

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Hampton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, a group of 28 students from Preeceville School, sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They're accompanied today by Mr. Lorne Plaxin and Mr. Gwyn Watkins, two of their teachers; their chaperons, Mrs. Marion Milette, Mrs. Joanne Chernyk, Mr. John Maslow, and Mrs. Lorna Brodziak. I hope that you find question period very interesting this morning after the Alberta election. I think that there will be some excitement here this morning. I'm going to meet with you at about 10:30 for pictures and refreshments, and I want to welcome you all here today. Will everyone join me in their welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, I'd like to add a word of welcome to the students from Preeceville and, in particular, Mr. Plaxin, an old friend of mine. My first teaching position 20 years ago was in the town of Preeceville, a nice area. The MLA for Canora has graciously invited me to join you for a few minutes at the end of question period for refreshments and discussion. I take him up on the invitation, and I look forward to meeting with you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would, too, like to join with the member from Canora and the member who just spoke in extending greetings to the students and the chaperons and teachers from Preeceville. Preeceville is the school that my wife attended, and I know that she has a lot of fond memories about the school and the community, which we visit quite often. And I would just like to say on behalf of her and myself, welcome to the students who are here, and to also hope that they have an interesting time in the legislature and an interesting visit in Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Increase in Payments to SGI Board of Directors

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. At a time when your government is cutting public services, raising taxes, and still running a \$2 billion deficit, can the minister explain why there has been a 65 per cent increase in the amount paid by SGI to its board of directors over the past two years?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, there was quite a bit of noise from his colleagues there. I missed the very part . . . 65 per cent increase in which?

Mr. Shillington: — There was no noise, Mr. Minister; you weren't paying attention.

It is an increase of about 65 per cent in the amount paid by SGI to its board of directors over the past years. When your government is running a deficit and cutting public services, when you're unable to provide fresh food for people of northern Saskatchewan, when food banks are overrun in the cities in southern Saskatchewan, how do you justify such largess for your own friends?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member would have been in Crown Corporations Committee yesterday he would have had the sheet of paper and heard the explanation that I gave at that time.

There were more meetings of the board of directors of SGI; there were more committee meetings, such as the safety committee on the Lights On For Life program, which I indicated yesterday in the House is meant for safety, and that committee has done a lot of very good work in developing the Lights On For Life program.

And further, Mr. Speaker, when the member alleges that taxes have gone up in this province, I'd like to remind him of the many tax reductions, the latest of which is the E&H tax removed on clothing under \$300, added to the gasoline tax removal. And, indeed, when you look at the budget preparations, indeed the province of Saskatchewan is next to none in all of Canada for tax increases in this country.

Mr. Shillington: — I'll tell you, this company is second to none for a Crown corporation, and it's more a director's fee.

New question, Mr. Speaker. I have the information that was tabled in Crown corporations, and that is what I found so outrageous. Let me just remind you of some of the totals paid to some of these hard-working individuals.

Mr. Henson — \$12,000; MacLean — 10,000; Nicholson — 17,000; Wagar — 12,000 for 10 meetings. Mr. Minister, we have the information that's tabled. How do you justify . . . this is public money, this is not a private company. How do you justify spending public money in such a lavish fashion for a few of your friends and not providing the basic necessities of life, fresh food, for people of northern Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's only incumbent when the member reads that kind of information he gives the whole story; the number of meetings — compare it to the years before. And I think also, Mr. Speaker, it might be a good time to mention just the performance of the board of governors of SGI and the management of SGI, and what has gone on for the past four years under this administration as opposed to the last four under the NDP. I remember very clearly rate increases of approximately 20 per cent in 1980; 28 per cent under the NDP in 1981. At the same time they raised their deductible from \$200 to \$350, and they lost money. Their rate stabilization reserve was negative. That's the management that came

under them.

Under this board of directors, of SGI under the Progressive Conservative government, we're seeing things like a large rate stabilization reserve. We're seeing a decrease in the rates of the auto fund. We're seeing surpluses there. We're seeing good management. And when you're talking about taxpayers' money, I'll compare the performance under this administration and these books than any of the ones in the last four years of the NDP administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. By that logic, Mr. Minister, you ought to double the fees of the board of directors of the potash corporation, and maybe they'd stop losing so much money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, since you're prepared to justify this, I want to pick an example. One Henson, struggled into seven of 12 board meetings and, for making it to seven of 12 board meetings, you felt necessary to reward him with a sum of \$12,000. Would you tell me what Mr. Henson's qualifications are that he deserves an average of an \$1,000 a meeting — more than that — about \$1,500 a meeting for attending only seven of 12 board meetings?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to follow the ridiculous logic of the member for Regina Centre, if we're paying money to our board of directors that are coming back with performances like these, I submit that their board of directors under the NDP should have been paying to SGI to go to those meetings.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wanted not some silly nonsense. I wanted to know why you think you have to compensate this man \$12,000 for attending seven board meetings and perhaps some committee meetings as well, I don't know. Why do you think his time is so invaluable that he has to be paid that kind of money?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly the per diems and that, that are paid to board of directors for SGI, has not changed that much in the last whole bunch of years. I guess the change is that we have got a lot of people in there — he mentions Mr. Henson; Mr. Nicholson has been mentioned before — a lot of very good people on there that are making a very solid contribution towards the running of our Crown corporation SGI. And I might also mention the chairmanship of Mr. Al Wagar.

And I think it's incumbent, when we're looking at the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan, we have these Crown corporations. They are out there performing a need in the province of Saskatchewan. And I hope, Mr. Member, that when you're talking about these kind of things you look at the bottom line.

I sat in Crown Corporations yesterday for three and a half hours. Not once was there a question about the financial position of SGI — not once. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the

NDP want to talk about anything good. They're probably lamenting the latest rain that's out there right now as well.

Mr. Shillington: — New question. By way of background let me suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the explanation for these per diems is that this is the first opportunity the Tory hogs have had at the trough in 50 years, and it's going to be the last, and you're going to make good use of it. And that's what you're doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — That's exactly what you're doing. Let me pick another — Mr. Nicholson, who attended 10 of 12 board meetings. He struggled in to 80 per cent of the board meetings. You felt it necessary to pay him \$17,000. May we have his qualifications and his expertise in the insurance industry? Would you give us that, and save us the speeches about how well you've done with SGI and what a mess it was for the first 40 years?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't claim SGI was a mess for the first 40 years, but there's probably about 11 that I could pick out of that 40 that I could really relate to.

You know, he mentions Mr. Nicholson now, and certainly . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, he mentions Mr. Nicholson, and yesterday I explained that he is the chairman of the safety committee of the board of directors for SGI. And they have implemented a program called Lights On For Life. Some of you might be aware of that. It was brought in and . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. The House cannot operate with the amount of noise that we're having. And I'm going to ask for order on both sides of the House so this House can perform its duties here.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — As I say, Mr. Nicholson is the chairman of the safety committee of the board of directors of SGI. And they have had numerous meetings over the past few years to develop the Lights On For Life program. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday in question period, the Lights On For Life program are coming in with very good results as far as awareness is concerned. And the number of collisions in the province is down, and indeed the number of fatalities. And indeed you can't relate it directly to a program because it's impossible to directly affiliate, but I believe it has something to do with it.

