



Special Committee on Tobacco Control

Hansard Verbatim Report

Swift Current – February 16, 2000



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-fourth Legislature

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TOBACCO CONTROL
2000**

Myron Kowalsky, Chair
Prince Albert Carlton

Doreen Eagles, Vice-Chair
Estevan

Graham Addley
Saskatoon Sutherland

Brenda Bakken
Weyburn-Big Muddy

Bob Bjornerud
Saltcoats

Debbie Higgins
Moose Jaw Wakamow

Mark Wartman
Regina Qu'Appelle Valley

The committee met at 7:05 p.m.

The Chair: — Well good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much for taking the time to show up and to offer your views to the committee that's travelling around Saskatchewan. We are a committee that was established by the legislature of Saskatchewan — the legislature doesn't establish many committees that do travelling — and our mandate is to take a look at what can be done by the legislature and via regulations with respect to controlling tobacco and use of tobacco products.

And we're pleased to be here tonight at Swift Current. This is our fifth stop, and we've gone across to some places in southern Saskatchewan — Estevan, Weyburn, Moose Jaw, and Maple Creek. Today, we're here.

So I want to say first of all welcome, give you a little idea of how we want to run the evening. I have a little presentation that takes about 10 minutes — try to shorten it to 10 minutes. We have about almost 10 people that are registered to make presentations. We are giving them . . . we were initially looking about 20 minutes, but if you finish sooner than that, then we will get through our evening sooner and there may be people, other people who may want to make comments after they're done.

So what I will do then is proceed with the presentation that I want to make which includes the introduction of some of the members that are here. My name is Myron Kowalsky. I am the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) from Prince Albert Carlton and I'm pleased to be Chair of this committee. Your Vice-Chair is Ms. Doreen Eagles, MLA from Estevan. I should mention that this is an all-party committee, so we have three members from the opposition and four members from the government on the committee.

Bob Bjornerud, the MLA from Saltcoats is on the committee — not able to be with us today. But Graham Addley, MLA for Saskatoon Sutherland is with us, right in front of me. We have Deb Higgins, who is from Moose Jaw Wakamow, MLA from Moose Jaw Wakamow; and Mark Wartman, sitting beside her, is the MLA for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley. And Ms. Brenda Bakken from Weyburn-Big Muddy is not able to be with us today either.

We also have with us here your MLA, Brad Wall. Where are you, Brad? Let's give Brad a hand for coming out tonight.

A committee cannot function by itself and we are very fortunate to have with us, Donna Bryce, who is sitting, dressed in black, sitting right here; she is the committee Clerk. And Tanya Hill who is the research officer. Tanya is right here in white. And Tanya will be doing our writing.

Also we have *Hansard* technicians — they are people that make sure that we can hear, that you can hear, and every word that you will be saying into the mike will be recorded and stored to posterity at the legislature of Saskatchewan. So we want to welcome . . . and our technicians are Darlene Trenholm, Kathy Wells, and Alice Nenson. And Darlene is here and Alice is over there.

And our broadcast technicians we have here with us today, Kerry Bond.

What's our job? It comes down to something that we can distil into four sentences for generalizations. The first thing we want to do is answer this question: what is the impact of tobacco use in Saskatchewan, particularly as it applies to children and youth? What provincial laws do we need to protect people, especially children and youth? That's why we're including high schools in our tour.

What should we do to protect the public from second-hand smoke? Should we be designating smoke-free places, and who should do it? Should we be doing it at provincial level rather than on the municipal level as is now being done? And what should we be doing to prevent and reduce tobacco use? Change the enforcement practices? Should we be changing pricing, education in our schools, or general public awareness?

So we're going through this public hearing process so that we can hear your views and we're going to 17 communities and 14 schools.

I'll just give you a little background on the situation in Saskatchewan. I want to take a few minutes on this particular graph. This graph compares what is happening in BC (British Columbia), Ontario, and Manitoba, and Saskatchewan, and all the other provinces with respect to how many . . . what percentage of the population smokes.

And if you take a look at Saskatchewan, you can see that our black bar — which represents those aged from 15 to 19, the black bars are 15 to 19 — our black bar is among the tallest; 34 per cent of our young people smoke. The only one taller, by the way, is Quebec at 36 per cent. The next runner up is Manitoba, but the rest are down further. When it comes to all ages, 15 and over, we're about in the middle of the pack there.

This graph shows the number of cigarettes smoked daily over a period of time, what the stats showed over a period of time from 1981 right through to 1999. The first line, the very top line is a line that represents all males, and you can see that they started with about 23, 24 cigarettes a day and that there's been sort of a steady decline over the years. And it continues to decline.

The next line is all the females, all ages, and you can see that the general trend there has been declining until about 1996, and about . . . since then it's sort of levelled off.

Now when we look at our youth, you get a slightly different picture. In the early affluent years here you see it was an increase, then there was a couple of decreases. A short increase again here for young males, and then steadily decreasing. This is for males. And when you look at the graph for young females, you can see that it's much more volatile over the years.

But the concern that we have, I guess, is what's happening right over the last four or five years. Since '96 the intake of female smokers has increased so that they . . . young men and young women now smoke about an average of 12, 13 cigarettes a day.

If you look at some local stats in Saskatchewan — and

particularly as it applies to young people — this is what they report that they smoke on a daily basis. We divide the province up into the south, middle . . . central, and northern areas. The northern areas have the distinction of having the highest percentage of youth reporting smoking: 38 per cent of males and 51 per cent of females in northern Saskatchewan.

Compare that to southern Saskatchewan — that's this lightest bar — 30.6 per cent of the young males and 32 per cent of young females. And once again, here you can see that the females, percentages on females here outrank the young males. And this is the percentage of youth that smoke.

There is some tobacco control legislation in the province right now. There's The Minors Tobacco Act which was implemented in 1978. It prohibits the sale of tobacco to people under 16 and allows merchants to sell to minors providing they have written consent. And there's a maximum fine for selling to minors of \$10. These are not very enforced.

There is another piece of legislation which gives The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 the power to regulate smoking in public places. What is enforced though is the Tobacco Act of 1997 which is federal legislation. In this case, it prohibits the sale of tobacco to persons under the age of 18. So the onus is clearly placed on the vendors. It allows for fines as high as \$3,000 for a first offence and \$50,000 for a second offence for merchants who offend. And many merchants have been warned, but not many yet have been fined. It prohibits the advertising of tobacco products in newspapers, television, radio but it does allow the sponsorship of adult-oriented events, namely cultural and sports events.

You've heard a lot about, more recently, about the packaging of tobacco products and that is being regulated federally. Speaking to the issue of packaging, this chap here is looking at these pictures and he says, "These pictures of diseased lungs on my cigarette pack make me nervous." And she says, "Me too. I think I need a smoke." Well it speaks a little bit to the addictive qualities of cigarettes.

Cost of smoking in Saskatchewan. The direct costs are about \$87 million. These are given to us by our statisticians in the Health department based on the methods that's used in the North American continent and based on studies that have been conducted by researchers and scientists on the methodology. But \$87 million to our treasury every year dedicated because of the increase in hospitalization, doctors, drugs, and fire loss due to smoking, tobacco smoke, consumption of tobacco smoke.

In addition to that, there's the indirect costs to the people of Saskatchewan — \$179 million. Mortality refers to the wages, the annual wages lost because a person died prematurely, but died because of tobacco-related disease. Morbidity refers to the days lost and time lost due to smoking. Then there are other costs added to that like the cost of looking after low birth weight children. That totals up to \$266 million of costs to the province.

If you take a look at the other end of it, what about the intake? The province takes in \$17.20 per carton plus the PST (provincial sales tax) and that comes out to be 125 million, but less of course than the costs.

The federal government also taxes tobacco products — \$10.85 per carton plus GST (goods and services tax). That comes out to 2.2 billion. And Saskatchewan smokers paid about \$67 million of that.

So what we are doing is taking a look at some of these hot topics that the health effects, that youth issues, that smoking in public places, how to recover health care costs, and accountability.

Here's the graph that kind of caught me unawares in a sense because you are so always aware if somebody commits suicide — everybody knows about it in the community; if there's a traffic accident, it's sudden and it's there and we all hear about it. But there's less than 200 of each of those in the province every year. However, if you take a look at the smoking-related deaths, it's well over 1,000 documented in Saskatchewan and these are highly . . . a lot of them are preventable simply by reducing the number of people that smoke.

There is some difference here in health care costs and tax revenue and that difference here is the basis of lawsuits that have been carried on in the States and, of course, that BC is looking at. I don't have that slide with — or is it a little later on here? — I don't have that slide with me; I'll talk about it in a minute.

Just a little relief here, let's see what happens here. This is a little guy here — now some of you might be able to remember that far back when you had your first cigarette — and he's moaning and groaning and mom says, "Are you okay? You smoked some of the cigar, didn't you?" He says, "Yes, mom, I think I've caught the cancer." And dad says, "Well shouldn't we tell him it's just nausea?" And she says, "Well all in good time. Give him a chance to learn by himself."

And I guess this is a little bit of what we're aiming for, or a balance that maybe if we could set up. The balance is that those want clean air can have a good conversation right beside that fellow who wants the benefit of using all of his own smoke and is free to do so. This speaks to . . . study links cancer in non-smoking to passive smoking.

We're going to now ask you to give us your opinions. I want to mention that we have a web site: www.legassembly.sk.ca/tcc for Tobacco Control Committee. And you can write it down now or you can always come to Tanya later and pick it up.

There's one thing that I didn't mention and that is the litigation that's going on right now. In the USA (United States of America) there were four states got together and took a lawsuit against the tobacco companies. They won. As a result of that lawsuit, the rest of the states banded together and came to an agreement with the tobacco companies that the tobacco companies should pay them \$250 billion over the next 25 years for the states to use to defer their costs.

BC is looking at legislation like that right now. Ontario has indicated that they are also thinking of suing the tobacco companies in Canada. And of course, there is a federal government which is now currently suing the tobacco companies for smuggling of tobacco.

So there are things that are being done in our country. We have been told by certain advocate groups that we are a little bit behind, that we should be moving on this. That's one of the reasons we established the committee, to be able to establish just what it is that we should be doing and how fast we should be doing it.

So we look now to your . . . to help your part of the program and when you come forward to the mikes, what we would do is ask you to first state your name and then go right ahead with what you have to say, and our members will then have an opportunity to ask a question or two on it.

Thank you very much.

First presenter, the Committee would like to hear from Joan Kalmakoff. Is Joan here?

Ms. Kalmakoff: — My name is Joan Kalmakoff. I am a volunteer with the Canadian Cancer Society.

A smoke-free environment? Wouldn't that be wonderful? But it won't happen unless we all prepare to make it happen. We have to accept the fact that tobacco is an addictive product. People of all ages surrender themselves to a substance that takes control of them. We wouldn't think of consuming solvent and poison insecticide or paint stripper, but as some components of a cigarette we do so as we inhale cigarette smoke.

Some of us do so with the use of a filter, and some of us are not even provided with that little protection. We have to inhale it directly as side-stream smoke from someone who either has no regard for their own health, no regard for the health of those around them, or is tangled in a web of smoke entrapped with the addiction. We have to recognize this is an addictive substance and even though many who currently smoke recognize it is as bad for their health, they struggle to break the habit-forming addiction.

A few years ago an informal survey was conducted during the campaign that the Canadian Cancer Society conducted in April. I am a volunteer with that organization, and it was interesting to note that over 80 per cent of the people who participated in the survey were supportive of more smoke-free places in Swift Current. The people who answered the survey included both smokers and non-smokers. It appeared to be a good indication that people were ready to accept more smoke-free areas in this community. However, no further steps to initiate anything was done in this regard with the exception that both malls restricted smoking to a certain section of the food court.

Upon making some inquiries I understand it was not from a lack of effort, but rather due to a concern that no local governing body was willing to tackle the issue. Perhaps it is a non-confrontational approach, but at some point we have to realize that dodging the issue is not helping anyone — the smoker or those exposed to second-hand smoke.

Economics alone should present a clear picture. As we just saw, the total direct and indirect cost of tobacco consumption to Saskatchewan residents was estimated conservatively at over \$260 million per year in 1997. The Government of Saskatchewan receives \$17.20 per carton of cigarettes in tax

revenue. The actual revenue received was \$123 million. Presently over 7 million cartons of cigarettes are being sold. But in order to cover the costs of health care over 15 million cartons of cigarettes must be sold. The number of cartons being sold would have to double, and then we know that the number of smokers would have to double. And then where would our health costs be?

