of the government. But it takes courage for a Member of the Government to rise and to introduce a Bill to correct a mistake in which he along with others had a hand in making.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I have a privilege to launch debate on what I consider to be one of the most important issues within our society today. It is an issue which effects each of us. As Members of this Legislative Assembly we must never forget the fact that we were the ones responsible for effecting changes to the law as it is applied in Saskatchewan. Granted, many of the statutes are determined at the Federal level, others are struck at a municipal level, but many of the laws and regulations which we abide by, are set by this very Legislature.

In proposing changes to The Liquor Act, I am asking each Member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to take an honest and sincere look at the present age of consent as it applies to the legal age for drinking in Saskatchewan.

It was this Government which took the initiative and the responsibility for lowering the legal age from 21 years to 18 years. Was it the right move? Is our decision of yesteryear generating unforeseen problems today? These are but two very pertinent questions which I hope are given honest and frank debate as this issue comes under discussion.

Individually, we might ask ourselves — How can I, only one Member effect change. How can I do it alone? None of us can. However, individually we can do our part, and we have an obligation to the public we represent, to ensure that vitally important public issues are brought into the public arena for re-examination and deliberation.

Personally, I feel very strongly that the drinking age should be raised to nineteen years of age. My viewpoint is no more influential on this matter than any other Member, however, I do not think it is any less significant either. It is my humble hope, Mr. Speaker, that each Member can objectively weigh the pros and cons of this decision and vote accordingly when the time comes.

I am confident that if we follow that course, the amendments I am proposing this afternoon will receive endorsement from this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, as a government we should never be afraid to re-examine from time to time, decisions which have been made in the past. As humans we naturally are prone to the frailties of mankind and misjudgments and errors can be made.

This Government does not have a monopoly on wisdom and right. No government does. However, the true test of good government can be found in its ability or inability to admit shortcomings and mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, in retrospect, I feel very strongly that our decision during our first term of office to reduce the legal drinking age was hasty and ill conceived. I am not suggesting that we deliberately invoked change which was contrary to the wishes of the majority of Saskatchewan people, however, I feel

that we “misread” not only the undercurrent of public opinion, but also underestimated the impact of our move to reduce the legal age.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing genuine public concern being expressed about the present legislation which allows 18 year olds to legally purchase and consume alcoholic beverages. The concern is being expressed from all segments of society. Parents, temperance groups, church leaders, teachers and yes, even teenagers themselves have personally expressed their concerns to me about this matter.

Since the age was lowered, I have received a considerable volume of public feedback and I am sure the letters and calls which I have received are similar to the ones most of you have received as well.

I know there are many arguments to be heard on both sides of this issue. For the most part, they are the same arguments which have been echoed over the years, however, since 1972 when the legislative change was approved by this Assembly, some new arguments have been heard.

As we weigh each viewpoint with objectivity and honesty, there is one argument which relates very closely to each Member of this Assembly, and it is this issue which we must honestly assess if we, as elected public officials, are to assure ourselves that we can in good conscience, vote on these proposed amendments.

The question is this, “can we individually cast our political biases to the wayside and honestly come to grips with the stark realities of what our past decisions have meant in relationship to the present legal age?” If we can, then I am confident that my proposed amendment will receive positive consideration by this Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would like to take a few minutes to detail some facts in relation to the overall question of alcohol and its use. However, before doing so, I should like to clarify my position respecting some of the oft-repeated arguments which can be heard whenever this subject comes up for debate.

How many times have we heard “we can vote when we are 18, we can go and fight for our country when we are 18, why can’t we drink when we are 18?” Mr. Speaker, as logical as that argument might sound, I do not think that view adds any credence to this issue. No matter how providential we might think we are at times, as politicians we cannot legislate responsibility, and that word “responsibility” is the key. There are 15 year olds who can probably drink more responsibly than 18 year olds, just like there are many 18 year olds who can handle their drinking more responsibly than a 40 year old.

The question we must ask ourselves is this “in light of the fact that alcoholism is now considered to be the third most serious illness in North America, should we, as legislators pass laws which legally pave the way for more people to have access to alcohol?” That, Mr. Speaker, is the key question to be considered during this debate.

Then there are others who will say, “but we must accept the inevitability that alcohol is part of reality in today’s

society." I agree that alcohol is probably here to stay, but, that in no way diminishes our responsibility to ensure that we minimize the adverse affects caused by its consumption.

Permit me now to detail some statistics which hopefully will provide a firm foundation for my views, and which will hopefully provide some guidance for those Members seeking documentation in relationship to the realities that alcohol consumption does pose a very serious economic and social problem within society today.

The first fact of life which we must accept is the realization that "the booze business is big business." Did you know that Canadians spend more on liquor each year than Parliament allots for the entire defense budget, over two billion dollars? Did you know that in the United States Americans drink up over \$25 billion worth of liquor each year? Yes, our American friends spend more, but on a per capita basis, Canada has more alcoholics that the United States. And, when we examine the "costs" in economic terms, the annual increase is frightening.

In 1969, total sales for alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan totalled \$71.8 million. In 1973, sales were in excess of \$94.3 million and this year, the figures have escalated even further.

In terms of gross revenue to the province, in 1969, liquor sales generated \$22 million to the provincial treasury; in 1975 revenues jumped to \$39 million; and this year, financial projections show an estimated revenue of \$57 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the more significant facts in relationship to the economies of alcohol and its sale to the consuming public. However, there is another side to this issue. Permit me to quote some figures which show some of the social costs involved, and I want to use the base year of 1973 to point out some facts:

Estimated Cost of Alcoholism in Saskatchewan in 1973.

(a) Chronic drunkenness offender	\$ 407,484
(b) General hospital patients for alcoholism	884,868
(c) Public assistance costs	17,741,217
(d) Costs due to industrial alcoholism	4,584,584
(e) Traffic Accidents	2,784,974
(f) Alcoholism patients treated in psychiatric institutions	324,720
(g) Alcoholism Commission budget	1,021,293

For a total of approximately \$27.8 million, Mr. Speaker.

To me, Mr. Speaker, these figures are startling, but there are more. Statistics tell us that over 42 per cent of all fatal accidents in Saskatchewan involve alcohol, 42 per cent. In the city of Regina in 1970, there were 2,307 convictions under the .08 legislation. A year after we dropped the legal age to 18 years, the total jumped to 6,352, a 270 per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious situation. I think we all agree that the situation is indeed profound but some might still ask us, what will raising the legal age have to do, and

how will it contribute to reducing some of these frightful statistics?

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Morris Chafetz, Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism in the United States made a very significant point when he said:

Far too often, young people spend their early years, listening to adults tell them to get lost, then as they grow up they are told to start finding themselves.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, we must help them start finding themselves sooner and there is no time like starting now. And that will require that we be honest enough about our own biases to provide a full range of information to young people, and courageous enough to involve them in decisions that affect their lives.

I see it as absolutely imperative that we act now, in order to avert even further deterioration in the future. The situation will be catastrophic if our young people do not adopt a more responsible attitude toward the taking of alcohol than today's adult population do.

The question arises, why do today's youth drink? What prompts them to take that first drink? Not even the recognized experts have been able to come up with an answer to that one. However, one reason which keeps coming forward is the matter of experimentation. A national study in 1974 showed that 93 per cent of boys and 87 per cent of girls in their senior year of school had experimented with alcohol, and more than half the nations' seventh graders had tried drinking at least once during the previous year. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, statistics support our fears that the situation is by no means improving, as each year, the usage rates increase.

For instance, the Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario found that in Toronto in 1968, 46.3 per cent of students said they had used alcohol during the last six months, but by 1974, the percentage had jumped to 72.9 per cent and of this figure, 45 per cent of the students admitted that they drink at least once a week.