And like I mentioned yesterday, I go around the province, people are asking, what are the results of the Lights On For Life program? Is it helping in our province? They're concerned with safety. And like I mentioned yesterday, not once has an NDP member ever mentioned the word "safety," what are the results. They don't care about safety; they're looking at the money involved.

And I'll just reiterate once again the financial position of SGI: the rate decreases that have gone on under this government as opposed to the rate increases of 20 per

cent, 28 per cent; the increase in the deductible under them. And at the same time they had the gas tax on that went to SGI, and they still operated at a loss . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I'm going to caution the member for Quill Lakes. I just asked for order and you've been hollering continually, and I would caution you to control that.

Mr. Hampton: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister responsible for SGI. Mr. Minister, as the result of the Alberta election last night of which you're well aware, and I understand that you spent \$600,000 on your Lights On For Life campaign, have you and your colleagues decided what amount of money you're going to spend on your "lights out" campaign? Something's got to be done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can respond to this except, as I mentioned last night in my estimates, there's an old saying that I'm reminded of, and that's "They're so far behind, they think they're ahead."

Mr. Hampton: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of SGI. Would you care to have me give you a hand this weekend when I go home to do a little bit of a poll, give you an idea of whether one's on and one's out, or whether they're both out?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, a lot of comments come to mind right now, but certainly there are usually two headlights on every car and there are a lot of headlights now on in our province due to the program for Lights On For Life, a program that's brought in by this government for safety purposes. And if you want to look at it as a poll, we take it very seriously — issues such as safety. We'll continue to do so and we'll stand behind that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Air Travel — Frequent-Flyer Plans

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier. It deals with the government's policy respecting airline frequent-flyer plans. And on Tuesday, Mr. Deputy Premier, you said that it was government policy that employees who enrolled in such plans were not to use the bonus points for their own personal use but have them be used for government business.

Yesterday you admitted that the policy had been violated by the president of Agdevco. Can the Deputy Premier tell the Assembly whether a recent trip to London by one Terry Leier was also in violation of the policy?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, Terry Leier doesn't work for Agdevco or for the Provincial Secretary or for Sask Power or, to my knowledge, any of those things that I'm responsible for. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I don't know anything about a recent trip by Terry Leier to London.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary to the minister in charge of the Crown management board. Can you, Mr.

Minister, advise the Assembly whether a recent trip to London, England, by Terry Leier was in compliance with, or in violation of, the policy enunciated by the Deputy Premier?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any recent trip. If you could give me details of the time, I can check that particular thing out.

With regards to when the question was taken, I checked, Mr. Speaker, with the Department of Economic Development and Trade, the department I am responsible for, and found that there were no people under that particular department that used the Air Canada plan, and I satisfied myself of that. I will undertake to check through CMB as to whether or not anybody used that plan. I would doubt that that's the case.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Premier. Can you advise when the government's policy, which you enunciated, I believe, yesterday in the House, was sent around to senior public servants. I find it difficult to believe that the policy had been circulated to Agdevco prior to Mr. Wells' trip. And I ask you: when was this policy circulated?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — My recollection is, Mr. Speaker, that it was in April of 1985 that the deputy minister to the Premier informed all deputy ministers and department heads in government. My recollection as it relates to the timing of when . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the hon. member from Regina North who is all wise — North East . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And he will structure his organization — heaven forbid that he should ever get back to this side of the House — so that he does have a deputy minister in charge of Agdevco. We don't have a deputy minister in charge of Agdevco. We don't have a deputy minister in charge of Agdevco; we have a president in CDO in charge of Agdevco. It's a commercial Crown and a trading company and one that works very hard. And they spend a lot of time away from home travelling in eastern Europe and other parts of the world selling Saskatchewan, and do an excellent job.

Now to get back to the question, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of precisely when Mr. Wells became aware of the policy as it relates to these rewards through frequent traveller plans. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when he did become aware of the policy, he reimbursed the portion of his wife's ticket — his wife's ticket. And I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that his wife was an invited member of that delegation so, you know, there could well be a question as to whether she should have been paid for in the first place by the corporation. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the minute that he became aware of the policy as it relates to frequent flyer programs, the corporation was reimbursed.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would you acknowledge that the reimbursement took place this week after the matter was raised in this legislature?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I won't acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker, because quite frankly I didn't ask the question.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Crown corporation for which you are responsible and, you are asking us to believe, to which over a year ago a government policy in writing was circulated — that's what I take; and if I'm wrong, please correct me — are you suggesting that when that came to your attention, you did not know when the reimbursement was made? Are you saying you don't know when Wells reimbursed Agdevco?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that a written policy was circulated to all departments of government over a year ago, in April of 1985 — all departments of government, all deputy ministers and department heads. I did not say that the policy was extended to the Crowns at that time. I did say I don't know when Mr. Wells became aware of that policy. I did say that the minute that he became aware, he reimbursed the Crown, the corporation, as it relates to that frequent-flyer program and that policy, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Premier. Would you advise the House when the reimbursement was made, and will you acknowledge that it was made this week?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge when it was made as soon as I find out when it was made, and I will direct the question to the Crown, and find out. I haven't asked the specific question to the Crown, and I will undertake to find out for the member.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary, and I will direct it to the minister in charge of the Crown Management Board. Have all Crown corporations been advised of this government policy, and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the question becomes, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not Crown Management Board — I take it from the basis of the hon. member's question — as to whether Crown Management Board notified other Crown corporations. I took that to be the question of the hon. member, and that's what I will undertake to do.

The Crown Management Board is not in the business of sending out directives to every Crown corporation as to how and when they do it. I said I would undertake to see whether or not that was done. I think the observation made by the Deputy Premier was, as I understand, is that the Government of Saskatchewan — the Government of Saskatchewan, through the deputy minister to the Premier — sent out a notice to all deputy ministers, and that's usually the flow of information with regards to that.

The Crown Management Board does not send and does not deal with other Crown corporations in the same way that the deputy minister or the Premier deals with other deputy ministers, as you are perfectly aware of that. What I undertook to do for you is to indicate whether or not that policy flowed through the Crown corporations through

CMB. And I undertake to provide that information to bring it back to this House.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy premier. This has to do with the same issue and with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, for which I believe you are the responsible minister. Can you advise us when that policy was made known to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, which does not have a deputy minister, and whether or not the policy has been applicable to that corporation, and for what period?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'll find out specifically and precisely when the policy was communicated to all those Crowns that I'm responsible for and make this House aware.