The bottom line is tobacco-related health problems are costing the government dearly. Can the citizens of Saskatchewan really afford to support this problem? If a strong stand is not taken by the government regarding tobacco issues, a very clear message will be given to the taxpayers. Thank you.

The Chair: — Well, thank you very much, Joan. A very, very precise . . . There may be a question or a comment from a committee member. And I'll just give them an opportunity to raise an issue if you want.

So the message that you're saying is get to it. Thank you very much. Can we have a written copy of what you prepared, Joan? Thank you. Next the committee would like to hear from Jeff Richards.

Mr. Richards: — Hi. My name is Jeff Richards, and I own and operate the Val Marie Hotel which is just south of here. And first I guess I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak and apologize for how nervous I am because I'm terrible at public speaking or anything like that, but I'll do my best. What I've prepared is about four pages here, and I'd like to start off with an article that I found a long time ago in a magazine. I found it in 1996, and I've kept it. And I've actually had it hanging in the bar for that long.

So here's how it goes:

Four women in a BMW (Bavarian Motor Works) sedan pull up in front of a restaurant. The parking valet is at the driver's door before their car even comes to a stop and he informs the driver that she will have to park across the street in an unlit parking lot. He explains this to her by saying, "It is our policy to reserve our closest spaces for domestic cars in support of domestic labour."

So upon arriving at the front door of the establishment, they are met by the protocol manager. "Ladies," he says, "I'll have to ask you to go home, shower and shampoo with fragrance-free soaps, change your outfits, return without makeup, and once again, park across the street." To answer the four stunned looks on their faces, he explained, "Some of our customers are sensitive or allergic to certain smells. They find perfume, cologne, hairspray, powders, and creams to be offensive. The leather belts, shoes, and purses are obvious affronts to our strict vegetarian and animal rights clientele. And quite frankly, I personally find the rest of your outfits visually objectionable. By the way, if any of your diamonds originated in South Africa, please leave them at home too so as not to upset our apartheid-aware diners."

So four showers and two hours later, the women reach the lobby of the restaurant once again where they are escorted one at a time to the house doctor's office to be weighed

and have their blood pressure checked. We don't want to be liable for feeding someone who should not be eating our food, he explains.

Finally they reach the dining room where they are approached first by the wine steward who informs them that based on current standards they will each be allowed two servings of alcohol except of course for the driver, who will be allowed none.

Next the waitress provides menus and in bold letters the menu advises no high-cholesterol meats, no artery-clogging sauces, no cheese, no butter, no sour cream, no salt, no fattening dessert, no caffeine, no wine or sherry used in food preparation, no fried foods, no imported foods, no seconds — to your health.

Once the waitress serves the meal, she says, "Please pay and leave immediately upon completion so as not to inconvenience our next customers or staff."

Ludicrous? Preposterous? Well it's already happening. Similar rationale is used by anti-smoking lobbyists already. On one side is individual freedom and pleasure; the other side is everyone who seems to know what's best for me.

Michael D. Washington from Rochester, New York.

So, obviously Mr. Washington is taking government legislation of our industry to an extreme example, but he's also very close to the truth when he says that individual freedom is compromised. I say this in defence of those of us that are in the hospitality industry who are having our freedom to decide tested as well as our intelligence insulted.

I don't wish to talk tonight about research and what results different studies have proven regarding second-hand smoke because I think we can all admit that for every study done, we could probably find another with exactly opposing views.

I would, however, like to talk about our ability as experts to use our intelligence to decide what changes need to be done to our establishments in order to better serve our customers in a very competitive market. We make our living pleasing our customers and we'll always fill the demand of the majority.

A terrific example of this is the massive number of non-smoking rooms that are in hotels today. There never was, and never has been, any laws or rules which these rooms must be designated, yet they're ample everywhere. This is the experts in our industry doing what people want. It's very simple.

I would like to tell a story. As I was writing this on Monday afternoon, I also phoned for reservations at a hotel in Saskatoon. And when the lady on the other end asked me if I would like a smoking or non-smoking room, I said it didn't make any difference because I don't smoke but the wife does. So I said I would actually prefer non-smoking just to torment her. And the lady on the other end said that it was an easy decision upon looking because she found out that all that was left was non-smoking rooms.

Another great example is McDonald's. They had a demand to

ban smoking in their own places, and they did that. They decided that the business they gained would be greater than that that they lost. We don't know if that's true or not but it goes to show the committee that we are a responsible industry that will act on the public's wants. So for the government to impose an across-the-board ban on smoking would only serve the wants of the few while taking away our right to give customers what they want. So I would like to say again it is not an effective solution.

As I said, I don't wish for us to debate the effects of second-hand smoke, but I think that we can all concede that smoking is a problem with youth. The main agenda of this committee should be the control of the availability of tobacco to children, and educating our children about the effects of tobacco so that when they mature they are able to make educated decisions about smoking.

May I suggest to the members that stronger laws — maybe even as strong as those applied to liquor — be imposed on tobacco. One must already be an adult to enter my bar right now, you know. And as an adult you're aware of the risks of smoking.

Once again I will state that a ban on smoking in public places is not the answer to anything. As the saying goes, it's like killing flies with a two by four.

This is an issue that is being solved by people in our business right now. They're installing large ventilation systems; they are creating entirely separate smoking and non-smoking areas by doing whatever it is that their clientele wants.

I would like to ask the committee to also look at the economic impact of smoking, or of a smoking ban. The province of British Columbia is currently in the midst of a major crisis due to one of these bans. Ontario went through one a little while back and had to repeal theirs. There is going to be staggering costs involved with implementing, monitoring, and dealing with the inevitable disregard for a smoking ban.

It is very unfortunate these meetings held here in Saskatchewan have been so poorly planned and advertised because I would have liked to present the committee with some statistics from the provinces that have already tried this. But I would suspect that my colleagues in cities down the road will have more time and they'll give you all of this.

I can say though, that in my small operation I would honestly fully expect to see a 30 to 50 per cent drop in sales after banning smoking and that would translate into the layoff of two employees, both of which support children with their earnings from us. For my own family, for certain, we would see a dramatic drop in our income. And please don't take this as a threat — and I'm not crying for sympathy — I'm simply saying that this is what would happen if there was a smoking ban. There is absolutely no establishment right now that would not suffer from something like this.

So once again I want to thank you guys for allowing us to voice our opinions and fears regarding what we view as, you know, what we think you guys want to do as a smoking ban.

In your letter to Bill Nelson to the Hotels Association of Saskatchewan, you stated that your mandate was to review the

impact of tobacco use on youth, tobacco control legislation, tobacco use bylaws, and enforcement strategies. And I believe that there are legitimate concerns involving the number of youths starting to smoke and the availability of the product to them, and I would like to see this committee dedicate their effort to youth.

So in closing, I hope that we can leave here tonight with the notion that our rights in Saskatchewan will be never taken away by something like a smoking ban. Thank you once again, ladies and gentlemen, and let's not let government hit our industry again by trying to apply PST to restaurant meals.

The Chair: — A little free advertising there. Thank you very much.

I should just mention that the committee will be on the road for at least another three weeks, and then it will probably take a minimum of another two or three weeks after that before even our first report is written, so that if you are able to come up with additional information that you think would be very pertinent to this committee . . .

Mr. Richards: — Well I'm sure that down the road guys will have that for you. I'm positive when you get to Regina that you'll be met with a lot of that kind of stuff — I would guess.

The Chair: — Okay. So now we have to go to Graham Addley first.

Mr. Addley: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to get a little bit more from you concerning the focus of this committee, and that's youth stopping smoking or not starting smoking.

Mr. Richards: — Yes.

Mr. Addley: — Could you elaborate a little bit on that portion of your . . .

Mr. Richards: — Like I said back here, that when you wrote to Mr. Nelson who is the executive vice-president of our association, you wrote that your mandate was to review the impact of tobacco use on youth. That's good. Tobacco control legislation, I don't agree with. I think that's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . okay, let me finish. Tobacco use bylaws and enforcement strategies . . . I'm of the opinion, and I'm sure that most people are, I don't want . . . Like, I have a little girl, you know, I don't want to see her smoking cigarettes.

You know I was a smoker for a long, long, long, long time, you know, and I don't want to see her smoking cigarettes because I don't want to see her have to quit. But I also don't want to have to tell somebody in my place that he's going to have to leave if he wants to smoke his cigarette.

I would sooner that my new customers coming don't have to deal with that. You know, guys that are 16 right now, 15, 12 even, I hope they don't start smoking so that when they come to my place when they're 19 years old, it's not an issue. That's what I want to see. I don't want to see the right taken away. I'd like to see it, you know . . . I just don't want to see it happen at all.

Mr. Addley: — Right. I guess maybe I didn't ask the question properly. There's sort of two issues. There's one on rights of the vendors and that's one issue.

Mr. Richards: — Oh, absolutely.

Mr. Addley: — But the part I was getting at in my perspective is that the three parts that you didn't like were related to the impact on youth smoking. So it's all of those in connection with youth smoking. But you had some suggestions on what you thought should happen to curb youth smoking early on in your presentation. I didn't catch them.

Mr. Richards: — Oh. Well I'm not going to try and find it in here, but I would guess that a lot of it would have been education. You know I remember being in high school. I'm only 30 years old, you know, so I haven't been out of high school that long, and I don't remember cigarettes being a huge topic anywhere in school, the health risks involved with it.

And I mean Mr. Kowalsky's cartoon showed perfectly well you could probably put some blackened lungs on the pack and we'll go, well that's a pretty good picture. It looks real. You know what I mean? You can write whichever you want on the pack and they're going to smoke. They're going to smoke more than likely. But if you can at a young age instil the risks, I don't think that we'll have to deal with this in 20 years or 30 years.

Mr. Addley: — So you're . . . (inaudible) . . . mostly in education?

Mr. Richards: — I think so. I think that's the answer to the problem.

Mr. Addley: — Okay. Studies have shown that if you can get to the age of 21 never having smoked, you're not likely . . .

Mr. Richards: — You're not going to smoke.

Mr. Addley: — So I think that's the focus of this committee to get that age group to not smoke. So I guess the two other quick points is I do appreciate the compliment that government was moving quite quickly in this case, that . . .

Mr. Richards: — Well I've never seen you guys being as fast in my lifetime but — and it's been a short life I'll admit — but I've never seen anything like this.

Mr. Addley: — Well hopefully that's a way of the future. And I guess the other question, leaving the youth side apart, with the conversation on how it will impact your business. What methodology did you use to arrive at such a . . .

Mr. Richards: — At 30 to 50 per cent? Here's exactly what I did. I got this information Monday morning when I went to the post office. I understood that this meeting was going to be here Wednesday night. So what I did was I had a couple of my best customers sit down and we all said okay, when — and I live in a small town, about 160 people where I live and so I know everybody — we went down the phone list and we wrote down all the people that smoke; we wrote down all the people that don't smoke. I honestly did do this. I'm not kidding you. We did this, okay? And it looks to me like if I had to tell the people

that smoke that they couldn't smoke in my place, the low end would be 30 per cent of them probably wouldn't come. Lots would still come in and not smoke, you know.

The high end would be 50 per cent. Fifty per cent probably wouldn't come in any more. They wouldn't come in because they come to drink coffee and smoke cigarettes and talk about farming or cows or trucks, or they drink beer, you know. That's what they do. That's what they do in my place.

They don't come to talk about fresh air, you know. They come to smoke cigarettes and drink. That's what they come to do. Nothing more. It's a simple, simple, simple business that we run. And if I start telling them that they can't . . . not only that, not only will the smokers or a portion of the smokers not come in, their groups, their circles of friends more than likely won't come in. Not everybody is sickened by second-hand smoke. I quit smoking and it doesn't . . . I work in a bar — it doesn't bother me. You know, I could sit . . . you and I could sit at a table, drive in a car, and you could smoke cigarettes all the way, it wouldn't bother me. So some people it doesn't bother, you know.

And if you take groups away, you're going to take people with them. Do you know what I mean? People are not going to run to me and say, thank you, Jeff, for banning cigarettes in your place, now we can finally come in. That's not going to happen. The non-smokers already come in, you know. There's nobody going like this: oh I'd love to sit in that Val Marie Hotel but that smoke is going to kill me, I can't go in there. You know, that's not going to happen. You know, it's going to be a drastic reduction in income that's, and I can say, I would say that 30 to 50 per cent.

The Chair: — Okay, we're running a little short on time.

Mr. Richards: — I'm sorry. I'm just trying to answer his question.

The Chair: — I want to just allow Doreen to ask a question.

Ms. Eagles: — Jeff, I thank you for your comments. I want you to know that I am going into this commission with a very open mind.

