

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ORAL QUESTIONS

Shand Power Project

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier and the minister in charge of SPC. On July 3 the Minister of the Environment, in answering questions during the Committee of Finance, speaking about the Shand power project in the Premier's riding, told the House on a number of occasions that the Shand power project would be subject to the same environmental impact review as any other major project.

In fact, at page 937 of *Hansard* the Environment minister said, Mr. Deputy Premier, the following:

Nobody has given approval to go ahead and develop either the Shand project or the Rafferty-Alameda at this time. They have to go through the review process and at the end of that process is when the decision is made.

My question to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, is this: in the light of those statements made by the Minister of the Environment, how can you explain the provincial government's cabinet order, under date of June 17, a copy of which I have here before me, which authorizes the purchase of two turbines for the Shand power project, at a cost of \$72 million, for the Marubeni corporation?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the Shand power project, and the lead time that's necessary to get that electricity to the consumer by 1992, when it's projected that it will be required, requires that those kinds of orders be placed now.

Any environmental assessment or impact study have nothing to do with the turbines, but have everything to do with the emissions and emission controls, so that there is no direct relationship between the order of the turbines and what may or may not be necessary to meet environmental requirements.

Mr. Romanow: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It may be true that the question of emission control and turbines are not related directly, but the fact of the matter is that the Shand project, of which the turbines are an essential part, is a subject directly of the question of the environmental impact study. And you have committed your government, seemingly, to a \$72 million expenditure in this regard. Are you telling the House that you're doing that purely on speculation? In other words, that the possibility will be, at the end of the environmental review impact study process, that there will be no go-ahead from the Minister of Environment, and therefore \$72 million is wasted?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the \$72 million turbines for the Shand project are in no way speculative

in nature. In fact the emission levels that Sask Power has been able to achieve in all of its projects, including Estevan, Coronach, and the environmental standards have always met or exceeded U.S. and Canadian standards. And that same level of confidence exists today. And the people at Sask Power and the outside consultants that have done their analysis are absolutely confident that there will be no problem in meeting any environmental requirement that's put on them by the Department of Environment.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Deputy Premier. I hear the Deputy Premier's assurance, as minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, that the project by SPC will meet environmental standards. That's not the issue, sir. The issue here is the credibility of you, your government, and the credibility of the Minister of the Environment.

And my question to you is simply this: are you telling us that because of your commitment of \$72 million to the Marubeni corporation of Japan to buy these turbines, that the environmental impact process — the hearing process — at the end of which presumably the total project will get the go-ahead or will not get the go-ahead, are you telling this House and the people of Saskatchewan that that whole exercise is a sham?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the turbines that have been ordered by SaskPower from Marubeni-Hitachi in Saskatoon are turbines that will be required for the Shand project. They must be ordered in time to have that capacity on stream, based on the lead times projected by the people that are in that business by, I think, 1992.

For that reason the turbines have been ordered to keep the project on stream. We have all the confidence in the world that we can meet environmental standards. We have in the past, we will in the future, and we have that level of confidence.

As it relates to the environmental impact study, there, I understand, has been a statement filed with the Department of Environment relative to Rafferty and Shand, and there will be public hearings, or Rafferty and Alameda, and there will be public hearings in that regard in the near future.

An Hon. Member: — For what purpose?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — The member from Regina North East says, for what purpose? Well, Rafferty and Alameda, Mr. Speaker, are dams. And they impact on environment in a different way than emissions from stacks, Mr. Speaker. And so we're talking about two different things here.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Deputy Premier. Let me ask the Deputy Premier this question: what happens, Mr. Deputy Premier, if, at the end of the environmental hearing process, the Minister of the Environment and the Department of the Environment

says that the project at Shand does not go ahead because it does not meet the environmental standards? What do you do with the \$72 million worth of equipment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, in the event, in the very outside possibility that that very hypothetical situation might occur, I suppose the first option, as the member says, is to get rid of the minister. And that's fair.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, Marubeni-Hitachi is not in the business of selling turbines to Sask Power alone. And I fully expect that, and I know, in fact, that they have bid on lots of other projects in Canada and in United States, and I fully expect that turbines of 300 megawatt variety would be marketable elsewhere.

So I don't see it in the same light as the hon. member. I think that it's, in fact, a wise decision to plan to have the project on track, recognizing the risk that's associated with those plans, and that risk assessment has been done and the turbines have been . . . the orders have been placed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, further supplementary to the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier would have the House believe that these turbines are, in effect, as somebody from this side has said, almost commodities which can be taken off the shelf. If they're not purchased and used here in Saskatchewan, he has every confidence they can be purchased and used elsewhere. And presumably that same approach could apply to the initial purchase of these turbines, but that has not been the case because you made the announcement back in September about your intention to do so.

An Hon. Member: — September '86.

Mr. Romanow: — I say to you . . . September of 1986. I ask you, Mr. Deputy Premier: is it not correct that the very fact that you've committed your government to \$72 million to these turbines in effect has effectively tied the hands of your Minister of Environment on this important issue and thereby has made the entire hearing process a total sham? Isn't that the situation?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I take it that that is the hon. member's position, and I don't think there's anything that I can say will change that. The fact is that we view this as a good project; we view it as being environmentally sound; we expect that we can meet any of the requirements, as we have in the past. And SPC, even in the days of your government was very good in that respect and is even better today, I suggest, in environmental matters.

Now, the risk assessments have been done. We are confident. And for those reasons we have gone ahead to keep the project's critical path on the path, Mr. Speaker.

Joytec Equities — Venture Capital Project

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is

to the Minister for Science and Technology, and concerns the government's claim that in this day and age every government cent spent matters. And it concerns Joytec Equities Incorporated of Saskatoon. This venture capital corporation, created in February of 1986, is supposed to manage . . . produce golf simulators. It's collected \$210,000 worth of taxpayers' money from your department. It has also collected in the neighbourhood of more than \$1.1 million in venture capital write-offs. But the company has yet to produce one golf machine for sale. It can't even meet its own March target deadline for production. I want to know what the reason for delay is, and when we're going to see some results from this kind of investment by Saskatchewan people.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question with regard to Joytec. I will simply say that Joytec is a very active company at the present time. The money that has been expended by our department, of course, is for research and development, and they are still in those stages. There is ongoing discussion with regard to sales with countries abroad, and I feel that the company is proceeding right on track.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, this company has been given every opportunity by your government. It's been given every opportunity by financing from your own department from the venture capital funds. It's had the Premier go to Japan to talk to Marubeni Corporation. It's even had space at Saskatchewan Expo, and there's still no production. When are we going to see some results? When are we going to see some jobs for Saskatchewan taxpayers?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to like putting down the good things that are happening in this province, and we take a lot of pride in the fact that our high-tech companies in this province are doing very, very well. We run second, or we run third behind Ontario and Quebec insofar as space technology and telecommunications is concerned. And we have a very active high-tech industry going on in this province.

Joytec, as I indicated, is a research and development company to this point. They have produced a few machines which they have been using for demonstration purposes. They have negotiations ongoing with companies in Japan and other countries throughout the world, and I'm sure that before very long we will see them producing a few of these machines in Saskatchewan. But for the time being, they are doing a lot of research and development.

Mr. Koenker: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. They certainly are doing a lot of research and development, but there's no production. Is the minister aware that on April 1, Technigen Corporation, which recently, a few months ago, took over Joytec, issued a press release claiming that it had sales agreements worth \$122 million to sell more than 6,700 simulators; and that at the same time, the Vancouver Stock Exchange investigated this claim out of concern for its grossly exaggerated claims that Technigen itself has contacts with the Panamanian company through the Swiss company, and that the Government of

Saskatchewan has gotten the taxpayers of Saskatchewan into quite an interesting deal with this company, and yet can show no results. When are we going to see results? What steps have you taken to protect Saskatchewan's investment in this Joytec company? Or is it a joy-ride?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that some of the comments made by the member opposite are certainly unfounded. I think that if he would look into it a little bit further, he would see in fact that it's a member of the NDP Party in B.C. that has raised this. And of course, right now there is an issue before the courts. It's been brought forward by Technigen. And some of the comments that were attributed to this individual have . . . and one of the newspapers involved . . . there is a case ongoing. And I think I would suggest that the member opposite look into it a little bit further.

As far as Joytec is concerned, they are a very active and viable company. And I'm very sure that we will be seeing a lot of good things happening there in the very near future.

Mr. Koenker: — I suggest that the minister himself take a look into the facts and into the charges that have been laid and have been tabled. And I ask again: what steps are you prepared to take to protect Saskatchewan's taxpayers' investment when your government has put more than \$1.5 million into Joytec?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member opposite that we have every confidence in the high-tech industry in this province and in Joytec. We have no reason to think at this time but what Joytec are going to provide a lot of additional revenues for this province through their golf simulator.

As I've already indicated, discussions are ongoing, and agreements have been reached with a company in Japan. And they are also negotiating other contracts throughout North America. So I have no doubt but what many of these machines will be manufactured in Saskatoon in the very near future, and we have no reason to be concerned at this point.

Sale of Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture, and it deals with one of the many ill-advised moves of your government, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, you will know that your department has made it well known to the entire world that one of Saskatchewan's top, if not as a matter of fact the top, tourist attraction, the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, is for sale for \$1. Last year, you will know, Mr. Minister, that over 150,000 people visited the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, with over half of those traveling more than 50 miles to be there and to enjoy the park.

The province has invested well over \$1 million in the

park, and it employs 14 people. It's a proven success and a proven asset for both the city of Moose Jaw and the province of Saskatchewan. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: why are you in such a rush to sell off such a valuable asset?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, we're in no big rush to sell off a valuable asset. What we're in the process of doing right now is calling for public proposals to see what kind of interest exists out there in the private sector. We'd like them to come along and give us some solutions to the problems we're experiencing, where we're losing a minimum of a quarter million dollars a year in taxpayers' money.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it's not unusual for a park of that nature to operate with a deficit. you and I both know that the value of that park is not found in the assets, the moneys that it accrues at the gate. The value of the park is found with the business that it attracts to the surrounding community, as well as to the entertainment it provides for families and children of this province and beyond.

Your government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the billion dollar smile tourism promotion. And I ask you, if you are truly interested in the promotion of tourism in this province, does it not make better sense to put the money into maintaining and improving facilities such as the Wild Animal Park? After all, what's the use of advertising for tourism if we're going to close down the tourism attractions?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, it makes eminent good sense to put more money into the wild animal park. But why should the taxpayers of Saskatchewan be putting money in there into a losing cause? If the public are willing to come forward, we will offer them a long-term lease, contingent upon the amount of money they're prepared to put in, and contingent upon the fact that it must continue to operate as a zoo.

Mr. Hagel: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you and I both know that the first offer for the sale of that park was made to the city of Moose Jaw. And the negotiations for it, I would offer quite frankly, were bungled by your department.

You will know that there are some governments in this province that are dedicated to spending taxpayer money wisely, and the city of Moose Jaw is one of those. Don't you think that in making that first offer to the city of Moose Jaw, that they deserve more than one month to make that very important decision?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, I think the city of Moose Jaw had considerable time. In fact we delayed the opening of the park to give them more time to consider, and they decided that it just was not a good investment because they didn't want to pick up the loss, that was being absorbed by the rest of the Saskatchewan taxpayers, by only the Moose Jaw taxpayers.

Mr. Hagel: — Final supplementary, Mr. Minister, I ask you to make a commitment in this Assembly today to the children and to the families of this province. Will you give this Assembly your word that a year from now, in the summer of 1988, the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park will be operating, regardless of whether or not you find a buyer to operate all or part of the operation? And will you also give us a commitment that the wild animal park will continue to be Saskatchewan's zoo for Saskatchewan children and Saskatchewan families.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to give a commitment that the zoo will be operating for many years to come, thanks to public participation.