Closing of Campsites in Province

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister in charge of parks and Renewable Resources. And it deals, Mr. Minister, with your . . . The question I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is and it deals with the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, last week's decision to close down 36 campsites along our highways and roads. And just a very quick question, Mr. Minister.

In view of the fact that these roadside campsites are very important to the tourism industry in our province, especially the one site that you have planned to close down in Beaupré Creek, which is a historic site, which was the first conservation officer's home in that area.

Mr. Minister, once again I ask you: will you reconsider your decision to close down the 36 campsites, and if not, later today would you provide the Assembly with a list of the 36 that you plan to close down?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has referred to 36 campsites. I'd like to correct that misinterpretation. They are not campsites. Only 10 of 36 are campsites, involving 75 camping spots. And, Mr. Speaker, these are not fully-serviced lots. We're not talking about electrified lots.

Before any decision was made, Mr. Speaker, on the 36 facilities . . . before any decision was made, we consulted with the Department of Highways, the Department of Tourism and Small Business, and there were 18 separate criteria used for evaluation. We were assured, Mr. Speaker, that there would be no harm whatsoever to tourism closing three primitive camping spots in a far northern part of Saskatchewan which is already very well serviced by a number of camping spots in that area.

Mr. Speaker, what we have tried to do in our rationalization is look at what the public wants for camping spots and for recreation sites. And what the public is telling us it they like having 17 provincial parks, fully modern, with showers and facilities like that; they like having 101 regional parks; and they like the 252 other camping facilities we provide in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we are providing approximately 9,000 camping spots in Saskatchewan. I did some checking; that is the highest per capita in Canada. We are also

scheduling, Mr. Speaker, the opening, the introduction of five new provincial parks.

When we look at these facilities — and they are not campsites, only 10 of them are campsites, we're talking of closing — we find they are totally underutilized. There will no staff cut, Mr. Speaker, and there will be an increase in service to the more popular areas. Things such as boat launching, access to lakes and access to fishing are in no way impeded, Mr. Speaker.

We have had inquiries from communities and individual groups since it became public that some facilities would be closed, and those individuals have indicated to me that they might even be interested in taking them over and running them themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we anticipate generating savings of \$100,000 per year with these measures. With \$100,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, we feel we can redirect superior services to other cities.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Thompson: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Renewable Resources. The question that I asked you, Mr. Minister, would you reconsider closing down these important campsites? You indicate that the department is closing them down due to a study that you took and that the sites are really not wanted, and another example you gave was that you were going to save \$100,000. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that is not true because those sites are very important, and you have letters on file from individuals from the communities who want them to remain open.

Mr. Minister, I ask you once again: will you provide us with that list that you plan to close down?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, in the Athabasca constituency, 16 sites providing 320 camp spots which will remain open. The hon. member referred to Beaupré campsite as being historic. It is not a historic site, Mr. Speaker, and there are three tenting spots available on that site. At Doré Lake, 16 kilometres away, there are four sites with 43 camping spots available.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, of the rationalization, in my own constituency there are three facilities which were scheduled to close, one of which by example is Bug Lake, which roughly corresponds to one of the ones the hon. member referred to in his remarks.

But Lake, Mr. Speaker, is a small little area on a lake with three spots for tents, that is never used, and a couple of picnic sites. And I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we won't be maintaining that site as a campground. The people, who use it, generally go there just to take bait out of the lake, or route to better camping facilities a few miles further down the road.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Increase in Opportunities '86 Program

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the minister responsible for the Employment Development Agency, and I'd like to make a statement concerning the initiatives being undertaken by the Government of Saskatchewan to create jobs for Saskatchewan students this summer.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting that with the monthly job statistics having been released this morning, that in question period we didn't have one question from the vigilant opposition on the item of job . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Ministerial statements are to be statements of what's happening and not to enter into political debate.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Sorry, Mr. Speaker, my apologies. First of all, I would also like to inform the members of this Assembly that the job creation record of the administration is again unmatched by any western province and, indeed, by any other province outside of Ontario.

This morning's information from Statistics Canada puts the actual unemployment rate in Saskatchewan at 8.2 per cent, a drop of 1.3 percentage points from last month, and on an unadjusted basis the rate has dropped to 7.6 per cent. In the month of April alone, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Statistics from Statistics Canada do not enter into a ministerial statement as new information. If there is something new that you have that deals with your department, I'd like to hear it.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I assure you that the information that I'm preceding with is very relevant, but anyway I will come to the point. Earlier this year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Earlier this year I announced the Saskatchewan Opportunities '86 program, a wage subsidy program designed to create summer jobs for post-secondary students and secondary students who intend to return to school in the fall. At that time I indicated that we intended to spend some \$8.5 million to create jobs for up to 9,000 students. I also indicated that this program would be operated solely by the Saskatchewan government and that the federal government would operate its own summer creation program for students.

The Opportunities programs, Mr. Speaker, were instituted by this administration in 1983. Opportunities '83, '84, and '85 created a total of 17,230 jobs for summer students. Last year, looking at the results of a drought year, we, and the Government of Canada, co-operated in the Canada-Saskatchewan Opportunities '85 program that spent \$9.1 million in creating 9,730 summer jobs for Saskatchewan students.

This year the federal government decided to operate its own program of just over \$3 million and we anticipate 15 . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Shillington: — The minister is patently talking about past programs. He's not making any announcement. This is a straight political statement and it's out of order in ministerial statements.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. When I'm on my feet I'll ask the members to be absolutely quiet. Ministerial statements are to be new information provided from a department. The member is covering areas that I have cautioned you were not classified as ministerial statements. If there is some new information, I'll take that. Otherwise I would ask the member to refrain from speaking.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I assure you there's very significant new information, but in order for the impact to be understood, some of the background at least has to be presented.

The Saskatchewan government, considering the effects of a second year of drought and the effects of lower oil prices in the oil patch, decided that last year's program, large as it was, might not meet the need this year.

In order to ensure that students who wish to continue their education have the opportunity to do so, we have announced measures to improve our students' assistance program in a greatly increased Opportunities '86 program. In this fiscal year we will increase expenditures for student assistance by 45 per cent to over \$60 million.

Our announced \$8.5 million Opportunities '86 program, Mr. Speaker, will provide an increase of over 27 per cent in funding for student employment. The deadline for filing applications to the Opportunities '86 program was this past Monday, May 5. As of this morning, we have already processed 5,500 applications and approved just over 8,000 summer jobs for Saskatchewan students, at a projected expenditure of \$8.4 million.

Response to the Opportunities '86 program has exceeded even our increased expectations. As of yesterday we had received about 2,000 applications that had been mailed by the closing date, over and above the ones that we have now approved. I am, therefore, Mr. Speaker, pleased to announce that the Government of Saskatchewan will increase the budget of the Opportunities '86 program by a further \$2 million . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — . . . to a total of \$10.5 million, thus allowing us to respond to all of the applications that had been mailed in by the program's closing date. This will bring the total of jobs created by the Opportunities '86 program to over 11,000, and the total number of summer jobs created . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long this Assembly is going to be forced to listen to a political speech by the minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order! When I'm on my feet, I'm going to caution the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg not to be hollering.