Mr. Richards: — Thank you.

Ms. Eagles: — I'm not making a decision on anything until I hear from everyone. But, I believe that education is very important amongst the youth so that they don't start smoking. We were at the high school in Maple Creek today, and I asked the kids what they thought of the woman on TV, you know with the . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Richards: — Yes.

Ms. Eagles: — And they said, oh it's gross but I mean, she was old.

Mr. Richards: — Yes. Yes.

Ms. Eagles: — You know, like I mean they don't think anything is going to happen to them.

Mr. Richards: — Yes, sure.

Ms. Eagles: — I do honestly think that smokers have to respect the non-smokers. I mean, if I smoke, it's my habit and you shouldn't have to breathe my air.

Mr. Richards: — You got it. Yes.

Ms. Eagles: — Regarding bar owners and restaurateurs, I think, what I've been hearing so far, the general consensus is that if the clientele warrants it we'll make smoke-free areas, but don't legislate us. That's what I've been hearing.

Mr. Richards: — Please. And that's where we're asking.

Ms. Eagles: — And again, I'm not saying I agree or disagree with this, but this is what I have been hearing and I am being open-minded.

They were talking about the smoking ban in BC and apparently . . . a friend of mine that has a restaurant out there told me that there is the smoking ban. When it went into effect, the police can't police it. They turn it over to Workers' Comp. They can't police it so everybody's smoking.

Do you have any suggestions on how you could police something like that?

Mr. Richards: — You can't. I have no idea. This girl here, her name is Colleen, she works for me on a part-time basis. She's a student from the University of Toronto, and she's out doing some research in the Grasslands National Park. She works for us part-time.

And Ontario tried one of these things — as I'm sure you know — and she told me of a bar in Toronto that she frequented quite often, and they just broke the rules because it was going to be upwards of three or more years before it ever got to be anything but a piece of paper handed to them that says: you broke the rule. You know I don't know, how do you police that? How do you stop me? People are going to do it. And I don't think you need to police it. To be honest with you, I don't think it needs to be done.

Again, McDonald's shows the example. I don't know about all the McDonald's, I don't know, but I know this one here in Swift Current you can't smoke in. I don't know about the rest, but I know this one you can't.

So they've made that decision. They're not stupid people. McDonald's is very successful, you know. They make a lot more money than me. So there's a demand and they met it, you know.

Again I'll make the example with the hotel rooms. There never was . . . we were never told that you had to have these. And a hotel room especially, because if you don't smoke in your room it immediately becomes a non-smoking room — whether anybody ever smoked in it or not. It's just the smell is going to be there.

So I don't think that there is an effective way to police this thing whatsoever. I don't think that it could ever be, you know.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. I just have one other

question.

Mr. Richards: — Sure.

The Chair: — When you talk about McDonald's, one of the reasons I think that they've gone into this is because of what could happen down the line. You know, they got people that are looking at the research that's being done now on second-hand tobacco smoke, and I think they want to protect themselves from eventually being sued by their former employees.

Mr. Richards: — Yes, I'm sure.

The Chair: — How do you think your industry is going to handle that?

Mr. Richards: — How do I . . . I'm sorry. I lost part of you.

The Chair: — How would your industry handle that?

Mr. Richards: — How would our industry handle that?

The Chair: — You know, having smoke . . . non-smokers work for you.

Mr. Richards: — Well first off, if you're a non-smoker and you come to work for me, I think right away you're fully aware of the fact that you're going to be around second-hand smoke. That's a given, right away. That's like a guy that takes a job with a stunt company and then sues him when he gets his leg broken, you know. I just can't see how that would ever become a lawsuit.

I also believe that the Workers' Compensation Board is going to somehow be involved in this. If this ever becomes a problem with the hoteliers or restaurateurs or whoever's getting sued, I think that our insurance and the Workers' Compensation Board will immediately start looking at things like this. Our insurance is ridiculous now, so if they throw on another 200 or \$300 a year to cover us for this, you know . . .

The Chair: — You may be looking at insurance.

Mr. Richards: — You know what I mean? I don't think that that's going to be a big issue though. Do you? Do you feel that, that years down . . . that 20 years from now Colleen is going to come to me and say, listen, that summer that I worked for you I think that I got damage?

The Chair: — Well, yes. No, I just feel that it's something that we have to be conscious of as we're coming through with recommendations on it.

Mr. Richards: — Definitely.

The Chair: — And I don't have the answer at this stage.

Mr. Richards: — But I also hope that — I'm sure, not hope; I'm positive — that that isn't the driving force behind McDonald's doing what they did. McDonald's is gearing themselves to guys like me who are going to come in there with my wife and kid and little baby, and they're going to say, boy oh boy, look at this, they can play on the swings and there's no

smoke and yadda, yadda, yadda. Right? You know, that's what they're doing.

The Chair: — Well, I think they . . .

Mr. Richards: — They're smart, you know.

The Chair: — They want to stay in business forever.

Mr. Richards: — Sure.

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. Richards: — And they're going to be there forever. You know, and they're going to keep adapting. If it becomes trendy for little kids to drink whisky, McDonald's will start serving whisky, you know. They will.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Jeff Richards.

Mr. Richards: — Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. Richards: — I should go on record I'm opposed to have children drinking whisky. Stop that tape before I say that.

The Chair: — I don't know. I think *Hansard* can distinguish between humour and serious talk here. So the committee would like to request Melodie Tilson to come forward so we can hear from you, Melodie.

Ms. Tilson: — Thank you very much. My name is Melodie Tilson. I am a health policy consultant from Ottawa. I have spent the past 10 years working in tobacco control. For the first five as the director of public issues with the heart and stroke foundation and for the last five as a health policy consultant. My primary clients include the Canadian Cancer Society, the heart and stroke foundation, and Health Canada, and most of my work has focused on tobacco control issues.

I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to address the all-party committee today. I think you have a very important job in front of you, laying the groundwork for developing provincial legislation which should have and could have tremendous value in protecting the health of the people of Saskatchewan, and in particular, the children.

I have prepared some notes but before I get into that, I really feel compelled to address a great deal of the misinformation that you were just fed by the restaurant owner that spoke before me. I'm shaking not so much out of nervousness, but I'm quite upset that committees like this, that our official committees get fed such false information and it goes on the public record.

First of all, there never has been legislation in Ontario to legislate smoke-free public places. The legislation has been done community by community. Toronto did repeal their bylaw in large part because of an outcry by restaurant owners only six weeks after the bylaw went into place — hardly enough time to see whether or not restaurants were going to suffer or indeed have a positive effect on their business from the bylaw.

However there are many, many, many other communities throughout the province that are enacting smoke-free bylaws, including 100 per cent smoke-free restaurants and other public places, and these bylaws are being embraced by the communities and enforced and accepted.

The comment that for every study about the harmful effects of ETS (environmental tobacco smoke) you'll find one with the opposing view could not be more false. For 20 years we have had increasingly compelling scientific research that proves that environmental tobacco smoke is harmful to non-smokers and indeed kills them.

Sudden infant death syndrome— one of the most important causes of what is widely known as crib death is the exposure of the fetus to the tobacco smoke of the mother and also the exposure of the newborn to tobacco smoke in the home environments. We know that ETS causes everything from ear infections to lung infections, bronchitis, pneumonia; all kinds of hospitalizations of children are caused by exposure to ETS, and largely in their home environments and in the public places that they visit.

We know that exposure to ETS causes a minimum of 300 lung cancer deaths in non-smokers every year in Canada and that is an old stat so I'm sure the number is quite a bit higher now. And we also know that roughly 10 times that number, so 3,000 deaths from heart disease, are caused every year in this country from innocent non-smokers who are forced to breathe in the tobacco smoke of other people. This is not an individual rights issue; this is a health issue.

And this brings me back to my remarks that I had prepared. It behooves this committee to remember in your deliberations as you travel from community to community that what the task before you is, it's to craft legislation that will protect the health of the public throughout your province. And yes, there are going to be some feathers ruffled but that does not mean that you do not do the job that you must do and protect people. The restaurant owner said that it should be left up to the marketplace. Well would we let him build his restaurant with asbestos? Do we let the restaurant owners and other businesses put up blinds that . . . the PVC (polyvinyl chloride) blinds that were found to contain lead dust? Of course not.

It's government's job to regulate in all different areas to protect public health. There have to be controls on the market. And yes, Saskatchewan is far behind other provinces and other areas of the developed world in acting on this issue.

Now I would like to get into three particular elements that I think the legislation must cover. First of all, what we've been talking about is mandating smoke-free public places. Voluntary bans don't work; we know this. Yes, we've had a few isolated examples of McDonald's and Tim Hortons that have been successful, but what we need is a level playing field so that we don't see great dislocation in communities where you have smokers going to the bar-restaurant that still allows it and taking business away from other restaurants.

If there's a level playing field, then the market will adjust. And there are lots of economic studies as opposed to groundless fears. Economic studies from British Columbia which, by the

way, a year after the legislation has gone into place is having very good success in implementing. The Workers' Compensation Board has said that they have roughly 90 per cent compliance rate since the last phase went into effect this January which made bars and restaurants 100 per cent smoke free. So 90 per cent compliance in such a short amount of time I would consider a great success.

Partial reductions . . . partial controls in public places don't work. It may lessen the immediate irritation for someone sitting in a non-smoking section of a restaurant, but it does not decrease the exposure of the patrons to the toxic chemicals in tobacco smoke, and that's what we're talking about. Having a non-smoking section in a restaurant is like having a no peeing section in a swimming pool. It doesn't work.

We hear lots of outcry that the restaurants will go out of business, but as I said, there's a growing body of evidence. We have the BC example, the entire state of California, along with five or six other entire states have legislated 100 per cent smoke-free public places including bars and restaurants, and they're doing just fine, not to mention countless other communities.

We've heard these same arguments for the last 20 years every time government tried to impose smoking restrictions. Look at what happened with the airlines. You were talking . . . when we were talking about smoking bans on airlines, smokers were saying that this would never work. How could you make a smoker go two hours or six hours or longer without a cigarette on transcontinental flights or long-haul flights? And yet, a few years down the road we see that the airlines are doing fine with the smoking bans, smokers are still flying, and the health of the public as well as the airline workers has been protected.

And yes, I believe the MLA that mentioned the real reason behind McDonald's going smoke-free was fear of lawsuits. I think that's absolutely correct. That was one of the major factors why the airlines decided to go smoke-free, because they were being sued by the flight attendants and other staff on board planes whose health was being adversely affected.

So your job here is basically to weigh mountains of health research against the unfounded fears of the unknown. There's no contest.

Numerous surveys also show strong public support for these measures. We have surveys in various communities across Saskatchewan — Moose Jaw, Regina, and others. There are surveys in other areas of Canada as well as Canada-wide surveys that show that more than three-quarters of the public support smoking . . . smoke-free bans.

Research also shows that smoking restrictions have an important corollary effect and that is reducing smoking rates. Some studies show that smoking rates have gone down in workplaces that imposed smoking bans in the workplaces by roughly 5 per cent, and that those who continued smoking decreased their tobacco use by 10 per cent.

And the other thing that legislated smoking bans does that has a real impact on the children, apart from protecting them from ETS, is it really helps to change the social norm for smoking. If

young children virtually never see smoking when they go out in public, in the long haul it's really going to have an effect on how they perceive whether or not this is the norm. If you ask most kids how many people smoke or what percentage of the population smokes, most kids think the vast majority of the public smokes even though it's in fact less than 30 per cent. If kids never see people smoking in public, that perception will change. And that's really important.

The argument that what we need is more education is absolute bunk. We tried educating for 20 years. Not that education doesn't play an important role, but it's only one very small piece of the puzzle and we know that education alone does not change behaviour.

I know my time must be almost up so I'm going to move quickly through the next segment which is, I think, the legislation needs to include a set of measures to get serious about reducing youth access to tobacco, reducing sales to minors. Yes, you have the federal tobacco Act that's in force in Saskatchewan, but it is insufficient; it doesn't go far enough. The age should be . . . the minimum age of sales should be increased to 19 and it should be mandatory for retailers to ask for identification.

And one thing that this would do is help the public participate in enforcement. So if you're standing in line behind a young-looking person who's buying cigarettes, it's hard for you to know whether this person is under the age of 19 or not, but you can hazard a pretty educated guess whether or not they're under the age of 27. And all you need to know then is whether or not the retailer asked for ID (identification), not whether or not they did indeed sell to someone who's under age.

It's also important to license retailers. And so instead of just imposing fines which are often insufficient, you can remove the licence of the retailer who repeatedly violates the legislation. Licensing also provides you with a database of all those companies that sell tobacco. And that's important information that, believe it or not, most jurisdictions do not have.