A noted American sociologist, Dr. Gerald Globetti has spent years studying the phenomenon. What does he say? He says:

Sooner or later all young people in our society are faced with the inevitable decision to drink or not to drink. About 75 per cent of them will make this decision and use alcohol before they are legally entitled, one third on a regular basis, while five to ten per cent will experience serious complications as a result of drinking, and one in 12 will go on to become an adult drinker and an alcoholic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another study showed that approximately 23 per cent of those students who indicated they drink, exhibit potential problem drinking signs. No, statistics do not paint a very encouraging picture. Yet, it is how we interpret these facts which will determine what happens in the future. Aside from that however, I do think I have shown the seriousness of what we are faced with, in relationship to this legislative

amendment I am proposing.

Mr. Speaker, another important aspect of responsibility in terms of alcohol usage is the education process.

Yes, this Government is spending a considerable amount of money each year on such programs as the Aware Program and other ventures. I feel that these programs are having a great impact, however, I am not convinced that we are doing all we can and at times I seriously question the priorities which have been established in the past.

The ultimate answer to a meaningful and substantial reduction in the devastating toll of alcohol abuse and alcoholism lies in the capacity of adults and youth to make sound decisions on the subject. Young people need clear, realistic and honest information about alcohol use and misuse in order to make responsible decisions. Facts about alcohol should not be presented in isolation, but, Mr. Speaker, they should rather be integrated into a school curriculum as part of education for living.

I feel that many of the same decision making mechanisms involved in deciding how to use alcohol should be involved in deciding how to drive a car, how to handle finances, whom to marry, and how to plan a future life. I think it is absolutely imperative that such education should begin early, before values and behavior patterns become fixed.

It is pretty frightening when sociologists and psychologists tell us that children, even as young as six and seven, have already started to formulate ideas, irrespective of how primitive, on drinking and whether or not it is a good idea.

Now is the logical time to again ask the question, why do people drink? Generally there are psychological factors involved. They either drink to celebrate or to escape feelings of depression. But they also drink to relax, to go to sleep, to quench their thirst, to increase appetite, even to participate in religious rituals, and so on.

In Ontario, for example, over 80 per cent of people over the age of 15 drink alcoholic beverages. A survey last year, also showed an alarming number of youngsters under the age of 15 who drank as well. Many of these started using alcohol to imitate their parents, other adults, or some of their friends, perhaps in an attempt to just seem to be sophisticated.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of life, people are influenced to drink more or to drink less by the people around them. In that sense, all drinkers have some responsibility for the overall level of consumption in the general population. Also, there is a relationship between the overall level of consumption and the number of alcohol dependent people. Wherever studies have been made, the common theme reflected in the conclusions is that there is a problem and it is a serious one and it is getting worse.

I would like to see the Government allocate budget funds in the near future towards studies in order to evaluate the seriousness of this problem. It is a problem here in Saskatchewan. There is no doubt about that. How much we do, or how far we extend ourselves in meeting it head on is up to

each and every Member sitting here in this Legislature.

A moment ago I said that the studies which have been made in other jurisdictions pointed out problems on a consistent basis. For instance, a study was commissioned in Michigan after the legal age in that state was lowered from 21 years to 18 years. Among the findings, Mr. Speaker, total accidents involving 18 year old drivers had increased 125 per cent in the first year of the lowered drinking age, and 55 per cent of the fatal accidents involving 18 year olds were alcohol related. A closer analysis of the reports downgraded somewhat the high figures, but even with the reduced percentages, the increases were still extraordinarily high. The study as well showed that in the first year after the change, alcohol related collisions increased by 28 per cent. Even after the second year, alcohol related collisions increased by 14 per cent while total collisions increased by a mere eight per cent.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, are we still convinced that we made the right decision four years ago to lower the legal age to 18 years of age? Driving and alcohol is only one aspect of the whole question, yet each study has shown very clearly that wherever the drinking age was lowered, Mr. Speaker, there was a dramatic increase in fatalities and property damage in relationship to driving. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it worth it?

In terms of human lives, in terms of dollars and cents, in terms of physical deterioration, in terms of quality of life, in terms of suffering and heartbreak, it just does not matter, every statistic available shows conclusively that absolutely nothing is gained by lowering the age.

If we reverse that same question and ask what is gained by raising the age to 19 years, some pertinent points are made.

Earlier I made the observation that alcohol is part of our society. Does that mean that we shrug our shoulders and say, we'll just have to cope with it, or, do we show leadership and determination to fulfil our moral obligation and responsibility to do our part as elected representatives to fight this thing just as vigorously as we would approach any other serious disease?

And, Mr. Speaker, it is a disease. That stereotyped impression of an alcoholic being a skid row drunk is gone. It affects every profession and group in society with as much intensity as does cancer and tuberculosis. In the United States it was estimated last year that alcohol was directly responsible for over \$3 billion in lost revenue due to illness, and the treatment of that illness, lost productivity and so on.

I again ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it worth it? And if it is not worth it, what are we prepared to do about it?

Quite obviously there is a very strong lobby very much present within our society which constantly promotes even greater laxity with respect to liquor laws. The brewery industry is one of the richest and most powerful industries anywhere. In addition, the sale of alcohol represents a very significant cash inflow for the Provincial Government. Yet, are we prepared to measure the merits of this issue in strict monetary terms or are we going to look beyond the financial ledger and

consider the social factors as well?

Mr. Speaker, when I receive letters from teenagers pleading that we do something to raise the legal age, I am fully convinced that this is not just an issue of concern among the adult population. When I talk with middle aged people who have been involved with Alcoholics Anonymous for years and they express shock and dismay at the rapidly increasing numbers of young people who attend AA, it shows just how deep a cut alcohol is making within our younger generation. Mr. Speaker, don't get me wrong. There is nothing shameful about being in AA, quite the contrary, these people are doing something about their problem. What are we doing to help?

It has intrigued me to watch and listen over the past few years as the public outrage grew against drug abuse, particularly as it related to our younger people. There were letters to the editor, homes and school groups, parents, the law, the parliamentarians, the church and the media all combined to develop a real concern about the seriousness and abhorrence involved with the use of street drugs.

But what about alcohol? What has been said? Where is the public outcry?

Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is alcohol abuse and not drug abuse and I mean street drugs, which represents the most serious drug problem in today's schools. Perhaps we don't attach any great concern over alcohol because we do not treat it as a drug and we have learned to accept a permissive attitude in any relationship to its use. I am sure that we would all be shocked if our children drove around at noon hour smoking pot but yet we don't seem to get too alarmed when our 18 year old students go grab a beer at lunch time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a certain inconsistency here which can only be corrected if we better educate ourselves about the realities of alcohol and commit ourselves to a positive course of action to do something about it. By raising the legal age to 19 we'll be making a significant start. However, that does release us in no way from the ever present responsibility to monitor the effects which alcohol is having on our society today.

When the age is 18, we find 16 and 17 year olds in the bar. By raising the legal age and placing a much greater emphasis on enforcement I am convinced that we can positively influence the downward trend which I feel will result in relationship to usage statistics. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to show our young people that we care about them and are concerned about their future. There will be those who will heap scorn on any decision to raise the limit but I can live with that criticism, Mr. Speaker. I would much sooner face these people than face my own conscience each day knowing full well that I contributed, through my individual position on this issue, to the very serious problems which parents and teachers face each day with the realities that their students and their children are having real problems with alcohol.

If any Member of this Assembly can prove to me that alcohol in any way contributes favorably to any aspect of our society, I would be prepared to reconsider this amendment. However, I feel that such is not the case. I say, Mr. Speaker, we face a big challenge. Do we turn our backs on the problem or do we roll up our sleeves and get to work. Much needs to be done. We have all failed to properly educate our young people on the aspects involved with alcohol consumption. To date we have been merely content to allow the experimentation process to do the job. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough.

When I hear stories where 13 year olds are found to be suffering from alcoholism there is something wrong with society. And if we, as elected representatives of the public, close our eyes and our minds to these facts then there is something wrong with each of us. Mr. Speaker, if we are not part of this solution, then I say we are part of the problem.