If the members had been listening, you would have heard the minister announcing just now a \$2 million increase in the program. That is the point of the ministerial statement. Now the minister has gone on excessively long, and I would ask him to finalize the statement immediately. And in the future ministerial statements must be short and to the point.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In summary I once again indicate that because of the demand that we have received for this program, which has significant benefits to the students of the province as well as to many small-business men and farmers and communities in the province, we have increased the total budget by \$2 million. We will be providing somewhere in the area of 13,000 jobs, which is an increase of 33 per cent over last year's program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, what we have just heard is a complete abuse of the rules of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, all we have that is new is an updated estimate of what this program is going to cost us. Everything that was said this morning was announced months ago, and all we have is an updated estimate of the costs.

I don't intend to dignify what has happened this morning by making the same mistake of carrying on with a 15 minute diatribe, Mr. Speaker. Suffice it to say that if this government thinks it's good politics in a time of food banks and record unemployment rates in this province . . . if you think it's good politics to stand up and beat your chest and say what a grand job you're doing, then maybe we just ought to let you, in spite of the fact that this is contrary to the rules.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proposing amendments to The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act, and copies of the proposed amendments have been distributed to members.

The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act requires lenders and sellers to disclose credit charges in writing. The Act covers provincially regulated lenders such as credit unions and trust and loan companies. It also covers sellers such as department stores or farm implement dealers who finance purchases. These are sometimes called line lenders.

Banks, which are regulated by the federal government, are allowed to offer variable loans. As a result, banks have had a competitive advantage over provincially regulated financial institutions. Current legislation prevents provincial institutions from offering variable interest loans because their cost of borrowing cannot be expressed in advance in dollars and cents, as is required by the Act.

The proposed amendment is intended to clarify the Act and update it to reflect market-place realities. Specifically, it is proposed that variable rate loans be allowed subject to very strict conditions.

For example, let us suppose a consumer wants to borrow money from a trust company. The consumer now will have a choice between a loan with a fixed interest rate and one with an interest rate, usually lower, that rises and falls with the Bank of Canada rate. If the rate falls, the consumer will be better off than if he had taken a loan with a fixed interest rate. If the rate rises, the consumers' cost of borrowing would of course rise, and it is to address this point that this amendment contains a number of safeguards.

These safeguards require the lender or seller to make certain disclosures to ensure the consumer fully understands the implications of taking out a loan with a variable interest rate. The conditions we will be imposing include the following requirements: one, a clear statement that the interest rate and other factors can vary; secondly, the borrower or the buyer is allowed to pay the outstanding balance without penalty; three, examples of cost of borrowing are set out; and four, statements are sent out at least every six months.

If a lender does not fulfil all these conditions, Mr. Speaker, the borrower or the buyer may not have to pay the cost of borrowing. Permitting variable interest rate lending or financing will benefit both consumers and provincial industries affected by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, variable rate loans are not new. However, there is growing consumer demand for the flexibility variable rate loans provide. The proposed amendments

do not affect the civil rights of Saskatchewan citizens. No additional administrative or other public costs are required.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is one that will be welcome by provincially regulated credit unions and trust and loan companies, I'm sure. I move second reading of The Cost of Credit Disclosure Amendment Act, 1986.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. I thank the minister for what I think was a fairly full explanation of the detail of the Bill.

She made one comment in closing that I thin is very accurate, and that is that the Bill is going to be welcomed by the trust companies and the banks. You bet your boots it will be. You bet your boots it will be, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, I grant you there are certain difficulties which have arisen with respect to this Bill. But I say to . . . I yell; I try to yell above members opposite — including the Minister of Finance, who ought to know better, who is the dean of this House and ought to know better — I say to members opposite that this Bill is not in the best interests of consumers, Madam Minister. And this Assembly has to decide whether or not we exist for the benefit of the banks or the benefit of the people, because the two interests, I think, do not coincide here.

(1045)

I know there's a problem with the existing Bill. It was brought into existence some 17 years ago, 18 years ago, at a period of time when all interest rates were fixed. But it served a useful purpose in that it gave to the consumers clear and concise information with respect to what they were paying.

They could understand the cost of borrowing, and, in my experience, most people who get into financial difficulty don't understand the cost of borrowing; they don't understand what the interest rate is going to mean to them and how quickly it's going to overcome them. And that is why so many people who borrow get into trouble. This Bill attempted to deal with this, and the minister is gutting the Bill with this amendment. It will no longer provide that information to people.

The important point of the Bill was that people got . . . Well the minister is shaking her head in disgust. The important point of the Bill was, you got this information in advance. It doesn't do you a lot of good to find out afterwards you couldn't pay the bill; you couldn't pay the loan off. That's not very useful.

Madam Minister, I wonder if this . . . I say now in a non-partisan fashion, I wonder if this is a Bill we should be passing at this session. I wonder if it wouldn't be a better procedure to refer this Bill to a special committee of the legislature and have the Bill considered. It touches upon some difficult, complex matters. I know the banks want it passed today, but I don't think the consumers, if they understand it, want it passed today.

I'll ask Madam Minister to stop yelling till I'm finished. I listened with interest and quietly while she was talking. I ask for the same courtesy, Madam Minister. Well now she's saying some things that are downright unpleasant.

Madam Minister, I wonder if it wouldn't be a better idea to let this Bill stand, refer it to a committee, and consider the matter, because it raises some complex issues. The consumers should know and should know in advance what the total cost of a loan is going to be, and they should have an opportunity to figure out whether or not then can afford it. If they can't understand the cost of borrowing, they'll never know whether or not they can afford it. That's simple logic. This Bill attempted to deal with this. You're gutting the Bill.

You might argue that the Bill was gutted by events, and I think largely it has been. The Bill has been ignored for 10 years. Variable lending rates have been the common practice, and the Bill has been ignored, and it hasn't been enforced except by some sharp-eyed borrowers and their lawyers, on occasion, who have used the Bill to avoid paying interest. So I'm not claiming . . . I'm not making a great argument for the Bill as it stands. It's not working and it's probably unworkable, but the principle of the Bill is one that we should seek to preserve.

That is why I say, Madam Minister, I would ask you to consider referring . . . letting the Bill stand over, perhaps referring it to a special committee of the legislature. Let us consider the matter. It is complex and it's very important. It's not something . . . This is one of those areas when a government can fall into the trap of listening to the lobbyists. The banks and the trust companies have every means available to make their views known to the ministers and the department. They're very effective lobbyists. The people who can't pay their debts don't have that, and their voices are silent, but they are legion.

So I'm going to in a moment ask for leave to adjourn this debate to give it further consideration. But while I am reviewing the Bill, I want to ask of the minister and the treasury benches opposite that you consider giving this Bill a good deal of serious study, because the original principle embodied in the Bill is well worth preserving.