And finally, I recommend that you set a minimum fine. The federal legislation only provides for maximum fines. And so you see a great variety in penalties imposed depending on how seriously the judge takes this issue. So we need a minimum level of fine and it needs to be high enough for there to be a deterrent value here.

I have heard a story of a retailer being charged in the morning, getting fined 500 — or sorry, charged, taken to court, fined \$500 — and was caught again selling to young people that afternoon. Five hundred dollars is only a slap on the wrist.

And I would also like to recommend that you limit the kinds and numbers of outlets that sell tobacco products. This would have tremendous impact in reducing the availability of tobacco products, and again, in changing the public perception regarding the social acceptability of smoking.

I did a research paper on this issue a few years ago. I wasn't planning to address this committee when I came to Saskatchewan so I didn't bring the paper with me, but I would be happy to send it to Tanya when I get back home.

The other thing that reducing the number of outlets, or indeed the ultimate solution which would be limiting tobacco sales to government-controlled outlets the way liquor is, is that that would really facilitate enforcement. Rather than having something in the order of 80 to 100,000 outlets across Canada that sell tobacco, you would reduce that number by, I would think, something greater than tenfold.

It would facilitate enforcement also because government would be the ones in control of selling the cigarettes. So there would be no vested interest on the part of the retailer in making money by selling illegally to children.

And there would also be an effect in reducing adult smoking. We know that when you make it harder and less convenient for people to smoke — by workplace smoking bans, for example — that smoking rates do go down. If you make it harder for people to actually purchase the cigarettes, then smoking rates would likely be reduced.

And the last thing I want to say, very quickly, is that your legislation to be effective needs to be adequately financed. There needs to be funding for province-wide tobacco control initiative. One of the most important things the funding can go to is enforcement efforts. So no matter how great your legislation is, yes, you do need enforcement . . . enforce it.

With regard to the fears that smoke-free bans are unenforceable, that is also not true. We see bylaws, all kinds of bylaws in the community that, for the most part, are self-enforcing. And we know that there are a number of provisions that you can put in the legislation that will help you. Mandatory signage really helps take a lot of the pressure off the restaurant owner and the business owner when the people know that smoking is not acceptable here. If there are no ashtrays around, you're not going to find many people — at least not after the short term — who are going to start butting their cigarettes on the floor.

And if you think it's not fair to put this onus on the bar owner — despite all that you know about the health effects — think of what's happened with drinking and driving laws in the last number of years.

First of all, it's a fairly new change in our society. When my parents were young, they went out drinking and dancing on Saturday nights and they drove themselves home and no one thought anything of it. We certainly think differently these days; to such an extent that we've legislated and we impose serious penalties on those that break the law. And we also make it incumbent upon the bar owners to remove the keys of the patrons that have had too much to drink.

So if you think it's going to be difficult for a restaurant owner or a bar owner to ask someone not to smoke in a smoke-free establishment, then why is it acceptable for them to be legally required to remove the keys?

So we have lots of precedents. I think the only thing we need is political will, and I would urge all of you to have the political will to write the legislation that is needed to really protect the citizens of Saskatchewan.

And I thank you again for your time.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Ms. Tilson.

Before we proceed any further, I should have mentioned this first. This is a sitting of the . . . committee of the legislature and the standard procedure for that is for the public to be present but for the public not to participate in any way in the discussions between the MLAs or the witnesses. So I'd ask you to refrain from any applause for the rest of the evening. Thank you very much.

Now we will go to questions and comments.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Melodie. You stated that sales to minors should be reduced — and I agree with that — but what do you do in a case where the parents are actually buying the cigarettes for these kids. We've been to high schools and the kids have said, hey, mom and dad will buy me the smokes.

Ms. Tilson: — What has happened — it's written in the federal legislation and it's written in most provincial legislation — is that it is against the law to provide tobacco to a minor. So not only is it illegal for the retailer to sell but it's illegal for another person, another adult, or even another child for that matter to supply tobacco so that parent could be fined.

Ms. Eagles: — But I mean is anybody going to go into their home, follow them home and say, look it, you know I thought these cigarettes were for your kid, you know, and now I've caught you.

Mr. Tilson: — No, we're not likely to go into the home. And that is a problem. I think that is where you do need to continue to educate as you're enacting a lot of other policy measures.

Ms. Eagles: — So education isn't a bunch of bunk then?

Ms. Tilson: — No. I was saying education is bunk by itself without policy to support it. But I apologize if I led to some confusion there. I think education is a really important component of a comprehensive strategy. But the strategy has to be founded on public policy measures that are supported by legislation but that don't rely — or, sorry, that are supported by education but that don't rely on education.

Ms. Eagles: — Okay, thank you.

The Chair: — Are there any other members of the committee that would like to pose a question or a comment?

Okay, then thank you very much, Ms. Tilson.

Ms. Tilson: — Thank you very much.

The Chair: — At this time the committee would like to call on, I think it's D. R. Stewardson. Doctor? No, D. R.

Mr. Stewardson: — Good evening, my name is Dave Stewardson. I am here representing myself.

Let me tell you a little story. A few weeks ago, my wife and I decided to go out for lunch on the spur of the moment. So we went to a restaurant, after much haggling and deciding which one, and we noticed that as we went in there was no sign saying

this is smoke-free or we offer a non-smoking section or whatever. After we were in and seated, we realized that the configuration of the restaurant was such that even if there had been a non-smoking area, it wouldn't have worked because this restaurant was basically just one large room. And so to artificially divide it into two parts, smoking, non-smoking would have been ludicrous.

We did not enjoy our meal because we were subjected to second-hand smoke. And so my thrust here is your third point there about the second-hand smoke. That's where I'm coming from. We did not enjoy our meal although the food was quite good. At the end of it when we left we asked to talk to the manager. The manager didn't happen to be there.

And so we left, but we thought we'll not leave it here. So we wrote the letter — the manager a letter, pardon me — and expressed our concerns that we had enjoyed his food but not the atmosphere. The manager, of course, was good enough to phone us and we had a discussion over the phone. He was very rational. So was I. We didn't accuse one another of whatever, and we had a good discussion. And he made some interesting comments.

He said that he and his father, who run the restaurant, both had been smokers and they'd both quit. He said that he would prefer to have a smoke-free restaurant but he feels that that's not possible right now because if he does, he might lose business. Now we might argue whether he does or doesn't but he has a nervousness about this.

We discussed the fact that his restaurant is, as I said, configured such that smoking/non-smoking would be silly — the smoke drifts over.

As I said, we had quite a good discussion. He suggested to me very strongly that if there were smoke-free restaurant legislation, that he would be very, very pleased to comply with it. He said he would be in the front saying, yes, I agree; I'll have a smoke-free restaurant.

Now I remember things from times like cigarettes being 42 cents a pack — if you can believe that — so I've been through the whole thing. I smoked for 35 years and I quit six years ago, very suddenly, because I had a heart attack. So I haven't smoked since then. So I've seen both ends.

I remember going getting fitted for a suit, and while the guy was fitting me I was smoking and he was smoking too. We don't smoke in airplanes, we don't smoke in public transportation; we used to. We don't smoke in a meeting like this; we used to. I challenge you, 30 years ago there would have been people smoking back there and nothing would have been said. Why can't we have smoke-free restaurants?

So my challenge to you, ladies and gentlemen, is to think this through very, very carefully. Should there be legislation in Saskatchewan to provide for smoke-free restaurants? Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Stewardson. I think you've made your point. Thank you very much.

For next, we have Menno Martens.

Mr. Martens: — I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to address your committee and I will be speaking to the issue of second-hand smoke.

This meeting, ladies and gentlemen, and any meetings such as this are not about gathering evidence. The evidence is in and has been in for a long time. This meeting is about courage and will, or their absence.

Everyone knows that being subjected to second-hand smoke is harmful. According to the spring issue of *Health Advocate* magazine, 1996, the continued exposure to environmental tobacco smoke raises a non-smoker's risk of developing lung cancer by at least 50 per cent. That was 50 per cent.

Warnings about tobacco are screaming from every pack of cigarettes. We have facts. No one can any longer dispute that people who smoke in a public building are assaulting non-smokers with the lethal, toxic substances that actually cause the premature death of people.

The American Lung Association says, and I quote:

Tobacco smoke and radiation may have this in common.
There are just no safe levels of exposure.

If people assault other people with a deadly substance or weapon, they can normally expect to be arrested, but smokers are permitted to assault non-smokers with impunity and under the protection of the law. Do you know of any other form of lethal assault that is thus protected?

Since this message — although well-known — has not produced much of an effect to this point, particularly in this province, we may need to try another.

Reference to this has already been made, but we live in a litigious society. The day is at hand where non-smoking employees working in a smoking environment and coming down with a cancer-related disease will be just as successful in the courtroom as those litigants who are presently launching lawsuits against the tobacco industry in a more general way.

The tide at this point in history is running in favour of a complete ban on smoking in public places. We can come drifting in when everyone else is already in the harbour or we can show a little leadership. Saskatchewan's a province that introduced medicare. We could have been leaders again, but we have let the initiative for progressive change in the health field go to places like California in the United States and British Columbia in Canada.

We no longer can get the red ribbon or the blue ribbon or the white ribbon. All we can hope for now in Saskatchewan is honourable mention, but I ask what rank this province and this city has chosen for itself. May I urge this committee to recommend a smoking ban in all malls, retail outlets, and restaurants? That would be a good start. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. The committee is very pensive today — thank you very much — not very talkative.

Thank you, Mr. Martens . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, we did start early this morning. Next on our list is Sharon Zarry.

Ms. Zarry: — Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Sharon Zarry. My husband and I are owners of a small hotel in Shaunavon, Saskatchewan. Much of what Jeff Richards said was said far better than I can say it, but I do have a few additional points to make.

My first question is, are we living in a democracy or a dictatorship? If we're living in a democracy, there should be a freedom of choice for the public to make. An example of that is that, if someone is allergic to grass that's been cut, does that mean that nobody then in the community can cut their lawns because their next door neighbour has an allergy to grass?

How far do we go to protect the public from themselves? At present, there's a school in Ontario that has banned perfumes, hairspray, deodorants, all products that have odours, because they have one student who has an allergy problem. How far are we going to go to let the minority rule the majority? We have, we have a bar that is not considered a public place in my opinion. We have an age restriction that does not allow anybody under 19 years of age in there and consequently, in my mind, that is not open to the public.

I have some points to dispute with Melodie. First of all, she said that there had been no laws put into place in Ontario, and then she proceeded to say that there was a bylaw that had been in place for six weeks. So obviously there had been some type of law that was supposed to be enforced in that particular situation.

She says why are people forced to breath in the smoke. The point is, if they go into a facility such as a restaurant or a beverage room, there is smoking. They should know that before they go in. If they choose to come in under those circumstances, that is their choice.

Again, how far would we go to protect people from themselves. She talked about the ETS causing SIDS (Sudden Infant Death Syndrome). If that should be truthful — and I don't dispute it — then are we going to start telling people that smoke in their homes that they are no longer allowed to smoke, period? Is that how far we are going to go with our legislation?

And if we were to put these kind of laws into effect, what are we to do with the people that already have the smoking problem? Are we going to take and bundle them all up on some island in the middle of the ocean and let them stay there until they die, as many years ago was done with lepers where they were put in a special little hiding spot and nobody else was supposed to go near them.

She also said that there's . . . if they can make laws in California, why can't we do that in Saskatchewan. I would hardly think that Saskatchewan can be compared to California. I'm not good with numbers but I suspect that the population of Los Angeles would probably be close to all of what we have in Saskatchewan.

On the one hand she wants to take away the general public rights, but then she suggests increasing the legal age to 19. At

present time the legal smoking age is 18. In our beverage rooms we already have signs posted saying that nobody under 18 can purchase cigarettes. And in addition to that, it doesn't seem to me that it should be a problem when we're not allowed to have anybody under 19 years of age in our facility.

I happen to have a business that has at least 85 to 90 per cent of our customers that are smokers. If this legislation were to come into effect, I can only see that our business would be folding down for sure. We cannot continue to have legislation always cutting us down, always taking away from the little bit of revenue that we're presently having.

She said that drinking and driving laws were legislated, and that all they did was make it safer for the public. But they've also literally killed our hotels in rural Saskatchewan, and I just think that we're going to have to start to realize that if there are no businesses left in Saskatchewan to pay for the taxes that is needed to keep this province in operation, then pretty soon there won't be a government to look after anybody else.