Displacement of Saskatchewan Unionized Boilermakers

Mr. Gerich: — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour on the construction site at the Prince Albert pulp mill. I would like to ask the minister: are the Manitoba union boilermakers depriving local Saskatchewan union boilers of jobs?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, there's an ongoing problem that we're having in Saskatchewan with respect to the P.A. situation on jobs and the boilermakers' union. And the ongoing problem has started at Estevan where the boilermakers are insisting on bringing in Manitoba workers and displacing Saskatchewan workers.

And I had a call last night at about midnight with respect to the Prince Albert project where unionized boilermakers and the boilermakers' union, which is headquartered out of Winnipeg, is sending in workers from Manitoba, and they have allowed one Saskatchewan resident to be hired and have sent in three from Manitoba. And I'm trying to deal with this situation.

Mr. Gerich: — . . . (inaudible) . . . being discriminated against. What are you doing to correct this matter?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member from Redberry asked a supplementary, and we gave him that permission.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The situation with respect to union matters is governed by the by-laws of the union, and, in particular, this is an international union with no Saskatchewan local. And we are trying to have them establish a Saskatchewan local so that they will hire Saskatchewan union members. And we're running a constant problem here of resistance.

I've gone so far as to call the international president in Kansas City. But I still get reports of intimidation and a \$2,000 reward for any one of the members caught speaking to me. So it's a difficult situation. We may have to continue with the persuasion or maybe amend The

Trade Union Act to protect . . . We may have to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. If the minister has any . . . a few remarks to wrap up his answer, he can; otherwise we'll move to the next question.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been trying to use persuasion. But it isn't working and we may have to amend The Trade Union Act to protect Saskatchewan workers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Grasslands National Park

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know we all enjoyed dealing with the wild animals, particularly the one over from Melville. My question, again, is to the minister. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I am not going to ask the member at this time to withdraw that remark. But I would like to caution him.

And the member from Regina Rosemont, unfortunately, has engaged in rather unparliamentary remarks for some time. So I would like to caution him that those kind of remarks are not acceptable in this House. And I would like to once more remind him of that, and ask him to please refrain from making those types of unparliamentary remarks.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest that there was another domicile for the minister, the member from Melville. I won't, however, given your comments. My question is to the Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture, and it has to do with the long-awaited grasslands park, or creation of the grasslands park here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, in recent days we've seen reports where the formation of the South Moresby National Park has been accomplished, thanks, mostly in part, to the good works of the people for Parks Canada and their efforts to bring together a number of conflicting groups such as the conservationists, Haida Indians, and loggers. And they're able to do that and put in forward the park.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, whether or not you are now — given the fact now that South Moresby is off the platter of Parks Canada — whether in fact, you, on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan, will move forward and create the grasslands national park here in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I thank the hon. member for raising the issue. It's one that's been very near and dear to the Government of Saskatchewan's parks for some time. As the members opposite are aware, we ran into some technical and quasi-legal difficulties in the creation of the park. We seem to have come about 90 per cent along the way to having them solved. And I'm pleased to say that officials from my department, from Department of the Environment, and from Parks Canada have ongoing

discussions to try and ameliorate the situation and get it solved as quickly as possible.

Mr. Lyons: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the negotiations have gone on for a long time, stretching back from the '40s. In 1981 an agreement was signed with the federal government, an agreement in principle, which would put the park on the road. We've heard the same answer time and time again, that the negotiations are ongoing. Can you give a date in which you will make the announcement that in fact those negotiations have completed, and can you tell the House and the Assembly here, when in fact we can expect grasslands park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, the member is perfectly correct. There was an agreement signed in 1981. Unfortunately, what that agreement did was say, we will at some future date amend legislation to make this possible. The government of the day was the NDP. The minister of the day, former member from Morse, had every opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to introduce those amendments had he chosen to do so. He did not. This government is moving ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Order, please. Order, please.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Government Mismanagement

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under rule 16 of which I gave notice last Friday. Since the introduction of the budget by the Minister of Finance on June 17, my colleagues and I in the New Democratic Party have had people from every part of the province who have spoken to us expressing great concern about what was mentioned in that budget.

We have heard of deep concerns about past policies of this government which have brought them to the financial strait-jacket that they find themselves in today, and of present policies of the government which are destructive and do little to deal with the problems our people and our families face in Saskatchewan today, day after day.

On behalf of these people and countless others who they represent, and who have members on this side of the House represent, I move the following motion, seconded by my colleague from Regina North West. And I move:

That this Assembly condemns the provincial government for its mismanagement, wasteful spending, unfair tax breaks for the wealthy, and expensive patronage appointments at a time when it is unfairly increasing the taxes on ordinary Saskatchewan people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few words to that motion which I have just moved, seconded by my colleague from Regina North West. And on behalf of

these people, I move the motion, because many of the measures which we have seen in the budget, particularly those dealing with tax increases, are doing a great deal of harm for the well-being of many Saskatchewan people.

Now it may be seen by the government members opposite, and the members opposite, that by using the word "condemns," which I have done, that it's somewhat strong or harsh. I chose the words deliberately, Mr. Speaker. And before any of those members, as the member from Swift Current has just done from her seat, get too wrapped up in their indignation or their self-righteousness, I ask each one of those Conservatives, in this Legislative Assembly, to remind themselves of the people who have spoken to them in recent weeks, of the letters which they have received from thousands of people all over Saskatchewan, and the letters to the editors which they have read, all of which have said that the government is wrong, and that this government has been bad for Saskatchewan, and that this government has betrayed them.

Yesterday the Minister of Finance stood in this House and he introduced several Bills dealing with major tax increases for Saskatchewan families. And these Bills, I might add, are just the beginning. The budget announced a massive tax increase on ordinary Saskatchewan people, and there are more Bills yet to come. And at a time when there is a need for increased economic activity to create jobs for the thousands of unemployed and for our young people, tax increases will take away over \$300 million of consumer spending power and put it into the hands of this government to pay for the \$300 million-a-year, oil royalty holiday given to the oil corporations last September and in 1982.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is one comparison which illustrates better than any other where the priorities of this government lie. Working people and farmers pay more so that the wealthy and corporate oil sector can have more. Now the member from Weyburn says he's heard this speech; well he's going to hear it again and again and again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And I know he doesn't like it, Mr. Speaker, because he doesn't like the truth.

The people who live here in Saskatchewan, who work here, and who raise their families here, the people who have hopes and dreams of building their homes and their communities and their province, have imposed on them with these tax increases the greatest tax increase in Saskatchewan history. But the oil corporations who pump out an important non-renewable resource are given a royalty holiday of \$300 million a year. Now this, I say, Mr. Speaker, is a resource which we can only sell once. There is no second time. and if we give it away, there is a price to pay for evermore.

This government has chosen to give it away. And they argue that it has to be done to create economic activity. But where is it? Where is the economic activity? Who has

benefited? Where are the jobs? And why is our population decreasing? And why do our young people have to leave this province in order to find jobs?

Between 1982 and 1986, this government gave away over \$1 billion in oil revenues, and this past December, 1986, they announced that that policy of oil royalty holidays will continue even more and longer.

Now that kind of policy has had some very negative results, for which we are paying the price today. These policies have led Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, into record-breaking, 10-digit deficits. Six consecutive deficits have resulted in a cumulative deficit which will total approximately \$3.4 billion. In 1982 this government over there inherited a surplus of \$140 million, and through their mismanagement and political expediency they squandered it all and ran this province into debt. And now, now the taxpayer is forced to pay more and more, while they get in services less and less.

The record of its mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, is evident in a number of areas. The energy sector I have already mentioned — the massive give-away. And so what is the result? The oil is gone, the money is gone, and the jobs are gone.

And let me just provide an example of what happened. It had nothing to do with commodity prices. It had everything to do with conscious decisions of this Conservative government. In 1982 the production, in millions of cubic meters, of oil in Saskatchewan was 8.1 million cubic meters. The value of that oil was \$1,189 billion. Saskatchewan people received in revenues, through royalties and taxes, \$700 million, and we had a surplus of \$140 million.

In 1985, Mr. Speaker, when the production was 11.9 million cubic meters, and when it was valued at \$2.4 billion, do you know what Saskatchewan people received? They received \$655 million less than they received in 1982 because of this atrocious give-away.

That's why the Minister of Finance comes to this House in this budget and again introduces Bills to create massive tax increases on the citizens of Saskatchewan, because they've been so busy paying off their friends in the oil corporation sector.

Why we are where we are today? In 1973 when the price of oil in U.S. dollars on the U.S. barrel was \$3.89 a barrel, we had a surplus budget in Saskatchewan. In 1974 when the price of oil was \$6.74, we had a surplus in Saskatchewan. But in 1985 when the price of oil was \$30 a barrel because of this give-away, we had a deficit under this government of \$378 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that deficit was a deliberate decision created by the member opposite. It's mismanagement that led us to where we are today, and it's this mismanagement which has led to the largest tax increases on people in Saskatchewan history.

Now the energy sector is not the only example of the atrocious mismanagement of this government which now

is leading to these kinds of tax increases. The potash sector is equally as good an example of mismanagement.

When this government was elected in 1982, every year prior to that the potash corporation made profits: in 1980, \$167 million; in 1981, \$141 million. But after the election of this Conservative government, that changed, and there was a reason for that change. The reason was because the government set out to deliberately undermine the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — deliberately undermined it. The government has thrown away tens of millions of dollars a year by forcing the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to draw plans to compete on the world market with the private potash companies. And this decreased competition has benefited only the private, foreign-owned potash companies.

And let me illustrate that, Mr. Speaker. In 1981 PCS enjoyed 63 per cent of Canpotex off-shore sales — 63 per cent, 1981. By 1984 that share was only 43 per cent, because of the deliberate actions of this government.

And now the Minister of Finance stands up the other day, when questioned by the press, and he says he's going to turn over the \$810 million debt, much of which has been created by this government with their mismanagement, onto the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and increase their taxes even more, rather than have the potash corporation pay for it out of profits when it begins to make those profits again.

That's the kind of mismanagement and decision making that has brought about the massive tax increases the Saskatchewan people have had put on them.

I could talk about what's happening in the mismanagement in our highways. Here we have one of the largest investments made by the citizens of Saskatchewan, and year after year after year the government allows this investment to go into disrepair because they have not provided enough funding for the maintenance of those roads, so that a measure of Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan people is being allowed to deteriorate because of government mismanagement with inadequate maintenance. And the cost of reconstruction will be great, and the taxpayers will once again have to pay more.

Similar kinds of mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, have taken place in the areas of health and education. And here again we're experiencing a general deterioration in what were two of the brightest stars in the provincial system. The Tories promised to make health care in Saskatchewan number one in Canada. Everyone remembers that. Instead, the prescription drug plan has been decimated, the children's dental plan has been cut back, and rural hospitals are talked about in terms of rationalization.

Saskatchewan hospitals have experienced bed closures, reductions in teaching positions, and the loss of medial specialists. People are paying more through their taxes but getting a deteriorating health care system.

Cut-backs within the education system have also been

rampant. Technical institutes together cut by \$4.5 million. University operating grants, a zero per cent increase. Education development fund, which the Minister of Finance boasted about in his budget speech, cut from \$35 million to \$14.5 million. And the end result, the end result has been a great deal of confusion and dismay at these wrong-headed decisions. And education opportunities have been reduced.

Our students, our young people are being told by the Minister of Social Services that it's more important to save money than to provide jobs for them. And at the same time the Minister of Education is saying to them, to many of them, that they can no longer get an education. No longer can they get an education.

And in conjunction with this mismanagement, this government has taken abuse and wasteful spending and patronage to new extremes. Everyone knows about the Weyerhaeuser deal. Everyone knows the kind of sweetheart deal which was made to sell off this Prince Albert Pulp Company. There was no down payment. The \$248 million is payable . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. The member's time has elapsed.

