

April 21, 1986

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Health
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I was asking the minister about some numbers on the hospital beds that were closed in Saskatoon in the past year, from April 1st of '85 to '86. I wonder if the minister had a chance to get those numbers for us.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate my staff who worked very diligently and also the hospitals who provided the information over the past couple of hours, three hours. And I'd like to read this for the information of the members present. We didn't just do it for this year; we went back to 1982. and I want to indicate to you when I indicate 1982, that was March, 1982. So any figures for 1982 would be figures indicating when the members opposite were government.

The total bed closures for Saskatoon, the total bed closures for Saskatoon in 1982 — let me again indicate to you this was entirely under the previous administration; these figures are at the end of March — for Saskatoon were . . . Do you want to shout from your seats or do you want to hear the information? This is for 1981-82. The figure for Saskatoon bed closures were 223; the figure for 1982-83 was 197; the figure for 1983-84 was 152; the figure for 1984-85 was 112; and the figure for 1985-86 was 132. So you can see that they have progressively gone down. From March 1982, the bed closures to '86, approximately 100 less beds closed over that year.

So let's look at Regina and Saskatoon combined, and we will see that the total for 1982, and that again is March 1982, is . . .

An Hon. Member: — How about this year? That's what we're on.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We will get to there. If you want to shout and holler, it'll take longer . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I know that's your habit. But if you just bear with us for a minute . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They're always a little noisier after supper in here for some reason. Certain members are.

In 1982 is 264 — 264 beds closed in Regina and Saskatoon; in 1983, 254; in 1984, 217; in 1985, 169; and in 1986, 194.

So you can see considerable decline, year after year, in the last four years as compared to figures of 223 in Saskatoon compared to 132 this year; 264 compared to 194. I hope that satisfies the member as the information he wanted to know.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to answer the question that I requested information on. In the year past, from April 1st of 1985 to

April 1st of 1986, University Hospital in Saskatoon, how many beds were closed, in which areas, and for how many days?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — University Hospital for the year of 1986, there were 86 beds closed — 86 beds, Mr. Chairman. There were the 6 pediatrics that we talked about, from May 1 to March 31, '85. From June 28 to September 4, '85, there were 4 rehab beds, 3 beds in medicine, 14 beds in neuro-surgery and ophthalmology, 18 in surgery, 5 in pediatrics, 20 in gynecology, and 6 in geriatric.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Now that was in the University Hospital. What was it at City Hospital for that same time period?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes. For City Hospital there were 46 for the total year of 1986, breaking down as follows: medicine, 8; urology, 10; gynecology, 10; neuro-surgery, 2; ENT, 5; general surgery, 7; orthopedics, 4; for a total of 46. And City Hospital indicates they have no closures in the summer.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And, Mr. Minister, for St. Paul's — what are those numbers for St. Paul's?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I should point out, for City Hospital those closures were between July the 1st and August . . . April 1, '85 to March 31, '86. Now for St. Paul's, there are no bed closures at the present time for 1985-86 fiscal year. For the Christmas period of two weeks, there were 92 surgery beds, and I've explained that that has happened many times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, let me, let me indicate, if you want to shout, fine. Do you continue to care to shout from your seat or do you want me to give you the answers? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I will. No, I will give you the answer.

It's tougher when you shout and your opposition member can't hear, but there were 92 surgery beds at Christmas, which I say is nothing unusual. You check back year after year, you will see this. I've given you the indication why. Many people prefer not to go to hospital at Christmas for surgery. Some of the medical people prefer to take their families on holiday, and some of the nursing staff and support staff have their holidays scheduled then also. For the Easter period, a two-week period, there were 67 surgery beds and 10 medicine beds.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I appreciate getting that information, although it took a long time to do it. And basically what we find is a couple of hundred beds closed when the waiting lists are 8,000. And I noted with interest your reason for these closures at St. Paul's. Basically now you're blaming the nurses and the doctors for the closures at the base hospital in Saskatoon. And I will be relaying that on to the nurses and the doctors because they will be interested in your comments.

And the member from Maple Creek shouts and hollers from her seat in her ordinarily, obnoxious way. And I just say that it's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that you can hardly hear in here for the noise coming from the government benches. The ruckus and riotous nature of

these people — this massive, majority, arrogant government — when people stand and try to ask questions of the minister, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this is a government out of control. And I say that across Canada, across Canada we see the attack on medicare that we have seen in Saskatchewan go on and on.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, the people of Canada are finally understanding what Conservative governments are all about. And I say in the last little while we've seen them turfed out of Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — We've seen them turfed out of Manitoba, not very long ago. And tonight we saw them turfed out of Prince Edward Island.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And just to inform the Assembly, elected in 17 and leading in five for 22. The former opposition . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! This is absolutely . . . Order! This is absolutely nothing to do with the estimates at hand. And let's get on with it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I say to you that relating to health issues, and one of the big issues in that election campaign was health issues as it is here in this province, and I say when you have health issues . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. This is not related. What is going on in that province is not related.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, we have had the minister talk about other provinces' health care at least 10 times. And I would like to tell you that we have talked about other provinces' health care any number of times. And so I say that one of the big issues in the next election here will be the same as it was in Prince Edward Island — health issues. That's what the election's going to be about.

And I'll say, they ended up with 10 seats in Prince Edward Island because they failed the people in Prince Edward Island. and when we have an election here, Mr. Chairman . . . and that's one of the reasons I believe you're getting off the boat and out of politics, is because you don't agree with this government on their health care issues either. And I would say to you that tonight's display in Prince Edward Island, based on health issues, I might add, show clearly the people of Canada are rejecting cut-backs in health.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! We are not talking about the election in Prince Edward Island. Let's get on with the estimates.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I say to the minister opposite that when we talk about transfer cuts from the federal government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I hear one of the member opposite yelling cannabis. And I don't know whether they were smoking it before supper or what, but I say to you that yelling from their seats in this

manner continually . . . And I see the member from Meadow Lake laughing in his seat and making noise, and the Minister of Health can hardly hear the questions that are being put to him. I find a terrible display of unruliness in the Assembly tonight that's being allowed. And I say when you have words like that being cast across the Assembly, I find it disgusting and repulsive that the minister would allow his members during Health estimates to act in this manner.

(1915)

But getting back to the issue of health funding from the federal government to the provinces, I say that the elections across the country — the elections across the country — whether it's health care in Manitoba, health care in Prince Edward Island, or health care in Ontario, these people are being rejected time and time again. And I say we should have an election, because what I'm hearing is the people of the province want an election. The doctors certainly want an election to allow them to vote on the actions of the Minister of Health. The nurses . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The former minister of Finance says they're not going to vote NDP. Well we don't know how people are going to vote. That's why you have elections, Mr. Chairman.

And I would say if you could get some control of the members opposite who are shouting and yelling from their seats over and over again, I would say to you that we can never get any work done because of the loudness of the members from the government benches. And I just say that a government that has this kind of a massive majority and tries to override the opposition issue after issue, I say deserves not to be re-elected and won't be re-elected at the next election.

But I would like to ask the minister if he could for us outline in the three hospitals in Regina, the base hospitals, one at a time, the closed beds over the past year. I think you lumped them together, and what I had asked for is a breakdown by area in the hospital for Pasqua, Plains, and General.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well before I do that, I'd like to correct some allegations the member opposite, in his tirade of discussion on the Prince Edward Island election — I don't know what that has to do with it at this point in time, and I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for your ruling. I mean if we're going to discuss health, we have to get on with this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, the member likes to mislead. I heard him distinctly say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the member from Quill Lakes continues to bellow from his seat. He thinks his role in the legislature is to stand there and bellow and bray from his seat.

I want to give you some information. I want to correct some misinformation that the member opposite alleged to. He said there were about 200 bed closures. That's absolutely wrong, misleading. I gave you the figure of 132. I know you couldn't hear it. In 1986, 132. You couldn't hear that because your colleague was bellowing from his seat. And compare that 132 beds in the total of 1986, and compare that to 223 in 1982. Just let's keep the record straight. For him to get up here in this House and

say 200, is an exaggeration and an untruth. One hundred and thirty-two is the figure, and you compare that back to 1982 when they were in power and the figure was 223. So I just want to lay the record straight for you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this House.

The question, I believe, was for Regina; and I think you want to know hospital by hospital, year by year. And I'd be pleased to give that figure to you. The total for Regina in 1982 was 41; in 1983 was 57; in 1984 was 65; in 1985 was 57; in 1986 was 62. Broken down by hospital: the Regina General Hospital in each year, each case is zero; the Plains Health Centre, in 1982, were 25 beds, and 25 beds in '83, 25 beds each year through — 25, 25, 25 every year, the same figure. Okay.

The Pasqua — and you know there was major construction going on at the Pasqua, which was a factor in these bed closures — for '82, there were 16; '83, there were 32; '84, there were 40; '85, there were 32; and '86, 37. So as I say, you can see the peak there in '84 when the construction was going on. Those are the figures I supplied to the member for the Regina hospitals.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I need a clarification on Saskatoon. You say a total of 132. When you gave the numbers to me hospital by hospital, mine don't add up to 132. So if you could regive them for University, City and St. Paul.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Okay. I'll do that, year by year, and I'll go hospital by hospital.

An Hon. Member: — '86.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — You don't want to hear '82? I think I'll give '82 just for comparison's sake. In '82, Saskatoon City Hospital, 74; '86, Saskatoon City Hospital, 46; University Hospital, '82, 89; University Hospital, '86, 86; St. Paul's Hospital, 1982, 69; St. Paul's Hospital, 1986, zero.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — St. Paul's Hospital in '86 is zero?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well could the minister explain about the 77 beds that were in all the press at St. Paul's Hospital? Are you misleading the Assembly or are you giving the facts? Because in 1986, that time period was the same time as all the newspapers were carrying the story, which you agreed with, that 77 beds were closed. Now you stand in your place and say none were closed in 1986 in that time period at St. Paul's. Now I wonder: can you give me the straight goods here, or are you just making them up to try to make yourself look good?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — For St. Paul's, the figure I was reading out to you, those are for significant summer closures, and as I said to you, there were no bed closures at this time. There were the bed closures for a short period of time at Christmas and Easter that we indicated to you previously when I read those out to you. But a significant bed closure for St. Paul's over the period '86, there were zero. So that brings you to the 132 figure. But the 77 and 96 were short-time bed closures, which is nothing new over the Christmas period of time at St. Paul's Hospital.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, you're incredible. You're incredible in the fact that you would leave off whatever numbers you felt like to make your numbers right. I don't understand how, at St. Paul's Hospital, you can say that we had 77 beds closed. It was in the press. The *Star-Phoenix* carried it as a main story, and you get up in the House and announce that there was no closures. Then when the opposition takes you to task on it, you say, but they were insignificant, we didn't include those closures there. Well who is to believe you? How can you believe any of the other numbers when you obviously, when caught out, are saying that there were zero beds closed. You then say, well they were insignificant — the closures there were insignificant. Well I'll tell you, the 8,000 people on waiting lists to get into a bed in Saskatoon don't think they were significant.

And the fact is, if you add these numbers on — and God only knows how many other numbers you've left off along the way — the bed closures in Saskatoon are about 200, because if you add 77 to 132, which you conveniently forgot, it's about 200. Now I wonder whether or not your ranting and raving a minute ago, and the hooting of your colleagues about the fact that we had said 200 and then you say only 132, the fact that you were totally wrong, has any impact on you — has any impact at all.

But I think what it points out, Mr. Chairman, is that listening to this minister give answers that are accurate, when he does bother to give answers, simply confirms what the doctors and nurses say about this government — that can you believe what they say when you see what they do — 8,000 people on waiting lists.

The minister gets up and not only does he not give facts, he gives inaccurate facts about what is happening in Saskatoon. He says . . . the member for Turtleford yells and hollers and says that they're not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, see, there he is, yelling again. I have to raise my voice, Mr. Chairman, to get over the hooting and hollering from the member from Turtleford. See, he's loud; he's boisterous. And I'll tell you, this arrogant mass of majority that we have here, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it's difficult to do the business of this Assembly because two problems: one, it's so noisy in here from the members of government — you can't hear — secondly, the minister won't give any facts. He conveniently forget. Can you believe it? He conveniently forgot to include the 77 at St. Paul's — forgot. They were insignificant; didn't have to include those.

Well, Mr. Minister, can you give us a list of other insignificant closures you conveniently forgot to add on? How many more hundreds of beds were closed that you conveniently forgot because it didn't solve your political problem of having beds closed in Saskatoon at the same time as you have 8,000 people on waiting lists? A situation that I say, Mr. Chairman, led to the demise of governments across this country — Tory governments, I might add, reconfirmed tonight in Prince Edward Island. And I say to you that when you have the courage to call the election, Mr. Chairman, when you have the courage, and the party opposite . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. What has an election got to do with . . . Whether it's here in this province or in P.E.I., an election has absolutely nothing to do with the estimates that we are involved in. Let's get back on course.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite can try to hide the facts about what health care cuts are doing to their political future across Canada, but I say, you can run but you can't hide from the cut-backs that are occurring. And we released to the minister — who tried to hide from the fact that there was going to be \$154 million cut from the funding to the province of Saskatchewan — last week we proved it to him in a study that was done in a report done by the Canadian Hospitals Association. Then he says, well maybe there will be cuts, but I'm going to fight them.