With those comments, Mr. speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting Credit Reporting Agencies

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, The Credit Reporting Agencies Act, 1986 has been provided to the hon. members. This Bill will replace the current legislation, The Credit Reporting Agencies Act, which is to be repealed.

The Bill does not include licensing and bonding provisions. All references to licensing and bonding are removed. In all other respects the proposed legislation is identical to the existing legislation.

Hon. members will appreciate that the new legislation

continues to protect consumers by prohibiting undesirable credit reporting practices. As well, legal remedies are granted consumers for incorrect or false information supplied by credit reporting agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the bonding provisions of the former legislation have never been used because credit reporting agencies do not actually handle or receive people's money. The agencies affect consumers' credit ratings, not their finances, so bonding does not protect consumers. Consumers can still check their files and correct or challenge the contents. Consumers may also seek legal remedies for libel and slander outside this Act.

The role of licensing is to identify credit reporting agencies operating in Saskatchewan. Licensing is unnecessary for this purpose because the three agencies operating in the province must register under The Business Corporations Act or The Business Name Registration Act. The new Act will save Saskatchewan taxpayers money because of administrative savings. The revenue generated by licensing only three agencies barely, if at all, covers the cost of issuing the licences.

The new legislation is yet another example of the government's common sense approach to governing. We are doing away with an unnecessary licensing function and its attendant administrative costs with no compromise, Mr. Speaker, of any kind in consumer protection.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of our commitment to better legislation, not more legislation. No part of the Bill gives powers which interfere with the civil rights of Saskatchewan citizens. I would be pleased to go into further detail respecting the Bill in committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I now move second reading of The Credit Reporting Agencies Act, 1986.

Mr. Shillington: — Madam Minister, all I can say is, if you're serious about what you said, I hope this session is truncated by an early election and this Bill is never passed.

Madam Minister, you may not have enforced the bonding provisions; I don't know. But let me give Madam Minister some assistance with what bonding and licensing is supposed to do. Bonding is not supposed to just protect the consumers' money. It's also supposed to ensure that (a) the legislation is obeyed, since the bonds are forfeited if you don't; (b) anyone who suffers damages can collect it.

At the hands of an irresponsible credit reporting agency, people can suffer enormous damages. The purpose of the bonds was supposed to be that it would ensure that people who were injured, got judgement, could collect it. That's what a bond is supposed to do. Licensing was never intended to assist people in identifying a company. Of course that's available elsewhere. It's a lot easier to find through the registrar's branch than it is through your licensing system.

Licensing is an enforcement provision. If you disobey the

legislation, you lose your licence; it's that simple. It's the only way of enforcing this legislation against companies who often have very few assets in this province. The only way you have of dealing with agencies, credit reporting agencies, whose assets and whose business is in another jurisdiction, is licensing. You cannot effectively discipline them in any other fashion.

To remove the licensing provision removes any ability to enforce this legislation, Madam Minister. And I'm surprised that Madam Minister has been a minister for three years now, if I'm correct, and understands so little of the consumer protection legislation.

Madam Minister, I may change my views, and our caucus may come to a different conclusion, but as I stand here now I'm not impressed with this legislation as you explain it. The purpose of this department is not . . . Well the Minister of Tourism and Small Business is going to have lots of opportunity to get into the debate later in the day in your estimates. I wonder if you could just maintain yourself and contain yourself for a few minutes until we have these Bills out of the order paper.

Madam Minister, the function of your department is not to make life easier for credit reporting agencies; the function of your department is to protect consumers. When you remove the bonds and you remove the licensing provision, you might as repeal the Act, because there is nothing left of it, and no means of enforcing it.

I think I am correct in saying that no credit reporting agency has its head office in this province. They're all in Toronto and New York. And you, madam Minister, if you . . . If the Minister of Justice is around, and he's not . . . He's very ready with advice when he is, but he's not at the moment. The Minister of Justice . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member realizes that you're not allowed to draw attention to members that are here or not here, and I would ask the member to stay with the subject.

Mr. Shillington: — I wasn't doing so in a pejorative sense, although it might have sounded like it. I was making the point to the Madam Minister that it's fairly elemental law. There's no means of enforcing our provisions against people who aren't in this province. Legislation under our system of law can have no extra-territoriality. The only way you can enforce it is to license them; you're taking that away, in my view — and I may change it. In a more studied view, I may have a different view, but in my view now is, you mustn't repeal the Act. I don't know what you're leaving the legislation in place for.

Madam Minister, I'm going to again ask for leave to adjourn this. Again, I wonder if madam Minister wouldn't reconsider it and perhaps when you're reconsidering it, perhaps let this Bill stand over as well until another session and allow people an opportunity to make representations on it. I don't think it's in the best interest of consumers. With that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Tourism and Small Business Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 45

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, last day in Tourism you gave a statistic that \$1 worth of advertising buys exactly \$12.40 cents worth of goods. I asked you how you'd arrived at that figure; whose number is that? And you have failed to give that answer. I would like to get the source of that statistic.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I apologize for the delay. We have an official coming down from the upstairs balcony. We'll get that information momentarily.

Mr. Engel: — That's fair enough. I think that's a fairly basic question that I'd like answered because of the fact that we delayed the estimates yesterday to give the minister a chance to talk about how much more they're spending on advertising. And this government puts a lot of emphasis on the value of advertising, so I think before we get into the basis of why they spent an additional \$3 million in advertising in the department, it would be nice to know what he uses as a source to say that \$1 spent on advertising buys \$12.40 worth of sales. And I'd like to know: is that a national average from the advertising bureau or . . . he didn't say 12.50; he didn't say \$12; he said \$12.40. So somewhere along the line somebody did a survey, somebody did a study, and I'd like to have the terms and the background material from that study.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the information that we have been providing is acquired through the studies that are carried on, both in-house and by external consultants, and I submitted the last day . . . I know my material has 11 pages. I think we condensed it to four or five pages of the consultants who we have contracted with over the last year.

What happens, of course, is that the inquiries that we receive . . . People are sent questionnaires asking for detailed information. There are then some simple extrapolations made, and we come up with the numbers that we have given you. They are Saskatchewan specific. They are not in any way a national figure.

The general term for the studies is conversion studies, and some of the results . . . The number that I gave you was in general touring. All right. And we find that, of the inquiries that come in, almost 67.2 per cent of the inquirers actually take a trip in Saskatchewan. For every dollar that is spent on advertising, 12.40, which is the number I gave you, was spent by tourists in the province in that general category — general touring.

In sport fishing, 20 per cent of the inquiries actually came to the province. And for every dollar spent on advertising in that area of sport fishing, \$21.80 was spent by tourists in the province. As far as what we classify as general adventure, 64.1 per cent of the people who made inquiries about that type of holiday actually took a trip to Saskatchewan. And for every dollar that was spent on

tourism advertising in that area, 2.50 was spent by tourists in the province.