I hope that each Member of this Assembly does some honest soul searching with respect to this very serious topic. Individually, maybe we have been fortunate because we have not had to face the realities of alcohol abuse or alcoholism in our own family. But then again, let me remind you, maybe we haven't had to face the sorrow when a loved one is stricken with cancer or tuberculosis either. But one thing we must never say, is that it can never happen to us because it can.

So, Mr. Speaker, today, I am asking this Assembly to take one step forward, and I humbly ask each of you to support me in this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 36, be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. H. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, in some respects I am not sure but what calling the question wouldn't, in fact, be a pretty good idea, although I recognize that there may be some Members of the House that would find that to be out of order this afternoon.

I think that the remarks of the Member for Weyburn with regard to asking Members of the House to consider very carefully the matter of raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 is something which in fact has been happening for some time. And I think ever since the fall each of us have been wrestling in our minds and in our own hearts with the question of whether the suggestion to raise the drinking age is one which we, individually, can support or not. I dare say that for the vast majority of Members they have already made up their minds. And so I say that while it is not customary for the question on an issue of this sort to be called that quickly I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the question will be called and that it will be called soon. As I have said before it is my intention to support the motion as the Member for Weyburn has put it.

Now I think that the Member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) is obviously interested in the debate and I expect that we may hear from him a little later, Mr. Speaker. There is no question but what the flag has been run up on the issue. I suggested earlier that I ran the flag up in the fall but I had it suggested to me

outside of the House that in fact there was at least one other Member of this Assembly who a couple of years ago ran up the flag. I think it is fair to say that when the original legislation was before the House and some Members voted against lowering the age to 18 that they were, in a way, if you like running up the flag. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am not as much concerned about in whose name the Bill rests as I am with the idea that the Bill presents and I am as much in favor today as I was in November of the idea of having the legal drinking age in Saskatchewan raised from 18 to 19.

Our caucus, Mr. Speaker, as I said in March intends to vote on the matter on an individual basis. I hope that the matter will receive sufficient support not only in our caucus but in each of the other two caucuses, if that is the correct plural, that it will pass.

There are a number of reasons why I supported the resolution when it was before us in the fall and a number of reasons why I continue to support the Bill and I would like to highlight those, Mr. Speaker, without repeating the speech that I gave when I spoke to the matter in November.

First of all since the legal drinking age was lowered there has been a significant increase in the consumption of alcoholic beverages by young teenagers in the 14 and 15 age group. Most of us will recognize that when the legal drinking age was 21, 18 and 19 year olds were able to obtain alcohol. Now that the age has been lowered there has been a filtering downward of that phenomenon. While Members of the House may argue for hard statistics on the matter I invite them only to consider the situation in their own community. I invite them to consider the number of occasions when they have heard of students at the elementary school level who had alcohol at a school function on a Friday night or a Saturday night or at a social gathering. And take a look at the increase in the incidence of that in the last few years, think back to a situation four or five years ago when that kind of thing never happened at all.

A little better than two years ago, Mr. Speaker, two school jurisdictions in Moose Jaw conducted a survey among a little better than 2400 students which revealed that 55 per cent from the ages of 12 and up claimed that they had been drinking liquor. In addition to studies like this one each of us can relate to local circumstances where the incidence of alcohol use among very young teenagers is growing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Weyburn indicated when he was speaking a few minutes ago, and I agree with him, that the matter is an extremely complex one, that the entire question of alcohol abuse is not one that is going to be solved by this House agreeing to the Bills and the amendments that have been brought before us.

In addition to raising the drinking age we have got to take another look at the question of enforcement. I am sure that there are Members of the House that would agree that the matter of pricing of alcohol needs to be looked at. I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, and I say again that it seems to me if we try to put all of these things that need to be done into one package that the matter becomes so complex that we don't make any forwards steps. And while we may take small steps I would rather that we progressed in the right direction taking small steps

than look at the entire problem and say it is too complex to do anything and therefore do nothing.

It seems to me and again I must say that I agree with the Member for Weyburn that we have a responsibility as legislators. Legislators lowered the age, legislators created the attitude that brought about a freer thinking about the use or the abuse of alcohol and I think legislators have a responsibility to prick the social conscience and to raise the age.

Now a second argument, Mr. Speaker, for raising the legal drinking age can be found in an examination of traffic accident statistics. In this connection I would first like to draw the attention of Members of the House to the May-June 1975 issue of the Saskatchewan Motorist. In this issue is an article entitled Teenage Drinking and Driving and I quote from that article:

A study conducted by researchers at the University of Western Ontario indicates that lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18 increases the number of alcohol related collisions not only among drivers age 18 to 20 but also 16 to 17 year olds. An examination of accident records in London, Ontario revealed that when the drinking age was lowered to 18 in Ontario in 1971 alcohol related accidents among 18 to 20 year olds rose 174 per cent the first year after the change and 14 per cent the second.

And interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, among 16 and 17 year olds alcohol related collisions went up 63 per cent the first year and 108 per cent the second. The research has concluded that the younger teenagers were now passing for 18 to obtain alcoholic beverages as the older teens had previously passed for 21. And I think that that kind of thing is something that we have all seen happening in our own communities right here in this province.

In another study this time in Michigan the Automobile Club of that state published figures to show that in the first year of legal drinking for 18 to 20 year olds significant negative results were evident. In the first year that 18 to 20 year olds could buy alcohol legally the incidence of traffic accidents by this age group accounted for a 54 per cent increase in fatal accidents. The 18 to 20 age group according to the same study accounted for 104 per cent increase in injuries and 135 per cent increase in property damage. To further show how statistics mount against the present drinking age let's examine some additional facts.

In Saskatchewan the increase in drinking driving conditions during the time when the age was being lowered that is between the years 1970 and 1973, it rose by 214 per cent. Impaired driving conditions in Metropolitan Toronto for those in the 18 to 20 category rose by 900 per cent after the Ontario law was changed and lowered the legal drinking age to 18. An article in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix December 4, points to further statistics which are germane to the argument. In Alberta traffic deaths among 16 and 19 year olds went up nearly eight fold in the three months after the legal drinking age was lowered to 18. A 1970 survey of Metropolitan Toronto schools found 46 per cent of students from grades seven to 13 admitted drinking. The percentage after the drinking age was

lowered to 18 rose to 74 per cent. In Newfoundland the legal drinking age was lowered to 18 in 1972 and after the change became law we had 95 per cent of the students replying to a questionnaire on drinking, 25 per cent said they drove while they did so.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to cite any more statistics because I think we can get all the statistics and lose the significance and we lose the meaning but I think it is sufficient to say that in study after study in province after province and in certain states in the United States after the age was lowered statistics relating to alcohol related accidents among young teenagers rose and rose sharply. Not only has there been an increase in carnage, in deaths and in injuries, there has been an increase in accidents as well.

Mr. Speaker, another reason why I am prepared to support the Bills as they are before us is because I would like again to draw to the attention of the House the motion that was put before Saskatoon City Council last spring where a resolution was put and passed asking the Provincial Government to raise the legal drinking age and in that motion it said raise it to 20. That motion passed by a significant majority, eight to three. A group of people representing at the local level, roughly ten per cent of the population of the province has indicated their concern and asked the Government if they won't reverse the trend that had begun years ago and put the drinking age back up. Now I frankly think, Mr. Speaker, that raising the drinking age to 20 or 21 is probably a better step than raising it to 19 but as I said when I spoke to the resolution that was before the House in the fall that I frankly didn't think there was as much chance of it passing if the age was 20 or 21 as there is with it being 19. And I want Members of the House to be aware of that, that there is a tremendous amount of support in Saskatchewan for the concept of raising the drinking age. Not only has Saskatoon City Council voiced a view but we have had, and I am sure other Members of the House as I have, have received all kinds of communications in the last few months from interested organizations and interested individuals urging us to raise the legal drinking age from 18 to 19. I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of support is there.

I hope that Members of the NDP caucus and Members of the Progressive Conservative caucus will give the Bills the kind of support that I am confident is going to come from the Liberal caucus. We will have the Bills before us soon for the question. I urge all Members, Mr. Speaker, to join in support of the Bills before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill, like the previous speaker, at least, I would support it if it had raised the age to 19, 20 or 21.