Well I tell you, if we have a fight like was put up by Premier Devine when he went to Ottawa and got us a cut of 81 cents for the price of wheat, when he went down, got a delay in the Husky Oil upgrader of a year at a price of \$13 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it's got a lot to do with health. It's got to do with your ability to negotiate with the federal government.

And the minister yells from his seat, shut him down. Now I'll tell you that's arrogance. I'll tell you that is an arrogant minister who, when a member is asking questions, legitimate health questions, will shout from his chair, shut him down. And I'll tell you the role of the chairman . . . And I'm glad we have the individual in the Chair we have, because he will not be led astray by the minister who, when under attack, will shout from his chair in a partisan way, to a colleague in the PC party, shut him down.

(1930)

Can you believe it? Can you believe that that is what the Minister of Health is saying tonight, from his seat — that when members are asking questions about his inability to answer questions, to give information that isn't accurate, do you know what he does? Do you know what he does? I'll tell you what he does. He shouts from his seat, shut him down.

I'll tell you that is a brave minister. With 53 members in the government, that they have to resort to tactics like that of shouting from his seat, shut him down.

But I wanted to ask you, Mr. Minister, is if you can outline now what other beds did you conveniently forget to include in your list of beds that were closed in Saskatoon? We now have the number up to 200. Were there any at City or University or any other ones at St. Paul's that you considered to be insignificant, and if you'd also give me a list of the insignificant ones just so we could decide that?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the arrogant approach of the member opposite and the shouting from his ranks as he's talking.

I want to indicate to you that, as I said when I presented this, St. Paul's Hospital had no bed closures at this time. You can check *Hansard* if you want. I said in 1985-86 fiscal year: there was the Christmas period of two weeks

with 92 surgery beds closed down; the Easter period of two weeks with 67 surgery beds and 10 medicine beds. If you will check back in *Hansard*, you'll see that I indicated that when I gave the situation at St. Paul's Hospital.

If he wants to make fun of those figures, and he wants to say somebody is hiding something, all that member is doing is criticizing the hospital boards of this province, because these figures came at 5 o'clock and from 5 to 6 o'clock from the hospitals who worked diligently to provide them.

Now it may well be, and I know it's NDP policy — I remember very well when they wanted to close down the Grey Nuns' Hospital. It was run by the nuns and there was fantastic care given there. But oh no, the socialists said, we can do things better. They took the Grey Nuns' Hospital away from the nuns and they called in Pasqua Hospital. I can tell you that when the nuns run the hospitals, there's exceptional care.

I can tell you also they have a hidden agenda. I understood this when I came in as Minister of Health. They wanted to take St. Paul's Hospital away from the nuns. That's what they wanted to do. I can tell you if they should ever have the good graces to get back in, in another 30 years, it's still on their hidden agenda because they're against the nuns. They believe the state should run every hospital. I told the nuns when I came in: we do not believe in that; we will finance your hospitals; we will build onto your hospital because we believe that you give tender loving care. And that's a lot different than the centralist policies of the socialists opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — So when he stands so sanctimoniously in his seat thinking he's the protector of care, when they would attack the Grey Nuns, an institution that brought health care to Saskatchewan in the days of the fur trader, that were the major health care givers in many areas of this province for years and years and still are today. And the socialists attacked them and took their hospitals away. They underfunded St. Paul's. I had to put a million dollars in for equipment. And year after year we've looked at St. Paul's operating budget. We're building onto St. Paul's. But I can tell you, socialists don't like nuns and they take the hospitals from them. So let that be well understood because that is the hidden agenda of the NDP.

I told the member opposite, and you can check *Hansard* and I'll say it again, that I said, in St. Paul's there are no beds closed at this time. In the Christmas period there were two weeks and there were 92 surgery beds. And that's nothing new. That's gone on year after year. In the Easter period there were two weeks with 67 beds and 10 medicine beds. And I stand on my figures comparing the summer closures under the NDP of 223 beds in Saskatoon, 132 of them in 1986. And I will stand on my figures that in 1982 under the NDP there were 60 summer bed closures at St. Paul's, and in 1986 under the Devine government there were none.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister wants to go back and talk about history and what the NDP and, I suppose, the

CCF and Tommy Douglas did for health care and how terrible it was. But if you're going back into the treatment of nuns in the province, one would only have to go back to 1929 to '34 to the last Conservative government to realize at that time the Conservative government of the day took the crosses out of the schools and didn't allow the nuns to wear their forms.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, if you want to talk about a government and the way they treated religious groups, if that's your accusation, if that's what you're talking about, my colleague from Athabasca has gone out to get a little book that documents clearly from 1929 to 1934. And I was very glad the chairman allowed you to talk about the record and the past history, because we have some points that we're going to raise about how Conservative governments dealt with religious orders when they were in government last time. And you want to talk about a hidden agenda, we'll talk about it.

And Mr. Chairman, I'm glad you allowed us to get into this whole area of how religious orders are treated by different governments. I don't know why you did, but now that we're into it, we'll have a debate on it. And my colleague, when he gets back, I have some quotes that we're going to read into the record about what the previous Conservative government, the Anderson government — the only other government of the Conservative persuasion we had in the history of the province — what their attitude was towards religious orders. And we can have a debate.

You've put on record your opinion of what went on under Tommy Douglas and Allan Blakeney in health and how terrible that was. I don't think anyone is going to believe you, because people know what happened in the 1940s and '50s and '60s and '70s under consecutive CCF and NDP governments in the whole health care area. And for you to try to stand in your place today and convince the million people in the province that the NDP and the CCF were bad for health care, shows how credible you are, sir. You're not credible. The doctors believe you're not credible. The nurses say you're not credible.

So if you want to stand and get red in the face and talk about how NDP and CCF governments, under Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd and Allan Blakeney, were bad for health care, good luck to you. I don't think anyone is going to listen to you, but carry on, because it only adds to the perception that this government has a credibility gap that's 2 miles long and growing every day. Because I'll tell you, when you attack people like Tommy Douglas on the health care issue, and when you attack Allan Blakeney and Woodrow Lloyd, the people who put medicare in place . . .

An Hon. Member: — Allan Blakeney.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes. Allan Blakeney was in the government and in the cabinet when the medicare was brought in, in 1962. He was in, in 1962.

Obviously, Mr. Minister, you have a great deal of explaining to do to the people of the province. And when I say, when it comes to credibility, you have little, and here again . . . Well the members want to yell and holler

from their place. That's fine. We can hardly hear the answers to the questions or the questions . . .

But this is a book about politics in Saskatchewan. And I would just like to quote from it. Mr. Chairman, this is from page 41 of this book, *A Family History*. And on page 41:

In the year of 1929 was also marked by the election of the Anderson government in Saskatchewan, an anti-French government. That year also marked the death of Sir Gouin, prime minister of Quebec, with whom Raymond had several interviews. In 1930 when the strategies of the Anderson government made it quite evident that an all out attack would be launched . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. This is not relevant. There is nothing in there that is relevant to the health . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order. There is nothing in there that the member is reading that has any . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order. There is nothing in there that is relevant to health and associated in any way with what is taking place in these estimates.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I was pleased that you allowed the minister to talk about the history of other political parties on health . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The minister when he was talking was relating it to the health to the Pasqua Hospital and as it related to that institution. What you're saying has absolutely nothing to do with health in any way, shape, or form. I would ask you to get on with the procedure.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I am relating this to health issues, and as I understand it, as it related to, as the minister was talking about, nuns who work in hospitals. And I just say that that time period in our history is not a proud one. It's not a proud one at all. And when you talk about religious orders working in hospitals, what was done to religious orders in the schools, and I believe in the hospitals at that time, is not a proud record.

And I don't intend to spend a great deal of time about it, because I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that it was irrelevant when the minister was talking about it and he went on with it. And I only thought, to correct the record, that we would have some balance.

But where this does relate to the absence of health care is on the issue . . . on page 42, where it tells you what the result of the poor health care system at that time was. And it says, "In 1934 at a provincial election the Anderson government was completely wiped out." And I say that's what will happen here as soon as these birds screw up their courage and call an election. Because they're on the way out; they're on the way out. They have stayed beyond their welcome.

And what they are saying to you, sir, is because of your inability to give answers, they want an election on health care. And I would ask you now whether or not you think that your credibility in giving these answers on the numbers of beds closed, after you attempted to give information that wasn't accurate, whether or not you will tell me, in the city of Regina, the numbers you gave, do

they include all of the closures or just part of them?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Regina shows all of the closures, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, in June of '85 cabinet was presented with a brief from the Saskatchewan seniors' fitness association. A number of recommendations were contained therein. I'll read the summary:

We need a strong, dynamic program to encourage involvement by seniors in physical activities, to develop an ongoing leadership program among seniors to make it fun, and to show an activity to be worthwhile in itself to the individual.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, what steps have been taken with respect to that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I remember that being brought to cabinet. I think you would be best to ask the Minister of Culture and Recreation. He was the minister who addressed that program, or that request.

Mr. Shillington: — Well has a response gone out?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — You'd have to address that to the Minister of Culture and Recreation.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, with respect to alcohol, I know this has received some comment in this House. I want to add mine to others who have addressed the subject. I clipped out of the newspaper a few weeks ago an article which pointed out that while the sale of spirits was down, the sale of beer and wine had risen. Is it beer and wine that figure largely in the advertising. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if this is not some cogent evidence that advertising does have an effect, that advertisers aren't simply making gratuitous donations to the media — they're advertising because it does, in fact, increase sales.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, I don't know if you can draw that comparison. Certainly we're discussed the indication. I think there is no empirical evidence to show that alcohol is up in consumption. Certainly it's brand name preference, and I don't know if there's any truth behind, or any substance behind, you allegation at all.

I'm proud to see that pure alcohol consumption in Saskatchewan has declined, and it's declined year after year in the last four years. Certainly we can go through the whole thing of advertising again. We know that advertising was there in the printed media for many years.

And certainly we've talked for some length in this debate on the resolutions and certain are on the estimates. And we've seen that the federal government have adopted our stance of some of the educational aspects of the advertising. And what we see on the evidence is, it's clear that the advertising of beer and wine and spirits has produced absolutely no increase in sales or consumption of alcohol in this province.

(1945)

So I don't know what else the member wants to discuss in this regard, but certainly I don't see where it has been a major factor contributing to increased consumption.

Mr. Shillington: — Well how on earth does the minister arrive at that conclusion? It is beer and wine which is advertised on televisions, and it is beer and wine sales which are up, while the consumption of alcohol overall is down by 11 per cent.

I ask you, Mr. Minister . . . These figures, I believe, are for the year ending 1984. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would give me the figures for the year ending 1985, the figures for spirits, beer, and wine?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We don't have the figures to '85. You'd have to ask the minister in charge of the Liquor Board when his estimates come up. I don't have those figures to give to you at this time.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you must have figures with respect to alcohol consumption from your advisory committee. You set up an advisory committee; you must have some figures. It's just not believable that you've obtained the report and obtained no statistics to go with it. Mr. Minister, give us what your advisory committee gave you.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly the member again fails to listen. I've explained the advisory committee to his colleague from Regina North East on numerous occasions in this House. And that is, I set up a committee to look at youth and drugs and alcohol, and that's what it was designed to. So when you're looking at that, you have no figure to say what the overall consumption is. I never asked them to look at that type of figure.

Mr. Shillington: — Then give us the figures for the consumption of beer, wine, and spirits by young people, if that's what you have?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As I explained before in this House — and obviously you weren't present — is that we don't have that kind of figure. I don't know whether you go in to buy liquor or not; I assume you probably do from time to time. And I don't know if they ask you your age; I don't think they do. So how would we have any figures to know what age group were buying them, especially youth who cannot legally go into the stores? It's somebody pulling it for the youth. So we have no indication of that.

Our figures are based on the treatment for youth. And I must indicate to you again: my concern is that there are young kids out there who are misusing drugs, they're on cannabis, they're on prescription drugs, overusing those, they're combining that with alcohol. I'm concerned about this. I have people in the schools indicating to me that they're concerned. So we look at the number that we have to treat, and we're trying to come forward with some initiatives to improve treatment to these young people.

Mr. Shillington: — Well it is of considerable comfort to know that the minister is concerned about the use of illicit drugs. There is virtually nothing, I think, that this government can do besides provide treatment. You

cannot . . . It is now illegal. Its use is restricted by the Criminal Code and, I may say, not very successfully. There isn't anything you can do with respect to the consumption of drugs, Mr. Minister.

There's a good deal you could do with respect to the consumption of alcohol. So I asked the question about alcohol. I'd ask the minister to say with that and not get onto some total irrelevancy such as drugs. And I'm not suggesting that cannabis and other soft drugs and hard drugs are not a problem. I'm just suggesting we have a very limited role to play with respect to their consumption — major role to play with respect to the treatment — but a minor role to play with respect to the consumption of those drugs.

So let's stick with alcohol, which we do control. I ask you again, Mr. Minister, the consumption of beer and wine is up; spirits is down very markedly; what else can that be but advertising? What other hypothesis could you suggest to explain that dichotomy with respect to consumption?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly I'm concerned about the treatment for youth. We have no figures to show us that the consumption pattern by youth has changed over the past 10 years. There's no empirical evidence to show any difference.