It's important to note that these are based only on inquiries. These are people who come to the province after having made an inquiry, so these . . . There's then a follow-up questionnaire. This does not include the benefits of the electronic media, of some of our other programs. These are very well defensible figures and are taken from those conversion studies which are the type we're talking about. I trust that provides the information the member needs.

Mr. Engel: — There's information we get when advertisers try and sell us on advertising, even politically. They'll give the numbers saying that so much money spent on advertising will buy this degree of success. And I was wondering if that's the kind of number you had there and that's what you were using. And I appreciate the minister's answers.

I'm concerned with the money you're spending on advertising, and with the announcements you made, because we adjourned this Tourism estimates, and the announcement you made in Saskatoon yesterday — and I watched it. Do you wish to share with us . . . have you a paper you want to send over and give us a breakdown of that \$3 million worth of advertising? I'm just pulling the number out of my memory from what you had. Can you send a paper over saying who the agencies are that are going to place it and what the advertising package is going to be about?

On the basis of your own press release and your own salesmanship of it, I want to tell the minister that I was more impressed with the former minister's little announcement here in Regina, compared to yours in Saskatoon, because at least he didn't wind up — at least he didn't wind up the same way you did. And I don't know if I have the minister's attention or not. But when you wound up your little press conference up there, Mr. Minister . . .

Maybe, Mr. Chairman, I should wait until he's going to listen because I don't know why I should be repeating my question if he's not listening to the answer. But when you wound up your press release yesterday, you made the statement that there's that many people going to have to stop in Saskatchewan anyhow on their way to Expo. And I thought, well I wonder, why are you then spending this \$3 million if those guys have got to come here anyhow on their way to Expo? I think you boobooed a little, and maybe you should try and make up for it today to the listeners we have that are out there watching and that were so disappointed in saying that you're going to spend three million bucks.

Would you tell us who is placing the ad and what basic number . . . The advertising on your communications budget — is that going to stretch the 4.253 million that you have budgeted, or is that going to fit within that framework?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Just let me here first of all clear up a misconception. I imagine the member opposite was doing something else at the time he was watching the

television.

The comment about the Expo traffic coming anyway was made by the press, not by me. The point is, in response to a question at the post press conference interview, there was a question asked about the problems that the tremendous number of visitors we would have this year, what that would mean for next years tourism numbers. And I made it very clear that we see 1986 as a year of opportunity; that we as a department, and we as a government, feel our role is to do everything we can to encourage those travellers who will cross the province to leave the beaten path — the two major east-west arteries — to get into other parts of the province to see the things that we have to see.

And we've also made it very clear that from there the responsibility rests with the private sector, with the tourism industry in the province, that employer of 32,000 people, to provide the services, to provide the facilities, and to provide the attractions that will send those people home in a positive frame of mind about our province, that will have those people providing word-of-mouth advertising, and in fact will bring those people back.

So the advertising program that we've undertaken this year is built and designed to coincide clearly with the opportunity and to make that opportunity in fact a real one. And I think that the people who saw the demonstrations that my colleague from Regina North — soon to be from Regina South — put on here in Regina, and our demonstration in Saskatoon, were very impressed with the quality of the material and even as much so with the enthusiasm of the staff. And I think that speaks highly.

In terms of the other portion of the question, to break down the tourism promotional expenditures . . . and if I could have the member's attention so I don't have to repeat this. A breakdown of tourism promotional expenditures: we're talking here, of course, of moneys that come from two subvotes in the blue book, the communications budget and the tourism marketing budget, and they are in separate sections.

Breaking down that promotional expenditures, paid advertising amounts to 1.7 — well let me give it completely — \$1.75 million. Publications — and I in the House the other day demonstrated some of the things. We have many, many publications, and we had a kit prepared yesterday for the press people, and some of them may share it for you. If you'd like to come by my office, I can give you some samples. Or you can simply write the department, as thousands and thousands of people are doing, to get that information. That amounts to \$950,000.

Audio-visual productions: this is for production of the audio-visual portions. An example would be Sun Spirit Saskatchewan, although that's not included in this particular budget. But our advertising packages which were made public yesterday, the targeted television and radio ads to the various markets, is \$75,000 — that's for production. The exhibits and displays that we have, that we take with us to the various sport and travel shows that we attend across North America — the exhibits amount to

\$10,000. And our direct sales projects, expenditures there are \$430,000.

And I believe, when you total that, you will find the total of \$3.215 million that is spent in those general categories.

It might be of interest as well to — I'll give you all of this — the increases over the previous budget, just so . . . simple for you. The paid advertising has an increase of \$464,000. The publications — and the key expense here is the additional publications that we need because of Expo — we anticipate an increase in the requests for our publications. That is what you would consider, I suppose, normal increases. But the Expo opportunity and the material that we will be displaying on site at Expo amounts to a significant increase, and that's about \$350,000. And our direct sales projects — and again related primarily to Expo activities, on site primarily, but also off — is \$75,000.

So the total increase is \$889,000 over '85-86. And I think hopefully that clarifies the breakdown of the moneys and where the increases come.

Mr. Engel: — The major portion of the question that I directed to you was: who's doing up most of these for you? What are the agencies that are handling it?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — In terms of the expenditures when we discuss the production, the development of the product, whether they be the publication or the ads, that work is primarily done by Roberts & Poole. the placement of the product, that is when contacts are made and agreements made with television stations, with networks, with radio stations, and also in our publications — which magazines they would appear in — the placement is done by Dome. So we have two elements, one being the production development, the other being the placement.

(1115)

And it's important to emphasize — and the members have made this mistake, and I'm sure it's inadvertent — but the members have several times indicated that a significant portion of money went to Dome. The money went to Dome, and Dome dispersed it amongst all those electronic and print media people. So it is really inaccurate and totally misleading to this committee to indicate that that money went to Dome. And I'm sure that the member, now that that's been clarified for him, will not make that mistake in this Assembly again, and certainly not outside.

Mr. Engel: — I'll make it inside or outside. When you gave us the numbers of how much Dome got on the advertising, it was over \$1.5 million, Dome's contract was. Now if they spent a million dollars on placing it and had a half a million — and our understanding and the information we have is that Dome credits your party with 15 per cent of all their placement costs. And that's why we're concerned about Dome. Because when Dome works for your department for \$1.5 million and gets 15 per cent credit to do PC ads, and they do the same amount for SGI and this department and that department, that adds up to a sizeable amount, Mr. Minister.

Now the question I have today: of this 3.25 million, how much of it is placement costs, and how much of it is production costs?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I have to take rather considerable objection to the preamble to that question. That is absolutely false. I believe, and I don't profess to know, but I assume that that was the practice under your administration. I can understand why you would make that mistake. But I assure you that that is not the situation with this government, and I am really disappointed that you'd make a charge like that with absolutely no basis in fact. And that certainly is disconcerting.