I am going to quote quite extensively from the research done by Dr. Paul Whitehead, the consultant to the Aware Program.

I think it is important that people realize that in the last two years there has become available a considerable amount of data on which people may base their opinions.

Dr. Whitehead has this to say on the effect of lowering the drinking age on the collision involvement of young drivers. I quote:

While there is general agreement that age related characteristics are more important than alcohol in explaining the higher collision rates among young drivers, changes in the age of majority in an increasing number of jurisdictions mean that alcohol may play a more crucial role in the future.

The use of alcohol among young people has increased substantially in the last decade. For example, whereas in 1968 only 46 per cent of high school students in Toronto had consumed alcohol at least once during the previous six months, by 1974, 73 per cent had done so. Much of the increase occurred prior to the lowering of the drinking age in Ontario in 1971. But there is other evidence that total consumption as well as frequency of use increased after the change in law. For example, Schmidt found in the 1972 study an increase in on premise sales of alcohol. Miss Martin-Findlay in a 1974 study concluded that legalization increased beer drinking among young people to the same level as that in the general population, whereas before it had been lower.

Lowering the drinking age to 18 would also be expected to have some impact on the high school population. A study of views of vice-principals done by Smart and White in 1972, found that a sizeable proportion of vice-principals viewed drinking as an increasing problem, particularly at school functions, during school hours and at lunch time. However, the greatest concern was the increase in under-age drinking, the spill-over effect on younger students that is a result of older students at the same school having legal access to alcoholic beverages.

The findings that the consumption of alcohol among the young people has increased as a result of lowering the drinking age, adds weight to the growing body of evidence that the change in the drinking age has produced increases in rates of collisions among young drivers. The proportion of collisions involving young drivers that are alcohol related has not only increased to the level of older age groups. In some cases it has surpassed it.

There are some who argue that most of the increase is a result of changed reporting practices. But there is strong evidence to the contrary from sources where factors involving selective reporting are not apt to operate. For example, results of roadside surveys in Michigan indicate that the percentage of 16 to 20 year-olds with blood alcohol content levels of .05 per cent or more increased from 1.3 per cent in 1971 to 4.9 per cent, the following year when the drinking age had been lowered.

The impact of the increased consumption of alcoholic beverages has not yet been specified in detail. However, we can use age specific data for alcohol related and non-alcohol related collisions to make some predictions about the nature of this relationship. Hoeday, in a

study in 1970 showed that of fatal crashes in Michigan prior to the lowering of the drinking age, he found that the number of drivers peaked at the age of 18 and again at 21. Yet the bi-modal character of the distribution disappeared when the number of fatally injured drivers was spotted separately for drivers who had been drinking than for those who had not been drinking.

Accidents for the non-drinking drivers peaked at age 18, whereas drinking drivers were involved most often at age 21, the legal drinking age at the time. These data suggest that the consumption of alcohol has an effect on collision rates that is separate from those factors that raise it at younger ages. If the effect is purely additive we can extrapolate from the Michigan Study that lowering the drinking age to 18 approximately doubled the number of alcohol related fatalities for that age category. However, we cannot ignore the possibility that greater consumption of alcohol could in effect potentiate the other factors that cause high rates at this age. The four-fold increase observed in London, Canada, for all alcohol related collisions at age 18 following the lowering of the legal drinking age, certainly supports this motion.

I want also to discuss, however, some things which are not generally discussed when this matter is debated, and that is the effect of lowering the drinking age on crime.

Often the effects of lowering the drinking age confined to studies of collision involvement. That is only one of a large number of areas where alcohol affects human behavior. This ignored the findings of both the Schafer Committee in the US and the Le Dain Commission in Canada which stated in both cases that alcohol use has the strongest relationship to crime of any drug, legal or illegal. Studies also reveal that suicide and murder rates among young people have paralleled their increased collision rates. This is not surprising. Le Dain reported that alcoholics and problem drinkers were involved in 33 per cent of murders, 38 per cent of attempted murders, 54 per cent of manslaughters, 39 per cent of rapes, 42 per cent of other sexual offences, 67 per cent of assaults. A recent study amongst Indians in British Columbia in Canada, showed that over 60 per cent of their suicides, 80 per cent of their violent deaths, and 100 per cent of their murders involved alcohol.

Those adults who are concerned about the increasing use of other drugs in our society, may want to reflect on Dr. Whitehead's advice on this subject. He said and I quote:

Previous research strongly suggests that the reduction of illicit drug use among young people must be intimately tied to the reduction of illicit drug use as well. Not only among young people but also among their parents and the rest of society. Effective changes in licit and illicit drug use and practices will likely involve changing the prescribing and practices of physicians, reducing the availability of alcohol and other drugs and other mechanisms that for the most part still remain unexamined and untried. There are certain measures which

involve primary prevention but are not aimed specifically at young people but rather at the larger population, reducing the availability of alcohol and other drugs, using a variety of social control measures, would undoubtedly reduce consumption among young people as well. Lowering the legal blood alcohol concentration level to .04 per cent is advisable (according to Whitehead.)

By the way, I will point out that would mean the enforcement level would be .06, as at present the .08 legislation is not enforced until .1. Quoting again from Whitehead:

Lowering the legal blood alcohol concentration level to .04 is advisable particularly in view of the increasing multi-drug use where higher levels of impairment result than would be the case if an individual drug were used alone. This would have to be accompanied by a level of enforcement that would increase the driver's subjective perception of the likelihood of getting caught to the extent that there is a sizeable deterrent effect.

This could involve roadside surveys with random breathalyzer tests or tests for other drugs. The advantages of such broad-based measures are two-fold. Firstly, they are easier to implement because they do not require selecting a high risk group, namely, young males. In addition, they would reduce impaired driving and collision among all age groups rather than only among some with high rates. If the measures do not take full advantage of some of the opportunities available to affect particular age groups, thus a more comprehensive prevention policy would also involve measures that are specifically aimed at young people. The most obvious of these is to raise the drinking age in those areas where it has already been lowered and to retain the current legal age in areas where it has remained unchanged. Raising it to age 19 for the time being would be less disruptive and perhaps more effective than reverting to age 21 immediately. The special feature of this approach is that it would virtually eliminate legal drinking among secondary school students and hence the spill-over effect of their drinking behavior on their underage school mates.

Further increases, if desired, could be staged in single year increments so as to make the change more palatable to members of the target group. Both fairness and the appearance of fairness may also be enhanced. A different approach would be to increase the unfavorable consequences of impaired driving among young drivers. Licensing schemes that extend the probationary period to 12 or 18 months and involve the temporary loss of one's licence for even minor traffic offences have been tried on a limited basis in Australia. Evaluation of such a scheme in Australia provides some evidence for a positive effect in reducing the collision rate among young drivers.

Further opportunities exist in driver training programs, for example, an apparent reduction in accidents was noted at follow-up among young drivers involved in a counter measures program.

The DWI program which was recommended by our Committee some three years ago. All of these suggestions, if tried should be experimented with in a context that makes systematic evaluation of their effect possible. This is no less true in the case of educational programs we might initiate. I quote again from Whitehead:

The potential of education programs as an effective counter measure are slight. Such programs are politically popular because they are safe. However, we should not engage in them without having a sound sense of what they might accomplish. In their effort to succeed they must be rigorously established if they are not to constitute a waste of scarce resources. An effective social policy for reducing collisions due to alcohol and drugs among young drivers would be one that combines these two types of measures. Those that are aimed at all persons who drive while impaired, those that take advantage of particular factors associated with young people. We have specified some of the measures that may be implemented immediately, further delays will result in even higher rates of damage.

Mr. Speaker, one of my concerns is that we have a comprehensive and a consistent approach to alcohol problems in our society. Certainly I would agree the legal drinking age should be raised, but we should not do this alone because such a move could be interpreted and is interpreted by some young people as just a way to make them scapegoats.