I know how many kids need treatment. I see them coming to Calder; I see them coming to Mandan. Many of these are hooked very heavy on cannabis, which leads to other problems. Some of them are misusing prescription drugs; some of them are misusing drugs over the counter; some of them are sniffing gasoline; some of them are using Lysol. To me that's a concern; that's a very significant concern. I think to treat that and to try and find ways to get these young people back into the mainstream of society, where they can make their contribution, is the direction I'd like to go.

Now the member can stand up and make much, and say it's all because of advertising. I don't believe that. I don't see any ads for advertising cannabis on the television. And I can tell you the consumption of cannabis is going up year after year. There are kids sniffing gasoline — and I don't see any ads saying, sniff gasoline. But they're sniffing gasoline; they're buying Lysol; they're combing all these things.

I'm concerned about providing for Saskatchewan people the best treatment resources that we can. Now they may be against that. They may be against that kind of treatment. I hope they are not. I hope they are not.

To that end, it's been brought to my attention that Mandan, North Dakota, is one of the best treatment centres in this part of North America. Dr. Saul Cohen, the head of the alcohol commission, and myself are going there in the next month. We're going to see their program. We would like to bring part of that program back to Saskatchewan and build a Saskatchewan model, where if we have our young people who have these problems, that we can get at it early and we can treat them and let them get rid of this terrible habit and move into the productive lives that they deserve in this province.

Mr. Shillington: — While Mandan does deal with drug addiction, its primary treatment is for alcoholism, not for drugs.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if there's any way we could stick to alcohol rather than you heading off into drugs. It is just such a relief to know that you think that consumption of illicit drugs by young people is a problem. That just provides so much relief and comfort to the public of Saskatchewan. We were certain that you were all in favour of it.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could save us these pious platitudes of yours and discuss the issue over which you do have some control — that's alcohol.

Mr. Minister, with respect to drugs, the use of soft drugs, I assume you're talking about, you said the consumption was going up year by year. Would you give us the figures for the last . . . whatever years you have?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I have a number of . . . a couple of figures that might be interesting to you. My officials indicate that we have a report from the liquor commission that from September 15, 1983, to September 15, 1984, sales of domestic and imported beer declined 1.7 per cent. So there was a decline of domestic and imported sales of beer in the period of time that you seem to be very concerned about where they went down 1.7 per cent.

Getting to your last question about the consumption of drugs. Again, I mean there's no way other than what you hear from teachers, and what I was saying to you, I talked to many teachers. They indicate that they see kids using cannabis, using non-prescription drugs and prescription drugs in harmful ways, and we go by our treatment figures, the same as we do with the alcohol. I can indicate to you at our two treatment figures in Regina and Saskatoon, we see that the figures in 1981-82 were 117 young people that were treated, escalating to 140 in 1984-85. So certainly there are more and more, and that's just Regina and Saskatoon, not counting those that went out of the province to Mandan for treatment.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, would you give us similar figures for the succeeding two years. You gave us the figures for September 3, '83. Would you give us the figures for the succeeding years?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Which succeeding years are you asking for?

Mr. Shillington: — Right up to the present, Mr. Minister. I assume you could give us the figures for September '84 to September 15, '85.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The figures that I just gave you from September 15, '83 to September 18, '85, a decrease of domestic and imported beer sales by 1.7, are figures that have been supplied to us by the liquor commission. I don't have them from there on. You'd have to check with the minister in charge of the Liquor Board when his estimates come up.

Mr. Shillington: — How about then breaking down that into the two years. You've actually covered a two-year

period, September 15, '83 to September 15, '85. Would you give me the breakdown for the two calendar years, for the two years in there?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We have to work that out. We don't have it handy with us now, but we could work it out for you.

Mr. Shillington: — All right. Would you give us the figures for the sale of wine during that same two-year period? I do not understand how your figures could be of such a confused mess, but give us the figures for wine then.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention of the member that he should be asking these questions of the sale of liquor to the member in charge of the Liquor Board. I mean, I don't know which figures, how many bottles of beer were sold each year, or how many bottles of wine. I mean, if that were my responsibility, we'd know.

There's a minister in charge of the Liquor Board of Saskatchewan, and to get that detailed information, the member should realize that that's where you'd ask them.

A minute ago or two, he was on his feet asking me about the figures in the advertisements in the telephone book. I mean, good Lord, Mr. Chairman, we can't be responsible for answering the questions for every department in the government. And I'm sure that the member in charge of Saskatchewan Liquor Board, when his estimates are up, will give them every figure that he wishes to know.

I have some statistics that have been handed over to me from the Liquor Board. They're not detailed; every year, every bottle of wine, every ounce of liquor, every bottle of beer. So I think he would be wise, and I think you should remember, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain estimates that you ask these questions in where the minister has the back-up of knowing those figures.

My people are involved in health care and in treatment. And I have always, when I rose to reply in regard to alcohol consumption and the use of illicit drugs, talked in the term of treatments, which is the mandate that I'm charged for.

As far as the consumption, I haven't got those kinds of figures at my fingertips. So I think, Mr. Chairman, we should direct the questions to the appropriate ministers.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I am having the greatest difficulty believing you don't have those figures. I show your . . . I see you reading off the documents given to you by our officials, and they after they . . . make an utterly fruitless effort to get the figures into your mind, you then stand up and say, you haven't got them. Mr. Minister, either you don't understand what your officials are giving you, or you don't care to give them to us.

Mr. Minister, you had one set of figures which you gave me, and you gave it to me because it tended to support your point of view that consumption is declining. I, Mr. Minister, then asked you for other figures which might present a more balanced picture, and all of a sudden the minister's mind becomes as blank as a freshly cleaned

window pane. He knows nothing except the one fact that beer has declined by 1.7 per cent over a two-year period.

Mr. Minister, it is the responsibility of the minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Liquor Board to sell alcohol. It is not his responsibility to curtail the excessive use of alcohol. That is, and always has been, the responsibility of the Minister of Health. So please don't try to beg off this question, as you've begged off every other one we've asked you over the last two and one-half weeks, by saying it's someone else's responsibility. This, Mr. Minister, is your responsibility. So I ask you to have another look at those figures and give them to us.

(2000)

I am reading from the *Leader-Post*, and I will read the paragraph which I gave you, and it reads:

The sales volume of spirits was down in Saskatchewan last year, while wine and beer sales rose slightly. Taking volume figures for spirits from April 1 to December 8, 1984, there was a decrease of 8.5 per cent . . .

And then it goes on:

He said beer sales increased by two per cent and wine sales (increased by) 3.5 per cent.

The person who's commenting, who is a Mr. Bennett, Al Bennett, director of finance and administration for the Liquor Board, said the economy and the increase in prices were likely the main reasons for the decline in sales.

Mr. Minister, I wonder what was the main reason for the increase in sales in beer and wine. I suggest it was because the beer and wine was the subject of intensive advertising. If you have any other explanation for this fact, or if you dispute the facts given by the *Leader-Post*, then give me your facts. If you don't, let's deal with the only thing that we have, which is an article by the *Leader-Post* which so far as I know went unchallenged by the Liquor Board.

So, Mr. Minister, do you have any different facts? If you do, give them to me, and stop giving them to me selectively. If you don't have any other facts, then would you address yourself to the clear implication in this, and that is that advertising bolstered the sale of beer and wine while it didn't bolster the sale of spirits, because it isn't done on television and radio.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would just remind the members, and I have listened to the debate for the last little while . . . just a caution to all members of the House, regarding rule 494 in *Beauchesne's*, regarding procedure of estimates under general administration — and I would read for you to remind you all:

The whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way when the committee is considering the first item of the Estimates of that department, which reads as follows: "Vote 1 —

Administration”; but the discussion may not be extended to any particular item mentioned in the Estimates of that department. If, however, the words “General Administration” (of which we now are partaking cover all the expenses to be incurred during the year by that department, it is relevant to discuss every phase of the department totally or in detail.

And I intend to follow that rule in *Beauchesne's*, and I would just caution the members and remind the members that we will stick to Health estimates and stay away from going off on tangents into other departments.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, I ask you again if the figures presented by the *Leader-Post* — and you claim you have nothing to the contrary — if those figures do not suggest that advertising beer and wine did increase their sales, since they showed a markedly different sales pattern . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Perhaps I didn't state the issue clearly from the Chair. But within my opinion as chairman, that is not a Health estimate question. You, the member from Regina Centre, had indicated a previous question that had to do with the Liquor Board, and I would ask the member to put that question to the appropriate minister during those estimates.

Mr. Shillington: — I am not . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Order! The member from North East Regina knows full well that the job of the chairman or the job of the Speaker is complete neutrality and I would not want to think that the member from Regina North East, whose career has been long and lengthy in this House, would want it any other way or impute it as any other way.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a grant in the Department of Health, grant to Saskatchewan Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. That is not the only money spent with respect to alcoholism and drug abuse, Mr. Chairman.

It is not the responsibility of the minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission to deal with excessive alcohol consumption. The responsibility of the minister in charge of the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licensing Commission is to administer the sales of alcohol. The Minister of Health has always had responsibility for excessive consumption of alcohol, and that's the subject we're dealing with.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is in order. And I say, if these questions are deemed not to be in order, then I want the Speaker brought back, because we have been asking these questions for the full 12 years that I've been in this Assembly.

I ask you again, Mr. Minister, whether or not you had a report yesterday which clearly documented excessive consumption of alcohol by young people.

An Hon. Member: — Remember that one.

Mr. Shillington: — Remember that one, Mr. Chairman? It seems to have been the responsibility of the Minister of Health to allow . . . to commission a report on alcohol consumption by young people which pointed to excessive consumption.

The argument I am trying to make to him is an argument . . . is something that is patently self-obvious to everybody in Saskatchewan, and that is that those advertisements, which feature young people and beer and wine, are contributing to the problem.

I have, Mr. Chairman, a piece of evidence here, which I think suggests that. Because the consumption of beer and wine is up. And I want to know whether or not the Minister of Health does not admit that these statistics do suggest that advertising alcohol and beer do contribute to increased consumption.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I say, we don't keep accurate results of consumption, because I don't know how one is going to do that with young people, other than questionnaires, and the questionnaires we have put forth indicate that there hasn't been any dramatic change in consumption over the last 10 years.

As I've said time and time in this House, and that's why I commissioned the study, I'm concerned about treating kids. We all know there's kids out there that are hooked on a number of drugs, and they have alcohol abuse, and they have drug abuse, and solvents and so on. I've said it time and time again, as Minister of Health and minister in charge of the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, I'm interested in developing plans to provide treatment for these people. Now they may want to stand in here and talk and talk and talk about advertising. There is no empirical evidence to indicate that advertising raises consumption. You can go all across North America and you won't find that.

But we can find that there are kids out there that have problems. I don't know what causes the problems. It may be a broken home. That's hard on a kid in his teen-age years. It may be loneliness; it may be poverty; it may be affluence; it may be a number of things. It may be a single-parent home; it may be a feeling of poor self worth.

You know, you taught school, the same as I did. You know when you face a class, there's 30 or 40 kids in there. And each little fellow and each little girl comes from a little different background. And he enters into that whole dynamic of junior high school. Some excel in sports; some excel in academics; some are good in the arts. They're the lucky ones.

Some unfortunately don't find their niche and they gravitate to a peer group that says, let's make our mark in life by getting high. And they find all ways of getting high. And I want to indicate to you, and I've taught many teen-age students, and I'm sure you have, and I know the member from Regina North West, if he would tell the truth in here, would say the same — that with young people in high school, peer group pressure is the main motivator. The main motivator.

And there are many things in peer group pressure that can

influence a kid. Many things. I know that my member from Wascana could stand up in this House and give everyone in this place a very good lesson on what makes young people tick. A man that could take boys from all parts of Saskatchewan, right off the combines and off horseback and off hay racks, and turn them into the best football team in Canada year after year after year, understands young people.

And I could tell you a government that gentleman is related to and a part of would certainly be interested in helping young people, because I say I don't think there's an individual in Regina that has higher esteem for understanding and helping young people than my colleague and friend, the member from Wascana.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — And I would say to you that that member can tell you what makes young people tick. I can tell you that my deputy minister, sitting beside me tonight, who came up through the ranks of teaching in Saskatoon to become the director of the Catholic school system in Saskatoon, understands young people better than most in this province. When you have people like that as your colleagues and people like that as your advisers, I can tell you that we are concerned with the treatment and the health of these young people in Saskatchewan.

I can tell you that those are the kind of people, those men who have dedicated their life and their career to helping young people, can tell us what the need is. And they believe that the need is to try and bring about other programs, bring about associations that will take these young people that are headed up the wrong road in our society and give them a chance to get back into the mainstream, to take part in their education, and to fulfil the potential that the good Lord gave them. That's what we want to do, and those are the kind of programs we'll be putting in.

The can talk about ads. They can talk about all these sort of things all night. I want to tell you that I am sincerely committed, along with the gentlemen that I have mentioned, to providing the best treatment services for young people in Canada. And we're going to do it right here in Saskatchewan, and we're going to develop it here, and we're going to ask a lot of people, a lot of concerned parents — as we did with the report — to give us the advice, and a lot of young people, on how we should best achieve that.