Excuse me — why is the member on his feet, from Regina South?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I've got a special little group of guests that I'd like to introduce at this time.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of our Assembly, some special guests in the Speaker's gallery. And these little people are — there are seven of them, ranging in age from five till about eight or nine, and they're with the Whitmore Park Child Care Co-op. Their three teachers are Elizabeth George, Katharine Boughen, and Chantile Shannon. One is missing, but we'll catch up with her later.

Now while some of these little visitors, Mr. Speaker, are relatively young. I am sure that they will enjoy the tour of the building and examining the fine artifacts that are here, and certainly will enjoy the lemonade and stories that I'll share with them in a few moments time. I ask all members to welcome them to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Government Mismanagement

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to join with my colleague from Regina North East in this debate. The people of Saskatchewan are very disappointed in the government that we have operating in this province at the moment. They are expressing their discontent with massive demonstrations. They are

concerned about many things that are going on with respect to health care and so on. But I think what people are very upset about is the simple fact that they've been misled.

The government has preached fiscal responsibility, but they have practiced unrestrained fiscal irresponsibility. They have talked during election campaigns, not only in Saskatchewan but other parts of the country as well, about how they believe in less government, that less government is better government. And they'll tell you that in every constituency that you go to in this province. The PC party, the Progressive Conservatives, are the party of less government, less bureaucracy, and less red tape. They're the party of — as their members go around and preach — of less influence in the economy. They don't want to be involved as much with the taxpayers of this province.

(1445)

The Conservative party, the party of less government, has increased political patronage at unprecedented levels, Mr. Speaker. They have doubled the number of political aides that they have hired for their 16 cabinet ministers. They now have 183, paying in the vicinity of somewhere of \$10 million per year.

The Conservative party, the party of less government, has increased taxes at an unprecedented level in this province. They have increased taxes since 1982 to a little over \$1,000 per family of four, and that's very, very difficult for people who are making 18 to \$25,000 a year. And it's becoming more and more difficult with the massive increases that we witnessed in this budget of June 17, which provided a substantial increase added to that \$1,000 per family of four since '82. In fact, if you do the calculations, Mr. Speaker, the calculations will show very clearly; they will illustrate an increase of another \$1,000 per family of four in this recent budget alone.

The PC party, the party of less government, has a deficit of over \$3 billion. And what they've done is, rather than provide less government for people, they have harnessed and burdened the people of this province with a debt that they will never recover as long as this government is in power.

Is this less government, Mr. Speaker, all of these tax increases? Is this less government for the people of Saskatchewan? It's less government for some people, but it's certainly more government for the taxpayers of this province. What it basically provides is a deep, delicious pork barrel for out-of-work Conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina North East talked about Weyerhaeuser, and he talked about the sweetheart deal, and this is an example of the political patronage that we've seen. Another example we've heard in this House is the Peter Pocklington deal — the \$21 million subsidized loan from Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation), \$10 million of which is a gift, as an incentive to set up a pork processing plant in the province at the taxpayers' expense.

They have placed their friends in government positions at

fairly high wages. They have given Paul Schoenhals, a former MLA from Saskatoon, a nice plum as chairperson of the board of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — How much, John?

Mr. Solomon: — They have provided . . . That was a little over \$100,000. And the previous chairman was a part-time position receiving far less than that.

George Hill, a former president of the PC Party, another one of their friends, deep into the deep, delicious pork barrel, is reported to be receiving over \$200,000. And he's now chairman of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

A consulting contract provided to one Tim Embury of \$500,000, who was the MLA for Lakeview prior to 1986. Gordon Dirks, another former MLA, received a contract, untendered I might add, of \$35,000 for a study that was to be done in three months. Dennis Ball, who is now the full-time chairperson of the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board, is receiving \$122,000 as of 1985, which was substantially more for a position which used to be a part-time position as well.

It has spent, this government opposite has spent over \$20 million in the last fiscal year, that we have a record of, in advertising — self-serving government advertising at taxpayers' expense.

Investors and speculators have taken a large number of dollars out of the treasury, as well, through investment tax credits at the venture capital tax credit program. A small minority of people have been able to amass \$67 million in tax credits, Mr. Speaker. The amount of research and development in jobs created for the province is highly questionable. And the two examples we've seen are, of course, Supercart International in Regina, and now Joytec in Saskatoon.

We are seeing the government spending taxpayers' money in a mismanaged, loose, looney-goosey fashion on the Rafferty dam project; proposed \$600 million in the Rafferty and Shand operating station as well. And of course, information that we have is that these projects are purely political projects announced, and they'll be built in constituencies which are represented by the Premier and a fellow cabinet minister.

And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, as these patronage appointments are going on, ordinary citizens of this province are compelled to pay higher rates of taxes. We heard about the gas tax, which is a 15 per cent increase, roughly a 15 per cent increase in the gas tax it was on over four years ago. The sales tax had been increased by 40 per cent, as we heard. And, of course, the flat tax increased from 1 per cent to nearly 2 per cent. What this means is, rather than increasing the basis points of the provincial tax, which is now at about 52 or 54 per cent (for each flat tax point increase is equal to seven basis points), so in effect we've had a 14 per cent basis point increase over the previous 52 on our income tax payable to this government for their follies and their schemes.

The average taxpayer has paid about \$107 million in flat

taxes alone in terms of increase. And on top of that, they've lost the property improvement grant, which resulted in another \$80 million increase in taxes. At the federal level as well, initiatives have increased the burden of taxpayers of this province. There's been a \$1,000 net increase in taxes per family from '84 to '87 alone. Meanwhile, over 60,000 profitable corporations in Canada currently pay no taxes under this new proposed tax reform of Mr. Wilson.

We've seen, in this province, a tax increase of \$73 a month to nursing home residents. we've seen a \$20 a month increase in home care fees for low-income seniors, and a \$50 a month increase in home care fees for seniors who don't qualify for the government subsidy. We've seen the abolishment of the drug plan which will increase costs to the tune of \$50 million to Saskatchewan residents, Mr. Speaker. We've seen increases to tuition fees at the university level. We've seen increases, as well, to people who use our parks and our recreation facilities.

The government talks about fiscal responsibility. We've seen massive tax increases at unprecedented levels. The government talks about the economy being under control and the economy prospering in this province. We've had more bankruptcies in this province in the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, than any other province on a percentage basis. While the Devine government manages to find large sums of money for large corporations and political friends, Saskatchewan consumers and small businesses are abandoned to face tough economic times. We have tough economic times in this province. There is no great revival of the free enterprise ethic under this free enterprise government.

In 1986, Mr. Speaker, there were 21 per cent more bankruptcies in Saskatchewan than in 1985. This figure represents the second highest bankruptcy rate record in Canada — dwarfing the Canadian percentage rate of 6.5 per cent. In addition, there were 2,234 disappearances from the province's corporate register in 1986. This is a significant indicator, since a business doesn't have to go bankrupt to close its doors.

We can talk about these bankruptcies, and we can talk about migration — the outflow of young people leaving this province, as the member from Regina North East touched upon. And what is more alarming than anything, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have, from January to June of this year alone, nearly 4,600 people who have left this province more than entered. And what that does to this government, in my view, is provide another nail in the coffin in terms of their program of fiscal responsibility, their program of job creation they've been talking about over the last number of years, and really destroys their argument.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, last year you may recall we had over 14,000 people leave the province. So in the last 18 months, we've had roughly 19,000 people.

Mr. Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Gerich: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let us take a very close look at the motion introduced this afternoon by the opposition.

I remind this legislature that for 10 long years Saskatchewan suffered because of their mismanagement, wasteful spending, and extensive patronage, and their unfair taxation policy of theirs. Now for 10 long years wasteful spending, mismanagement were the order of the day for the NDP. For ten long years, Mr. Speaker, expensive patronage and unfair taxation policy was their way.

For 10 years the people of Saskatchewan were subject to the NDP policy of putting family of Crown corporations before the real Saskatchewan families. For 10 long years the people of Saskatchewan were subject to the NDP policy of putting their Crown corporations before the real Saskatchewan families. And I have to get that point across, real and clear, to the people.

The nightmare of the NDP social experiment came to an end in April 1982. You will recall that on April 1982 the people of Saskatchewan rejected the mismanagement, the wasteful spending, the expensive patronage, and unfair taxation. And the people of Saskatchewan freed themselves from the chains of the NDP technocrats.

Obviously the NDP have not learned from their lessons in history. They have no idea why they sit in opposition. But allow me to explain this to the legislature. Why do they sit in opposition? And when will they continue to be in . . . And why will continue to be in opposition for many years to come?

There are two words in the dictionary that the NDP opposition has never learned to deal with in the meaning of. The first word is "hypocrites". Now any political party that would have the nerve to talk about mismanagement, wasteful spending, and unfair taxation, expensive patronage, after being defeated in two elections, because those very issues are the . . . because of those very issues, are obviously hypocrites. Indeed, they're sanctimonious hypocrites.

The second word the opposition has learned not to deal with is "reality". The NDP opposition has come to face the reality of April . . . has not yet come to face the reality of the April 1982 election or the October 1986 election. The reality of the people of Saskatchewan have no more desire to return to this mismanagement, wasteful spending, and unfair taxation, or expensive patronage of their NDP ideas.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before the Assembly today is a mockery of our parliamentary system. The motion is shamelessly and blindly partisan attempt to use this Assembly to distort the record of the government. The motion is nothing but NDP chicanery.

Mr. Speaker, in order to set the record straight, it will be necessary for this Assembly to amend the proposed motion. I wish to inform you, sir, that it is my intention to move the following amendment:

That the motion would be amended by striking all words after the word "Assembly" and substituting:

commend the government of Saskatchewan for

its effective management, fiscal responsibility, fair taxation policy, prudent appointments which have resulted in effective and efficient government for the people of Saskatchewan.

Seconded by the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to explain to this legislature why it is imperative that the opposition motion must be amended in the manner that I have presented.

You and I know the record of mismanagement in the NDP years. Mr. Speaker, I recall the extravagant expenditures of the public money to buy uranium and potash mines. I recall the millions of dollars spent to buy farm land. And in all of these cases, it was in the name of state ownership. State ownership is a glaring example of mismanagement of the past. The socialist mentality of the 1970s was replaced by the common sense and practical style of government implemented by this Progressive Conservative government since 1982. Progressive Conservative government has a record of excellence because of its effective management of government.

Mr. Speaker, as a government we have effectively recognized a structure to make that government more cost effective and efficient for the people we serve. We subscribe to the idea that government is a servant and not the master of the people.

(1500)

The reorganization of government departments and reduction in the size of the civil service has resulted in more responsible and effective provincial government. Gone are the days when the attitude was more government, bigger government. In the two elections, the people of Saskatchewan have said no to that concept.

Mr. Speaker, to hear the NDP talk about wasteful spending is like listening to a river boat gambler talk about the virtues of clean living. People of Saskatchewan have come to realize that when the NDP was in control of the public treasury, it was like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop.

Now Winston Churchill, who spent a lifetime in a crusade against socialism, was right. And in saying . . . he said socialists have no guilt when it comes to using other people's money to create equalized misery. And that was the NDP legacy here in Saskatchewan for the previous 10 years before 1982.

Mr. Speaker, wasteful spending is when the government uses millions of dollars of the public's money to buy uranium and potash mines. Wasteful spending is when the government spends millions of dollars to promote the family of Crown corporations. And wasteful spending is when the government spends millions to take over farm land set up in a scheme called the land bank. We remember the days of wasteful spending when there was no thought of tomorrow — no planning, no direction. Those were the NDP years of waste, and wasted years they were.

Mr. Speaker, I remind this legislature that in two elections

the people of Saskatchewan said no to the NDP waste.

Now through the fiscal responsibility of this Progressive Conservative government, our province is using the public money to provide effective and efficient government services. Yes, we've been practising restraint. Yes, we have reduced public expenditures where necessary.