The Provincial Government's consideration of plans of increased liquor licences for dining rooms and restaurants by over 100 is insane. So, too, is the \$200,000 cutback in the Aware Program. But the five per cent increase in the Alcoholism Commission budget, the five per cent increase this year, is not only insane, it is shocking. That increase over last year's estimates and supplementary estimates isn't even enough to cover inflation. In effect, then, it is a cutback.

Those of us who suspect that restraint budgets in Ottawa and Regina are fighting inflation on the backs of the poor, can be certain of this, it is being fought on the backs of the alcoholics and their suffering families in Saskatchewan.

There are a number of other points that I think must be tackled if we are going to be consistent and comprehensive and effective.

It has already been mentioned that we must have more enforcement. At present the laws are simply not being properly enforced. The question of identification cards should be raised. We have at present a voluntary identification card system which is simply not working. If we can't have a comprehensive sort of identification card system which would include photographs and signatures, an effective kind of system, we shouldn't pretend that we have a system at all. Because the present system is completely ineffective.

Another area that has to be tackled if we are concerned particularly about young people, is the steady, constant, high pressure approach which they are subjected to by the liquor industry. We, unfortunately, in this province allow liquor companies, the distilleries, the wineries, the breweries to have

full time representatives whose job is to promote the use of alcohol. The major way in which these men function is through sporting and cultural events, particularly sporting events that are aimed particularly and intentionally at young people. They know particularly that young males are very bound to have a great interest in sports. And what better way to establish a generation of beer drinkers and whiskey drinkers or whatever than to identify with sports and alcohol.

Any of the Members of this Assembly who are themselves involved in sports, or value sports, know what I mean, that there is hardly a sporting event, there is hardly an athletic activity in this province in which the liquor interests are not directly involved. They are involved to promote increased alcohol sales.

I want to read to you something that was said in this Assembly back in 1958.

May I here say, I would like to pay a tribute to previous administrations for the steps they took in the early days to prohibit promotion in the province. I think that is one of the chief reasons why our consumption is much, much less than in other provinces.

That was C. M. Fines, at that time the Minister responsible for the Liquor Board in 1958. In 1959 he went on to say:

I would also like to emphasize that it is not the intention of the Government to change its policy with regard to the promotion of alcoholic beverages in the province. Saskatchewan has for many years been the only major province in Canada which does not allow agents of liquor companies to promote sales within the province.

That was in 1959. That meant that Saskatchewan was unique as it was in many areas among all the provinces of Canada, in that it would not allow the liquor industry to promote their products.

Mr. Speaker, in the '60s, that policy was changed. The present Government has not backed off on the changes that were made in the '60s, so that now we have instead of the zero number of liquor representatives that were in Saskatchewan in the CCF years, we now have in the province 34 agents for distilleries, two for wineries, 42 for breweries. We have 78 people whose job is to go out and promote the sales of alcohol in this province. And the largest part of their efforts is directed at sports and through sports at young people.

I think that is incredible. My position is that those positions should be completely removed from this province. I think we should return to the kind of principles that the CCF had here in the '40s, the '50s and the '60s when they said very proudly, that we were the only province in Canada which did not have these agents for the liquor companies, and that because of this according to Mr. Fines, that was one of the reasons why our alcoholism rates were lower than the rest of Canada.

Another policy that has to be part of a comprehensive approach to this problem, is obviously that of pricing. Many, many times in this Assembly I have made the argument for the increasing of the relative price of alcohol. These arguments

are too well documented in the literature of alcoholism research to need to be repeated.

One of the interesting points to me is that a recent panel study done by the Aware Program to study the effectiveness of their program, which by the way indicated that the public of Saskatchewan is willing to support pricing programs to reduce alcohol consumption. In fact, 76 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan are willing to support pricing policies to reduce overall alcohol consumption.

I suggest that in the history of this province there have been very few policies which have had such wide support as is indicated from the public on alcohol pricing.

Another matter which greatly concerns me is the matter of the continuing separation of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board and Liquor Commission from the Minister who is responsible for the Aware Program and the Alcoholism Commission. Our report three years ago recommended that one Minister should be responsible for the Liquor Board, Liquor Licensing Commission and the Alcoholism Commission. We also recommended, more particularly, that this should be the Minister of Health. We said there should be a social-health policy in regard to alcohol in the province. What that would mean is this. That health concerns, social concerns, would determine alcohol policy. That the concerns of the Aware Program, the Alcoholism Commission would determine the behavior of the marketing, for instance, of alcohol in the province. This has not been done. It's not done anywhere in Canada. I grant you once again we would be leading Canada in this area.

But I say that only with a consistent kind of policy, a policy which makes the approach that the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licensing Commission consistent with the concerns expressed by the Aware Program and the Alcoholism Commission can we hope to beat this extremely complex and deep problem in our society.

What we have now with the separation is the Liquor Board, the Liquor Licensing Commission in this province carrying on as they do in other provinces. And that is, carrying on on the basis of what I would call a merchandizing approach to alcohol.

We see increasing numbers of government liquor stores being opened up. We see constant pressure on the Government from restaurants to be able to sell alcohol, from beverage rooms to be able to increase their sales in various ways. We'll be seeing, no doubt, pressure for more special liquor vendor licences. All politicians are aware of the kind of pressures I'm talking about. We'll see too, liquor board stores being turned into self-serve stores. Those who have studied this kind of thing, and it has been studied, are quite aware that all this does is utilize the impulse kind of selling techniques, so that the sales of those liquor stores increase.

Now, if that's our intention we should follow on with that merchandizing mentality. On the other hand if we are concerned about the health and social issues we should have programs, policies in regard to the merchandizing alcohol in this province, which will not encourage increases in consumption.

Yet, another area that I'm very, very concerned about is that it's not simply good enough to say to anybody, young people, let alone adults, that okay, you know, you should stop drinking or don't drink. That may be wise advice, but the fact is that you have to get beyond that question of whether people do not drink as to why they drink. You have to offer them alternatives. I think this particularly true of young people. It's one reason why I'm concerned about the involvement of the liquor industry in sports. For myself, I see a health oriented, sports oriented kind of philosophy developing among young people which would say, you don't use drugs.

The young people do not have to drink, they do not have to smoke, they do not have to use drugs to have a rewarding life style.

I say that it's time that we had a massive approach, for instance, to the area of recreation. I think we're getting fairly close to the point in this province where we have enough recreation facilities. If our school auditoriums and gymnasiums and assembly halls and so on were available in the evenings and weekends as they should be for total use, what we really need is funding for recreation programs. I would suggest the kind of program that might just start out with having a recreation director, very largely at least funded by the Provincial Government, identified, associated with every high school in the province to serve that kind of area. To program, not only for young people, but for senior citizens, for the whole community, in the afternoons, the evenings, the weekends, when those facilities are available.

I'm greatly disappointed that we haven't had really aggressive action following up the physical education committee's report to the Minister of Education. That's an excellent report and the idea of having one or two hours of physical education and other physical activities a day in schools in this province, is one that I would think that along with the positive health oriented philosophy would provide real alternatives to young people, that if they could gain a sense of well-being from physical activity, from the improved mental capacity that goes along with physical activity, that if they could gain rewards, if they could gain highs from life itself, they wouldn't have to turn to alcohol and other drugs for their highs.

Therefore, I think this is the kind of thing, all of these steps that I've discussed, here are the sort of things that should go along with the increasing of the legal drinking age.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to press for such programs and I will at the same time support these Bills.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Robbins (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and make a few remarks with respect to this particular Bill and I certainly support the raising of the legal drinking age to 19 or 20 or 21, it doesn't matter to me. I do think that there is some merit . . .

Mr. Romanow: — How about 65?

Mr. Robbins: — Sixty-five is fine with me

too. I do think there is some merit in looking at 19 year olds at the present time, basically because of the problem that is fairly evident in our schools. There is the fact that there is a spill over effect as previous speakers have referred to, in relation to drinking among younger persons.