Now if the members opposite are against that kind of a procedure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the member from Regina North East would like to stand in his place and say he's against doing that, so be it. I don't believe he's the kind of individual to do that. I believe that he sincerely would like to help in the treatment aspects also. I haven't heard many comments from him as to say how we should best do it. I haven't heard that, but I do believe deep in my heart that that member, given the opportunity, would stand up and say, I think this is the way we should do it. Because I do believe that sincerely he perhaps has a concern. He's been in the schools for a few years, and I think he has a concern. And I think he's interested in seeing the report, and I've promised him, as soon as the

report is printed I will deliver one to him. I will deliver one to him.

And I ask him, as a person who's been involved with young people for years, to support the initiatives in there that are good, to not always be negative, to not always be casting gloom and doom and no new ideas. Certainly, there are initiatives that we can take in the recommendations in that report that I believe will help many young people in this city and in this province.

I want to get on with the job of doing that. We can't do it all overnight. This problem has been here for years and it is increasing. But I think it's time that we sat down as legislators and we looked at this because it is the youth of our province. It is the youth of our province.

I've put together a committee who have gone out and sampled the opinion as best they could. They've come with some recommendations. That report will be available in the very near future. And I ask the members opposite, if they're sincere, to come forward and say, look at, here are some things we think should be done. We encourage you as the government to do them. Here are some things we don't think are valuable. Let's discard those, if they can indicate those are not valuable.

But let's, as legislators, for goodness' sakes, in this province — when our young people are having problems there with cannabis, with gasoline sniffing, combined with alcohol — let's provide the treatment centers and let's quit quibbling away her hour after hour to see if an ad . . . where there's no empirical evidence has increased consumption. I say let's get on with the job and stop this nit-picking.

(2015)

Mr. Shillington: — Well I'm surprised to hear that the minister believes that questioning reports which suggest that 20 per cent of young people have a problem with alcohol is nit-picking. I'm surprised that that subject is a nit-picker subject. I think some people felt that that was kind of an important subject.

Mr. Minister, do you believe it is any part of the responsibility of the Department of Health to deal with the issue of excessive consumption of alcohol by young people? I would appreciate it if the minister would save me all the nonsense about treatment. None of us are against treatment. None of us . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, oh yes, there he goes. None of us are against treatment, Mr. Minister. We're all for treatment. We have said that. And your attempt to suggest that we are not is just simply making a fool out of yourself. No one's going to believe that.

Would you, Mr. Minister, deal with the question of excessive consumption and not treatment? Would you deal with that question? Tell us whether or not you think it's any part of your department's responsibility to face the problem.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, you know, I don't anger very often but when I hear him stand here two seconds ago and say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want to shout

from your seat? Go right ahead. Keep up the nonsense and the hollering. But I heard that member say very distinctly, and so did my colleagues — the member from Wascana heard him say this — he said, let's forget talking about the nonsense of treatment. He said that. I heard him say that. You can check *Hansard* in the morning. He said, let's forget the nonsense of treatment.

Now I rest my case there. I believe in treatment. He believes that talking about treatment for young people in Saskatchewan is nonsense. I say you should be ashamed of that statement. You should be ashamed of that statement because if that's what you believe, if that's what you believe — that treatment of young people with addictions is nonsense — then you should get up and you should apologize to all the young people in this province.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm going to repeat my question until the minister hears me. Do you believe it is part of the responsibility of your department to curtail excessive consumption of alcohol, as distinct from treating the disease caused by excessive consumption of alcohol which has not now and has never been an issue? Mr. Minister, do you believe it's any part of the responsibility of your department to attempt in a preventative fashion to curtail the excessive consumption of alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member, if he would pay attention when he's in the House, he might get the suggestions and the initiatives that we're taking. I don't know if he's seen these or not, but certainly the Christmas alcohol advertisements that come out definitely and say to people, consumption of alcohol and driving of automobiles will land you in jail in Christmas, could cost you your life; how would you like to spend Christmas alone; have been award-winning, have been tested on the population of Saskatchewan and have a 90 per cent recognition factor and also have the people of Saskatchewan saying, play them again year after year after year.

And he says, do you do anything to try and lower consumption? I don't know where he's been since the Safe Grad program has been in, the Safe Grad program which is adopted in high school after high school after high school. And the member from Shellbrook will attest that in his school, and I understand there's another one now — I think it's one of the collegiates in Regina — have decided that this year their graduation will be completely alcohol free. And that comes from the Safe Grad alcohol program.

We have health initiatives up in the Melfort and Tisdale part of the province, a program called Health Is it!; programs in several of these regions which have a strong component, a strong component in those programs against alcohol consumption for young people.

So for him to stand there and say, what are you doing — well there are some things that we are doing to indicate to young people that the excessive use of alcohol is detrimental to them, that they should be abstaining from alcohol whenever possible, and that they should not be mixing it up with their graduation and highs in their young lives. Because as we all know, all too often that results in an untimely death of a young person.

So I think there are some instances to indicate that we have taken a strong stand against the consumption and excessive consumption by young people.

Mr. Shillington: — All of the instances which the minister related with respect to efforts to curtail excessive consumption of alcohol were advertising programs. It is apparent the minister fervently believes that advertising can discourage the use of alcohol. Why does the minister insist that the same advertising programs cannot encourage the use of alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I just refer you to study after study across this country that will give you no empirical evidence. It's brand selection. And sure, it may change brand preference. It does that with the adult population. It may do it with the young people. I don't know. But I can tell you that there's no evidence to show that the alcohol advertising has upped the consumption.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, if advertising so effectively discourages consumption, why does the minister believe that advertising does not encourage consumption? Please deal with the question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, certainly, if he understands Safe Grad, which obviously he does not, Safe Grad is a lot of people-to-people program.

As I remember Safe Grad when I was teaching school, you would elect a child or young person from your school who would go to the Safe Grad seminar. They would gather in Regina or Saskatoon. I remember a gentleman that was very instrumental, and I give him a lot of congratulations — it's Gerald Kleisinger. Gerry Kleisinger would run these programs for the kids. He would bring them in and they would have a period of discussion and make a decision and a commitment that they would go back to their high school, and in that high school they would talk to their other grades and their peers, and they would institute a Safe Grad.

And I think that has had considerable success, and I give men like Gerry Kleisinger great support in that, and congratulations. I think they've gone a long way to helping young people with this whole problem of excessive drinking and carousing and driving dangerously at graduation.

I see it's going a step further now, and I congratulate these communities. I believe in Shellbrook it's the local Lions Club that are saying, look, we will transport you. And the kids have said, okay, we're going to have a good time that night and we're going to do it entirely without alcoholism.

So there's a lot of people-to-people programs too that are having a tremendous effect upon young people, and I believe also upon adults. I see time after time where service clubs are saying to adults, if you're out celebrating, call this service club and we'll drive you home. I see young people saying, we'll drive adults home. I see programs developing in the schools in Saskatoon where it is Students Against Driving Drunk. I see parents' groups saying, parents against drunk driving.

So it isn't . . . It's a lot of people-to-people work that is causing a great change in the attitude towards excessive consumption.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the Safe Grad program may involve advertising plus work in the schools. Your Christmas program was nothing but advertising. You just finished extolling the virtues of that advertising program as influencing attitudes about alcohol.

Why do you believe that your program, which attempted to discourage use of alcohol, did affect attitudes towards alcohol, while the vendors . . . while the brewers and the wine merchants, their advertisements don't affect the attitudes towards alcohol?

Why, Mr. Minister, is the advertising effective in the negative and not in the positive? I really want to hear you give us a crisp explanation for that rather strange anomaly.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I suppose maybe it has something to do with the season of the year too. You know, when you look and see, don't spend Christmas in jail, I think a lot of people think, I really don't want to spend Christmas in jail. And maybe that adds. You know, I don't know.

Maybe he would like to spend Christmas in jail. I couldn't say. I don't think many on this side of the House would like to spend Christmas in jail. Christmas to us is rather a sacred time. It's time of family. It's a time to be with your kids. I think that's what you believe, Mr. Chairman. In fact it may be a time to be with your grandchildren, I don't know. But I'm sure you appreciate Christmas and you sure don't want to spend it in jail.

So I think significant like that may have an impact. It certainly does because people say, show it to us, time after time. It's helping me not go out driving when I'm drunk. It's helped me, maybe saved my life. It's helped me to be home with the kids on Christmas morning, rather than in a jail cell. So I think the significance and the impact at that time of year certainly does have an impact.

Mr. Shillington: — The minister suggests to this Assembly that an advertising program which suggests that there are certain delirious effects associated with excessive consumption of alcohol may deter consumption. I buy that. That program, the Aware program, any number of others, have been effective.

Why does the minister not believe that an advertising program which associates good health, popularity, and other good attributes in young people . . . Why does the minister not believe that the association of those ideas is ineffective while the association of the evil effects of alcohol with consumption is effective?

I want to know why the minister thinks the Christmas ad was effective but the booze merchants' advertising is not.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I think you have to look at the nature of the advertising, the time of the year. There's many factors there.

I think you can't find empirical evidence to say that advertising of liquor increases consumption. You'll find brand selection. And I think that's what its designed to do.

The Christmas ads definitely come with a very solid message that if you drink and drive you're going to end up in the pokey. And I don't think many guys want to be there. And therefore I think it has a significant impact upon them.

I think we're comparing apples and oranges here because I think the time of the year certainly has an impact. I think the message, how it is directed, has an impact also. So you know, we can go on and discuss this. This is fine and dandy. But I think there's two different factors and I say the proof is in the testing.

You go back and I say you can't find empirical evidence to indicate that advertising increases consumption, but you can find designated spot time advertising at Christmas concerning safety and driving has had a significant impact upon the attitudes of people.

I think they're two different things, to tell you the truth.

Mr. Shillington: — Does the minister acknowledge Dr. Saul Cohen to be an expert in the area of alcoholism?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I don't know. If I say he's an expert, he'd want to know what I define an expert as. Certainly Saul Cohen is a respected person in this field in Regina.

Mr. Shillington: — Do you admit that his experience and his training equip him to make an accurate judgement with respect to problems associated with alcoholism? Do you admit, Mr. Minister, that his experience, his background, his training, equip him to make accurate observations with respect to alcoholism?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I can certainly say that Dr. Saul Cohen and I meet continually and have a lot of discussions on this. He certainly has been one of the proponents of my encouragement of Mr. Epp on adopting Saskatchewan's policy on the educational aspects of alcohol advertising. I can say unequivocally that Dr. Cohen supports that and has encouraged me to support Mr. Epp. I think Dr. Cohen has been surprised to see that many of the commercial stations are advertising the positive aspects far in excess of the 15 per cent. And I met with Dr. Cohen just recently, before he went for his winter vacation in the South, and we are scheduled to meet again in May and go to Mandan to look at the services there. I meet with Dr. Cohen approximately once a month.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay. I take it from the fact that you meet with him once a month that you value his opinions. I think that's probably a fair assumption.

Let me read to you what Dr. Saul Cohen had to say with respect to the effectiveness of liquor advertising. He said, and this is a direct quotation:

However, there is evidence that youth are the most influenced by alcohol advertising. Youth are

at a very impressionable age and are readily influenced by their environment. In this regard the role of advertising is significant. One only has to reflect on the tremendous impact of advertising of toys over television has on children, especially at Christmas time. There is every reason to believe that alcohol advertising messages will have similar influence on people's attitudes and behaviour towards the use of alcohol.

Do you accept that, Mr. Minister, as an observation from one whose skill and training qualifies him to make such an observation?

(2030)

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I would accept that as another attempt for the member to quote out of context. I know that prior to the advertising coming in, Dr. Cohen had that viewpoint. I have met with Dr. Cohen many times since the advertisement has been on. Dr. Cohen has indicated to me on numerous occasions that he believes that the positive ads are having a significant impact, and he has congratulated the media facilities for playing them more than they have.

So I would say the member does the same thing that he does time after time after time. He tries to take a quote from a person and ridicule that person. He will not speak to a person outside of here on a topic like that. He wants the immunity of the House. I say that that — and I don't deny that quote came from Saul Cohen — but to stand up and say that is the viewpoint of Saul Cohen today is certainly an exaggeration, and I think a disservice to Mr. Cohen. Because I meet with Saul Cohen all the time and I can tell you that Saul Cohen's opinion has changed considerably, because he has seen and he deals — and he deals with these young people. And he has seen in many cases the beneficial aspects of that advertising.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you obviously have been out of the class-room for too long. Because a little while ago you were referring to being in the class-room and the kind of attitudes that young people have. Well, I can tell you that I have just recently come out of the class-room, and I will not accept anything you say, when you say that advertising does not have an influence on young people, whether it applies to the buying of certain kinds of clothes, or buying certain kinds of records, or the buying and the drinking of alcohol. That is just an inaccurate statement, not supported by the best kind of information that you can find.

Oh, it's supported by the liquor companies, of course. Why wouldn't they provide you with all kinds of documentation showing that all it does it try to get them the share of the market, as you will argue?

Well I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that when you go into an elementary school of 400 students, and you hear some of those children coming to school singing the jingles of the beer ads — you're not going to tell me that it hasn't had an influence on them. And it happens every day. Return to that class-room and find out for yourself, sir.