And on the other hand we have been building Saskatchewan and expanding government services to protect the people of Saskatchewan. There's been a 63 per cent increase in health spending . . . health care spending, since 1982. It's an example of the Progressive Conservative commitment to the protection of Saskatchewan people; \$1.2 billion for health care is the highest it has ever been in the history of Saskatchewan. This is a clear-cut example of spending public money wisely to provide quality of health care.

Another example of prudent spending has been our protection programs for the farmers and home owners. We've been the leader in the government, all over Canada, in protection programs for the people of this province.

This is the time in Saskatchewan history for responsible financial decision, a time for leadership. It's a time that calls for courage and principle. I'm proud of, and confident in, the man at the helm of our state and our ship, our Premier. Premier Grant Devine is respected for his dynamic and innovative leadership. The Premier recognizes what must be done today in order to build Saskatchewan for the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, let us look back through the pages of history at the 10 long years of the NDP regime. Did they have a vision and foresight to build the future? I think not. They were preoccupied with tinkering with the system to create state control and state ownership. Their objectives were to tax the daylight out of any resource industry that might invest in this province; tax the middle class until they bled. And like certain barnyard animals at the trough, they made Saskatchewan's government an NDP patronage heaven.

At this time I would like to . . . they were talking before about patronage. A former member of Kinistino, Mr. Don Cody, was elected in 1971, defeated in '75. And he was given a job at SGI, senior position until 1978, in June, when he was re-elected MLA. Go down to Mr. Don Faris, a former member from Arm River; he was appointed director of communications of the Education Department and of Co-ops, in March 24, 1981. . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is my pleasure to enter into this rule 16 debate, today, and I must admit, Mr. Speaker, in beginning, that it's a little bit difficult to believe that the member from Redberry made that amendment in seriousness. Obviously he's not listening to his constituents, nor is he listening to the people of Saskatchewan, and I refer him specifically to the *Sask Trends Monitor* publication which

was released last week and clearly condemned the Government of Saskatchewan for its actions. So I stand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to speak strongly in opposition to the amendment proposed and to support the original motion, which is:

That this assembly condemns the provincial government for its mismanagement, wasteful spending, unfair tax breaks for the wealthy, and expensive patronage appointments at a time when it is unfairly increasing the taxes on ordinary Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in recent days the people of Saskatchewan have been asked by the PC government to make a leap of logic. And the leap of logic is this. The government has said to the people of Saskatchewan that by cutting government expenditures they're going to save money. And I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: save money for whom?

Foe whom — we must all ask ourselves in this Assembly — for whom does and should government operate? Should government operate for the interest of oil companies? Should government operate for the Peter Pocklingtons of the world? Should government operate for the Weyerhaeusers? Should government operate for the interests of defeated cabinet ministers and Tory MLAs? And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to those all is a strong and clear no.

The other question that we have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: should government operate for the ordinary people of this province? Clearly — and I agree with one statement made by the member from Redberry — clearly it is the responsibility of government to be the servant of people. And I think it's on those grounds specifically, Mr. Speaker, that the original motion must be supported.

And government has to ask for whom is its role most important? Is it most important for government to operate in the interest of those who have most? Or is it more important, as a matter of fact, for the government to operate in the interest of the citizens of this province who have least? When government makes choices, Mr. Speaker, it clearly has the responsibility to understand the impact and the implications for the citizens of the province, for the impact that it has on the real people of Saskatchewan.

And I suggest that in any democratic society — and I suppose some are questioning how democratic some of the changes that are being introduced are — but it is a strong, strong belief from the people of this country and the people of this province, that in a democratic society the government should be, in effect, the people. And the voice of government should speak in the interests of people, and especially in the interests of those who are least able, I should say, to determine their own destinies.

I think this reflects the kind of co-operative thinking of the people of Saskatchewan traditionally in this province — people who have concluded decades ago, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate way of solving problems in our society is to band together and to take the co-operative approach; people who believe that it is the responsibility

of their governments to act as instruments to solve problems.

And so let us look at several choices that the government has made recently, Mr. Speaker, recently made by this PC government. And let us look at who is affected least and who is affected most by the negative decisions made by the members of the opposite and the government.

One choice this government has made is to undertake no job creation, no significant job creation activities. It's amazing to me that, in light of the high levels of unemployment that we have had for some time in this province, that we see no initiatives being taken to create meaningful jobs for the people of the province. Who does that affect least? Of course, obviously it affects least those who are already employed. And it also in fact affects in a positive kind of way large corporations who are looking for people to work for the smallest wages. Who does it affect most? The people who are most affected by that decision, Mr. Speaker, are the unemployed and, most seriously of all, those people who are receiving social assistance as a way to make ends meet on a day-to-day basis.

The government made other choices. It decided to cut summer employment funding in the Access Youth program from \$13.7 million to \$4 million — a cut of approximately 70 per cent. Who does that affect the least? Obviously, it affects the least who are already employed. Who does it affect most? It affects most, unemployed students and especially those unemployed students who need their summer jobs in order to have the incomes to continue their studies. Those students who are most affected are those from lower income families in Saskatchewan.

The government made other choices. It chose to increase nursing home rates in Saskatchewan by \$73 a month. Who does that affect least? It affects least the more well-to-do seniors, obviously. And who does it affect most? It most affects the seniors with the lowest incomes.

The government chose to increase home care fees by 66 per cent. Who does that affect least? Again, obviously the seniors with the higher incomes, and most affects those seniors who have low incomes.

The government decided to increase sales tax by 2 per cent from 5 to 7 per cent. Who does that affect least? Everybody's affected, but who does it affect least? Obviously, those of the most higher income individuals and families in Saskatchewan. Who does it affect most? Lower-income families who have less money accessible and who spend a greater portion of their incomes on meeting the needs, and for whom the extra \$100 dollars they'll pay in sales tax this year will have the greatest impact.

The government decided to reduce access to the children's dental care program. Who does that affect least? Well obviously, in terms of negative affect, the ones who are least affected are the dentists, who will be the benefactors of this plan. Who's affected most? Single parent families, again, families who are required to have two parents working in order to meet their needs and, most obviously, Mr. Speaker, the access to the program

will affect the children of Saskatchewan who have benefited from a high quality preventative health care program for a number of years.

The government has introduced the deterrent fees in prescription drug plans. Who does it affect least? And the answer has become somewhat, I think, repetitive, Mr. Speaker. It affects least, people who have higher incomes. And it affects most, families with lower incomes who have to assume all the extra cost and, most seriously of all, seniors on fixed incomes who are elderly and oftentimes requiring a large number of prescription medications to maintain their health.

The government decided to increase the flat tax by a half of per cent to one and a half per cent. Who does it affect the least? Those higher-income people who are able to use the tax breaks that they've always had and continue to have, determined by the way the flat tax is deducted. And who does it affect most? Obviously again, Mr. Speaker, the middle- and low-income people who are only able to use basic deductions in their income tax.

The government chose to put back the gas tax of 7 cents per litre, which at best, and in its kindest terms, Mr. Speaker, can be referred to as an interest-free loan from the people of Saskatchewan to the government of Saskatchewan. Who's affected least? And again, it's the higher income individuals and families. Who's affected most? Low income people who lose their expendable income and also the small businesses of this province who are using gasoline in order to operate their businesses.

The government chose to increase tuition fees in universities and technical institutes. And again obviously the impact is least for those families who have children attending those institutes from families of higher income. Who's affected most? Again those with lower income.

And so we see, Mr. Speaker, that there is a pattern. When we look at the decisions of the government that have been introduced in recent times, over and over again we see that there's not a saving of money. What there is is a shifting of the burden from government to individuals, in such a way that those individuals and families with the most suffer the least, and those with the least suffer the most. And that's the story in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker.

It's blatantly false to say that the cuts are reducing costs if our first priority is the ordinary people of Saskatchewan. It's convoluted logic, I suggest, to suggest that these costs are good for government. As a matter of fact, they are bad for people. It reflects the misplaced priorities of the government, Mr. Speaker, and marks a severe shifting of the burden for services to people who can least afford them.

And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that I oppose the amendment introduced by the member from Redberry, and I firmly support the motion we have before us condemning the provincial government for its mismanagement, wasteful spending, unfair tax breaks for the wealthy, and expensive patronage appointments, at a time when it is unfairly increasing taxes on ordinary

Saskatchewan people.

(1515)

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate to expose the bankrupt and hollow rhetoric of the NDP opposition. This motion before the House is sanctimonious. This motion is full of self-righteous NDP rhetoric. The motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before this House is proof, is proof that the opposition is bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of policy and most of all, bankrupt of leadership.

The motion before us today in this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is negative. It distorts the truth and is a waste of the productive time of this legislature. Mr. deputy Speaker, the NDP opposition wishes to have examples of wasteful public spending. Allow me then the opportunity to remind the opposition that it was they who spent over \$500 million to take over potash industry in this province in the 1970s.

Let me remind them of their wasteful spending on the family of Crown corporations, which created a debt in excess of \$7 billion. Yes, I am quite pleased to point out the examples of wasteful spending during the NDP years.

Perhaps they would like to talk about the land bank. The NDP used \$138 million to remove 1.2 million acres, Mr. Deputy Speaker — from Saskatchewan farmers, independent Saskatchewan farmers in our provinces. State ownership is what they believed in, Mr. Deputy Speaker — state ownership. And they still do.

Or perhaps they would like to talk about the NDP investment in uranium mines — the very mines, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they, across the floor, now wish to close and put thousand and thousands of people out of work. Talk about mismanagement and wasteful spending!

Yes, Mr. Speaker, their record of mismanagement and wasteful spending is why they form the opposition today. And that is why they will continue to be in the opposition, and we will remain in government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP opposition wishes to discuss expensive patronage in the motion before the Assembly. Does the NDP consider the appointment of federal NDP politician Ian Deans to the Public Service Commission of Canada as patronage? Or do they consider the appointment of former Ontario NDP leader Stephen Lewis, as Canada's ambassador to the United Nations as patronage? I would ask how they describe those political appointments, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

May I remind this House that the NDP in Saskatchewan has a great track record in patronage. They were masters — masters — at the art of political patronage. And allow me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allow me to cite some examples.

Here's one that should be interesting to all members of

this Assembly, especially those on that side of the House who aren't as fortunate as the member for Regina Lakeview, who sought the nomination for the NDP in Regina North West in 1979, and then received \$7,100.04 from the Attorney General's department, headed by the current member from Saskatoon Riverdale, as an honorarium in 1981-82 for legal services rendered.

What I'm wondering, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is if this was meant to soothe the wounds inflicted by the current member for Regina North West, who upset her in the 1979 nomination in that riding, or perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was an appreciation for her abilities by the current member from Regina Centre, her former law partner. Patronage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, patronage? Far be it from me to make that suggestion.

Let me cite to you maybe a couple of other patronages here. Louis Roy was a defeated NDP candidate in Prince Albert-Duck Lake in 1975, later given a job at DNS, Tourism and Industry, consultant 4 — \$4,000-some-odd dollars, plus dollars, a month

And they want some more. Ken Wawryk, sought NDP nomination in Saskatoon, Sutherland, 1978, given a job with SMDC corporate affairs department, assistant researcher, \$36,000 a year. I'll tell you. . .oh, they want some more. The list goes on and on.

Ted Glover, appointed special assistant, April 1982, to the hon. E. Kaeding, Rural Affairs, \$3,650 a month. Bill (William) Knight, former NDP MP, appointed assistant principal secretary to the premier, July 17, 1979. Last salary was cited as \$4,900 — almost \$5,000 a month. Ted Koskie, appointed executive assistant to the minister of Consumer Affairs, brother to the hon. member from the Quill Lakes. Barbara Marie Kramer, daughter of Eileen Kramer, former NDP cabinet minister, \$2,200 a month.

I'll tell you . . . and they still want more — they still want more. Former NDP MLA was Allen R. Oliver, defeated in 1979, appointed to the Highway Traffic Board, received 16,000 and some-odd bucks. And the list goes on and on — on and on.