The funding which is presently . . . what she suggests should be delegated to the smoking problems will simply take away our limited amount of money in our province from the farmers who at this moment are in very dire straits. The far-reaching effects that our farming community has in rural Saskatchewan I think is totally unknown to people who live in a larger centre.

People in larger centres seem to think that if the farmers go under it's not a big deal, they'll just move to the cities. But everyday I hear of another business in the city closing down, so where do people . . . where are people supposed to find work? It is getting to the stage now where Alberta will pretty soon be taking most of our population because they're going to offer no income tax on anybody . . . on families that earn under \$30,000 and 11 per cent tax, personal income tax on families over \$30,000.

And if we continue at the rate we are trying to enforce another rule, another law — and it has already been stated that it's almost unenforceable — then what will we accomplish by implementing . . . by putting another rule into place?

Mr. Addley: — Thank you for taking the time to make the presentation. Just to clarify what the previous speaker had indicated. She had said that there was no provincial law, that it was based on municipal laws, so it would be like Shaunavon or Regina or Saskatoon. And the city of Toronto had a law and repealed it after six weeks but the other municipalities have continued down that road.

So just to clarify that point. I'm sure you still don't agree with what she said. But . . . (inaudible) . . . clarification.

Ms. Zarry: — No, I understand that totally.

Mr. Addley: — Oh, okay.

Ms. Zarry: — I understood that that was the point that she made. But I also understood that she was specifically saying that Jeff was incorrect, and he was not incorrect. There had been a law in that community. That's correct.

Mr. Addley: — Okay, I won't get in that middle of that debate.

Ms. Zarry: — But there had been a law in that community.

Mr. Addley: — Okay, I'll let you debate that with the previous speaker. But understood.

I guess some of the concerns I had was equating an allergy to certain things with a toxic chemical that can actually . . . well, does cause death. Some of the previous speakers that we've had at different events or meetings . . . I remember one woman had a 13-year-old son that was playing hockey. She sent him off to a neighbouring community in a hockey rink which was not . . . which was permitted smoking, and he ended up having to be off school the entire next week and was still on ventilators and different machines and that type of thing.

What would you suggest I say to someone like that, that says that if he doesn't . . . if he has an allergy or has a predisposition to having that kind of a reaction to cigarette smoke that he can't go into a restaurant, can't go into a hotel, or go into a hockey rink? I don't mean to be . . .

Ms. Zarry: — Well I do feel bad about a situation like that. I do know that in our community we do have a smoke-free skating and hockey rink. I was on town council at the time that that bylaw was passed, and even though I do own a business that allows smoking, I had no problem with that whatsoever.

Again I think that we seem to be condemning restaurants and bars here tonight, and I do feel that there are certainly places that do call for a ban on smoking. And again when we're talking about a public facility versus a place like ours where it is not what I consider a public facility, I think that's one of the definitions we have to arrive at.

I do feel that we do have to, we have to consider public facilities such as post offices, federal buildings, places like that. Yes, I can appreciate that those are places that the general public comes into — and that is a place that children as well as adults goes into — so consequently I do appreciate that those people have concerns and they have some legitimate . . .

Mr. Addley: — So just to clarify. So you would support a ban on smoking as long as it was a public place but not something that . . . like a bar, but restaurants would be OK? I'm not sure if you said the restaurants on that list. You're saying rinks . . .

Ms. Zarry: — Well I'm not sure how I feel about restaurants as such either.

Mr. Addley: — I just wanted to clarify that.

Ms. Zarry: — I think that the previous gentlemen said that he had difficulty with his meal because it was a smoking facility. I do feel that the bottom line is freedom of choice. If he definitely does not enjoy going into a place . . . and into an environment that has cigarette smoke then I would suggest that he should be asking at the door: is this a smoke-free facility. And consequently that, in turn, would tell that restaurant owner — who says he would be happy to comply with the law should it be a law — that he would make it smoke-free, then he would get more feedback from other people, then he would . . . And he

would know then that he is losing business because he doesn't have a smoke-free facility. So then it is his choice whether he wants to cater to the smoke-free crowd or the smoking crowd.

And I think that again is where we have some freedoms . . . or I mean we did have some freedoms. But I suspect that if this goes through, we will not have that freedom either.

Mr. Addley: — One of the concerns I'm finding — coming from a very small community — is usually there is just one restaurant and a lot of times the hotel is the bar in the evening and the restaurant during the day, and there is no other choice. So basically saying that this person has a choice, in probably the majority of small communities in Saskatchewan that isn't the case. So I guess just a couple . . . One more clarification and then one final question.

I just wanted to, as an MLA from Saskatoon, just correct some misinformation that you have about — I'm not sure which cities you're referring to — but Saskatoon at least has an unemployment, one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada, between 5 and 6 per cent. I was just at a business that doubled in size, and I mean they're having difficulties finding space. So things are looking really good in Saskatoon.

One final question, and it's sort of an over-arching question that goes for basically all business. I mean if you have a number of smokers that you say are in there smoking, and if it's a blanket ban, a level playing field, that you're being treated equally to any other business in the same circumstances, where would those individuals go?

I mean obviously they want to go and drink. They want to go and drink coffee. They want to eat and they want to smoke. If they can't do that in any public place, does that mean they won't drink beer? They won't drink coffee? They won't eat? Like where, where would they go?

Ms. Zarry: — I suspect they would be doing it at home, which is presumably what has been happening over the years since we've had all our drinking and driving laws into place. Because I know for a fact I have to buy my liquor from our local liquor vendor. And I go in there everyday and I see the number of people that are buying the beer as off-sale during the day. They don't come into our facility any more because they know that if they do, if they have more than two beer, they're going to get stopped by the police. So they go into . . . They do drink at home, and they do stay at home.

And, likewise, we have five restaurants in our community, and I have the choice whether to eat at them or not. And personally I choose to eat at home. And I feel that this will be the situation more and more and more. You're going to be forcing people into their homes and not being allowed to be out in the public or to socialize.

And that is my question again to Melodie. Is she planning to then implement laws that prohibit people from smoking in their own homes? Because that will be the next step if they're not allowed to smoke anywhere else. And if we're going to protect everybody from themselves, then that's exactly what's going to come of it.

Mr. Addley: — Thank you.

Ms. Zarry: — One question or one thing that I forgot to suggest was that if we have laws already in place for minors that are smoking, why would it not make more sense to make the people that are actually performing the action responsible for their own actions? Why should they not be the ones that have to be fined for buying cigarettes if they're underage? Why should the onus be on the person who is selling the product? I think that that is, again, a very poor way of trying to legislate a problem.

Mr. Addley: — We've heard that. And it's one thing I have learned is that there's no silver bullet here. That it's a comprehensive approach. That we have to try all different things. But thank you for sharing your views with me.

Ms. Zarry: — Thank you.

The Chair: — I still have a couple of questions. But before I go to my next question, I would just ask committee members in particular to refrain from going off topic and try to stay to this, stick to the smoking issue. And I would actually ask the presenters too to confine their remarks mainly to smoking, if you can at all resist it. I know there are a thousand other things we could get into but we just . . . we have to stay on topic here.

So now I've got a question from Doreen Eagles.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Sharon, for your presentation. Do you have a restaurant in your hotel or is it strictly a bar?

Ms. Zarry: — At the present time, it's strictly a bar.

Ms. Eagles: — Okay. Now regarding restaurants having non-smoking sections, do you think a glass wall separating a non-smoking section from a smoking section, do you think that could be an alternative to please the non-smokers and please the smokers as well?

Ms. Zarry: — I think it will help. Again, to reiterate some of my position, I am personally a non-smoker and I can honestly say that it seems to me that if I'm sitting at a table with another smoker, the smoke tends to drift to the non-smoking person. I don't know why but that just seems to be the situation.

And I do think that definitely a separation could make a big . . . could help. Again, as Jeff said, ventilation is certainly something that I think all of us would prepare to address. We've been at our hotel conventions. They've got all kinds of products out there that would probably help tremendously to keep that . . .

Ms. Eagles: — Another hotelier we talked to said that she'd be very interested in putting, you know, ventilation fans in, but then of course if you're just a small hotel in small-town Saskatchewan, there's also, you know, an expense to it.

Ms. Zarry: — That's correct.

Ms. Eagles: — And you know, she said the way the economy is, that they just right at this time they just couldn't swing it. But I thank you. That's it for me.

The Chair: — All right. Thank you very much. Well we're doing very well on our time because our reporters . . . or our presenters are being very succinct, so go ahead Mark.

Mr. Wartman: — Very briefly. You, amongst a number of other people, have raised the question, a spectre, of whether we're a democracy or a dictatorship; the implication being that if we legislate on any number of things that we're a dictatorship.

Would you, believing in democracy I assume, be willing to go along with the majority position that says we don't want smoking in our public places?

Ms. Zarry: — Unfortunately at this moment in time, no, I would not because I know what it's going to do to my business. And I know that if I have to go along with that particular statement . . . and I feel also that numbers can be played any way we want to.

You say that you've got a majority that are in favour of non-smoking. And I personally think that we have the majority of people that are simply sitting on the fence, that will not voice an opinion about anything.

We live in a very apathetic community right now and people just seem to think that if it doesn't affect me, it doesn't matter. And I think that there's going to be lots and lots of people that are just not going to raise an opinion because, first of all, it might make them uncomfortable to sit at a table like this, it might make them uncomfortable to know that they're being recorded, and it might make them uncomfortable to feel that they don't have the ability to speak in public.

So I do think that there are people that have concerns, but they're not voicing them.

The Chair: — There'll be no further questions. Thank you, thank you very much for your presentation and I should like to mention also that the committee will also receive written briefs in case there are people that may have a thought that comes to them subsequent to this meeting, or may not want to make an oral presentation. And if you have any written remarks that you would like to pass to the committee — Jeff yourself, or Sharon, we'd be pleased to have them — a copy of your remarks.

Now the committee will ask Vincent Rempel and Emily Rempel to come forward please.

Mr. Rempel: — My name is Vince Rempel, I guess I'll go first. I was going to grab the mike and stand up, but I see everybody's sitting down, so I'll stay sitting.

My father got hooked on cigarettes that were thrown free to him when he immigrated, when he came off the boat. He got hooked as a youth. I became addicted before I started smoking. How do I know that? Well, when I did start smoking — and I was only seven — I didn't get sick. Now, my cousin whose parents didn't smoke, the first cigarette he had, boy he thought he was going to die; he got that sick. So I'm pretty sure I was already addicted into the habit before I ever started to smoke because dad smoked everyday, in the house, in the car, in the truck, in the barn.

Do I blame him? Well, a little bit. But I can't really because I did the same thing. I carried it on. Now, fortunately, my daughters kicked the habit. When they had left home, they didn't start buying cigarettes even though I had made them smokers of second-hand smoke while they were in my house. So I've got to congratulate them on being strong.

But not everybody is that strong. And so, when you were talking about where do you draw the line, I think you have to consider abuse. There are several different kinds of abuse. Even if they occur in the home, they are illegal and children are removed from families because of abuse. Now I'm glad that people didn't consider it abuse when I was abusing my children with smoke. It turns out it didn't matter. It turns out they were pretty strong and they got away almost free. And I think we have to consider very strongly limiting smoking in public places to just . . . even if just all we want to do is to keep our youth free from second-hand smoke. We can't do that without limiting . . . without eliminating smoking in public places.

I want to add two short things. I'm going to avoid names because I don't have both of them, so I'm going to say to the hotel manager from Val Marie, when you're in a smoking environment, you haven't really quit smoking. You quit buying your own but you haven't quit smoking; you're just as subject to smoking diseases in that second-hand smoke as you were when you were smoking your own.

The other thing I want to say is that sellers of tobacco, or vendors, or people that allow the use of tobacco in a public place are just as guilty as the cigarette manufacturers. And really, you and I are just as guilty for allowing it to happen. I think I should stop there because I'd start to repeat myself.

Ms. Rempel: — I'm Emily Rempel. I live with this man. I'm thankful we're still living together. I guess you might call me a second-hand smoker for 50 years because my father smoked very heavily, my husband smoked, and so I in many ways quit smoking the same day my husband did.

Our children were exposed to second-hand smoke, and as Vince has already indicated, they got away rather scot-free if you consider that both of them only had bronchitis and only have some allergies, as do I. Both my husband and I have worked in administrations where smoking was allowed, and when I was taking on more senior positions I was often having to take leave of absence because I lost my voice. And I would lose my voice for about a week at a time, and this I really never equated to anything other than when Vince quit smoking, I have never lost my voice since.

So it does cost the employer, it does cost the public.