I don't think for one minute that it's the complete answer by any means, but I do think that the other things that previous speakers have referred to, the accessibility of alcohol, the pricing patterns in relation to alcohol, also should be utilized.

I must tell the Members of the Assembly that the Aware Program is one of the programs in the Department of Health that receives a fair number of accolades. I think the Aware Program has accomplished a couple of things. It has at least alerted people to the problem of alcoholism in our society. Secondly, it has, and I don't think that the general public is aware of this, it has taken a great deal of pressure off government in relation to promotion of liquor advertising.

However, the real function of the Aware Program, if it really achieves what it set out to achieve would be to reduce the consumption of alcohol and the consumption of alcohol is continually increasing in our society.

However, I don't know whether you can argue that it hasn't reduced the actual increase in the consumption to some degree. No one will know for sure. The Hon. Member for Arm River referred to Paul Whitehead and as the Minister in charge of the Aware Program and the Alcoholism Commission I get reports from Mr. Whitehead. They have run regular surveys, both rurally and in urban centres and there is an increasing indication that people are concerned about the alcohol problem. There is an increasing amount of evidence to the effect that a larger proportion of the population is willing to support the raising of the legal drinking age today then was the case even six months ago.

I am constantly getting reports from the Alcoholism Commission and also from the Aware Program with respect to the problem in schools. Even in the elementary school system severe problems have been found in some Saskatoon schools and the Hon. Member for Eastview will be interested in these statistics where they found in lunch baskets of kids in school in grades six, seven and eight containing bottles of vodka which they had brought from home.

Now this isn't something you can just lightly dismiss. It has real major problems for us in the future and I think because of that we need to take some pretty strong stands which are based on fact and which will get some results.

I also strongly support the lowering of the breathalyzer test to the .04, and if you check the records you will find that I supported that view when we discussed the matter some years ago in this Assembly.

Mr. MacDonald: — Don't kill all my fun.

Mr. Robbins: — I want you to live longer and I want to cut the costs of health. Actually a lot of the costs in relation to the actual delivery of health care today are related to alcohol use.

That's a fact of life. Dr. Rankin of the Ontario Addiction Centre claims that 40 per cent of the \$3,400,000,000 that Ontario spends on health this year are related to the use of alcohol and tobacco. Now if you discount that by ten per cent and we're up to approximately \$300 million in terms of alcohol and tobacco related costs. Which I call a life style disease. I really don't like to see you suffering from that disease. I'd like to have you cured.

Last year we had 298 deaths on the highways in this province and in 50 per cent approximately in that range, alcohol was the major factor. We had 10,000 people who suffered injuries in automobile accidents and who crowded our emergency hospital wards. Even from the standpoint of strictly economic costs that runs in the range of a couple of million dollars per year. If you want to look at the pure economic costs and forget about the suffering and the deaths associated with it. In terms of cardiovascular diseases, cirrhosis of the liver, etc. and I'm trying to protect you again, the Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley from those kinds of afflictions.

People sometimes say, oh, governments like to sell liquor because they make a lot of profit, \$49,185,000 last year. But in fact 30 per cent of our costs are related to alcohol problems and the alcohol diseases that flow from it, including accidents, and not just automobile accidents. An awful lot of our snowmobile accidents are related to the use of alcohol. Lots of our drownings are associated with the use of alcohol in boats. This is a fact of life that we should be able to fact facts.

I think on the basis of those statistics and other people have presented the case reasonably well, I simply want to make it very clear that I don't consider raising the legal drinking age to 19 is any cure-all but I think it's a step in the right direction and I would like to see that step taken and I urge every Member in this Assembly to support that view.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. L. Cowley (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I have been called upon very quickly here to speak. I do intend to have some words to say on this at a later date and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn) moved second reading of Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, earlier I proposed amendments to The Liquor Act, amendments that would raise the legal age for drinking to 19 years from the present age of 18.

At that time I brought forward a number of arguments coupled with many conclusive statistics which showed very clearly that in other jurisdictions where the legal age had been reduced, there was a corresponding rise in accidents in relationship to driving, coupled with a startling increase in other areas such as the economic and social aspect of alcohol consumption.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure uniformity of the law, the same amendment, of course, is needed in relationship to The Liquor Licensing Act. Many of the same arguments I raised earlier apply in relation to these proposed amendments, however, there are two new considerations which I would like to discuss with you in terms of this specific amendment.

The first issue I should like to discuss deals with the enforcement aspect of the law. At the present time it is unlawful for persons under the age of 18 years to consume alcohol in licensed outlets and it is also against the law for these same individuals to purchase alcohol through off sale facilities. These existing regulations themselves could form the basis for a separate debate as there are those who feel very strongly that penalties under the Act are either too stringent or not tough enough.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to debate this aspect of the issue. However, I do feel very strongly that steps must be taken to ensure that there is a much tougher attitude adopted in relationship to the enforcement of the present legislation. I fully recognize the fact that our law enforcement agencies are taxed to the limit, in most cases, however, again it appears to me that this question can be attacked from the position of determining priorities. For instance, do we view it more important to have our police patrolling the streets watching for drivers to jump stop signs, or would it be viewed more beneficial to have a greater emphasis adopted towards patrolling liquor outlets.

When the legal age is set at 18, it is inevitable that you will find 16 and 17 year olds in the bars, just as we had 19 and 20 year olds in our drinking establishments when the legal age was 21.

How about the purchase through off sale outlets? As it presently stands, where a vendor is convicted of selling liquor to a minor, in most cases he is given a light fine and then equally a light tap on the wrists. If we are serious about enforcing the law as it applies to the legal age for drinking, Mr. Speaker, I feel we should develop a 'get tough' attitude in relationship to enforcement.

So often it happens that if the owner of a licensed outlet does get fined for serving a minor, for the following three or four weeks, he clamps down and checks very closely to ensure that nobody in his establishment is under age. However, this attitude usually only lasts for a short period of time and before long, he has his guard down and sure enough, or on any given night, a number of minors can be spotted back in their regular place.

My question is this, Mr. Speaker, are present penalties tough enough? I suggest to you that they are not. If we cannot, in the near future agree on this matter, I at least hope that we can reach a common consensus that enforcement is not what it should be and more emphasis should be placed on this aspect of the overall question.

Mr. Speaker, when the intersessional committee of this House conducted hearings across Saskatchewan, the vast majority of those who appeared before the committee supported further liberalization of liquor laws. At least 75 per cent of the

presentations to the committee favored further liberalization, but at least 90 per cent of the later reactions to the report were opposed to further liberalization. The 75 per cent favoring further liberalization were, for the most part, vested interests. Their arguments, Mr. Speaker, were motivated by economics, yet the opponents stressed the social and religious aspects in their opposition to further liberalization. Quite obviously it was difficult to conclude a common consensus. No clear pattern of public opinion developed either during or after our hearings.

However, I was personally encouraged by the growing public concern over this matter. More and more people are at least willing to take a look at this entire question. The fact that we are at least willing to re-examine our position is encouraging. I would hope that this Legislature can arrive at decisions which are truly reflective of the majority public viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot separate the issues. The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act work hand in hand. And if you accept the facts and individually come to grips with the realities of the situation, as I have extensively outlined them in my earlier speech, on amendments to The Liquor Act, I am sure that you will agree with me, offer support to the amendment that I am proposing this afternoon.

If we commit this Legislature to a course of concern and commitment, I feel confident that we can affect the kind of change which I view as vital. If we are to ever hope to improve the situation in relationship to today's attitudes, particularly as it effects our youth over alcohol consumption.

It is one step at a time; it is an issue which extends beyond party lines. We must look at the whole question of alcohol education. We must look at the rehabilitation aspect, the financial aspect, the social aspect and so on. We are faced with a challenge which cannot be met overnight. We are, however, only kidding ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and admitting defeat if we shrug our shoulders and ignore the realities of this very serious subject.

I have always had faith in the legislative process. Over the years it has shown itself capable and willing to respond to the needs of the public.