Alex Taylor, defeated NDP MLA, a former NDP cabinet minister, elected 1971 Kerrobert-Kindersley, and defeated 1975 Kindersley, appointed director of negotiations 1975-77; chairman of Worker's Compensation Board '77 to '79. I will tell you . . . then received special permission for leave of absence to conduct a study for Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. January 1, 1981, through to December — \$48,000 for that study, plus \$4,230 expenses. I'll tell you, I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they talk about patronage — they talk about patronage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you can see by the NDP, they had no hesitation to extend political patronage to their party workers or supporters. I would suggest to this Assembly, the NDP opposition have no credibility when it comes to any constructive discussion of patronage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion before this House is wasteful. It accomplishes nothing but to waste public money and to waste the time of this House. The motion

before this House unfairly distorts the excellent record of this government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is never easy to take the economic decisions this government has had to take. It takes courage, and it takes leadership, and it takes the integrity to do what is right. And that is why I have such a high regard and respect for the Premier of our province and the leadership he is providing for our province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I get into the crunch of the things that we have as a government done over the past years, you will note . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I must interrupt the member from Lloydminster. His time has expired.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to enter this debate today. As I read the motion from the member of Regina North East, to me it clearly and concisely outlined the direction this government has taken in the province, and I think that the motion really tells the true story of what's happened to the people of this province. The motion tells us why the economy of Saskatchewan is depressed and deteriorating daily. And all of the Tory rhetoric that's been sold to the people of this province with millions and millions of their own dollars can't hide the truth.

The business community and the farmers and, in fact, all of the Saskatchewan residents are facing the unpopular results of what this government has done. As I look at this government's record in terms of what it has done to the small-business community regarding bankruptcies, it's an appalling situation, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province are quite clear that it's not acceptable.

In 1986 the business community faced 21 per cent more bankruptcies than they did in 1985 — the second highest record of bankruptcies in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, the business community find that not acceptable. Businesses in this province have been closing their doors, liquidating their assets, and moving to other parts of this country where the business climate is more favourable. They've left this province in search of an economy where a business truly can survive.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the business people that your government has affected, I'm not talking about those who survive at the hand of this government with hand-outs and the patronage and the corruption. And I'm not talking about the Tory hacks who wallow at this government's trough. I'm talking about the real people, my friends.

You can chirp, and you can natter, but you will know that the polls are indicating that the people of this province believe the New Democrats when they say you're corrupt, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the real people — the real people who thought that they could be part of a free enterprise system under this government; people who believed that there was a place for them in this province; a place where their entrepreneurial

endeavours could flourish; a place where they could raise their families; and a place they could realize their dreams. Mr. Speaker, this government has shattered many dreams in this province. They've been betrayed. The people have been lied to.

But there are those, of course, that fare very well. One of the former members, one of the former speakers, has indicated which ones that we feel have done very well at this Tory trough. And I'm not going to list the dollar figures because they're too exorbitant to even both with. But I want to tell you about Paul Rousseau, and I want to tell the people of this province about Schoenhals, and George Hill, and Embury, and about Gordon Dirks, and about Dennis Ball — all of your buddies that wallow at the Tory trough that you seem to keep full with taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there's a difference between the patronage that's been delivered to their buddies and to the way the real people of the province have been treated. The only kind of sharing that the business community has been asked to do, is to share in paying these high-priced wages that you're paying these hacks. They're asked to pay to cover for your political friends.

(1530)

The ordinary Saskatchewan people can't afford to be part of some of the programs that you've been delivering — programs for the rich and for the wealthy, and friends of this government. If these programs had created jobs for the people of this province, the people would find them acceptable. But, Mr. Speaker, that hasn't happened.

My colleague from North Battleford referred to them as having no bang for the buck. And that's exactly what's happened. Programs that don't work; people's dollars for your friends, but nothing for the ordinary people of this province. The PC Party lied to the people of this province during the election. And now the people are asked to pay for it.

A list of the things that have surprised the people of this province — I just want to read to this House. Gas tax, 7 cents a litre; sales tax, increased to 7 per cent; flat tax, increased. Mr. Speaker, the effects of the increased sales tax and the gas tax and the flat tax for the average family is going to cost them some \$350 a year. And I don't believe that's acceptable. And that's why I believe that this motion speaks to the problems that this government has created. I think it was right on.

This government has polarized the wealth of this province. They've brought the farmers to their knees. Small business is suffering, and the tradespeople are out of work. Professionals are unemployed. People that could be, and should be adding to the economy of this province. And all of this while the members opposite fill the pockets of their friends with taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government of corruption. As I campaigned in the 1986 election, and as I talked to the business people in Prince Albert . . . And the member from Weyburn's come back to chirp again, and we welcome him. But as I talked to the business people in the

Prince Albert area, and they tell me about the unfairness of their tendering practices, Mr. Speaker, it's little wonder why you couldn't win an urban seat and why the small towns in Saskatchewan didn't support your policies.

It's pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, why they wouldn't accept your kind of government, your kind of corruption, and your kind of mismanagement. They know, Mr. Speaker, that your government's been unfair. And they want some changes.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to go the couple of polls that were just announced, and that were just published in the last little while, and it tells you why you guys are sitting in the smallest you've been for many, many years in terms of percentage of public support. And I don't believe that since this budget you've introduced it's going to improve, because you're going to go nowhere but down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, they've misled the people of this province, they've betrayed the trust that the people put in them, and they're going to find themselves outside looking in as soon as they've got the guts to call another election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say today that I'll be supporting the motion. And I'll be supporting the motion on behalf — the original motion — on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan who've lost confidence in this government.

And I ask, Mr. Speaker, that every, every member of this legislature support that motion, do the right thing, and support the motion. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to rise and respond to the gross inaccuracies cited in the motion from the members opposite.

Quite obviously this province feels that the members opposite are masters of mismanagement, wasteful spending, and unfair tax breaks, for it was the members sitting across from me who were refused returning to office in 1982 and in 1986.

The members opposite speaks about polls, and I have good experience with that, Mr. Speaker. When I came into this legislature in a by-election in 1985, the members opposite were chirping about the polls then, and yet they managed to finish a thousand votes down in Thunder Creek constituency.

The NDP have never been good at listening to people, because that is they have no new ideas and no solutions to problems which face Saskatchewan on an ongoing basis. It's because of these things and more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they will remain in opposition for a long, long time. We, however, the Progressive Conservative Party, listen to people. And the people told us that they

wanted some things changed in this province.

I'd like to talk about a few things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that were raised by members opposite — things that people wanted changed.

The mover of the motion this afternoon talked a lot about oil. And even though, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't have any oil in my constituency, it impacts on a lot of people in my constituency, because for years the former NDP government told us that the energy sector was going nowhere in this province.

And we could see by the number of wells drilled in 1980 and 1981 and 1982 that they firmly believe that. They believe that we should pay hundreds of millions of dollars to the province of Alberta for natural gas; that there was no natural gas in Saskatchewan to service the rural community, to service the small towns, and to service some of the secondary industry which we wanted to develop in this province.

And lo and behold, with a change of government in 1982 those wells, and the wells drilled, dramatically increased. And all of a sudden we had natural gas so that we could service the rural part of Saskatchewan and service the small towns and communities; give them the same level of service which people in the major urban centres had been expecting for years and years.

You know, it's funny, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the national energy program came along in 1981, the government of the day didn't say boo. They didn't say boo when thousands of people were laid off in places like Lloydminster and Swift Current and Kindersley and Estevan and Weyburn. They didn't care about those folks. And when this government faced the same situation in the last couple of years, we took steps to make sure that those thousands of people kept their jobs, that those wells kept being drilled, that gas was found to provide service to rural Saskatchewan.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, it's important for a riding like mine, which doesn't have any oil or gas in it, but which now has thousands of people benefiting from the things that this government has done in the energy sector, that I know that the folks in my riding are going to continue to say no to the types of things proposed by the members of the opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — And I listened with great interest as the member from Regina East talked about potash and about the wonderful decision made by the NDP government to get into the potash business and how, since 1982, that this Conservative government had grossly mismanaged the potash industry.

And I wonder, has that member — and he represented a rural riding for 11 years — could possibly miss out on the fact that potash is a fertilizer and it is used in the growing of crops. And it so happens that the biggest customer for Saskatchewan potash is the United States of America. And when you take the price of corn, which is the primary user of potash as a fertilizer, and say that it has dropped

from \$3.60 a bushel to around \$2 — I believe the last listing I saw was about \$1.98 — he would know why the demand for potash in the North American market has dropped dramatically. He would know that in a competitive market like that that you have to reduce prices in order to continue keeping market share.

And I guess that is an indicator of how the folks opposite view things, because when you don't realize that the commodity prices out there are on a world-wide basis, and that you must go out and compete, because if folks are only getting half of what they did before for their product, they can't afford to put as much fertilizer on.

I think this government should be commended for increasing our market share in certain parts of the world, and for maintaining most of the market share which we had there before, even though people don't want to use the product particularly, because what they're getting for their product is less than half of what they did five years ago.

I also took with great interest, Mr. Deputy speaker, the comments that were made from folks opposite about there being no money for Saskatchewan business people. Being in the production of agricultural products, I consider myself a business man, as do 66,000 other families in this province; indeed the biggest business sector, if you will, in the province of Saskatchewan.

And now there has been no money provided for the small business sector in this province. And I think about the \$1.2 billion for the production loan program which has kept many of these business people operating and functioning over the last couple of years. I think about the \$185 million that went out to the livestock cash advance, which once again kept a lot of people operating and functioning, kept them there to take advantage of the upturn in the market-place which has now happened with the cattle producer in this province, with the hog producer in this province, indeed with the entire red meat production facilities in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think about the Premier going front and centre with the federal government for the deficiency payment last fall — a billion dollars into the pockets of business people in this province. Those types of programs, those type of initiatives, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were never, ever undertaken by the NDP in the 11 years that they were in government — never. The biggest business sector in this entire province, and they got absolutely zero, except for the government coming in and overbidding the price of land so that the next generation could not come along into the farming sector.

The member from Prince Albert made the comment that people . . . we've been filling the pockets of our friends in this province with money. Well I have a constituency with 8,700 voters who I consider all my friends, and I admit that we have been putting money in the pockets of those people. and I think if you go out to my constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see that those people really appreciate the fact that their government and their members were doing everything that they could to put money in their pocket.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — And I guess if that makes me a pork-barreler of unprecedented proportions, I will have to go back to my constituents and say that, I guess that's what I could do for you, and the NDP didn't like it, and you're all a bunch of hogs at the trough, because we did everything we could to support you in your business and your livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, one final comment on this. Our Premier and our Minister of Agriculture is in Ottawa at present, dealing with his fellow ministers of Agriculture and dealing with the federal government to ensure that there will be more dollars coming into the pockets of the biggest business sector in this province. And I would just like to commend him on that effort, even though members of the opposition did not even know that he was there yesterday, working on behalf of Saskatchewan people.

But I think it just shows the initiatives that this government has taken over the last five and one-half years to ensure that we protect people in this province, that we protect farmers, that we protect rural Saskatchewan and our small towns — to ensure that that cash flow is there so that we can support our institutions, support the people in the secondary industries who are so important to our province.

Mr. Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon I observed the members of the government with their weak arguments of trying to defend the mess that they have placed the Saskatchewan people. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's hard to believe the magnitude of the mess that this outfit has created on the backs of the people of Saskatchewan.

(1545)

It has been indicated that they have laid on the backs of the people of Saskatchewan, billions of dollars of debt — 3.4 billion on the Consolidated Fund alone; \$11.7 billion of total debt, including Crown. This is the magnitude of the debt. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, what has been going on? There has been the biggest tax rip-off of ordinary people in Saskatchewan that this province has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — I want to say to you; take a look at the magnitude of the tax increases since they came into office. Take a look at the flat tax . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Time has elapsed. Time has elapsed.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 8 — Promotion and Development of the Tourism Industry

Mr. Gleim: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure on speaking to the motion of tourism in the province of Saskatchewan. Our government is committed to building Saskatchewan as we address the importance of economic diversification of the province wide, playing upon our strengths. And the industry that has economic diversity written all over it is the province of Saskatchewan.