I do believe that we do need to legislate protection for the people if for no other reason than for our own health of this country. And only a healthy, educated country is going to be making any impact in the global economy. And I think we need to think of this very seriously.

Talking about fresh air — where can the non-smoker get fresh air in a public place if we're going to allow smoking in the public places. I do think that the cost to us is too great to ignore. So please look at the cost benefit and think of our young people.

I am not as young as many of you here today, and I would like to see you all have a lengthy and a happy life. And I'm just grateful that I can still be here and speak to you. Thank you for listening.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Any questions or comments to read?

Ms. Eagles: — I have a question. Vincent and Emily, I thank you for your presentations. How would you define a public place?

Ms. Rempel: — I would define a public place as not just government offices, but malls, shopping malls, restaurants, hotels. I'm really very pleased that a lot of the hotels are providing us with non-smoking sections.

When I was ... before I was retired there was one hotel honoured my request and would give me the same room every time because I could sleep there and then still have my voice in the morning. They were very recognizing of my handicap, if you like, it was a handicap. I used to sing; I can't sing very much any more. And that, if I had ever been a professional singer, would have been a real hazard to me.

Ms. Eagles: — Do you classify a bar, like you said, a hotel?

Ms. Rempel: — Yes, I do.

Ms. Eagles: — Do you classify a bar as a public place despite the fact that anyone under 19 isn't allowed or certainly shouldn't be in there?

Ms. Rempel: — I do.

Ms. Eagles: — Okay, thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much.

I have one question to Vincent. This is the first time that I've had a witness refer to parents' smoking and regarding that as a abuse. And I was wondering whether ... how you came about to that opinion? How did you come to that opinion that it could be considered as a abuse? Now I assume that you're talking about it in the same way that abuse is used in other senses where now, for example, even corporal punishment in some cases is regarded as abuse.

Mr. Rempel: — Well, I think that's the best example I could use. When I was, oh, 9, 10, 11-years-old, some of my friends were beaten so badly as punishment that they couldn't come to school the next day. At that time that wasn't abuse. It wasn't considered abuse because it happened in the home.

Now today that same activity — if it became public knowledge — would result in children being removed from the home. And in the same way I think we are at the point where we have to consider any unnecessary harm to be bordering at least on abuse — any unnecessary harm.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Thank you for your presentation. The committee would now like to call on Judy Smith.

Ms. Smith: — I must be getting younger. I have to take my glasses off to read. I guess I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to discuss the tobacco issue in Saskatchewan too. I guess I'm sorry I haven't been able to contact anybody from the Canadian hotels association down east to bring out statistics or ... anyway so I'm going to speaking more from the heart than anything. I came with no pamphlets, no statistics, no bells, no buttons, to support my position but I have got five years of very hard-earned experience behind me.

My name is Judy Smith, I represent the Grassland's Inn property which I own in the town of Mankota. My business is comprised of a 17-room motel, a licensed dining room, and the local tavern. Our town population is around 250 with support from the outlying area of about another 500 people — in that area somewhere. Our population has steadily declined the last five years, probably on an average of about 50 people a year, probably due to a lot of forces beyond our control — the loss of our elevators and railways, the closure of implement dealers, land foreclosures, you name it; it's hitting us — just like every rural town in Saskatchewan.

My interest tonight is to try to help you realize the implication of a total ban on smoking that it would have on the properties such as mine. First of all, I don't deny that smoking stinks. I know, I know because I smoke. If you've never smoked — good; you don't have to even imagine the horrors of trying to quit. I've tried, I've succeeded, I've failed, and I've tried again. Some day I'll win again. I equate it to trying to rip off your big toenail. If you stub it often enough, someday it'll happen.

Let's try to help our youth. I think that's the focus I'm hearing a lot today — the youth. And I agree that youth is the very important place to start. The target to make youth understand the effects of tobacco use has to be enhanced. I don't care whether it's through advertisements, paper media, educational methods. It's proven to have worked somewhat already. I don't believe that it's hogwash, that it doesn't work. That's the direction that the government can enhance upon.

I also work with education. I'm a trustee. I've been a trustee for 14 years or something now, and I know what it's doing in our schools. I know what educating kids is doing in our schools. I think that needs to be a real focus.

The service industry is doing their part by prohibiting sales of tobacco products to minors. In fact in rural areas, where we really know our youth just like our own kids, it's not unusual for us to speak to them about the effects of smoking and alcohol and spinning their tires, as far as that goes. We have a rapport with kids.

In my own town we have less than 1 per cent of young people who smoke, simply by being educated and being aware. And the peer pressure that is applied towards them — you're a geek and a loser if you smoke. They even declared their own school non-smoking, and that was not mandated. The kids did it themselves.

Banning smoking in my bar will not prevent youth from taking up smoking. They aren't in my bar. In my business, my lifeline is the reliance of sales of the food and beverage industry. There are no other options for my property. I doubt IBM would even

consider purchasing my facility as a computer depot. The road is just too rough to get there. Not that I would consider it either.

The hotel is the hub of our town — a fact that we only became too well aware of after a fire destroyed the previous establishment in 1998. It's the place to socialize and enjoy the company of a friend; for a short while, for a long time — it's up to you. A place to get a hurried meal on the way to a minor hockey game. It's a place to hold a social gathering for your family. A place to grieve and hug after a funeral. We've experienced not having a gathering place like this once, and we don't ever want to have it again. We had no place to go. We had a ghost town. If you lose your hospitality place, you lose your town.

Operators are not ignorant to the wants and the needs of their customers. They are the base of why we survive. We know that patrons want decent air quality — even the smokers do. We strive to provide adequate ventilation and non-smoking areas. Legislating expensive options such as air cleaners will only make those manufacturing companies rich and make us lock our doors. We can't afford them. They're astronomical prices. We do what . . . I feel we try to do what's ever within our power.

Our patrons let us drive them home when they've had a drink too many . . . a drink or two too many, you know. They let us know if the smoke is getting too thick.

Let us decide how to survive on our property. We'd like to relate this, I'd like to relate this kind of to the bathroom in your house. Do I try to tell you that it's mandatory to use a certain anti-bacterial, government-regulated, statistical-documented disinfectant to clean your toilet, so that when I come to visit, I know I won't leave with some disease? I think not.

Maybe the hospitality industry in larger urban centres could benefit from some smoking regulations. I believe they should be given a choice however. If it is the desire to establish a non-smoking business, they have the clientele to support them. Non-smokers will go there. Smokers should also have the choice of their establishment that will cater to them. There are more people in the urban centres. Where there are more people, there's more options.

In my situation, if I'm legislated to become a non-smoking area, it's also going to be a one-way ticket right to my door lock.

The last two evenings I did a survey of the patrons on both the restaurant and the bar . . . in both the restaurant and the bar: 78 per cent of my clients smoked. Now I'm not saying that's a norm. That happened the last two evenings. You know, maybe sometimes it's going to vary. I'm not a statistical person.

Where do you, where do I find 78 per cent more non-smokers to fill those seats? They aren't there. I depend on the loyalty of the people that I've got coming in.

Ninety per cent of the people who occupy the rooms in my motel request smoking rooms. I have non-smoking if they want them. The vacancy rate is really high in them. I don't know why. Maybe you guys got answers to that. I don't know.

What do I do? Close it all down? Say you want to smoke, you

smoke outside? I don't think so.

Seventy per cent of my employees smoke. Do I tell them to find another job? It's the environment we're in. They choose.

I didn't invest \$500,000 plus to lose my job which leads onto my employees' jobs. If I close my doors, I also lock out, on average, 10 to 15 people. Of these, five are single — some with young families.

It also affected approximately six students who come from the school on a work experience program, some of who I've employed, some who've gone on and got other employment because of that experience. I think that's important. We're talking youth again.

There are no other businesses for them to go to in town so they move. Probably migrate west to the welcome arms of Alberta. I don't know. The school loses. We have more teacher cuts, more educational programs end. Ratepayers are footing the rising costs of education. More farmers leave, less people pay the taxes. It goes on and on and on. It snowballs all the way around.

How much more intervention can businesses take? The proposed expanded SPST (Saskatchewan provincial sales tax) base that is a possibility. The PST on restaurant meals. It's a well-documented fact that affected businesses experienced significant reduction in sales which in turn reduces employment in the other sectors. In 1991 the restaurant industry laid off 46,000 employees in Canada because of the impact of the tax that was imposed to them. I don't know how we handle that.

That also reduces the spending power for students and young adults who don't have the money. No wonder that they have an attitude. Instead of the \$2 that they're going to spend on PST on their meals, they'll say, hey, that's another half package of cigarettes.

People who go into lounges are over 19 years of age, they are adults and want to make their own decisions. Smoking bans will drive customers away in droves. Statistics show that smokers spend more time and money in bars than non-smokers. Columnist Andrew Coyne quoted: the smell of tobacco in a bar is the smell of freedom.

Why force a business owner's bottom line for staff layoffs, store closures, force defiance of the law if my choices are to obey the law and lose my business or ignore the law and keep my business? Let us have a choice. Let us build our business by giving us the choice to be tobacco-free or tobacco-smart.

It is the government's mandate to promote and facilitate businesses, not to hamper it. The economy of Saskatchewan is not very buoyant at the present. Just ask any farmer. We don't need to see the situation compounded. Ask yourself how can you feel good about the effects of such legislation when you know it will negatively impact this sector of the economy?

All we have to do is look at what's happening in BC. They may have 90 per cent compliance rate but what is that rate versus reduced sales and closures? That statistic wasn't given. It's happened. I have some of those statistics too.

You have job security backed by a big pension when you become ousted. I have only a big set of keys. I don't want to lose that.

I think you could better spend your energy on the vast health and education problems, job creations, youth programs, reducing government spending, whatever you want. I'm not going to get into a you-know-what contest.

So thank you for your opportunity to voice my concerns and I hope these concerns will be helpful in your process in trying to give us a choice.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Who has . . . Doreen and then we'll go to Graham.

Ms. Eagles: — Than you, Judy. You mentioned youth a couple of times, and when we were at the high school in Maple Creek this morning, the kids told us, we already smoke. Where you should be focusing your attention is over at the elementary school because those kids haven't started and I mean these were — what? — 13-, 14-, 15-year-old kids we were talking to.

And you know, and I'm a firm believer in that education to keep the kids from getting started, well you know, is one of the keys to this. And I mean, like a lot of the kids said they just smoked for stress. And I don't know what the rate of smoking is amongst farmers, but if takes stress, I imagine it's pretty high.

Ms. Smith: — Where do we . . . we make headway with one big symbol and it's a big dollar symbol. And if enough money is spent that way, if money is put through the Department of Education, if programs are set up by the Department of Education and available to teachers, teachers use those programs.

Those programs get through to kids. I know for a fact. My kids — my youngest is 21 years old — my kids don't smoke. My kids hate it that I smoke. I can't smoke in my kids' homes. I respect that. I don't smoke in my kid's homes. I don't smoke in my parent's home because they don't smoke. I can go for hours without smoke. I can fly to Europe without a cigarette; it doesn't bother me.

Ms. Eagles: — Do you think that the kids telling other kids, like, don't get started? Like if we sent the high school kids over to an elementary school, it would have more of an impact than if the parents do. Because like a lot of kids . . . I was the same way: if mom and dad told me not to do something, I'd think, oh yes, what do they know.

Ms. Smith: — Mom and dads aren't nagging at their kids anymore. I never, ever told my kids they couldn't smoke. I think that starting very, very young, it's working. I know what my kids would watch on TV, I know quotes that they would quote off of commercials. I know information they brought home from school. I know it all had an impact on their decision not to smoke — every bit of it.

Like I don't think that you can ever, ever produce too much information for kids or try to give them too much information. I think . . . I've seen it work, I've seen the transition in 14 years of working with education. I've seen what happens when kids

are exposed to this type of information.

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Graham Addley.

Mr. Addley: — First, just to commend you on your support of these schools for encouraging them not to be . . . to be 100 per cent smoke free.

Ms. Smith: — I didn't encourage them; they did that themselves.

Mr. Addley: — Oh, okay. I thought you were a supporter . . .

Ms. Smith: — No . . . oh, I am supporting them — I didn't encourage them to make their school smoke-free.

Mr. Addley: — Okay, okay. I misunderstood, I thought you said the community as a whole was supporting them in encouraging them not to do that.

Ms. Smith: — They do.

Mr. Addley: — They did.

Ms. Smith: — They do. But the kids made the decision to make their school smoke free.

Mr. Addley: — Right, okay.

Ms. Smith: — And not only did the school in Mankota happen . . . it's happened in every school in the school division.