So don't use that as a justification for your misguided policy on liquor advertising, in order that you might be able to reward those who help pay your campaign expenses. Because that is not a legitimate argument on your part.

My colleague from Regina Centre a minute ago quoted from a very distinguished person, who had an opinion on liquor advertising, and at that time said that it was not the appropriate route to go. You stood up and you say, well that's an old statement.

Well, let me give you something that's very relevant and very up to date. It comes back from this report which you have refused to deal with the public — your advisory committee report, here, which I referred to on Friday last in this House.

And let me read you what this report says on alcohol advertising — and says it to you, because it's your advisory committee.

And I quote word for word:

Television is a powerful medium that most adolescents watch for hours every day. Alcohol is not only promoted through liquor advertisements but through the characters and the activities depicted on various shows. Since the fall of 1983, Saskatchewan had permitted beer and wine ads on T.V. and radio, and spirits through print media. A large number of briefs opposed alcohol advertisements, particularly those advertisements which associated young people, recreation and alcohol.

Those are the large number of briefs that were presented by people who made presentations to this committee that you appointed — which has done, I think, a pretty good job.

It goes further to say, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister:

... some studies suggest young persons are more susceptible to advertising, particularly lifestyle advertisements. As well, a large number of parents and others see the advertisements as presenting inappropriate role models.

And just to give you some statistics — not statistics but arguments based on statistics — it tells in your report to you that, based on Canadian figures, liquor advertisements average \$4 per capita, or a tenth of all mass media advertising.

Now that is a massive amount of advertising, Mr. Minister. Are you prepared to stand up in this House and suggest to the members and others in the public that that kind of an expenditure of money is simply made for some benevolent reason and not to promote the greater sales of alcohol? If that's what you're prepared to do, Mr. Minister, that's fine; you go right ahead and do that.

Your committee interviewed students — and I'm not going to mention any students, because that's strictly confidential, but I'm going to refer to some comments

which some of them made. One student is making a comment on alcohol advertising just blatantly said straight out: no alcohol commercials. Another case: TV ads should be banned because of the influence that reaches younger people. These are students talking to you, Mr. Minister. Another one:

The comment I have about alcohol abuse is that I think the alcohol is being abused. And beer commercials create a scene of sports, and alcohol is totally not needed because it creates a fad which should not be used.

And all that this advertising does is promote that kind of fadism. It makes the consumption of alcohol on a regular basis appear like the socially correct and appropriate thing to do. It attempts to make that young person feel that in order for him or her to fit among their peers, the peer that you spoke of, you have to do these things, because it makes you part of the action.

Don't tell us that 85 per cent advertising promoting alcohol is going to be counterbalanced by 15 per cent of your kind of advertising, which talks about something else. I mean, if you're going to suggest that that is some kind of an even handed balance, then I have difficulty understanding where you're coming from, Mr. Minister.

So the arguments you make here . . . And I wasn't going to get into this debate, but you seem to consider me some authority because of my recent coming from a class-room. And I don't consider myself an authority, other than I happen to be a parent, and I happen to have been a teacher, and I have been pretty close to some of those kids that I worked with, some of them who needed some particular kind of help.

And when I took a survey with my students on a lot of issues, which I took every year, I can tell you that those students, when asked by me and others in my staff if they felt that advertising had an influence on them — alcohol advertising — in the vast majority, said yes. These are middle-year students; these are division 3 students, Mr. Minister — the students who are at the age where this kind of influence is very, very powerful. And that's the kind of influence that you have been promoting, or your government has been promoting, because you have allowed, immediately after your election, the advertising of alcohol.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, and members, I think a man who would stand in his place and say he's the father of children and a committed teacher would have the commitment to not leave out certain portions of the report. He read certain, select portions. Just for the people that may watching tonight and for my colleagues in the House and the members opposite I will read entirely, and I will not leave out the terms that the member opposite who stood as a teach and as a parent, and I will show you when I come to those sections, omitted parts of the report.

It's on page 19, under discussion. And when my colleagues have it, I ask you all to look at it — page 19. Let's listen. Now if you want to shout from your seat, because you omitted sir, you know very well you omitted

significant lines . . . I'm going to read this into the record and I would ask that the members opposite would be quiet and listen to it. It's under discussion, and you can check *Hansard* in the morning and see what I'm reading and what the member opposite:

Television is a powerful media that most adolescents watch for hours every day. (I heard him say that about five minutes ago.) Alcohol is not only promoted through liquor advertisements, but also through the characters and activities depicted on various shows.

Those are shows like the Edge of Night or these soaps I guess they're talking about.

Since the fall of 1983 Saskatchewan has permitted beer and wine ads on TV and radio and spirits through the print media.

That's nothing new. Spirits through the print media have been here for a long time.

A large number of briefs opposed alcohol advertisements, particularly those advertisements which associated young people with recreation and alcohol.

Now my colleague read that. But you turn the page, and on page 20 it says, and I want you to pay particular attention because he didn't read this:

It is difficult to directly link . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Oh, shout from your seats when it gets touchy. I will start again:

It is difficult to directly link advertising to increased consumption.

Did you hear him read that?

An Hon. Member: — No, he left that out.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Alcohol advertising has escalated in recent years, while overall alcohol sales have levelled off or even dropped.

Did he read that?

Some Hon. Members: — No.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Then he went on to say:

The industry contends that alcohol promotion is not intended to increase overall consumption, but shift market share from one brand to the other.

An Hon. Member: — He didn't read that either.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes.

However, some studies suggest young persons are more susceptible to advertising, particularly life-style advertisements. As well, a large number

of parents and others see the advertisements as presenting inappropriate role models. (But he omitted this.) In discussion with adolescents, it was frequently mentioned that the advertisements had no effect on consumption, but they enjoyed watching them. (He omitted that. Then he went on to say) Based on Canadian figures, liquor advertisements averaged \$5 per capita or a tenth of all mass media advertising. In Saskatchewan the 1983 regulations which allow alcohol advertising also require that 15 per cent of the advertising be devoted to educational messages. (Then he forgot to mention) It seems most stations exceed the 15 per cent quota with messages on drinking and driving and so forth. To some degree the educational messages help counter the promotional messages. As well, the federal and provincial governments have developed and aired in their various health promotion programs. These include the federal dialogue on drinking, as well as the generation and the Break Free* anti-smoking programs.

And it goes on, Saskatchewan Health, and Safe Grad, and so on.

I say to you sir, you know I may have been out of the class-room a little longer than you have, and I didn't have the great opportunity of teaching grade 3 throughout my career. But I want to say to you, at least when I got up to quote something to a student, I read the whole thing. I didn't use selective reading as you did in this House three or four minutes ago. And I say to you, if you're going to be man enough to quote from a document, do it all, and cut that out, the selective reading, because that's a shame to you, and that's a disrespect to an educator to do something of that nature.

You should be ashamed of yourself, as a father, and as a teacher, to stand up, to stand up and deliberately omit — deliberately omit — the lines on the top of page 20 which says:

It is difficult to directly link advertising to increased consumption. Alcohol advertising has escalated in recent years, while overall alcohol sales have levelled off or even dropped.

He omitted putting that into the record. That indicates to me a deliberate attempt to mislead this House and the members in this House — and more, of course, the public out there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, now that the minister has finished his ranting and raving and his hollering, we can get back to dealing with some of what he has mentioned. Notice that he indeed read . . . and I could have read the rest of it too. The problem is Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well maybe I'll wait till all the members on the government side have stopped their yelling, because I can't even hear myself speak, Mr. Chairman. When they have settled down, then I will be prepared to carry on here. The member from Moosomin seems to be leading the parade here.

Mr. Minister, you did indicate that the report does say that it does not have any influence on some. Well I agree, and so will the public agree, that advertising does not have influence on some. But if it has influence on any amount, does it make that policy correct, is what I ask? And I submit to you that it does not make it correct.

(2045)

One of the reasons I am not reading from your report, Mr. Minister, because even though you stand there in this House with the printed version of the report in your hand and read from it, you still haven't tabled it. Now I ask you, as I did on Friday, what are you hiding? Are you hiding the fact, Mr. Minister, that your final report which was written by your people, may not quite be like the final draft which your committee submitted? And I kind of suspect, Mr. Minister, that when we compare your report, the one you tabled, to the drafts, final drafts which I have here, which I was provided with last week, that we are going to see some rather interesting discrepancies in your report compared to this one. I submit to you that that's going to happen.

I say again, whether there is an influence on 15 per cent of the student or young peoples' population, or on 30 per cent, on 40 per cent, the policy that you have instituted is a bad policy. How is it that those 10 or 15 or 30 or 40 per cent don't matter? They do matter, because we're talking about here, about the unfortunate incidences of abuse and the problems that are created. And it's those people who find themselves in situations of abuse who are the ones that are going to be influenced. That's the argument you're making, that it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter that some are influenced and some aren't. I submit to you that it does matter. It matters a great deal.

I really feel a little — and this is not on the subject but since you mentioned it I will say it — I feel that it's a little unfortunate that any minister of the Crown, and I've heard some of your private members say this across the way, but somehow you relegate people who may have taught grade 3 as being inferior teachers. I really take objection to that on behalf of teachers in the elementary school system.

I submit to you, sir, that a teacher teaching in a grade 3 class-room, which I quite frankly did not ever have the honour to do and I would have appreciated it because it would have given me a better perspective, but I submit to you, sir, that anybody teaching in a grade 3 class-room is just as important as a teacher as you might have been in whatever level you taught in. And for you to stand up in the House and make that statement, I think that your Minister of Education should have something to say to you about that at your next cabinet or maybe caucus meeting. Because I can tell you, sir, that there are going to be some teachers and some parents who are going to have something to say to you about that.

And the best thing you could do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I'll continue as soon as the member for Moosomin stops yelling . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And he's yelling some more. I suggest to you, Mr.

Minister, that the best thing you could do before we finish this deliberation of this estimates in the next hour and a quarter, that you should apologize to the teaching profession for the kind of inane comment you have just made about those people who are teaching at any particular level, whether it's university or the high school, as the member for Wascana was involved in and did a tremendous job, or whether it's a teacher in the division 3 level or a teacher who's teaching in the division 1 level. And you know that.

The problem with you, Mr. Minister, is when you were pressed — and that's one of the roles of a member of the cabinet, sometimes you will get pressed. I know that the pressures are great. And I know that they're particularly great when you're not prepared to answer question and you have to stonewall them and when you've got everybody who you are supposed to be serving in the health field, nurses and chiropractors and doctors and the public and the chairman of your board saying, please, Mr. Minister, do us a favour and resign. I know that's tough. That's pressure. But don't let that kind of pressure cause you to take on people who you have no right to take on and be critical of. I say that to you, and I would like you to reconsider.

I simply ask you, Mr. Minister, two questions: (1) do you think that even if 15 per cent of the population of young people is influenced by advertising, that that makes the policy okay; and (2) has your alcoholism commission, before it became the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission, or has your Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission given you a recommendation saying that you ought to allow advertising on the electronic media of alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I take exception to the member's remarks. You know, he tries to insinuate that somehow I was criticizing grade 3 teachers across this province. There is only one grade 3 teacher I was criticizing, and he sits right over there — the member for Regina North East, who stands in a sanctimonious and pious manner thinking that because he has taught grade 3 for a number of years, he has all the insights into adolescence and alcohol and drug abuse.

I happen to spend 15 years as a principal of a junior and senior high school, and I saw it firsthand. I saw it firsthand. And I think within that situation you have a little better feeling, a little better understanding, of the pressures that junior high kids are under, when they're coming into adolescence and puberty and they're trying to say, look at me, here I am, have a look at me. And as I described a while ago, the pressures that are upon them, and the variety of backgrounds they come from, that's the indication I was putting out.

But for the member to stand up and try and draw the longest bow I've ever seen, to say that for some reason I'm against grade 3 teachers, is simply not credible. I mean, that's plain stupidity, and that's what he indicated. I was against one grade 3 teacher, one grade 3 teacher who now represents Regina North East, who doesn't have the dedication to quote from a document in its entirety. That's the teacher I was criticizing, and I'll stand in this House and criticize him time after time again, because I think as

an educator and a man of letters, that is unacceptable for you to let on that those other lines weren't in there. And I think you should apologize, because all you were trying to do is mislead this House.

So for you to stand up here and try and make some great protestation on behalf of the grade 3 teachers in Ile-a-la-Crosse and in Buffalo Narrows and Nipawin and Melfort and Moosomin, is simply not in the cards. There's one grade 3 teacher I question, and that's you, because you don't have the integrity, you don't have the guts, to read the whole thing. You want to try and mislead people by reading selected portions. And as an educator, I say that's inexcusable, and you should be ashamed of doing that. So let's set the record straight: there's only one I'm criticizing, and that's that gentleman right over there, and I make no apology for doing it.

Furthermore — furthermore — he talks about young people. And if there is one young person in this province that's suffering from addition, suffering from the use of drugs, multiple use — sniffing gasoline and Lysol and so on — I'm concerned about it. I want to see how we can best treat that young person, be there one, be there 20, be there 500, how many there are. This government wants to find the most appropriate way to treat those people irregardless of what kind of situation got them into that deplorable condition that they're in today.