Mr. Engel: — Are you going to answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Possibly the member could eliminate the inaccuracies in the preamble and ask the question. I'll try to get him the numbers.

Mr. Engel: — The minister is very sensitive, because I would be sensitive too if I were spending the kind of money with Dome advertising. The question was straightforward and very simple. I wanted a breakdown between the production costs and the placement costs of the \$3.25 million.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — On average, Mr. Chairman, in response to the last part of the question, with our advertising, the production and development costs are between 20 and 30 per cent. And the remainder are the media costs — how much it costs to get the production on the air or into the magazine. So we can't provide you with each specific item, but on average those are good guide-lines that we can go by.

Mr. Engel: — Last year the placement costs were 1.5 million, and this year you're going to 2.6 million, an increase of a million bucks in your one department on advertising. Is that a fair assumption if you're not going to give us any details?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Once again, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat very clearly what I have already given, I thought, very clearly. The increases over '85-86 — all right? — increases, paid advertising, \$464,000. I realize that wasn't the previous question, but I thought I could maybe anticipate and give it to you there. Again, paid advertising: \$464,000.

Increases in publication. Those are things that we print for use. I think of the Saskatchewan holiday, the several publications that we have that are recognized, I think, all across the continent for their quality — \$350,000 increase there, and the majority of that — not all, but the majority of that will be because of on-site Expo activities in which we will be providing information to the millions of visitors who will attend the pavilion at Expo. Direct sales, direct sales projects — again the increase is primarily related to the Expo activities, the on-site activities — and here we have \$70,000.

Just so the member understands clearly, in terms of publications, the "Saskatchewan Accommodation"

guide, which lists all the accommodations in the province, an invaluable piece of information for a traveller who is spending some time in the province, and certainly something that I'm sure the hoteliers in your constituency as well as across the province are appreciative of.

The Saskatchewan vacation book separates the province into the various regions, goes through the attractions and the facilities that are available. Again, a publication that is gaining recognition across the province of Saskatchewan. Outdoor adventure, which is obviously aimed at a specific type of tourist, a major publication. and there are others. But when we talk publications, that's the type of thing we're discussing.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, yesterday or last day you gave me the information that Dome Advertising had a \$1.5 million contract for placement. You said that of the \$3.215 million in advertising costs, about 80 per cent of the closest breakdown you want to give us. About 80 per cent is placement costs. And I suggest that 80 per cent of three million and a quarter is 2.6 million and my question to you is simple. Are you going to give us the information or are you going to talk around it? Is Dome's new contract this year 2.6 million? It's a simple, straightforward question from the numbers you gave me.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I'll just make it very clear again. The member is, I'm sure again not intentionally, but tends to make misleading statements. We have indicated clearly what was spent last year on our media buy, what it cost us to get our product on the air or into the books. The numbers that we have are projections. We have no contract with Dome that says in this year you will get X. We develop our programs and we are very open about them. We took our entire package to the public yesterday, and you've alluded to that, both in Saskatoon and here in Regina.

We indicated exactly what the program looked like. The staff gave some tremendously interesting and detailed information about why we had structured certain ads and certain ways into various markets — demonstrated the differences between them. We indicated to the private sector how they can tag on by sharing the costs of some of these.

So obviously what we have in the blue book are estimates. And I think that's even the name of what we're doing here, our estimates of what we would intend to spend this year. And we readily admit that we've attempted very hard to increase the amount of money that we put into this. We do it for two reasons. We do it first of all because of the Expo opportunity, which has been discussed in some detail, and we do it because we're eight miles behind everybody else.

For instance, and I think these numbers are revealing, in paid media advertising for tourism in Canada, \$19.5 million is spent by the federal government this year. In British Columbia, \$6.6 million was spent last year — these are last year's figures, obviously. In Alberta, 6.1; in Saskatchewan, as we've indicated, \$1.3 million; we're in eighth place. Manitoba, 1.5; Ontario, 9.5; New Brunswick, 3 million; Nova Scotia, 3.5 million. The two

provinces that trail us, Newfoundland and P.E.I. And I think it's important to note that we would like to be spending more because, as we have indicated through the conversion studies that we talked about, there's tremendous benefit coming to the province from that.

And the problem is of course is that we have started at a very low base and are gradually working our way up. In essence, or in fact, in 1981, in Saskatchewan, and I believe your party was the government in 1981, a total of \$149,000 was spent on tourism advertising — \$149,000. Clearly you didn't understand or were not prepared to become involved in the commercial benefits that flow from tourism. And I've named these figures several times, but by the year 2000 we're talking about the largest single industry in the world — the largest employer in North America — currently, 32,000 people in the province, and increasing, depend on this industry. And we are not apologizing in any way for increasing. As I said in question period the other day, I wish it more.

And we will work as a department and as a minister with the support of my colleagues to see that that budget increases because these are well-spent dollars that are reaping returns to this province. And I think that the problem that we face in terms of our relative standing to those other provinces, as I indicated, is the fact that in 1981 we spent next to nothing, and we're slowly building from a very poor base that was established prior to '82.

Mr. Engel: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to quote a couple of lines from page 491 of the last year's blue book — not the estimates now, but *Public Accounts* — from *Public Accounts* in the blue book.

And the minister has been making snide remarks about why I'm sceptical, and why I'm a little bit sceptical. You even used the words "misleading." And I'm going to tell you; I'm wondering who's misleading who.

If you look at employment and development, your estimate last year was 1.42 million, an estimate of 1.42 million. And let's look over at the other side, Mr. Chairman, and I'll tell you, that's why things are changing for right-wing governments across this country. You look over at the expenditures side, when things are getting into a slump and the private sector isn't picking up their share to hold up and hold employment up. What did this Department of Tourism and Small Business spend on employment development? Fifty-six thousand dollars. The estimate, 1.4 million; the expenditure, 56,000. And you wonder why I'm sceptical and why I wanted just some details of your estimate when you say you're going to spend twice as much on Dome for advertising placement costs. I'm sceptical when I hear you say numbers in estimates if you don't give me some back-up information and some answers.

Look at the second line, Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan small industry development program. Now here's an area where everybody agrees that the small-business man can create jobs. The small-business men can take the people that are unemployed employables off of welfare. In 1978, my good friend Mr. Minister, there were only 1,800 people that were employable on welfare that weren't getting jobs. In 1979, there were 1,862; in 1980, there

were 2,000; in '81, 2,600. What happened in '84 and '85 . . . 11,984 and 10,720 in '85, employables, can't find work, having to stoop to get help from the state at your expense. And I'm telling you, Mr. Minister, when you budget 81,000 and you spend 8,000, that's the reason. That's the reason.