Mr. Addley: — Okay, good. If that's the case and that's your future, future customers and presently 70 per cent of the population don't smoke, and I don't know what percentage you said of the schools don't smoke, but if that's the case, wouldn't that make more sense to go after a larger market?

I mean I keep hearing from business people saying that, based on the 30 per cent of people that come into their business who are smokers, that that's the only group of people that they can make a living off of.

Ms. Smith: — No, no. But . . .

Mr. Addley: — Yet we're hearing people that don't go into smoke places because of a whole list of . . .

Ms. Smith: — But no, what I'm saying to you is that we can't afford to lose any of those people — they're our base. As far as smoking programs for people above the youth age, the adult age, we all know what it's doing to us, you know.

Mr. Addley: — Well, I guess I wasn't speaking to you as an expert on smoking programs or education, I guess just as a business person. I mean if you're going into a business — and the future is the vast majority won't be smoking in your area; presently the vast majority aren't — you're focusing on providing service, a smoking service, to a very minority group of the population.

Ms. Smith: — And shouldn't they have that right?

Mr. Addley: — I'm not arguing with the right, I'm talking about the business sense of it. I mean wouldn't you think you'd want to go after a larger business?

Ms. Smith: — Wouldn't you think that I would have the brains to look at that if I had that demand coming to me?

Mr. Addley: — Well that's what I'm asking?

Ms. Smith: — Like I said, you look after your loyalty group. If the demand is to turn around to non-smoking clientele coming into your business, of course you're going to cater to them.

Mr. Addley: — Right, no, I guess I've heard a couple of surveys of your present customers, but that's basically those that are there . . .

Ms. Smith: — That was two slow evenings.

Mr. Addley: — Right, no, but they're in your establishment so they don't have a problem with it. But if 70 per cent of the people are non-smokers — and you indicated in that very small survey that most of those were smokers — it was just a small minority were non-smokers. That is not a representative of the potential customer base?

I don't mean to be argumentative but I'm just wanting to get an answer. And you seem to have a good idea of your business.

Ms. Smith: — I guess in a small town and I probably . . . because we know everybody, you know, I know who comes in and who doesn't come in. I know who complains about the smoke and I know which ones I have that do not come in because there is smoke. I know which ones that come in that don't smoke, but don't complain. And I know which areas they want to sit in. I know whether they want to go to the bar, I know whether they want to go to the dining room. Like you're constantly aware of that. You are . . . we're doing everything we can to facilitate everybody in the community.

Am I getting to what you're . . .

Mr. Addley: — No, I don't think so. And I don't mean to be argumentative but . . .

The Chair: — I'm not sure she understands your question.

Mr. Addley: — Okay.

The Chair: — I just have one more question here and that is getting back to schools. Does that . . . the non-smoking policies in schools, does that include also the high schools? Do they not have a smoking area outside?

Ms. Smith: — Every school. We have one school that decided, and it was after amalgamation process that we went through two years ago, so it isn't even an original school of the ones that did decide to all go non-smoking. It's a school that's come into our system. They have a smoking pad quite some distance from the school.

The Chair: — They do have smoking pads.

Ms. Smith: — They have to smoke on that pad in one school.

The Chair: — Oh, okay. Because that is . . . that's the . . .

Ms. Smith: — And that's the largest school in the system, and it's a 9 to 12 school alone. Now I'm thoroughly convinced that, you know, your target area is youth. I don't like to see legislated or mandated things that are . . . that are going to be a detriment to other people. I, you know, I'm trying to make a living. I'm trying to provide a service, and I'm trying to respect the needs of non-smokers, and I'm trying to respect the needs and be smart about smokers that we do have too. I guess that's all I'm going to say on that.

The Chair: — Okay. Thank you very much. And the committee would like to hear from Ingrid Levorson.

Ms. Levorson: — Hello, my name is Ingrid Levorson. I am a former registered nurse now retired. I'm also a former smoker. I smoked for 20 years but stopped 26 years ago. I speak tonight as a nurse and as a former smoker and as a retired citizen. And I want to say that I totally concur with . . . I believe her name is Ms. Tilson and what she has said. Many of the things that I will say — my speech is going to be short — is what she has said.

I have cared for many patients, when I nursed, suffering from emphysema, lung cancer, heart disease, and circulatory diseases all related to smoking. Many of these patients, when they were dying, had said to me they wished they had stopped earlier. And because it had impacted on their health and then they were dying and they did have regrets.

I have been subjected to ridicule and harassment from hard-core smokers who refuse to believe the statistics. I believe I heard a little bit of this tonight. They don't believe the statistics on detrimental effects of smoking. They counter other behaviours such as alcohol consumption, eating junk food and fats in order to legitimize their smoking behaviour.

Now a little bit about happened in the past when I was nursing. When I was the director of staff development at the Palliser Regional Care Centre—I started work in there in 1982—I was able to convince the administration to create a smoke-free environment. Everyone was smoking there when I got there. They agreed.

Later as a director of care at the Prairie Pioneers Lodge, I again was able to convince the board of director to implement a smoke-free environment for both residents and staff. These regulations are still in place today 18 years later.

Just to diverge a bit. I heard over the news yesterday, in 1972, Finland started a program to reduce the alarming numbers of heart attacks related to high-fat diets and smoking. This was 28 years ago. They implemented programs to reduce this. People were dying of heart disease at the age of 35. Today there is a dramatic 73 per cent drop in people dying of heart disease in Finland in their mid-'30s and '40s because of the programs they implemented. So therefore I am disappointed with governments at all levels in Saskatchewan because they have not been more proactive regarding public smoking.

I just wanted to mention something. The man over here who said that he hopes his daughter will never smoke. He doesn't smoke and his wife does. Well, I'm sorry, to tell this man, but his daughter is smoking. Somebody mentioned that. She is already smoking. Because there's smoke in the house, second-hand smoke, you're smoking. And in case they may be interested, the statistics have shown for every cigarette you smoke you lose 14 minutes of your life. So you can start adding up the number of minutes and, boy, they add up.

And I agree with the man who talked about abuse. There are many types of abuse, and one is abuse by neglect. There can be elder abuse because of neglecting the elders. There is abuse because of neglecting children, not feeding them properly. And it's also an abuse to smoke in front of children or in their home. That is a form of abuse. It doesn't have to be physical or verbal. It can be because of neglect.

When I was director of staff development, I would show videos of mothers who were pregnant, and they were hooked up to ultrasounds. And when the mother took two puffs of a cigarette, the fetus stopped breathing for up to four hours. Now this is a truth. Now it's no wonder, when a mother smokes through her pregnancy, that this baby is born with poor lungs, and then has sudden infant death syndrome.

And I also concur with other things that are . . . you're in public such as . . . which I'll mention later, about cigarette package labelling.

However, if I was able to convince my superiors to implement smoke-free facilities — this is non-smoking, it's smoke-free facilities — surely the governments, with much power than I, can introduce policies that will protect the 70 to 75 per cent of the people who don't smoke.

And what I've been hearing tonight from people, and I can understand that they do want to protect their livelihood, but they have not one of them spoken about their health concerns of their families, their relatives, and their loved ones. And also that you cannot be that concerned with the public if you allow smoking, and 70 to 75 per cent of the people don't smoke.

New restaurants are being built as we speak — even here in Swift Current. Some of them have just opened. Not one of them provides a smoke-free environment. And also, after one or two months, the restaurants . . . they have a non-smoking area. It is so filled with smoke that you can't go in. And surely there should be regulations if they're building new restaurants that they should have new rules and regulations regarding building restaurants and having smoke-free environments.

The current non-smoking areas are futile, as the ventilation systems are poor or non-existent. I suffer from a condition called Sjogren's Syndrome. It's a complication of rheumatoid arthritis which results in excessively dry eyes, mouth, and respiratory tract. That's why I have to drink water, and that's why I sound like a smoker.

Because I cannot tolerate second-hand smoke, I seldom dine out and avoid all public meetings where there's smoking; example, political meetings — I used to go; I no longer go — poetry readings, and thankfully, I rarely need a taxi as they're saturated

again with cigarette smells.

I also believe that health care workers are in the business of promoting health and preventing disease, therefore, they should be non-smokers.

Saskatchewan has dismal statistics as revealed recently in *The National Post* and this includes many areas of health. We have the second highest neonatal death in Canada. Smoking by pregnant women, which I just mentioned, causes premature births, low birth weights, increase in sudden infant death syndrome — all of which reflects in the statistics.

Smoking also causes respiratory infections in the young. And I have to admit that I have to live with this for the rest of my life because I was a smoker. My daughter was born. My husband smoked. My grandparents on my husband's side smoked. My daughter ended up having ruptured eardrums 13 times and having many upper respiratory infections. And in the '60s, even as a nurse, I wasn't told that it was caused by cigarette smoke. Now I know, and I apologize to her on a yearly basis of what I've done because now she has a bit of hearing loss because of that. And thankfully, of course, she doesn't smoke.

And of course Saskatchewan has a very high incidence of diabetes. Smoking impacts negatively on diabetics. I'm also a diabetic. And because of their increased risks in strokes, heart disease, high cholesterol, and poor tissue healing, the people that are smoking that are diabetic will definitely die sooner and have many of the complications at an earlier age because of that.

So now my recommendations, which have been mentioned before: number one, prohibit drugstores from selling tobacco products. If they say they're going to go under because they can't make a living, good heavens, look what's just happened. One out of every three people are now taking herbal drugs. It's a billion, billion, trillion dollar industry which the drugstores are now into. Well, let them sell the herbal drugs . . . or herbal products but they should not be selling tobacco products. I don't believe drugstores can sell tobacco products in Ontario. I think my daughter told me that.

Unfortunately, Shoppers Drug Mart — it's a chain — has been now purchased by a major tobacco company — and I believe the tobacco company is in England — in order to push their products. And if you go into the Shoppers Drug Mart — such as in town here — the entire back wall where the cash register is just nothing but cigarettes. So the tobacco industry know that because if we can stop cigarettes from being sold there, they know what to do. They'll buy up drugstores. So now they own Shoppers Drug Marts.

Labelling of cigarette packages with graphic pictures is a positive move, I can assure you. Even though somebody will say, oh well, she's old when they saw the tracheostomy, the woman breathing. I think that everything helps.

I remember when I was in my '30s, a doctor told me it is folly to smoke beyond 40 years of age. I quit when I was 40. I always remembered what he said and I quit when I was 40. And I have told many, many people this. I've been able to convince several of my friends to quit smoking. I said, you do not generate tissue

cells after 40 like you did when you were young. And of course, I can look at some of my friends who are 20 years younger than I am who are considerably more wrinkled than I am because they're heavy smokers.

And also I believe the cigarette ads where it shows impotence in men. I think that helps too because it's one of the things that, you know, that men do not want to give up, is sex and cars when they get older. Well we see that when they get into nursing homes, they can't give up their cars and they don't want to give up sex. So guess why Viagra is on the market.

And so therefore I think these graphic pictures do help. And if anyone tells you it doesn't, I can assure you it's the tobacco lobby. And we have been sucked in by them.

I think that we should increase the cigarette prices really high to reduce young people from smoking and have heavy, heavy fines for illegal sales of tobacco; implement legislation to prohibit smoking in all public places with the exception of completely enclosed and separately ventilated smoking areas in restaurants and lounges. That means a totally separate ventilation system and completely enclosed. There are many of those in the United States.

So therefore these people who say that they only get the cigarette smokers in — 75 per cent of the smokers that come in are smokers — is because that 75 per cent of the non-smokers don't want to come in because they can't breathe the air. So therefore let's get the 70 per cent of the non-smokers coming in as well and then people who smoke can go into that strictly smoking area.

And I believe that businesses should be licensed to sell tobacco products. If they're found to be selling to minors, revoke their licence so they can't sell. It's as simple as that. You don't have to fine them, just revoke their licence.

Employees also have the right to refuse to work in smoking areas, if they do not smoke, without retaliation by their employer. That's all I have to say.

The Chair: — Well, Ingrid, thank you very much for giving us your personal testimony which is balanced also with some professional experience. Any comments by anybody?

Ms. Eagles: — I'd just like to say that the little bit of humour thrown in doesn't hurt.

Ms. Levorson: — Oh yes, thank you. And as I say that when I listened to the one speaker who's reading about what he has posted on his wall, I honestly didn't know whether I should throw up or go blind, because I've read these things before and this was the harassment that I've been subjected to over the years and I just still stand tall and say I'm still for non-smoking. Thank you.

Mr. Wartman: — No, now that I want on *Hansard*.

The Chair: — Thank you, thank you very much, Ingrid. The last presenter we have on the list is Bob Davisson.

Mr. Davisson: — Thank you. I was not aware of the format here.