On this important issue our commitment is equally important. The facts are before all of us. How we view those facts and how we react to the stark realities involved will determine whether or not we allow ourselves to coast or if we rise above that position and assert leadership and determination to meet this challenge head on.

It is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I hereby move second reading of Bill No. 37 and I urge all Members of this Assembly to support these proposals.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

April 13, 1976

Mr. L. W. Birkbeck (Moosomin) moved second reading of Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this Bill, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972. And before I get into it any detail I want to go back to that part of the Legislature which actually promoted our amendment on this Act.

I should like to refer to an oral question period, January 15, in which I had directed some questions to the Attorney General, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, with reference to the power of the Government to license farmers in Saskatchewan.

I have copies of those transcripts from Hansard and I should like to go over them to give you an idea of what had been said. I quote:

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Attorney General in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture.

Does the Government of Saskatchewan's Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council have the power to license every farmer in Saskatchewan?

The Attorney General's answer to that was:

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Hon. Member, quite frankly, that I don't know the answer to that. I would suspect that we do not have by Order-in-Council, I would suspect that we require legislation authority to do that and we would have to come by way of specific amendment or a specific Act to the Legislature of Saskatchewan. But having said that the opinion is one that comes off the top of my head and I have to give it more consideration to say that I think the answer is, no, to that.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In respect to your answer to the fact that you don't know for sure, I feel that I do know . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

. . . because my supplementary would be: does the recent intention of this Government to require dairy farmers to make application for renewal of their licence, to sell a natural product each year, indicate the Government's intention to extend these licensing requirements to every farmer in Saskatchewan?

Which I would imagine from that and possibly from other lines of questioning that I had in the oral Question Period, that the Minister of Agriculture took it that I thought that dairy farmers were licensed under The Natural Products Marketing Act, which of course they are not. They are licensed under The Dairy Products Act. So we have that point clear. All it is is the licensing of farmers, dairy farmers, hog producers, it doesn't matter what natural product they are in production thereof.

Further on the line of questioning, Mr. Romanow replied:

The answer to the last question, the intention to extend to every farmer, I can answer, no, it is not our intention to do that. I am, however, noting the fact that the Hon. Member does apparently have an opinion as to the power of the Government of Saskatchewan to license, he has presumably looked into this by way of legislation himself. I sure hope that it doesn't mean that the Conservative Party is advocating or looking at the possibility of licensing farmers, because you seem to have done quite a bit of work on this, to have looked at it in detail. I certainly want to tell you that I, for one, and this Government would object to and strenuously oppose any idea of licensing farmers.

The Attorney General knew that day, in the oral Question Period, when I was questioning him on this matter, that it is not the Conservative Party's stand to license farmers, it was simply a political ploy, as he looked up at the press gallery — pens at ready fellows, get ready for this. And I might add, to go a little further, the press took it hook, line, and sinker. Friday, January 16, 1976 Star-Phoenix, I won't read it all, just a portion.

I hope your question doesn't mean the Conservative Party is looking at the possibility of licensing farmers, Mr. Romanow told the PC MLA.

You got your point in, Roy, you got your point in there, but I might add that the Leader-Post did you one better. I will just quote that one:

Turning the tables on the Conservatives, (of course the clear intent of the Attorney General was to turn the table) Mr. Romanow asked Mr. Birkbeck if he was advocating a policy of licensing farmers in Saskatchewan.

What a bunch of garbage if I ever heard of any. That is all that it is. And you sit across there and criticize us and you know you are the ones who are guilty. I didn't come here to play games with you, I came here to try to represent the people and their interests.

Further on in the questioning I said:

Mr. Speaker, just a comment on the Attorney General's remarks.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, you replied:

Order! The Member, even though he does know more than the Attorney General is not permitted to comment. If you have a further supplementary, fine.

I replied:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I do have a second supplementary. If this is not the Government's intention are you therefore prepared to accept an amendment to The Natural Products Marketing Act? Removing the powers of the Government to license every farmer in Saskatchewan?

Now then the Attorney General's reply to this:

April 13, 1976

Mr. Speaker, I don't, as I said earlier acknowledge that indeed, is a power or one of the powers of the said Act. And as to the actual amendment if the Hon. Member would care to prepare and to submit such an amendment I think we would be prepared to look at it and to consider it in the light of that.

Now then I have obliged, we do have an amendment for the House. I should like to just point out some of the reasons why.

Now, quite frankly the Attorney General is right in a sense that the Government doesn't have direct power to license farmers. As it says in the Act you must have 60 per cent of the producers. But before we get into that part, the purpose of the Act:

The purpose and intent of this Act is to provide for the promotion, control and regulation in any or all respects of the marketing of natural products that are within the province and clearing the prohibition of such marketing in whole or in part.

I would ask all Members to go through their reports, The Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Council Annual Report 1975. I don't find that those products that are under the control of this Act are faring that well. I think that report verifies that, yes, in one or two of the commodities they are not doing too badly.

I think that Section 4 is significant as much as it says:

Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the Minister may make grants to persons for any purpose connected with the marketing of a natural product.

So that those products under this Act may or may not receive grants.

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall constitute a council to be known as the Natural Products Marketing Council to consist of not less than five and not more than seven members, the majority of whom shall be farmers and shall designate one member to be chairman and one to be vice-chairman and shall fix the remuneration and allowances to be paid to the members of the council. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may also appoint a secretary of the council and such other officers and staff as the council may require for the carrying out of the provisions of this Act and the regulations and the fixed remunerations.

We have a lot of Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council powers that aren't in the hands of the farmers and this is what these people are going to be subjected to when you get 60 per cent consent to put them under this Act.

Just to look at some of the duties of that council:

To advise the Minister in all matters relating to the establishment and operation of boards, commissions and any agencies in power to act under this Act, be responsible to the Minister for the operation and administration of boards and commissions and for that

purpose shall make and enforce such regulations as may from time to time, to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

It doesn't matter what section you read out of here, it is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Conduct or supervise both the marketing plans as required by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the Minister. Perform such other duties relating to the marketing of natural products as the Minister may require.

It doesn't matter how you look at it, the power is not in the hands of the producers. The producers are not aware of the powers contained within this Act.

In part II a Producer Marketing Board may be set up under this Act.

And just to give you a bit of an idea of what that will entail. Section 11, and we will skip part I:

Part II — a plan may relate to the whole of the province or to any area within the province and may relate to one or more natural products or to any grade or class of variety thereof.

Just to be hypothetical for one moment, if you take this province geographically, have all natural products under the rules of this Act, you could in effect designate certain areas of the province to production of certain commodities. In other words if I were in a grain-growing area and wanted to sow my whole farm down to hay and raise cattle or leaf-cutter bees, I don't know but the Government, through this Act, would have the power to say, no, you can't do that because you are in a grain growing area. I am not looking at the immediate consequence of the Act, I am looking at the long range consequences. What your ultimate aim is and how it can be achieved through this Act. I think it is exemplified in The Dairy Products Marketing Act, because I questioned the Minister of Agriculture on it more recently. In that Act provisions are there, for all dairy farmers to be licensed, patrons of milk, and they are not at present, fluid milk shippers are being licensed and the manufacturing or industrial milk shippers are not.

Therefore this Act could be quite harmless if it wasn't carried out to its full extent.

I think if you really want to see how silly the whole Act is, you should look at the powers of the Board.

The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may vest in a Board any or all of the following powers: to regulate the time and place at which and to designate the agency by or through which any regulated products shall be marketed; to regulate the manner of distribution, the quantity and the quality, the grade or class of the regulated products that shall be marketed by any person at any time and to prohibit in whole or in part the transportation, packing, storage or marketing of any grade quality or class of any regulated product. To market including grading and insuring the regulated

product either as principal or agent. To exempt from any order or regulation, any person or class of persons engaged in the production or marketing of the regulated product, to any class variety or grade thereof.