That report will certainly address some of the ways we can do this. It has gone to the printers now. It'll be available to all members as soon as it's printed. The member opposite has a report that was distributed to members of the committee. I suppose some member thought it would be in the best interest of the committee to give him that report. That's fine and dandy. If they so wish to do that, fine. The report I was quoting from is not the same report as that, because that was never submitted to me. There is the report — there is the report.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, now we know, now we know.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly. And now you say, now we know. You know what they're saying from their seats when they say, now we know? They're criticizing the committee. They're criticizing the committee that had a preliminary draft, a preliminary draft of a report which somehow that member happened to get his hands on. I don't care how he got it, he got it. Fine. A preliminary draft. What I quoted from was the report given to the minister, the report given to the minister. And I will be distributing that report when it is printed.

So there's quite a difference between a preliminary draft which may not be the same in any way, shape, or form as the report submitted to me . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now he says aha, aha! Changes! Well, those changes, if they were brought about, were brought about by the committee. And if he wants, if he . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's correct. That's absolutely correct. Oh, you want to shout from your seats and says it's wrong, and make noise, and disrupt. That's fine.

The member from Shaunavon continually in this House is the most raucous member in this House. Night after night, after supper he is so noisy he just raises Cain all the time,

shouts from his seat continually and won't let his colleague sitting beside hear the comments I'm giving him.

I said to you, sir, you have a preliminary draft. I have the support submitted to me by the committee. If you want to criticize the committee from changing from the preliminary draft to the report, you do so. But you must realize, sir, you are criticizing the committee.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I beg to differ. Because I am not criticizing the committee. I read for your benefit from the page which happens to be the second page of this report which was presented to you and dated February 27, 1986. It states:

The Honourable Graham Taylor, Minister of Health, Room 38, Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan.
Dear Mr. Taylor: We are pleased to present the final report of your Advisory Committee on Alcohol, Drugs, and Youth.

Now I really think, Mr. Minister, that there is a distinctive difference between a preliminary report and what is said to be, in the report itself, the final report.

Now if there are changes, Mr. Minister, I ask you, have you had since February 27th, a meeting of this whole advisory committee, Mr. Minister? Since February 7th, has there been a meeting of this advisory committee to discuss the final . . . the report which you have, which I'm going to ask you to table today because you have it? And if you don't want to table it, we're going to ask you for some time, why, since you gave us a commitment on Friday that when the report is printed and you have it you're going to table it immediately. You say you had it. You read from it as if it was the report, and you are trying to say that this one was inaccurate. So I'm going to ask you later to table it.

But will you answer my question? Has your advisory committee had a meeting since February 28th, or the 27th, when they presented this to you to consider the report further to what they presented to you?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — You've been going on for some time talking about February 28th. That's when the final draft report was put in place by the committee. The report came to me — and this will be a little surprising to you because you've been hollering about February 28th for I don't know how long — on March 20th. March 20th it was presented to me by the chairman of the commission.

He presented me with copies of the report which I have distributed to my colleague, cabinet colleagues for a part of the social policy subcommittee of cabinet. They have reviewed it. We have decided as a cabinet to make it public. The report is at the printers and just as soon as the report is finished printing, I will, as I have said time and time again, I will deliver you one personally. Just the day after it's printed, when they come in my office, when they come in my office and I have them in my office, I will give you one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm giving you the printed report, the final report, the same one as the public will get. And I've told you, I think I've told you, and if you're at all honest you must admit that I've told you, I

believe, four times in the last week, that the day I get the report, I will personally go and give you one. If that makes you happy, I will give you one. You can have the first copy.

An Hon. Member: — I'll come to your office.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Come down to my office. I would be glad to have you down in my office.

I would say this. If you would come to my office, if you would come to my office and discuss a health care issue with me in my office . . . I would tell you, in four years, other than Norm MacAuley, who was a member of this legislature previously, who tried, and tried, and tried under the NDP to get a hospital for La Ronge, finally came in because he knew me as an opposition member and said, Graham, he said, maybe you'll listen to me. And he said, I tried with those guys, he said, and they wouldn't listen to me. And I said, Norm, I enjoy you, you're a nice fellow. We had a good talk. And I can tell you, La Ronge are getting a hospital. Construction and planning for the construction is starting now.

But I say to you, member from Regina North East, and I think you may be the first one, because I've got a little more faith in you than some of those other ducks. You would be the first, you would be the first NDP member since May the 10th of 1982 that ever entered my office to sit down and say, do you think you could do this in health care? You would be the first, and I can tell you, I will deliver the copy to you. If you want to come down, I'd welcome you to my office. We can sit down and go through it as two gentlemen and look at it. And you can say, look, Mr. Taylor, I think this is bad and you're crazy there, and I'll say fine. And you can say, I think this is good, and we should implement that. And our caucus would even support that. I would challenge you, I challenge you to come to my office when the report is ready and say, I believe this is good. And I can tell you my colleagues would support you on this initiative. I put that challenge to you tonight.

(2100)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I am really gratified that I am in your good books again. A little while ago I wasn't so sure.

You've got us a little wondering here. A little while ago you picked up a book handed to you by one of your officials. It looked like a pretty final piece of work to me. It was printed, it had spiral coils binding it together — not stapled like this — which was presented to you. You read from it as if, and you indicated it was the final report already printed now. You're now saying, when we ask you if you would table it, sorry, somehow it's not printed again. Are you suggesting that you only printed one copy, and that somehow the rest are to be printed at your convenience when you are prepared and ready to release it, when you think it's the most opportune time for you to do so politically?

I'm quite prepared to come to your office and pick it up. But that's not what I'm asking for. That's not what I'm asking for, because I'm not asking for me to get this report;

I'm asking for this report to be made available to the public of Saskatchewan, because it is their report as much as it is your report.

And so I am saying to you, since you have the report in your hand, and no amount of denying can change that now because you know you have indicated it's there, why will you not table it tonight so that we can have an honest look at it? What is preventing you from doing it? And don't tell us that it's because it isn't printed, because you just finished reading from the printed version, and you know it. And you know it.

Except that when we got to talking about it, you began to back off again, or if it isn't a printed version, Mr. Minister, then you are misleading this House in pretending that it was. Because when we pressed you a little further, all of a sudden it was not the printed version.

Now what is it? I'm asking you one more time: are you prepared to table that report tonight, because you seem to have it? And two, will you answer my previous question? Are you listening? Will you answer my previous question, which you failed to answer? Have you received a recommendation from the alcoholism commission, as it was, or the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission? And if you have, I'd like to have you give it to me, the written portion, recommending the advertising of alcohol in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well certainly getting back to the report, what I was reading from is a xerox copy of the report. I want to give you a very nice copy, and I will give you the . . .

An Hon. Member: — Why does it have coils?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well sometimes we put things together with coils. You may have done that in school. I don't know if you did or not. Sometimes I had students, I can remember they used to send in reports to me. Some would be coils. Some would have a nice plastic cover with a thing on the back. Some would be stapled. This one I chose to coil. So that's why it's coiled.

But I want to tell you, I'm going to give you the best copy, the first copy. I come here early in the morning. So the day they're in, I'll ring you; you come on down; we'll have a look at it. I'll sign it for you, if it would make you happier. I'll do that for you, and you can have it. But I don't think you want me to give it to you before the press get it, before the public get it, before the board of SADAC get it, before my colleagues get it. I don't think you want that. You just want to have the same fair treatment, and you're going to get it. In fact, you're going to get a little bit more. You're going to come down to my office, and if you want coffee, I'll give you a coffee, and I'll sign the report, and I'll say, here you are, Mr. Member, there's your report.

But I'm going to hold you to task, too. I'm going to say to you, what do you think of this recommendation? Do you think you could talk your caucus into supporting that? I'm going to ask you those questions. I'm going to say: are you opposed to this kind of a treatment facility? Would you support that? Because I'm going to ask you that. And I'm going to ask you a lot of questions that you and I'll sit

down, not here where you can stand up and try and score a point or hope to get a headline, but right down in my office where two guys, elected, two school teachers, one from the high school and one from the elementary — about the same amount of time. We can sit down. Both concerned with young people in Saskatchewan. And we can say, let's you and I just move politics aside and say, this has got to be good for the kids of Saskatchewan.

I'll invite the member from Wascana down, because he will certainly tell us. Maybe he's got a little more wisdom than you and I in this, and he'll say, I think recommendation 13 is a good one; 12 may be harder to achieve.

Let's all work for this for the benefit of young people of Saskatchewan. That's what we'll have. That's the conversation we'll have down in my office that morning, and you'll have the first copy.

You asked me if the alcohol commission had asked me to advertise alcohol. Well you know as well as I do, I am not responsible for the advertising of alcohol. Certainly the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm not. It is not under my jurisdiction. It is not under my jurisdiction at all. You must realize that.

Certainly they have not written to me and said, we support you advertising alcohol. But if they're going to have discussions, or correspondence, they would have it with the minister responsible — the minister in charge of the liquor commission. So as I've said time and time again, when his estimates come up, ask him those questions.

But certainly I am not the minister who says we advertise alcohol or we don't advertise alcohol. My mandate, and you were once the Minister of Health and you should understand that, is that my mandate is to deal with the treatment — the treatment of people who have alcohol and related problems.

In the most recent year, because drugs have taken on a larger component of abuse within our province, we have changed the commission to take in drugs as well as alcohol. So it is a commission that looks at two aspects of treatment of not only young people, but people throughout the spectrum of Saskatchewan society.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I'm a little amazed by how lightly you all of a sudden are taking this issue. You may want to joke about it. And you may get all of your cabinet front benches and your caucus members laughing about it as they have done for the last five minutes as you went into your little speech. They seem to think it's funny.

I want to put on the record, I don't think it's funny. I think what we're talking about here is a very serious issue. You have said that on a number of occasions. I only have to take your word for it. And for you all of a sudden now to treat it as a very light-hearted kind of an issue, I think really puts to the question your total sincerity.

I know that you're not in charge of the Liquor Board, Mr.

Minister. I know that you may not be the one who signs the Bill or presents the Bill or the legislation that permits alcohol advertising. But you are the Minister of Health. You are the one who is mandated to present to your government arguments and recommendations on the well-being and the health of the population of Saskatchewan.

If the alcoholism commission was not consulted by you to give its recommendation when your government was considering the allowing of alcohol advertising, then you have been derelict in your responsibility. Because it was up to you. And I don't know whether they give you a recommendation one way or the other. That's why I'm asking. And I'm only saying what I'm saying because you stood up in the House a minute ago, and you said that you never asked the alcoholism commission. I say, why wouldn't you ask your alcoholism commission to give your government a recommendation on whether there should be alcohol advertising allowed?

It's a very peculiar situation when you have the minister in charge of the Liquor Board pushing booze, and the Minister of Health curing the ills. That's not the way it ought to work. One would think that you would get around a cabinet table and even consult your caucus once in a while — you know, it's useful to do that — and talk about the issues. And the minister, whoever it is who's responsible for the allowing and the regulating of advertising of alcohol, would make his arguments and you would make yours, which I hope would be mine, and that you would have . . . win the day. But obviously if you were making that argument, you lost.

Now in consideration of that kind of an issue, you should have had a recommendation from the alcoholism commission. I'm asking you: did I read you right or did I hear you right when you said you did not ask for a recommendation? I thought I heard you say that. I may have been wrong, but can you correct me?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, I didn't say that at all. You heard me wrong. You can check the *Hansard* and see my comment there. You know, you indicate that there seems to be some strange situation, that there's one minister in charge of the liquor commission and another one in charge of the alcohol commission — and that has existed for some time.

And you say there's one minister pushing booze. I can go back through, and I will refer you to *Hansard*, the number of outlets that you opened under your administration — the number of outlets, a tremendous number of them by the NDP, the walk-in liquor stores opened by the NDP. Your party in Manitoba, and I won't criticize you for that, but the NDP in Manitoba — dial-a-jug, we'll deliver it today, home delivery, the same-day delivery. That's the status of the NDP.

I want to indicate some of the initiatives that we have taken in SADAC during the 1986-87 funding. In 1986-87 budget estimates indicate an overall increase of 7.5 per cent in the budget of the Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission. Number two, this includes a new benefits package for 23 community agencies which are funded by SADAC, constituting an increase to the funded

agencies of 9.8 per cent. I think this is a substantial increase and remedies a long-standing situation that had developed under previous governments.

Again this year, and we've talked about this, I've appointed a minister's advisory committee on alcohol, drugs, and youth. And this is the first such committee established in Saskatchewan and also across Canada to address this very important issue. As I have stated, I am currently reviewing this report and it will be taking action very shortly. And I've committed to the member opposite, I'll give him a report.

Last year I initiated a review of the status of Saskatchewan alcohol commission and at the request of the board, which resulted in a revision of the existing legislation — you'll remember that, Mr. Chairman — including a new name for the commission, that being the Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, reflecting the commission's broad mandate to address issues of drug abuse as well as alcoholism. So you see, we've expended the mandate.

And also I've indicated to the board of the commission that I'm very interested in the development of a five-year plan for the alcohol and drug abuse are to complement the initiatives taken by my government in other five-year plans in health.

So those are some of the initiatives that we have taken with SADAC in this budgetary year to increase, shall I say, the effect. I'll say that it's influence upon the lives of Saskatchewan people, and to improve the management — or the treatment would be a better word — the treatment of people who are suffering from this type of addiction.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would consider the Saskatchewan Safety Council a body whose judgements and observations with respect to traffic safety are worthy of note.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I think the Saskatchewan Safety Council have some good advice to offer in some situations.