It feels very formal, and I feel like my back is subject to tomatoes. But anyway my name is Bob Davisson. I'm the owner-operator of the McDonald's Restaurant in Swift Current. We implemented non-smoking in my restaurant — see, I wasn't prepared; I wasn't sure what I was going to be saying here tonight and what I was involved in — but a few years back. And I implemented the staff three years prior to that as a non-smoking facility for my staff which about 75 per cent of my staff are teenagers. As a result, the heavy or the strong smokers kicked up quite a fuss, but it only lasted for a little while.

And what I found was, the young people were smoking because it was convenient and it was the thing to do. Because it wasn't convenient — they couldn't smoke at home and they couldn't smoke at work — as a result I found quite a few of them quit smoking.

And then when we went into the non-smoking in the restaurant part of it, it absolutely it did not affect my sales. I had a few customers that I would hear tell their children that we will never come back here again because I'm not allowed to smoke but within a couple of weeks, I saw them back and they were fine.

And so I also look at the side of it . . . I used to have asthma real bad. I was on pills, powders, and sprays four times a day. And I am a customer that goes into restaurants that gets seated into a non-smoking area. But if it's close, within one or two tables of the smoking area, I can't do it, and I leave because I just can't take the smoke.

And what I see with people that have lung problems is, it's invisible. For people that are handicapped and are in wheelchairs, we in restaurants had to put out a significant amount of money to make our businesses accessible to wheelchairs and door openings and bathrooms and etc., etc., and that was just part of the business. Probably, less than one-tenth of one per cent of my customers are in that category.

But I do have a lot of customers that are . . . that have children or are themselves asthmatic but they're not seen. And the comments that I was getting after I implemented the no smoking was the comments from parents that just really made it worthwhile to me was thank you, I can take my children into a restaurant.

And so I feel for the people that are concerned. I really do. My heart goes out to them, but I really feel that the fear is not really there. What I have found with my customers that were smokers was, some of them have left and gone on somewhere else. But they just . . . they appreciate it now and as a result because they wanted to stay with their friends, they've cut back and quite a few of them have quit. So I see a positive, positive for it. And like it was said earlier, 70 per cent are non-smokers and you can go after that group.

Now I'm probably the only restaurant in the city that is non-smoking and I may lose business because other restaurants go to non-smoking. So I'm in a mixed emotion here about this, but I really would like to see for the sake of our children.

And one of the programs that I'm involved with personally and one of the targets that we do is elementary schools. And I'm in a program with the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police)

called Racing Against Drugs. We go into elementary schools throughout the province and we put on a program against drugs, and part of that program is against tobacco or against cigarettes. And it just reinforces into the young people the dangers of it, and to see an adult say it's okay not to smoke — because they think it's supposed to be cool.

And I think that's . . . I think that's about all I got to say.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Bob.

Mr. Davisson: — Oh, yes, yes. What I did want to mention . . . (inaudible) . . . have any costs? I say, yes, my cleaning bill's cut way down, just the cleaning of my curtains and the ceiling. I had to paint the ceiling every year and sometimes twice a year because it would get so filmed, and the curtains, etc. But, yes, that was, that was huge. I saved a significant amount of money in that area too.

Mr. Addley: — How long ago did you implement the non-smoking in your restaurant?

Mr. Davisson: — Does anybody here remember? You know, we're so busy I can't remember what even happened yesterday. It was a few years ago.

Mr. Addley: — Oh, okay. That's okay.

Mr. Davisson: — Somebody here might remember how many years ago, but it's been at least three, maybe more.

Mr. Addley: — One of the ideas that I've . . . We've heard some concerns from businesses that their business will be affected by going non-smoking. So what I've done is I've talked to some individuals . . . businesses in Saskatoon, and their suggestion was perhaps using a carrot approach that promote restaurants that are non-smoking and even do a . . . (inaudible) . . . so that, you know, we support people . . . we support this business as a non-smoking business.

Do you think that would have any impact? Or I guess in a community like Swift Current everybody knows you're non-smoking.

Mr. Davisson: — Yes.

Mr. Addley: — Or do they?

Mr. Davisson: — No, everybody knows.

Mr. Addley: — Okay.

Mr. Davisson: — It's been . . . and it probably took I would say less than a month before I was having to remind people. Because somebody would come in. It was so automatic just to pull out a pack of cigarettes and you would just tell them, you know, nicely that we're not. And I never had anybody scream and holler or anything.

And like the one lady was speaking just a little while ago, and she said she can fly over to Europe and she cannot have a cigarette for a while. And so it doesn't . . . like they can go in and have a coffee and visit and not have a cigarette and wait till

they go out in the car and drive home. I really don't think she'll lose business. I want to encourage her that if this is implemented, I really believe she'll be still in business and do very well and cut down on her cleaning costs.

And there's that other 70 per cent. I stay away from places. I wouldn't be able to come to a meeting like this tonight if there was smoking at it. And I think she would, she would benefit by it. Thank you.

The Chair: — Rob, I just want to ask you one question. I know that you made a personal business decision on this. Were you getting any encouragement from your parent company?

Mr. Davisson: — Yes. The parent company, I heard that they were going to . . . I started about three years before with my staff, as I said, and then when the parent company talked about it, that was an opening for me. So I was the first McDonald's restaurant to go non-smoking. And then shortly after that, they went nationally. But it was the owner/operator's choice. And so there is restaurants within Saskatchewan that have smoking and some non-smoking.

All of the corporate restaurants, that would be all the restaurants in Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, which are owned all by the corporation, are non-smoking. And then it was up to the individual owner/operator. And so I as an owner/operator chose to have non-smoking.

The Chair: — Well thank you once again, Bob, then for making your presentation. It's appreciated, especially to get the direct input from somebody directly in business, as are the others.

Mr. Davisson: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you. Now we are kind of scheduled to shut everything down by 9:30. it's now about seven minutes before then, and if there's anybody that would like to make a comment, we could invite you to come forward now. So, yes, would you like to do that sir?

Would you please start by just giving us your name.

Mr. Billard: — My name is Michael Billard from Elrose. I own a tavern. We just built one two years ago; it's a brand new facility. So our air exchangers and everything work quite well.

Now smoking, if you educate the kids not to smoke, which is what I think you should be doing . . . We're not going to change. Our customers are 19 and over. They decide what they're going to do. I mean, if we start educating these kids that smoking isn't any good and it works, what's going to happen is, as time goes by, we're going to go along with this.

I mean, right now our customers smoke . . . we have more smokers than non-smokers. As these kids grow up, as businessmen, we are going to be smart enough to go along with the trend. You know, like this fellow asks: the kids aren't smoking so why wouldn't you go to a non-smoking? Well, you're going to do it eventually because these kids are going to quit smoking. The less smokers, the more we go towards that. I mean it would only make sense.

This non-smoking, if it comes that I can't have non-smoking in my bar, I refuse. I'll do it. I can't afford not to. I will put a sign outside my door and say this facility is a non . . . is a smoking facility. The person that doesn't smoke if he doesn't want to come in, fine, that's his choice.

I mean these people, we're adults, we're 19 years old, it's their decision. We're not going to start telling them if they can smoke or if they can't smoke. I can see it in restaurants. I mean because they can't control it — kids come into restaurants. But they don't come into bars, I can't have a kid in a bar. I mean they're 19 years old; they're adults. They can decide if they want to smoke or want to come into a non-smoking area or whatever. Like our bar is quite good.

I don't smoke, my wife doesn't smoke, my kid doesn't smoke and he works there. This idea of because my parents smoke, I smoke? Well my dad smoked. He's 86 years old; he's still smoking. I don't smoke. I mean this idea of because the parent smoked the kid has to smoke — my brother don't smoke, my sister doesn't smoke. Fine, maybe I do smoke second-hand; pretty soon the government will tax that somehow. Sorry, but you know, this is silly.

The Chair: — Don't give us any ideas.

Mr. Billard: — I live in a town of 600 people and if I start . . . All my employees — that's another thing — all my employees smoke, every one of them. Now I stay open till 2:30 in the morning every night. Are my employees going to have to go outside to smoke, to have a cigarette, to have a smoke? I would be more scared of her getting mugged outside than somebody getting hurt, you know, from the smoke.

I mean we . . . it just can't be done. That's about all I've got to say.

The Chair: — Okay, thank you very much. Any comments or questions? Yes a couple over here. Graham first.

Mr. Addley: — Just one specific question. As a business person you indicate that if we educate the young people and they're non-smokers, of course as a business you'll make a business decision to make it non-smoking. At what point . . . what would the ratio have to be in the population? Right now it's 70 per cent non-smoking, 30 per cent smoking. At what level . . . what would the ratio have to be for you to make that . . .

Mr. Billard: — It's going to automatically work itself out. I mean these kids . . .

Mr. Addley: — I understand that . . .

Mr. Billard: — We're working on kids that are six years old when they're going to start going to school. And if you start pounding into those heads, 6, 7, 8 years old, after 10 years old, they're going to smoke or they're not.

Mr. Addley: — So 10 years down the road we've got a generation of non-smokers, so . . .

Mr. Billard: — But it won't be, it won't be a sudden thing. It'll just gradually work itself in.

Mr. Addley: — Right. So I mean it's dropped from about 50/50 ratio to 70/30, and if the education works, I'm just curious as to what the ratio would have to be. Would it have to be 80 per cent non-smokers or 90 per cent?

Mr. Billard: — Oh boy, I don't . . . I can't tell you on percentages, just being. . . I've been in this business for 13 years . . .

Mr. Addley: — Right. So you can't . . . you don't have a number in your mind to trigger that . . .

Mr. Billard: — So I would . . . you would just go with the flow and it would just cut . . . it would work itself in. You know, I can't give you a percentage because I adjust my business ways as I see it coming. I mean that's the only way you could do . . . you couldn't put a percentage on it.

You know, the lady from — I'm sorry to say this — but the lady that came from Ottawa said they educated for 20 years . . . tried to educate kids for 20 years not to smoke. Well I don't know what they did wrong but they sure as heck didn't do a very good job, you know. Maybe they spent all their time putting up all these statistics up. They should have spent more money educating if that's what they're trying to do.

Because I . . . as a kid nobody told me at school I shouldn't smoke. I mean I didn't, but I never had anybody come to school and say, you know, you'll get sick if you smoke. They never did. But I think education . . . that's the only way you're going to solve it. This banning completely, it's not going to work. It's in the education system you got to go.

Ms. Higgins: — I just wanted to ask you what your opinion was of other public buildings? I didn't catch it if you had said it. Or other public places where . . .

Mr. Billard: — Well I believe the hockey arenas, things like that shouldn't have smoking.

Ms. Higgins: — Totally?

Mr. Billard: — Yes, I believe . . . I'm just talking about like my bar. Because a public place kids can go in, from a baby, even an unborn baby, all the way up to 90 years or 100 years old, you can all go. A bar you cannot. You're 19 years old. You're making the choice of going in or not. You're an adult. You make that decision. If you want to walk into that building and there's a sign there that says it's not a smoke-free area, you're the adult. You decide if you want to go in there.

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you.

The Chair: — I have a question also. I don't know if you've had opportunity to talk to bar owners in larger centres. I'm quite aware of the point that you and others have made with respect to smaller centres. People in larger centres, are they having . . . is their bottom line likely to be affected as much or less or do you think there's a different attitude in more urban centres?

Mr. Billard: — I haven't spoken to any of them, but . . . See, another thing, like in my place I'll see somebody come in — and they never smoke — and they have a few drinks, they'll

have a cigarette. I mean there's no way I'm going to tell people in my place that they can't smoke. No way. I don't care what legislation you do. I won't do it. You can fine me, you can send me to jail — I won't do it!

Mr. Addley: — Could we have that in writing?

Mr. Billard: — Yes, you bet, because if I go to jail I don't want to have to put up with . . . You guys cause more stress; you guys, with putting up rules like this, you're causing us more stress and it's causing us more health problems than smoking in my building causes me.

The Chair: — Well, thank you very much. I guess one message we've been getting consistently is that there seems to be sort of one last bastion of smoking left in Saskatchewan, and that happens to be particularly the rural bars. That's what I'm hearing. And so thank you very much for, for certainly letting us know that, letting the committee know that.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it's 9:30. Unless somebody's got something that has not been said, then I would actually bring this to a close. There are . . . Committee members will be around for a couple of minutes while our staff, while our staff packs up all the stuff here, and we will . . . so if there's any other comments that you'd like to make.

I would like to express a thank you to all of you for your consideration to take the time out, and I can see that this is important to people of Saskatchewan. So thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 9:30 p.m.