Special attention to tourism's tremendous growth potential is not new, Mr. Speaker. Since taking office in 1982, tourism has been a high priority of this government. Expansion of tourism creates jobs and diversifies our economy. It is, in fact, a renewable resource capable of generating tremendous returns on investment everywhere in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, our tourism industry's main needs are to develop new attractions, facilities and services, and a higher degree of professionalism in the service of hospitality areas. To address these needs, we need new degree of tourism awareness, was essential, Mr. Speaker. After conducting several awareness campaigns in November 1985, 96 per cent of respondents in the survey said, yes, tourism is important to Saskatchewan's economy. Such a high level of awareness indicated strong support for enhanced tourism across the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, aggressive provincial advertising and market activities replaced the old image of Saskatchewan as a tourism destination with one of this exciting dynamics. Early initiatives included a tourism marketing assistance program to assist community groups such as visitor and conventions event organizers, and other non-profit groups, to undertake new and expanded tourism promotional activities in Saskatchewan. We involve communities, organizations, industry operators in co-operative advertising campaigns and direct sales activities, expanding our market efforts with more effective campaigns.

We promoted Saskatchewan as a tourist destination through Saskatchewan ambassador program. In 1986, over 1,600 residents became ambassadors of the province of Saskatchewan. We supported the creation of one of the most important developments in the history of Saskatchewan tourism — the Tourism Industry Association of Saskatchewan — TISASK.

This new umbrella organization provides a leadership in developing training programs, assists the industry in more effective marketing, and represents the entire industry in all levels of government. TISASK fills a void that existed for many years, and is a sign of emerging maturity of Saskatchewan tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, our government has, through Saskatchewan tourism and small business, now Saskatchewan Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives, engaged in effective series of aggressive promotions. In our key markets, in 1986, the Saskatchewan advertising generated over 45,000 inquiries, an increase of 181 per cent over 1986, Mr. Speaker.

Our home market has not been neglected; in fact, the latest promotion, the Great Saskatchewan Vacation

Contest, under way. It provided one of the most initiative approaches to urging Saskatchewan people to explore their province in 1987.

Briefly, the Saskatchewan vacation contest is running province wide. Winners will receive prizes that take them to other parts of Saskatchewan. All answers are contained in a department publication, *The Great Saskatchewan Vacation Book*.

I want to advise the House of some current tourism initiatives. To cope with well commended need for hospitality training, the Department of Tourism, Small Business and Co-operatives is planning to establish a tourism hospitality institute. This program will provide new opportunities for our people to gain greater access to employment for their future and advancement into the industry. Mr. Speaker, this will not be a bricks and mortar institute. It will be a system whereby training can be provided where it is most needed, in the most efficient and practical method possible. We envision a flexible operation which will utilize the expertise of successful individuals already in the hospitality industry.

Looking at ways to expand our tourism development at the community level, our government is planning tourism opportunities to assist individual communities develop their tourism potential. We will be looking and working with communities, large and small, across the province to help them create the market and to market top-notch attractions and events.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that the community events in Saskatchewan attract over 2 million people every year, generating over \$140 million in revenues. The programs will also include a service and a hospitality component.

All three components — developments, marketing, and service — of the programs will be contingent upon properly executed tourism plans for which communities will assist, will be responsible, thus reinsuring that most of the viable projects will proceed on a well-planned basis.

A few glimpses of the future work of tourism division revealed several interesting areas of concentration. Mr. Speaker, the department will work to restore U.S. air links with the province. It will continue to build upon exciting markets and look at developing new ones, and it will continue to seek new developers and development opportunities.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we will maintain the momentum we have generated, in partnership with the private sector, for our province's dynamic and vibrant tourism industry. We will explore and expand its potential, thus encouraging and assisting in economic diversification in every part of Saskatchewan. The key component of our tourism programs have been underlying principle of co-operation between government and private sector, because economic growth is not created by government, but by the private sector. To find new and more efficient ways of doing business, Mr. Speaker, we remain committed to working with people of the province, especially the business community, helping them to help themselves in building a better future for our province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this record of achievement, it is appropriate for me to assemble, to compliment the Government of Saskatchewan for the work it has done and continue to do for the betterment of the tourist industry.

It gives me great pleasure to move:

That this Government of Saskatchewan be complimented for the work it has done in assisting the tourism industry and its commitment through the Saskatchewan Builds program — Tourism in encouraging and promoting and continued development of a dynamic and vibrant tourism industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — And this will be seconded by the Hon. Jack Klein, Regina South.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Mr. Speaker. As I begin my remarks, I would like to indicate that I intend to move an amendment to the motion. And the reason I would move the amendment is simply because this resolution is sadly reminiscent of a number of PC slogans and promises that the people of this province have heard over the last five years.

(1600)

Initially, it was the “open for business” slogan. And the manufacturing sector was earmarked as the mechanism for economic growth and diversification. Unfortunately, no results materialized.

And then it was “partnership for progress.” This time the small business community would provide the central thrust for economic diversification. The employment development fund was created with 600 million committed over five years. But where is that economic development fund today? It’s replaced, Mr. Speaker, with yet another new fund, with new money, and undoubtedly new priorities.

Finally, in October of ‘86, the “Saskatchewan builds” program was unveiled. One component of this initiative was the creation of a \$50 million program to generate jobs in the provincial tourism and hospitality industry over the next five years. And again, diversification was the central theme. But now, as the Minister of Tourism and Small Business states, the brightest star on the diversification horizon appears to be now tourism.

The script, Mr. Speaker, is familiar — the spirited slogan, accompanied by promises of large sums of money spread over a period of time, giving the illusion of a long-term plan or strategy. But, Mr. Speaker, the programs that are put forward by this government are no longer credible. And they’re no longer credible because the government is no longer credible.

This government has betrayed Saskatchewan small business. And, Mr. Speaker, I think I can comment about that because I’m a small-business man. I deal with the small

business - you wouldn’t know, the minister chirps. I feel I can speak about this simply because I’m in touch with the business community. I’ve been in that sector for a number of years, and I know their feelings. I know their aspirations, and I also know their dreams.

The 1987 budget announced the creation of a new tourism and hospitality institute, and we noted on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that it was conspicuously absent of any details. We question as to whether it’s just another opportunity to funnel government money into the pockets of the political friends of the PC party. And we ask if this is another scheme to enhance Darryl Binkley’s bank account.

People don’t believe that this government is serious any longer, Mr. Speaker. The credibility of this government has gone the way of Supercart, of Ward Johnson Electric, and of Molson’s Breweries in Prince Albert.

The motion talks about complimenting this government on the work that it has done in assisting tourism. We say, Mr. Speaker, that the motion is simply not true, and it’s not consistent with the facts of what’s been going on in the province since 1982.

They failed at open for business. They failed at every effort that they’ve tried to attract business to this province, and the only way that they could get any business to come into this province — and I want to speak now for a few moments about Weyerhaeuser — is to give away a quarter of a billion dollars plus, of assets, in a shameful display. Give away a quarter of a billion dollars of assets — no repayment terms that are ever going to be delivered upon.

They’ve betrayed the people of this province Mr. Speaker, in the economic diversification that they’ve tried. They had to give Peter Pocklington some \$21 million of taxpayers’ money in order to bring a plant to this province that I’m not convinced we need. And why I say that, Mr. Speaker, is at the time they were dealing with Peter Pocklington from Alberta, Intercon is running at half throttle.

Mr. Speaker, the government has been in error and has failed at every attempt that they’ve made. They’ve saddled this province with a \$3.4 billion deficit, and now they’re coming to the people of this province to pay for it.

They come to the people with increased E&H tax; they come with a new flat tax, and now they increase that; the senior citizens \$73 a month, and the list goes on. Mr. Speaker, their actions are unacceptable, and I say to you, they’re unforgivable, and the people of this province will one day have a chance to set the record straight.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, this motion speaks out and talks about complimenting the government’s work on tourism and the job that they’ve done. And at the same time, this government is pricing itself right out of the market. The people of this province, and the tourists who frequent this province, or who would like to frequent this province and like to be able to afford that, are finding that

the rates that they're charging for parks and for fishing licenses are out of the reach of what they can afford. And it's my speculation, Mr. Speaker, that they've priced themselves out of the market.

And I think they want to take a lesson from their federal counterparts. The fee increases to the federal park at Waskesiu have cost the business people in that area a great deal of money. The number of people who have been able to afford to frequent that park has dropped 26 per cent, Mr. Speaker. And if there is anybody on that side that can understand what a drop in gross of 26 per cent would mean, I would be very surprised. And I say I'd be surprised if they could understand it, because if they could, they wouldn't have embarked on the rate increases that they have.

I want to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a few of the increases that this government has thrust onto the people of this province. Park entry fees, daily entree fee, from \$4 to \$5, increased 25 per cent; annual users permit fees increased 33 per cent, from 15 to \$20; camping service sites, an increase of 7 to \$12 dollars, an increase of some 71 per cent, Mr. Speaker, unserviced sites, \$6 to \$8, an increase of 25 per cent; seasonal campsite permits, \$250 to \$500, an increase of 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't go on with the increases because there's still a bit of a list. But I think it's important that the people of this province understand that this government simply doesn't know what they're doing. They're incapable of making a rational decision. And the increases that they've thrust upon the people indicate that very clearly.

Accommodations for the weekend, I would like to read into the record as well. Deluxe modern cabins increased from 37 per cent to 50 per cent, some 35 per cent increase; light housekeeping, 18 to \$24, an increase of 33 per cent; motels, \$21 to \$28, an increase of 33 per cent; holiday cottages, two people, an increase from \$22 to 29 per cent, that's a 32 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker.

For those that can afford it, these increases are fine. And that's who they've been delivering legislation for, for those who can afford it, their friends, those that support their political party.

An Hon. Member: — Only the rich.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Only the rich. What about the people of this province who don't have a 40 or 50 or a \$60,000 income? Those are the heavy users of those parks, Mr. Speaker, simply because they can't afford to go anywhere else. They can't afford hotel rooms. They're looking for cheap accommodations with their tent trailers and their hard-top campers. And this government is thrusting, for a serviced site, an increase of some 71 per cent.

Are you telling the people of this province that they're no longer welcome in the government campsites that we own? Are you telling them, by these rate increases, that you no longer want them to be involved in the tourist industry, or to have a weekend with their family at Emma Lake or at Candle Lake or at any other lake you want to

mention? Mr. Speaker, what they have done is unforgivable.

I want to go for a minute and speak about fishing licence. We've got a lot of anglers, a lot of senior citizens, who use angling as their main source of entertainment over the summer. Young families, fathers, mothers who take their children out for a weekend of enjoyment. Those same people that you're asking an increase of some 71 per cent to park their camper trailers and their hard-top trailers, you're also telling them it's going to cost them more to go out fishing.

Let me read into the record, Mr. Speaker, the increase in the fishing rates. An increase from last year \$10 to \$15 — an increase of 50 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — That superseded the previous \$5.

Mr. Lautermilch: — The member from Quill Lakes indicates that it superseded the previous five that they've thrust upon the folks, and I believe that to be true. Again another example of their unfairness. Non-resident fishermen, an increase of \$20 to \$30 — thirty-three and one-third per cent. Are they telling the people from outside of this province, from California, and from Arizona or from Montana or South Dakota or North Dakota, or are they telling the people from Alberta, British Columbia or Ontario or Newfoundland that they don't want their business in this province?

Mr. Speaker, any business man knows that when you're going to increase your retail prices on whatever commodity that you're selling, you do it in a staged fashion, and a fashion that's not going to take your customers out of your store. You're dealing with a big store here. This government is dealing with a big industry, and when you see rate increases 33, 50, 100 per cent — not acceptable at all, Mr. Speaker.