Mr. Shillington: — I wonder if the minister is going to answer the question. Does the minister believe that the Saskatchewan Safety Council is a body whose judgements are to be respected with respect to questions involving traffic safety?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I don't know the people on the Saskatchewan Safety Council. I don't have dealings with them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want to continue to shout or do you want to hear the answer? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, you can hear your shouting, and in fact you're often clucking. If you aren't shouting, you're always clucking in this House. Now which do you prefer to do? If you want to continue to cluck, do so.

(2115)

I tell you that I don't know the people on the Saskatchewan Safety Council. I'm sure that there are

some very good people on there, and they're concerned about safety, and I imagine that their concerns and reports are certainly things that impact upon safety. But I have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, I have very little doing with them. I imagine the minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Board deals with them in great detail. But I would like to see what the member is concerned about.

Mr. Shillington: — Do I take it to be a serious position, Mr. Minister, that you don't know the Saskatchewan Safety Council and are unable to offer an opinion as to whether or not their judgement with respect to matters involving traffic safety are worthy of note?

Mr. Chairman: — Order! I fail to see how the member from Regina Centre is tying this into a question related to health. And if he can do so, I will accept it. Otherwise, I think we'd better get back to the minister's estimates.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, as the minister vaguely suspects, the Saskatchewan Safety Council have had something to say with respect to liquor advertising. That's why I want to know whether or not their views are worth discussing in this Legislative Assembly. I ask for the response of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I've been very liberal in discussing . . . That's a hard term for me to use. I've been very considerate — and there's no similarity between Liberals and consideration — but I've been considerate in discussing the whole thing of liquor advertising.

I must say again, it does not fall under my mandate. I'm not the minister responsible. So any quote coming from the Saskatchewan Safety Council about liquor advertising should be addressed to the member in charge of the liquor commission, Liquor Licensing Commission, or else the member in charge of the Highway Traffic Board who deals with the Saskatchewan Safety Council.

Now the member may want to bring some point out. But I think, Mr. Chairman, in fairness we must keep these estimates onto Health estimates. And I cannot be responsible for every quote that the highway safety council makes or everything about liquor advertising, because I'm not the minister responsible.

I'm the minister responsible for the treatment of people with liquor and drug problems. And I have outlined time after time initiatives that we are taking to address that, and I will discuss that with the members opposite as long as they want to discuss it. But to see what I think about a statement of the Saskatchewan Safety Council, which more would appropriately be addressed, I'm sure, to the Minister of Highways or else to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan liquor commission . . .

Mr. Shillington: — Well, as the member admitted a moment ago, you also have responsibility for programs which seek as their end to curtail excessive consumption of alcohol. You boasted, you stated with great pride, what a sterling program your Christmas advertising program was. And maybe it was a sterling program. I'm sure it was; I'm sure it was effective.

The point we have been trying to make is that those programs which encourage the consumption of alcohol, whether they associate alcohol with rugger games — I was going to say soccer games; that's not accurate; I think they're rugger games — or whether or not they associate alcohol with old, red trucks that won't run very well, and pleasant summer evenings spent by young people, they seek as an end to encourage the consumption of alcohol.

Mr. Minister, you have responsibility for those programs, such as they are. They're pitiful compared with the programs which encourage the consumption of alcohol. You admitted you have responsibility for it.

Let me assist the minister by reading what the Saskatchewan Safety Council had to say. Well it was fairly direct:

The increased visibility and availability of alcohol conveys a message, especially to young people, that alcohol should be an integral part of their future lifestyle.

And then the letter concludes:

In summary, the Saskatchewan Safety Council is opposed to any measures that will make alcohol more available, such as mass media advertising.

Mr. Minister, why is it that you think that that recommendation from the Saskatchewan Safety Council should be disregarded?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, I can't see where that makes it more available. "Available" is the number of outlets. And I indicated that it was under the government previously that there was a gross expansion in the number of outlets. So certainly, if you advertise it on television, that doesn't say it's more available. That's what he ended his quote with. He said that the alcohol is more available. I don't see the correlation between an ad and availability — none whatsoever.

Availability comes in places where you have walk-in liquor stores, such as were brought in under the NDP party — a number of them. Availability comes in more lounges, more clubs, more dining rooms. I gave the statistics. I could dig them out of my files again, but they're in *Hansard* for all to read. I think it was about a week ago that we brought these figures forward.

So for the member to end a quote on something about availability — I think he should look at the actions of his own government when they were in power.

Mr. Shillington: — Let me, Mr. Minister, quote to you the portion I'd like you to comment on:

In summary, the Saskatchewan Safety Council is opposed to any measures that will make alcohol more available such as mass media advertising.

The particular comments of the Saskatchewan Safety Council did not have anything directly to do with availability. They had something to do with conveying a message that alcohol is part and parcel of a bright future

life-style. That was the comment from the Saskatchewan Safety Council. Why, Mr. Minister, do you believe that those comments ought to be disregarded? Their comments are crystal clear, Mr. Minister. They're opposed to what you're doing. why don't you respect their views?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm not saying that their comments don't have some degree of validity, but I just can't see the logic. And again I go back to this supposed lawyer who seems to . . . I don't know what kind of inferences he draws, saying that . . . Again he quoted to me that advertising increases consumption and availability.

Now I don't watch these ads; I don't know anything about them. But I can tell you, I can't see where advertising says anything about availability. I don't think there's an ad in Saskatchewan that says: run down to Slim's corner store and grab yourself a beer. You know, if that were the case it would say that's where it's available, at Slim's corner store or at Johnny's pub. I don't see those kinds of ads. So I don't know what he's talking about when he says advertising increases the availability.

Mr. Shillington: — That is not what the Saskatchewan Safety Council said, Mr. Minister. I'd ask you to stop disregarding what is fairly plain language.

The increased visibility of alcohol conveys a message, especially to young people, that alcohol should be an integral part of their future life-style. In summary, Mr. Minister, they're talking about the message conveyed by the advertisements, not its availability.

In summary, the Saskatchewan Safety Council is opposed to any measures that will make alcohol more available, such as mass advertising. I ask you, Mr. Minister, to address yourself to the message that alcohol should be a part of their future life-style. Why do you think the Saskatchewan Safety Council's views on that subject should be disregarded in favour of your own?

Mr. Chairman: — Is item 2 agreed?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — We both have more questions on item 1, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Did the member for Regina Centre have a question for the minister?

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, I do. I can understand why the government caucus is in a rush to get off of it. I would not describe health as this government's most sterling success. It seems to me, Mr. Minister, there have been a number of people who have been detracting from your successes. And I can understand why you want to get away from it, Mr. Minister, I wonder if, since you believe that Saul Cohen — and I frankly, I frankly doubt your word. You suggest that Dr. Saul Cohen has now changed his mind, he's now in favour of liquor advertising. Is that what you're saying? Because if it is, I'm going to be contacting Dr. Saul Cohen for an explanation as to his views. That was the impression you tried to leave us. Is that what you're saying, or were you just simply trying to mislead this Assembly?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, getting back to some of the guide-lines, then I'll address the question of Dr. Cohen. Getting back to some of the guide-lines that are in the regulations concerning the liquor amendment regulations 1983, I think to try and inform the member, difficult though it may be, what the regulations are concerning the advertisement of liquor. I would like to quote these into the record so that the member would be able to see the guide-lines, strict guide-lines that were put on if he should be able to understand them.

It says the board shall not approve an advertisement where, in its opinion the advertisement:

- (a) encourages the use or consumption of liquor;
- (b) contains family scenes, drinking scenes, or scenes involving minors;
- (c) associates the use of liquor with activities prior to or in conjunction with the operation of a motor vehicle, aircraft, boat, or snow vehicle, or activities involving skill or elements of physical danger;
- (d) claims that liquor causes any healthful effects or benefits;
- (e) conveys the impression that liquor is an important or necessary element of an activity;
- (f) creates the impression that liquor may be used or consumed in a way or manner prohibited by law;
- (g) states prices; or
- (h) contains any personal endorsement of liquor by any person who may be generally known or recognized.

In connection to Mr. Cohen, the quote that the gentleman red out previously was one taken from Mr. Cohen prior to the introduction of advertising.

All I can say is that Mr. Cohen has indicated to me on numerous occasions that he thinks that the educational aspects — he agrees with the Hon. Jake Epp — that the educational aspects of the liquor advertisement in Saskatchewan is having an impact. That is, he has indicated to me and to the executive director of the alcohol commission. I'm not saying he favours advertisements. I'm saying that he's indicated to me on a number of occasions that he does believe that the educational portion is having an impact. And I think that is also seen by my colleague in Ottawa, the Hon. Jake Epp, who is adopting the Saskatchewan model and suggesting it to the CRTC as the model to be followed by all provinces in Canada.

Mr. Shillington: — Has he ever indicated to you that his opposition to the advertising of alcohol by brewers and by wineries has changed?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No, I can't say he has changed his opinion on that. But I can tell you what he has told me and has told my executive director, that he does think that the Saskatchewan model — he realizes that the advertisements were coming in, Mr. Chairman. The member makes a big to-do about this. The advertisements — you must have read magazines in your day, I'm sure a number of them in your professional career. There has been liquor advertising in those magazines as long as I

can remember.

Cable television was coming in across the line all the time. Dr. Cohen has said that he saw that those things were happening, and he says that in his opinion the 15, and I should give credit to the networks — it's in excess of 15 per cent in most cases, in some cases up as high as 50 per cent — are having an impact, a positive impact.

(2130)

The same type of statement that was said in the report by the committee on youth and alcohol and drugs, where the kids themselves said, 300 children that had been — young people that had been interviewed by the commission — said that it didn't affect the consumption patterns. Many of them watched them because they liked the look of the ad, not because it convinced them that they should be drinking any more.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I gather that the upshot of your statement which, I suggest, was intended to convey an impression that Dr. Cohen no longer ascribed to those views, I think there is no other fir interpretation to be placed on your remarks, and you were attempting to suggest to this Legislative Assembly that Dr. Cohen no longer ascribed to those views. You have now stated that that is not accurate. He has not changed his views.

He apparently believes, Mr. Minister, that the positive advertising would suggest that alcohol consumption should be curtailed is effective. He also believes that advertising which seeks to promote consumption by private brewers and wineries is effective. Why, Mr. Minister, do you accept just one-half of that equation that advertisements which attempt to affect attitudes towards alcohol by curtailing consumption are effective, but those which attempt to affect attitudes towards alcohol by increasing consumption, are ineffective? Why do you accept just one-half of Dr. Saul Cohen's position with respect to the advertising of alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Because, Mr. Chairman, as I've said time after time, there are no empirical studies that indicate that advertising increases consumption. Brand name preference, yes — consumption, no. All I can say, and he has every right to ask Saul Cohen and if he wants to phone him, fine. I'll even give him his number. I don't know if Saul will be very anxious to talk to him, but that's up to Saul. But I will indicate to you that he has indicated to me, as he has to others, that he saw the situation before, and there was no positive advertisement at all. He has told me on numerous occasions that he thinks, and that's to the best of his knowledge and I don't question his authority on this topic, that he thinks that the positive ads are having a beneficial impact in some cases. He said that to me personally. He's told my director the same sort of thing. So I guess to go further on this would be to talk to Saul Cohen himself, and I invite the member opposite to phone Dr. Cohen and to discuss with him and ask him, if you're really sincere and interested. I doubt if you would. I doubt if you would phone him. I doubt that very much because I know your degree of sincerity is very, very minuscule. I doubt if you would take the time to phone him and ask him that question.

Mr. Shillington: — I have a suggestion for the minister. We have on occasion called witnesses before the bar of this legislature. I ask the minister, are you prepared to second the motion that Dr. Saul Cohen be called to this Legislative Assembly as a witness, as an expert witness, with respect to advertising and alcohol consumption? Mr. Minister, if I ought to call him, then perhaps the public ought to have the benefit of his views. Are you, Mr. Minister, prepared to call Dr. Saul Cohen as an expert witness with respect to advertising and alcohol?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Saul Cohen . . . and I take exception to the kinds of things that he insinuates about Dr. Cohen. Dr. Cohen and the committee have travelled this province; they've been in many, many areas of this province, have travelled the province to talk to committees, to talk to groups, to talk to people, to outline the concerns of the alcohol commission. I'm sure if the member wants to call Dr. Cohen, he can call him himself. But to ask Dr. Cohen to come in here, I think it's just simply ridiculous. Dr. Cohen travels this province, as do the members of the commission.

If the member wants to meet with the commission members, certainly he can come and meet with them at any time. But I doubt if he'd take that interest, because all that member is interested in is trying to score some cheap political points. That's all his arguments are. That's all it ever is — and that's the same for the member of Shaunavon, the member from Regina Centre, the member from Quill Lake s- they're all cast from the same mould. If they're not shouting from their seats in here, or clucking like chickens, or throwing socks in the air, all they're trying to do is score some cheap political points at the expense of some very dedicated people in this province. And I take exception to that kind of nonsense.