And to just go down a few more lines and these get worse as you go:

To cancel or suspend any licence for violation of any part or provision of a plan or any order of a Board or other regulations; to reinstate any cancelled or suspended licence; to require full information relating to the production or marketing of the regulated product from all persons engaged therein; and to require from those persons periodic information in such form as the Board may determine and to inspect the books and the premises of those persons. To fix or determine the price or prices, maximum price or prices, minimum price or prices or both maximum and minimum prices at which to regulate products or any greater parts thereof may be bought or offered for sale in the province and affix different prices for different zones of the province.

And that is the point I am trying to get at. It is that you have the power to designate these areas, control the production and the marketing in every area in the province. I don't think that the farmers of this province are aware of these powers. I know you can say there were hearings on it and that there was much discussion and that it was in the press and so on and so forth, but I still say that by and large the producers in Saskatchewan are not aware of these powers. And I am telling you that if they were you wouldn't get 60 per cent of the farmers, therefore, you wouldn't have the chance to regulate them under the powers of this Act.

It also says:

To seize, remove and dispose of any of the regulated product marketed in violation of an order of the Board and retain or otherwise dispose of the proceeds thereof.

In other words my wife could go to town and I could say, look, pick up some of those chicken breasts or chicken legs or whatever. She could be coming home with them and a member of this Board could stop her and take those and chuck them in the ditch and say, there, I am a member of the Board and I just disposed of that product. Again that sweeping power within this Act and I say it is no good and that is all I am trying to do with this amendment is to bring this to the attention of the farm people. If they really, after substantial hearings have been made where you had turnouts and where you legitimately had a majority of the farmers wanting to be under these powers, then okay, I can't disagree with that at all. If the farmers by and large and the majority really want to be under the controls of this then so be it, there is nothing that any individual can do about that.

Under Part III on marketing commissions, I am not insinuating that any of the Members in the House can't read this Act as well as I can. I am trying to pick out those parts of that Act which I feel need to be exemplified. Under Part III, 22 and Part II:

A plan may relate to the whole of the province or to any area within the province or may relate to one or more natural products or to any greater class thereof.

And you find that repeated over and over.

An order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council establishing a commission and a plan shall name the persons who are to constitute the commission and the chairman thereof, shall designate the date on which the plan shall take effect and upon which the appointed members of the commission shall take office and such order shall be published forthwith in the Gazette. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may vest in the commission any or all of the following power: to determine the time and place through which the regulated product or any variety, class and grade thereof shall be marketed.

And I would urge all Members to read that section, the powers of the commission, 23.

Mr. Allen: — What's wrong with it?

Mr. Birkbeck: — If you were a farmer you would know what's wrong with it. You can sit across there and say, what's wrong with it. I don't know whether you have ever read it or not. But you try it sometime and try to answer to the Government, there are a lot of people that the farmers in general in this province have to answer to. And there is one sure thing we don't have to answer to you. Not right now we don't and if I have anything to do about it they won't have to answer to you at all. This province was built on the strength of the farm people we have here and they made it on their own without rules, regulations and controls and I think they can make it on their own today. They are no different than small businessmen and small businessmen are telling us just get the government out of our lives and we will be all right, just leave us alone. And that's what the farmers are saying right now, just leave us alone.

Mr. Cameron: — Sounds like earlier remarks.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Yes, that's true some of his earlier remarks back to the oral Question Period, of course. You've got to try and get that press again, by golly. There is no doubt about that.

What I have been speaking to you from, the Act, was assented to May 5, 1972 and since then there has been an amendment to it, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972 assented to April 27, 1973. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out some of the amendments that we have to the Act and again it exemplifies this Government's attempts to enlarge upon its powers.

Mr. Mostoway: — Under every rock . . .

Mr. Birkbeck: — Yes, that's true and all the rocks are on that side of the House.

April 13, 1976

Section 23 is amended:

To require any or all persons who are engaged in the production or marketing of any regulated products to register with the commission.

Make sure you have registered, boys.

To require all persons who are engaged in the marketing of any regulated products to obtain licences from the Commission and to provide such guarantees of financial responsibilities as may be deemed necessary.

To issue licences and to fix and collect licence fees. Charges for services rendered by the Commission and penalties from any or all persons producing or marketing the regulated products and for that purpose to classify such person into groups and fix the licence fees and charges, or either of them payable by the different groups in different amounts and to recover any such licence fees, charges and penalties or any of them by suit in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(C) is amended by striking out Clause H and substituting the following clause:

To seize, remove and dispose of any regulated products that is marketed in violation of any provision of this Act or of any order of the Commission and retain or dispose of the proceeds of the product disposed of.

I can't say much more other than to say that in my opinion I can't see how any farmer in this province would want to subject himself to the laws that you have in this Act. I just can't understand it and I think if the farmers read the Act and really understood it then they wouldn't.

Now, the Attorney General on this question, he really gets off the hook and I let him off in as much as 60 per cent of farmers have got to agree to go under the powers of this Act. But on the other hand that is easily answered too. Surely it is obvious when you go out among the farm communities who the active people are that promote this kind of thing and, too, those who don't speak up, should suffer the consequences. And I say that if they don't wake up and have another look at this they are going to suffer the consequences.

That, Mr. Speaker, is really all I have to say on this and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Before the Minister of Agriculture says a few words, I want to simply make three very quick points in the hope that we can get done before 5:30 with the other Bills and get on to Committee of Finance Estimates at 7:00 o'clock tonight.

Very briefly, what the Member is telling us is that the Conservative Party is one opposed to the principle of orderly marketing of farm products and, therefore, is opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board. Secondly, what the Member is telling us is "Licensing" as he words it, is bad, but not so bad that the egg

farmers shouldn't be included in it and the turkey farmers who have been included in it, as this amendment proposes, so that's partly bad for somebody and partly good for somebody else, depending on how the Tories look at the situation. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, those of us who were in the House four years ago when this was debated, while I don't agree with the position taken by the Liberal Party, can assure the Member for Moosomin that all the people of Saskatchewan, the farmers, knew about this particular Bill because they got copies of it mailed out to them by the Liberal Party. And unlike the Member for Moosomin, I believe that the Liberal Party and the farmers of Saskatchewan can read and do read and do understand the provisions of the Bill. And unlike the Member for Moosomin they obviously supported the Bill because there has been absolutely no public or other outcry for the provisions of it in the last four years. As usual I think the Member is off base and I want to tell him that I will oppose any provision with respect to licensing of farmers as he suggests to this House.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

Mr. E. F. A. Merchant (Regina Wascana) moved second reading of Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words although it will involve standing the clock. I propose only to speak for about four or five minutes. This is an amendment Mr. Speaker, which I moved in the last House which wasn't ever voted upon. It is an amendment which I think the Government can accept and I believe that the Government approves of the change. It is a change which would involve children being able to receive support where there was a marital breakdown situation up to the age of 18, rather than just up to the age of 16, which is the current limit to The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

I have been told by the House Leader for instance that they don't oppose that legislation but there may be complications created and I have similarly been so advised by the Minister of Social Services. I hope in due course that the Bill in this Session may be passed. I wouldn't like to see the Bill not passed under the guise of the problems that it might create for other legislation. What I suggested to the Minister is that the Bill might be passed in the form that it would not come into effect until given Royal Assent or not come into effect therefore until the Government finds that it is possible to make the other changes that would be required to bring other legislation into conformity with it. I would not, for instance, approve if the Minister said that they wished to bring in omnibus changes or something in six months or 12 months, solely because I am greatly concerned that the matter might be delayed for an unduly long period of time. It's a good change, it's a necessary change, it's a situation where we all know that teenagers now going through high school deserve to be supported by their families if there is a marriage breakdown. It certainly is not the fault of the children if there has been a marriage breakdown. The age of 16 is an age that goes back 30 or 40 years when it may have been an appropriate age at that time. I

April 13, 1976

suggest that an 18 year age is certainly more appropriate under the circumstances of society today.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill and hope that in due course that the Bill may indeed be passed through Committee and become law.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:31 o'clock p.m.