I've got a letter that I'd like to read into the record as well, Mr. Speaker. It was in the *La Ronge Northerner*, June 3, 1987. And it's a rather lengthy letter, so I would just like to read parts of it. But it's sent from a Helen L. Maveton of Lakewood, California in the United States. And she writes:

Until this year, after enjoying our visits for 16 years, we are totally disgusted at the costly accommodations offered the campers. Camping rates for the spots we have parked in in the 12 previous years have doubled.

Mr. Speaker, she goes on. But I think she's made her point, and I don't want to elaborate on that particular part. But she's got a little question here; she has something to ask this government and the people that represent this area of our country. She says that:

Your officials have priced us out of your province. We can no longer afford these prices for just a spot to park our trailer. The camping grounds were fine the way they were. We are camping, not expecting high-cost accommodation. I sincerely hope you, the people, and merchants will make yourselves heard on our behalf as well as your

own and welcome tourists with prices we can afford.

How much more clear would a tourist, who spent 16 years in this province in the summers, have to be? What will it take to make you people open your eyes? What will it take to make you understand that your priorities are wrong?

You can't price yourselves out of a market if you're hoping to expand your growth. You've got to be realistic in the kind of income that you can expect in terms of tourism. You've got to be realistic in terms of how you stage rate increases. We all know that rate increases are inevitable, but they've got to be done with some care, with some caution, and some responsibility, none of which this government, Mr. Speaker, has shown. Every possible fee they've increased. And this is just another example of the contradictory and misguided policies of this government.

Mr. Speaker, this government is recognized by the people of this province as a failure. Their credibility is shot. Government incompetence is destroying opportunities in tourism, and by destroying opportunities in tourism, they're destroying opportunities for small business. Tourism can be, and one day with a New Democrat government will be, injecting money into this provincial economy so that we don't have to see cut-backs to dental care and to health care and increase to rates to our senior citizens.

But I'm sad to say, Mr. Speaker, it's not going to happen until we get rid of that bunch on the other side. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move:

That all the words after "that" in the first line be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

This Assembly regrets that the provincial government's narrow emphasis on it's open for big business policy has contributed to the government's inadequate performance with respect to the jobs and opportunities in the tourism industry and in the small business sector throughout the province.

This amendment will be seconded by the member from Moose Jaw South.

(1615)

Some Hon. Members — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — This debate will continue concurrently on the motion as amended by the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and seconded by the member for Moose Jaw South.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't be more pleased and enter this debate and speak a little bit about tourism and how our government in fact assisted that private sector in the tourism industry. And I will certainly speak on the original motion, Mr. Speaker, and just prove that the amendment was utter nonsense. And

I'm really amazed that the member would even begin to think about putting in an amendment like that.

I was hoping that the new members opposite would understand something about building, something about business, something about tourism. But I see it's the same old thing and they're living in the past. Even the tourists that were with us in the gallery left as he was speaking. I guess they couldn't put up with it either.

But as the member from P.A.-Duck Lake spoke and spoke about our programs and the credibility of our programs over the last four or five years, Mr. Speaker, I just couldn't help but reflect what those programs were and what they did for this tourism industry in our province. And for that member to make that kind of statement is incredible.

I visit with the chamber of commerce from Prince Albert quite regularly, your home town. And I dare say that I meet with them more than you do. And I would like to ask you if you have ever even attended one of their meetings. I doubt it. And you get up in the House and you say that you represent fairly the business community of Prince Albert. Well, I say, boloney.

He spoke a little bit about Weyerhaeuser, Mr. Speaker. He said, big business, and what does this government . . . He fails to recognize the essence of a corporation like Weyerhaeuser's presence in this province, in his home town, and how it will expand and supplement and provide growth to the business community in his own area.

It's just amazing that you're that short-sighted that you can't even understand that that very presence will do what it's designed to do, and help diversify our economy and spread business right around that whole area. It's almost sorry that you're their member with that kind of a down attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of being asked by the Waskesiu Chamber of Commerce to attend there recently on a tourism sub-agreement announcement. And it was delightful for me to be back there with my friends from Waskesiu, just north of Prince Albert, and to see the enthusiasm and the encouragement and all the excitement that was in the area, because they recognized that our government was still providing this needed assistance to the tourism industry.

And yet was there one member of the opposition up there on that glorious event — one member at this chamber of commerce event? Nowhere to be seen — none of them. And a major tourist announcement for that area. So much for that.

He's still got his head in the sand. He was talking about tourist rates. Are you kidding, Mr. Speaker? Five bucks, the price of a movie, to get into a park. I mean, what's the big deal? You talk about terms of percentage and, you know, 100 per cent of nothing is nothing; \$5 to enter a park for a whole carload — less than the price of a movie. I don't know what you're complaining about. I haven't been talking to any of these people that enjoy our parks that say that they can't go there because they can't afford it.

You were talking about fishing licences. And do you know that the seniors here get fishing licences free? They don't pay anything. You made it sound like they were paying \$100 a pound to catch their fish. They fish for nothing and they enjoy it, and they've got a lot of time.

They're the ones that go to the parks. They buy all this RV equipment. Not particularly the seniors, Mr. Speaker, but a lot of people in our province buy recreation vehicles now being manufactured right here in our province. We did that. Not you — we did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — And yet your member from North Battleford chooses to fight with the chamber of commerce in that area — doesn't like the new growth that's going in North Battleford. They're selling all these RV units over this whole province, Mr. Speaker. They're going to all of these parks. They're not saying anything about paying \$7 for the site; they want the site there. And if you think for a moment that the American tourists got a little bit of a problem with the fees, you're sadly mistaken.

Mr. Speaker, I carry around with me all the time a little \$20 U.S. bill. And I carry it around for a reason, and I carry it around from my days in the amusement park business. That \$20 bill that I carry, U.S., is a constant reminder, not of the \$20 bill we will spend in the U.S. market, but some American came here and dropped another 20 in the Saskatchewan market. That's very, very important to me. And there's a lot of these 20's going around now, thanks to our government and how we're going after the American tourist. You make it sound like a big deal to pay that entry fee.

Do you know that an American tourist in Los Angeles, when he looks at our fishing programs in the North, and we've got 100,000 lakes up there, he could fish from now to eternity and never touch them all. They go to the shows where our outfitters are, thanks to our government. Because it's a cost-sharing arrangement, the outfitters go, the government pays a little bit, we promote the North. They pay \$2,500 for three or four days of fishing from Los Angeles to the North — \$2,500. Are you telling me that a \$7 permit is going to bother those American friends of ours? You're living in the past. You're living in the past.

The other day, Mr. Speaker. . .But they are getting better, I have to admit that. The member did acknowledge that tourism is a collection of small businesses. It took us five years to get them to know that, but they're finally recognizing that.

And I have to again refer to the member from Riversdale speaking about small businesses the other day. Almost made a mockery out of this place when he was saying and he was laying claim due to the fact of all the support that he had. I suppose that the member from Riversdale, you know, has illusions of moving up in this world on the political spectrum, and as such, he's got to get the small-business community behind him.

But I can tell you, sir, that as you go through for your leadership, if you don't get the support of your back

bench from that business community, you're going to be sadly mistaken because they're taking you for a ride the same way that they are the business community that's out there. They don't understand. They're fighting with their chambers of commerce and everything. You should really sort that out if you want to move along.

I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I'm extremely proud to be a small part of Grant Devine's team, or the Premier of our province, his team — his leadership, and his vision for this province, of building. You know we all know that he is a builder. He sees the opportunities that exist in this province in diversifying our economy, and certainly as it relates — I'll get back to the motion — as it relates to tourism. He recognizes that the tourism and the inflow dollars that come in — we do a billion dollars a year of the tourism industry now, roughly — and he recognizes that from the tax dollars that come from that one particular industry, 32,000 people employed in it, those tax dollars, that's how we can put together our other programs in government, Mr. Speaker, protecting our people.

And that's why we go through this budget process and try to get the expenditures to balance with our income, our record, new business, investment opportunities. You can look around as we try to improve the provincial parks that are in existence. Certainly they're their for our people to use . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Now the member speaking from his chair says, sell them, sell them, you know — mockery. No, we don't want to. We want to provide in those provincial parks what the people want. Don't you understand that? We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that some of our provincial parks have to remain in the wilderness. People want that. We don't propose to put a McDonald's in every park. We never said we were going to. But certainly in areas of parks that are well utilized, like in Kenosee, that water slide is a welcome addition to every body in the area.

And don't think for a moment that our good friends in the United States, just an hour south, don't really appreciate having the opportunity to come into Saskatchewan, spend some more of these American 20's as they enjoy the water slides. It only makes eminent sense.

And when we look at privatizing our parks, all we're trying to do is put in there various items for the small-business private sector that the people of this province are truly going to enjoy. And I can honestly tell you this, but in your rapport and as you go wrong, you people are famous for dragging out these letters and saying, I've got a letter here that says . . . Well you haven't brought up one yet that says that you've got a letter that says that somebody doesn't like some of the privatization that occurs. I've probably given you an idea. You'll have one of your friends write one. But I can tell you that is not true. The people enjoy very much exactly what we've been putting into the parks.

Along with that, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you how it affects our economy. It creates thousands and thousands of jobs, this diversification in the tourism industry. Provides, more importantly, to me as well, Mr. Speaker, a special quality of life for our urban dwellers. They don't have to particularly leave Saskatchewan now

and go into the United States of America, or into a neighbouring province to see what's there. They can travel our own province. We've got an awful lot to offer in this great province of ours, and now as our urban people, people that I represent in Regina South, want to enjoy a little bit more about the summer, they've got all these glorious parks to go to.

And if they're used to watching television, and if they're used to playing a little bit of miniature golf or whatever, these things are available to them now. The parks have been modernized and updated, and all these things are available for their use. And don't think for a moment that they don't understand that somebody had to put them in. They've got to be paid for; the small fees that have gone up. They don't have a particular problem with paying an increase in fees.

Now as we mentioned a little bit earlier, and I'll just quit talking about the parks for a moment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to talk for a moment about Expo because one of the members opposite speaking from his seat was saying, oh yeah, you know, you're taking all of the people out of Saskatchewan. Expo. Certainly there was a lot of our residents from the province, from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, was extremely proud of our presence in Expo, and went to visit our pavilion. And they went there and visited with pride and said, yes, this represents Saskatchewan.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, and where the NDP always miss out, is the fact that Expo put Saskatchewan on the global map. And for the first time we took Saskatchewan to the doorstep of the entire world, and we displayed it to everybody from around the world for 165 glorious days. And we displayed our outstanding accomplishments, that again we dealt with in pride, Mr. Speaker. And Expo turned out to be one of the most successful world expositions ever. And our motto "A presence to be proud of," we couldn't be more pleased to participate in that.

Obviously the members that spoke from their seat earlier had the same attitude as the NDP government in Manitoba. Saskatchewan was the very first province to sign up a deal with Expo, Mr. Speaker, the very first. So, right off the bat, we understood and recognized the importance and the vehicle that Expo would be in promoting Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan-made products, Saskatchewan to the world.

But yet, the NDP government in Manitoba, no, they stayed away from it. They didn't want anything to do with it. I'm sure that they lived to regret it after it was all over, but none the less, hindsight and keeping their head in the ground . . . 2.8 million people visited the Saskatchewan pavilion, Mr. Speaker — 2.8 million — in 165 days. And in addition to those, millions and millions of people enjoyed the exhibitory from the exterior.

An Hon. Member: — Sure helped our economy, didn't it?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — There he goes, speaking from his seat again. He's back; I can hear him. He still doesn't understand how it helps our economy, Mr. Speaker. Well, if you would have. . . I've explained how it helped

our economy. If you would have been here a few minutes earlier you would have heard it.