Mr. Shillington: — I move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon, and I'm prepared to accept an amendment with respect to the wording of this, as it's been done very quickly. I move, seconded by the member from Shaunavon:

That Dr. Saul Cohen be called to this legislature as a witness with respect to alcohol and the advertising thereof.

Mr. Chairman: — According to the rules of the committee of the whole House I find that this motion does not meet what I will say:

That the practice of permitting substantive motions in the committee of the whole and committee of finance be discontinued.

Adopted December 10th, 1980. The motion therefore is not in order.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, it is in order with leave. SO I ask for leave to move the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — For the benefit for the member for Regina Centre, it is not granted with leave.

Mr. Shillington: — You have misunderstood your role, Mr. Chairman. You have misunderstood your role. You have to ask government members if they will give leave, and if . . . Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, you must . . .

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Regardless of leave or not, I have read the rule, and it is final that it is not permitted to present these motions.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, you are wrong, and I suggest you get some advice on this before you go any further. I have asked for leave . . . Let me finish. I asked for leave to move this motion. There is an obligation, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Do I take it that the member from Regina Centre is challenging the Chair?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I gather, not wishing to deal with the motion moved by my colleague, the member for Regina Centre, it struck me that the subject matter was absolutely germane. We had the minister putting forward what is surely an unusual proposition, a very . . . and I heard him put it forward, that electronic advertising which is directed to lower the consumption of alcoholic beverages is very effective; but electronic advertising directed to increasing the consumption of alcoholic beverages is not effective.

When asked why this remarkable situation obtains, he says of the one: it is effective because people say it is; that is why the electronic advertising will reduce the consumption of alcoholic beverages. When asked why the electronic advertising wouldn't increase the consumption of alcoholic beverages when it makes it look attractive, when it associates it with the sporting activities, and young people, and fun, and all the rest of it, he says opinions are not relevant, there's no empirical evidence.

May I ask the minister: what empirical evidence is there that electronic advertising, which discourages the consumption of alcoholic beverages, is effective to do that? Would you give me the statistics which have illustrated this, and which, in your judgement, is empirical evidence?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I guess one of the things, that certainly indicates overall consumption in the province has gone down, so I don't know how you could equate that to any evidence that consumption has increased because of electronic advertising. It's gone down, simply gone down. So I don't know how you could relate advertising to an increasing consumption when consumption has decreased. I fail to see that.

Secondly, I was talking about the Christmas ads, and I indicated that it may well be the time of the year, it may well be the direction of the ad, it may well be the safety component of the ad. It may well be that people just don't want to spend Christmas in jail. I don't know. But certainly that one has a great impact.

Now you want to say that all consumption — and consumption hasn't gone up. But if you want to make that argument that consumption is affected because of

electronic advertising, I think you have to realize that there's many other types of advertising. There's print advertising, things of this nature, that certainly have an impact, as well as electronic advertising. Study after study indicates that overall consumption patterns have not increased because of electronic advertising. Brand name preference may have, certainly.

It's exactly the same as I explained to you about five nights ago, that that's probably why Chrysler and Ford advertise their cars — that Chrysler would like to sell a few more of its models than Ford does. So they advertise them, and they tell the qualities of their cars.

So certainly I would want to see where the member is coming from on his line of questioning. But there is no strong evidence that the advertising on the electric media has increased consumption — and you can look right across the country on this.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Surely, Mr. Minister, if you want to know where I'm coming from, may I respectfully suggest that you listen to my question? My question was: very, very simply and very narrowly, what is the empirical evidence that the advertising to discourage consumption is effective? I'm asking for the empirical evidence. That's all I'm asking, because I want to know what you're talking about when you use the term "empirical evidence."

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I think some of the things that are going on within our province is empirical evidence. I think the very fact that high schools in this province, this year for the first time in history, in recent history, have said, we're going to have a safe grad where there's no booze allowed — Shellbrook and also one of the collegiates in Regina here. I'd have to . . .

An Hon. Member: — Cochrane.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Cochrane. My colleague from Wascana, who was the principal there, indicates it's Cochrane High School. I think that's empirical evidence, that there is evidence that people from the 145 per cent ads are saying — they're getting to young people — that's what Saul Cohen is saying. He says, I can see that they are doing some good out there when I see . . . And I don't think you'll take exception to this, and if you do I'd be very shocked. I don't think you'll oppose — surely you won't — the two high schools have elected to have entirely safe grads — no liquor involved at all. I congratulate those schools. I hope you would stand in this Assembly and do the same thing. I hope they set a pattern for other schools in this province. And I don't think you can stand in this Assembly and say that the positive 15 per cent ads could not have affected some of the decision of that school. If that is true I think there is empirical evidence that there is a change coming about, and that, to some degree, may be the responsibility and the impact of those 15, and in some cases up to 50 per cent, positive and educational ads.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Everyone, I think, congratulates any school that has a safe grad which doesn't involve the consumption of alcoholic beverages; fair enough. What I found a little difficult was your linking that to the advertisements. You were saying,

and, Mr. Minister, what I asked you for was not empirical evidence that there might be less consumption, but empirical evidence that there was less consumption resulting from these advertisements. And all I heard from you was a comment that perhaps it couldn't be denied that they might have had some effect. And that is empirical evidence. That is what you're putting forward, Mr. Minister, as empirical evidence.

(2145)

You put forward a proposition of fact, and then you say, I say it's due to X. Can you deny that it just could have been due to X, and if you can't, that's empirical evidence. Now this is a remarkable judgement as to what is evidence and what isn't evidence.

But let me pick this up a little more. The figures I'm now using are somewhat older figures because they have regard to what happened in 1984, a period when there was liquor advertising, electronic advertising of beer and wine. And to your knowledge is it not true, sir, that during that period, that calendar year 1984, the consumption of spirits declined, the consumption of beer went up, and the consumption of wine went up? And I ask you, sir, when wine was advertised, and beer was advertised, and spirits were not advertised in the electronic media, is not that empirical evidence based upon your test that those ads led to an increased consumption of beer and wine and not in spirits, because surely what other explanation do you offer for the consumption of spirits declining and the consumption of beer and wine increasing during that 12 month period, when there was no electronic advertising of spirits, and there was electronic advertising of beer and wine?

You have doubtless observed and studied those figures for 1984, and I would be happy to have your explanation of them and your admission that that is, to use your words, empirical evidence that beer and wine advertising increases consumption.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I think, sir, if you want to find out the details ... (inaudible) ... you'd have to question the minister responsible and in charge of this. He can give you much more detail than I can because that is his mandate, to be looking at the sales.

The figures that I have, and I will share with you, and I have before, that in '79-80, spirits, presented below are the Saskatchewan per capita consumption levels as compared to 11 other jurisdictions. I gave this to you before. The spirits in '79-80, we were the sixth lowest compared to 11 others. In 1983-84 — and you admit this — we were the eighth lowest in comparison to other jurisdictions. In wine, we were the fourth lowest in '79-80 and we stayed at the same for '83-84. In beer, we were the lowest and we stayed the lowest and we moved to the fifth lowest. And those are the figures that we have, and any further detail ... Certainly you could question my colleague and he may have more information, but that's the information I have, and as I've told you members of your caucus, time after time, that we are certainly concerned with treatment, and I'm bringing forth a report.

I've said to your member from Regina North East — we've even made an agreement to meet to exchange the report. And I asked him, and I ask you, sir, to look at that report. If there were recommendations in that report you don't agree with, you have every right as an opposition member to criticize it. Nobody disputes that.

But on the same hand, on the same hand, as an elected legislator, a person who I hope is concerned with the welfare of our youth in this country, you have the same obligation where there are sound and legitimate recommendations. And I want to say to you, sir, these are not recommendations coming from me. These are not partisan recommendations. These are not Tory recommendations. These are recommendations of a concerned number of people that I've put together on a committee, to go out and look at this situation, to talk to 300 young people across this province, to get their input.

And I say to you, and I ask you sincerely, if there are recommendations in there that you think should be supported, you can call me; you can write me. I would appreciate your support because I think this is a bigger thing than pure politics. I don't think it's right to be playing politics with young children who need help, who need help, who need their lives straightened around. I think that's bigger than all of us. I think that's a thing that we should put our shoulder to the wheel together and try and help those young people. And I ask you that.

Certainly I can't find the empirical evidence to indicate that advertising is increasing consumption. If you can, bring it to me; I will look at it. But I don't know if you know if there's studies of that degree around either. So I just say to you, if there is a problem out there in society, it didn't happen overnight. You know that as well as I do. And it's getting more complicated. Each and every year there seems to be new drugs, new things that young people are becoming addicted to. I'm sure five or six years ago, or eight years ago when I entered this legislature, I don't think you and I ever discussed the effect of cocaine on our young people. It's here today. It's here today. It's rampant throughout our society.

We've got to sit down; we've got to take a look at this. We can't play politics over the lives of young kids. We've got to come up with suggestions that we'll put together to try and help solve that situation. We're not going to do it overnight. I don't think you expect us to. You were in government for a number of years; you didn't solve it. We've been in government four years; we haven't solved it.

But I think with suggestions, with sincere appreciation of the problem, with all of us working together for the betterment of the young people of Saskatchewan, we can make a dent upon this, Mr. Chairman. We mightn't solve everything, but certainly as elected members we will be doing what the people of Saskatchewan have asked us to do; to try and collectively solve problems that face those out there in our society, who due to immaturity, who due to lack of education, who due to lack of parental support, who due to a multiplicity of factors, have got themselves into jackpots that they can't solve themselves. That's what I want to do.

We can sit here tonight and argue and argue empirically: does this affect this, or does that affect this? Let me tell you, as we stand here and go through our intellectual arguments on empirical influence and proof, there's a kid out there tonight in Saskatchewan, somewhere in Saskatoon or somewhere in Regina or in Meadow Lake, that needs some help.

I think what we should be doing is letting us get on with the work of governing this province. Let us get on with building the institutions that will help these young people. Let us get on with putting programs into our schools that will benefit them. Let us get on with bringing them the awareness of what the terrible effect of these combinations of drugs can do to these young lives when they're in their prime.

I know that the member opposite shares with me, he shares with me that desire — at least, I hope he does — to try and keep these young people developing their potential and to try and steer them away from these addictions that so many are caught up in. That's what we want to do. That's what I think the report will lead us to do, and I welcome the support of the opposition in marching together on something that I think is bigger and above political partisanship.

We can fight politically wise over a lot of things, in health care, in agriculture, in many aspects of the governing of this province. That is the way politics are. So be it. Fine and good. I'll take my shots at the opposition. They can certainly take their shots at me — at any of my colleagues. But I think with this matter of drugs and addictions in our youth, we would be wise to quit bantering politics about it — to stop that, and to get on with building a system that will benefit those people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we're all indebted to the minister for this little lecture. I want, however, to ask him again about something which, whether he believes or not, is still true, that many people regard the consumption of alcohol as a very serious problem for young people. Many people believe that this society, which we have a responsibility to help to shape, should not be encouraging the consumption of alcohol by young people. And many people believe that the electronic advertising of beer and wine does that. Whether the minister subscribes to that view — he obviously does not, but many people do.

Many people such as Dr. Saul Cohen, whose views ought not to be lightly cast aside; many, many of the people I have talked to — people who work in churches and other organizations are very concerned about the abuse of alcohol. They're concerned about the abuse of other drugs, but right now we're concentrating on alcohol. And they are concerned about anything which our society may do which puts the stamp of approval upon the abuse of alcohol.

And they take the view — I know the minister does not — but they take the view that ads which glamorize the consumption of beer and wine lead young people to the belief that this is thoroughly, socially acceptable

behaviour and leads . . . it is the argument, an argument which I share, that this adds to the amount of abuse.

I may say, parenthetically, that nothing we're doing here in any way stops the minister from getting on with the job of the work which he earlier spoke of, with respect to the abuse of other drugs.

I put forward to the minister some statistics from 1984; he did not see fit to reply to them as to whether or not there was an increase in consumption of beer and wine and a decrease in the consumption of spirits. I maintain that was the situation. He suggests I ask the minister in charge of the Liquor Board. I'm not encouraged by that suggestion. The minister in charge of the Liquor Board, as the Minister of Health well knows, is busy running sales and other proposals to merchandise liquor, as his general manager is perfectly free to state. And whether or not that's wise, we can argue when the minister's estimates come up. What I'm now talking about is whether or not it is wise to encourage young people to consume more and more alcohol. I say to you, Mr. Minister, I would like you to reply to my 1984 statistics, if you care to do so, and I would like you to do one other thing — would you repeat the last statistic you gave us, saying that dealing with the consumption of absolute alcohol?

And will you agree that whereas once we were the third lowest in Canada, we are now the fifth lowest in Canada? And will you therefore agree that our relative position with respect to the provinces has become less favourable since we are consuming more alcohol in relation to other provinces? Do I interpret those statistics accurately?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'll check that figure out for you through the Liquor Board. I'll check that out. There's some ambiguity there for us . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, there's one thing I just want to indicate . . . when the report from the Liquor Board here though — just to indicate to the member opposite who seems to be chortling away quite a bit over this serious topic, that the advertising of beer and wine and spirits has produced absolutely no increase in the sales and consumption of alcohol in this province. That is on the report from the Liquor Board. That's what they indicate, that the advertising has absolutely produced no increase in the sales and consumption of alcohol in this province. So I just thought we'd better end on that note.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.