But the outdoor exhibitory, Mr. Speaker, was unique to all of the pavilions at the Expo site. And we had sports kiosks available for all the members to see. We had J.I. Case displays. We had the Western Development Museum's steam calliope. And we had the stylized elevator itself, with the elevator going up and down, and the imaginary potash mine, and the like. It was a most enjoyable experience.

The Saskatchewan artists . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And another member speaking from his seat. It appears, Mr. Speaker, whenever I get going on a topic that I seem to exuberate a little, or get a little excited about, the members opposite just seem to kind of jump up and holler instead of getting into the debate. But never mind. I've got a good strong voice that my little Polish mother blessed me with, and I can out-yell those people.

(1630)

But the Saskatchewan artists, Mr. Speaker. You might remember when we had our Saskatchewan talent shows around this province, and all of the entertainers from around the province tried out to be a part of that team that went to Expo. You talk to those young people. You tell those young people that Expo didn't mean anything to them. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, they were the most excited young people in our province, and as they qualified to star in our show, boy, they couldn't have been more pleased.

It opened new horizons to these young people. Some of them had visions of going on to be professional entertainers, and perhaps with the experience they gained at Expo, their life-style will change because that opportunity was there for them. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, we again proved that Saskatchewan could provide world class entertainment right from our own backyard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Our Harvest Restaurant, now a legend, a five-star rating when the maximum was four. How can you beat that? And do you know how it was put together? It was put together by a successful local restaurateur in this province who designed the menu, who set up the place, and we set it up, and there it was.

Do you know what it was designed after, Mr. Speaker? Something that all of us in Saskatchewan are so proud of — our heritage, the ordinary fowl supper. And that's what our Harvest Restaurant was. And again, line-ups and queues that were amazing. And why? Because we just simply showed to the rest of the world what we can do.

Saskatchewan Day. What a magnificent display co-ordinated by two chairmen, one from Regina and one from Saskatoon, and it was a tremendous show. Again showing the world class — first-class people that we have available here in Saskatchewan that can put on exhibitory and displays second to none from anybody in the world. A presence to be proud of. Mr. Speaker, I can't even begin

to tell you, in the short time that I have available to me, what this presence did for the tourism industry in the province of Saskatchewan.

And while this was going on at home, things that the NDP never in their wildest dreams would have imagined could be done or would like to do. For the first time ever, promoting Saskatchewan outside of the province. Can you imagine that?

Mr. Speaker, anything as unheard of as promoting Saskatchewan to the rest of Canada and to our American friends? The first time in history that was done. I guess they didn't like these \$20 U.S. bills coming into our province — lots of them. Well we went after them, Mr. Speaker.

And do you know what we found when we advertised Saskatchewan to our American friends? For the first time they realized that Saskatchewan was there and wondered what it was . . . and it wasn't that we had a poor image, Mr. Speaker, it was that we had no image. They didn't know anything about us.

And when you consider the advantage that they have with the American dollar over the Canadian dollar, they're getting quite a bargain.

We worked with our local outfitters, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, as we took trade shows, and we went to Denver. We participated with hoteliers, outfitters, and the like, again to attract tourists into Saskatchewan. And we did it very successfully. And they were competing with some of the largest outfitting companies in the world. Because tourism, after all, is a pretty competitive business.

And yes, we entered the big leagues of this tough competitive business. And when we were at the sales missions, it was difficult to compete with outfitters from Michigan, with outfitters from Ontario, those that had been established for a long time — and we're trying to crack that market for the first time. But as they discovered more and more and more about our province and what we had to offer, they were certainly interested in giving us a try.

Sunspirit — the first new film that was produced on Saskatchewan in a decade — just an overwhelming, outstanding success. *Sunspirit* now sits in movie libraries around the world, Mr. Speaker. It's available to Americans, it's available to Asians, it's available to Europeans — on a moment's notice. The winner of more than several awards in the short while that we promoted it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And it was made by local film-makers, certainly. So, you know, speaking from your chair again. And I remember . . . It's unfortunate that the member from Saskatoon Nutana speaks from her chair.

I remember when we showed *Sunspirit, Saskatchewan* in Saskatoon for the first time, we had a special showing before it was public. And again, none of the members opposite took the time to come to it, not one. And yet it was available to them. And not one showed up. Now that goes to show you, Mr. Speaker . . . And then they stand up sanctimoniously in this House and dare to say that we

don't want to promote tourism, or don't know how to promote tourism, or that our programs are failing.

And that's why I'm on the topic that I am, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about the programs that have done their job. And wait until we get into our new programs and they find out what we're doing with tourism. They won't believe what's going to happen. You won't recognize your province in tourism in four or five years from now, because you don't recognize what's happened so far. And I'm ashamed of you to say that.

Our TMAP (Tourism Marketing Assistance Program) program, another program that helped our little communities to encourage visitors to come to their local areas. And all it was, simply, was working together with the small business community, with the private sector, with the non-profit organizations and the exhibition boards, and just put in equal dollars so now they can start promoting their own places and say that we've got the best exhibition or the best rodeo or the best whatever they've got.

And get people going, not only from the States . . . Sure we're number one, and you say that in mockery. And that's what I'm telling you. The member from Nutana says, you're number one, you're number one. Yes, we are number one! And why don't we promote Saskatchewan and be proud of it, instead of sitting there and being ashamed of it. I am not ashamed of my province. I want to show it to the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Visitor information centres, Mr. Speaker. The NDP wouldn't build them. We did. We've got them at our major ports of entry now into this province, so that as our visitors come . . . First of all, they're welcomed to our province by good, friendly staff, and they're told about all kinds of attractions in various places to visit in our province — try to encourage them to stay for an overnight, spend a few more dollars — very important to us.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think back of the years that I spent at the amusement park. I received no help from the government of the day. Not a penny. So I just gave up on them. They . . . Because, why? They didn't accept tourism for what it was. They didn't recognize tourism. They didn't know how to put any programs together. And yet I used to have over 100,000 visitors a year to my amusement park, all done by my own promotion. And if I wanted to drag in some Americans, I had to do it alone. No . . . They said no, we do ours provincially here. Everything we got is for the people. We don't want any outsiders coming into the province.

Well I beg to differ. Then they didn't want to move them around the province anyhow. They just wanted them to go to their own little neck of the woods, but thank God that's all finished now.

But continuing development from our government, with strong support from our government, Mr. Speaker. . . I had the occasion to go to the Moose Jaw air show on Sunday. Well I'm proud to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that one

member opposite did show. The member from Moose Jaw North, or South, I'm sorry . . . who is probably in his seat.

An Hon. Member: — And North.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Well, if the member from Moose Jaw North was there, I didn't see him, and I don't know how I could have missed him. But none the less, I did. But it was nice to see that they were there.

And what a glorious show that the base commander, George Miller, and his staff put on. And again, one of the highlights of the show, along with the military, of course, was the civilian aircraft, and our friends from Minot, the Pietch family. And I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker — not only did they come and contribute to that air show, but there would have been thousands of Americans, I would guess from that area, that came up to watch their local boys perform. And they did a heck of a job.

We estimate right now — and the numbers; we're still working on the numbers — that on Sunday there was in excess of 40,000 visitors for the air show, and that there could be as many as 50,000. Now, they're going to be working on that now. The Saturday before there was up to about 20,000. And I understand that that's not counting the kids, because there was turnstile problems. There was tremendous crowds, Mr. Speaker, and it was a tremendous show.

An Hon. Member: — How about Craven this weekend?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Now . . . that's right. In my remarks earlier, I had mentioned that this is amazing in this little province of ours — how the NDP could never see all this movement. In Craven now, in a couple of weeks time, we're going to have 50,000 people a day, or more, going to Craven, Saskatchewan. Can you imagine — 50,000 a day going to a community of about 200. Probably unimaginable for the members opposite.

But in any event, there again, and it's only because of the climate that this government is providing to get those things off and running and provide those to the visitors coming in, not only our American friends, but certainly out of province.

I can tell you that as you drive around the streets and you see our visitors from Manitoba, see our visitors from Alberta coming into this province . . . They're coming from all over. And B.C., who've got all the mountains — they're coming to Saskatchewan. There's something, I guess, unique about the Saskatchewan sunset — they really don't need a mountain in the way to shut it off; they just kind of . . . But, none the less, they come.

And others all around the province. There's other things. In Regina, I can speak for a moment on Mosaic. You talk, Mr. Speaker, about a tourism item. Mosaic — where we proudly display our heritage, whether we're Polish or Ukrainian or French or German, Chinese, whatever. Mosaic displays all of this to the whole country that's interested in coming to see it. They have their foods; they tell you the story of their tradition; they have their own traditional dress, and they provide the entertainment —

just a magnificent tourism attraction.

And as we travel around in various areas of our province and, depending on the smaller communities that you go to, we all recognize how proud Saskatchewan is of our heritage and of our culture. Well, what better tourism attraction is here than ourselves? We know that we're the most hospitable people in the whole world. We know that we want to bring the people in to visit us. We're proud of our culture. We're proud of our native culture, for instance. And that's another one that I . . . But in Mosaic there was 23 — I can't remember all of them — but all of these cultures and all of these various people getting together.

The Regina Agribition, along with the exhibition, the Saskatoon Exhibition, these are the things that attract people again, Mr. Speaker. The Agribition. People from around the world come in and visit the Regina Agribition. This legislature . . . and I've noticed some people entering the gallery now, probably tourists. Welcome to Saskatchewan if you're from out of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, tourism is at its best. And this is what the government does to encourage our visitors to come into our province and enjoy themselves and have a good time while they're here.

Up in Prince Albert, founders day; Nipawin, the pike festival. All kinds of people going to the pike festival. That's a summer-long attraction in Nipawin.

You can say, well then, that's fine; what do you do in the winter-time? We've got long, tough winters. Well I could talk forever I suppose, on winter festivals — the king trapper. Prince Albert has an excellent winter festival; I don't know if the members from there are aware of that. La Ronge. Meadow Lake.

Along with these attractions, Mr. Speaker, throughout the province we have hockey tournaments; we have ringette tournaments; we've got bonspiels. Now that's all tourism, and that's all designed to intermingle our communities. We invite the people from Nipawin down to Moose Jaw for the bonspiel, or the people from Prince Albert to come to Regina, or whatever they like.

We invite people from the South to go up North to see some of these king trapper events. They're outstanding. There's nothing to be ashamed of. And when you see some of these men, Mr. Speaker, that go for the king trapper, that can chop through a 12-inch log in about 8 seconds, it's amazing, and it's all interesting, and it all puts money into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that we're starting to concentrate on now are conventions. I believe that I could keep talking about conventions for an awful long time, but it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

An Hon. Member: — How much money are you bringing into the province?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — You're not aware? The leader of the

opposition House says that he's not aware of the convention dollars. Well, the convention dollars that come into this province, Mr. Speaker, are overwhelming. And as our large cities fill up . . . Here's the beauty of the conventions. As our large cities, which are now presently attracting conventions from all across the country, are filling up our hotels from the major cities, then our secondary cities can qualify for the smaller conventions. And as they fill up, then our little towns can provide the much needed facilities for smaller conventions. And like it's got a big repercussion that the members opposite won't really understand.

But none the less, Mr. Speaker, I see now that it is 4:45 and I know that our House leader has something that he would like to get done, so at this time I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

(1645)

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 4:46 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bill:

Bill No. 11 — An act to amend the Farm Security Act

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 4:47 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

CORRIGENDUM

In the *Hansard* of July 10, 1987, under the heading of introduction of Guests by Hon. Mr. Maxwell on page 1091, part of the greeting should read as follows:

C'est un plaisir pour moi, au nom du premier ministre et du gouvernement, de vous accueillir ici aujourd'hui. Et, Monsieur le président, puis-je dire que j'aime beaucoup l'accord Meech Lake.

We apologize for the error.

[NOTE: The online *Hansard* has been corrected.]