Industrial and technical assistance: estimate 175,000; 105,000 wasn't spent. You spent 70,000, and you wonder why I'm frustrated. You wonder why I'm trying to get some answers, Mr. Minister, because what you're doing is a lot of talk before an election, but no action — no action. And I think that everything you're saying today has to be read with a degree of scepticism, with a little bit of scepticism here, because when you made your own big, grandiose press release about spending 3 million bucks, you says, well they're going to come to Saskatchewan anyhow because they can't get to Expo without coming through Saskatchewan. That's the attitude of this minister, and I want to tell you, when you look at the results, when you look at the results of estimating 1.4 million and spending 56,000, something's the matter.

(1130)

Something's the matter when you're talking about employment and development, subvote 10. The estimate, 1.4 million, and the expenditure . . . Well they spent, Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians, 2,400; and you could go down the line and list the different ones that got it. But \$56,000 was it. That's for employment opportunities and development. Mr. Minister, your campaigning and all your talk, all your talk about this grand effect your advertising's having, sure isn't working here. I suppose in your advertising, and when Dome spent \$1.5 million advertising your department last year — and we're talking about small industry development program — you had \$80,000 on the estimate, and they spent 8,000 bucks. Ten per cent — 10 per cent — picked up on it, and the Alberta people . . . And I had a little paper here that I was going to show you, that in Alberta their right-wing policies aren't working and they're falling down right across Canada.

Mr. Chairman: — Order.

An Hon. Member: — Now what?

Mr. Chairman: — We're not talking about Alberta; we're talking about estimates here.

An Hon. Member: — We're making comparisons.

Mr. Chairman: — Estimates deal with Saskatchewan.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, get out your *Public Accounts* book; turn to page 491 and you look at Saskatchewan's small industry development program. The estimate was 80,000; expenditure was 8,000. And I'm saying governments that depend on the private sector for development — governments that depend exclusively on the private sector and say that they're going to be the engines to get our economy going, are getting turfed out. Turfed out. And to prove that they're getting turfed out, look at P.E.I. In P.E.I. they had a right-wing government

that operated like you do. They put in there in employment and development estimates, this one here of 1.4 million and spent 56,000. I wish somebody would calculate what that percentage is. What is 56,000 of 1,400,000? What is the percentage? I don't even think it rates.

An Hon. Member: — Well it's 5 per cent, about 5.6 per cent.

Mr. Engel: — Well 5 per cent of a million dollars would be . . . Yes, exactly 5 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — Five per cent.

Mr. Engel: — They had a 5 per cent batting average.

An Hon. Member: — Five per cent.

Mr. Engel: — Five per cent of their estimate was spent, and you tell me I can't tell you that right-wing policies aren't working. In Alberta, where they have the same right-wing, reactionary government that's trying to get the private sector to get their economy going, didn't work.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I would ask the member to get to the point of his question with the minister and not debate with the Chair what my ruling is.

An Hon. Member: — Touchy, touchy.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. On a point of order. I listened closely to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, who was speaking directly to a point he was making to the minister in charge of Small Business, very clearly talking about comparisons of other provinces and including the estimates that were made in previous years and what was spent.

What he said is that the minister's department had estimated \$1 million, and in reality in *Public Accounts* had spent 56,000 which is about 5 per cent or less of what they had promised to spend. Now I don't . . . I want to complete my point of order, and if the chairman would quit reaching for the button to cut us off, because I'll tell you, when members of the opposition want to raise a point of order, they're not going to be pushed around by a chairman who wants to cut off debate.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I'd ask the member to get immediately to his point of order, and I'm quite willing to listen.

An Hon. Member: — Well then sit down and listen.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well if I could have the floor to complete my remarks, and I want to talk for a few moment s— and if I could talk for a few moments before I get to my point — and I won't be getting to it immediately because I want to explain some background. I want to explain some background as to what my colleague has been doing. He's been raising important issues about small-business people and their concerns.

And the members opposite laugh. And this is the arrogance of this government. Even after Prince Edward

Island and Ontario and Alberta, they are still as arrogant as ever.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I've heard the member's point of order and the debate should get back to the topic.

Mr. Engel: — The point I'm making, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Chairman, is very plain — that under a right-wing government you spend a lot of money on advertising . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order.

Mr. Engel: — What are you talking about now? What did I say that's wrong?

Mr. Chairman: — When the chairman is on his feet, would the member please sit down.

Mr. Engel: — Why are you interrupting me? You're ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman: — Are you challenging the Chair . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Will we have order, please? Order. Order, please. Order.

While the member was asking the question, the member for Shaunavon and the member for Quill Lakes were continually talking and hollering. I would ask the members from Shaunavon and Quill Lakes to please stop disrupting the House with their hollering.

Mr. Engel: — The member for Lumsden was talking louder than my colleagues were. I see that the members opposite are very sensitive, but the point is clear. It is a sensitive point that we're making — that you either depend on the philosophy, you depend on the philosophy that you're going to have big business be the engine of the economy. That's the philosophical question we're debating here.

They said the employment and development opportunities are going to be generated in this province by big business. Well, big business backed off and said that when the economy's tough we're not going to do it, so they budgeted 1.4 million, spent less than 5 per cent — spent 56,000 — and it didn't work, because the measure of whether it works or not is have the people believe it's acceptable or not.

Across Canada right-wing governments who have tried this philosophy, Mr. Minister, are telling us it's not working. The premier of P.E.I., the premier went down the tubes. What province . . . (inaudible) . . .

An Hon. Member: — Prince Edward island.

Mr. Engel: — Prince Edward Island. I was right. I thought I was wrong there. But the premier himself lost his own riding. In Manitoba . . . In Ontario, Davis tried to make it work and he got turfed out. and in Saskatchewan you're trying to make this philosophy work. You say we're going to spend more. It's not working, so what do we do? We spent more money on advertising, and we advertise with the same firm that does our political advertising.

And I made the point loud and clear — and I made the

point loud and clear — that Dome Advertising does the advertising for your party, and they're getting more and more and more money. Last year they got 1.5 million; this year they're getting 2.6 million in an election year to do some advertising for you — 2.6 million, placement costs, according to the 20 per cent figure that he gave me. Of \$3.215 million in advertising, 20 per cent goes to Roberts and Poole. And I wonder if they do some production.

An Hon. Member: — Oh yes, they're on their list.

Mr. Engel: — They're on their list for production as well. And Roberts and Poole get 20 per cent, and the other 2.6 million goes to Dome, he tells me, placing for media advertising and tourism.

I think this government shows a lack of understanding of how to be credible and how to prove to the people of Saskatchewan. You don't say it over and over, and you don't say it louder, and you don't spend more money advertising if your programs aren't working. You change your direction. You change your philosophy. And if you don't, it's going to happen to you like it did in Alberta where 16 seats decided that the NDP have the right philosophy. In another 16 seats, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in another 16 seats we came within 100 votes. That's 32 seats decided that our philosophy works — our philosophy works; our philosophy where the people have a piece of the action, not just big businesses, not just Weyerhaeuser, not just Weyerhaeuser. Tourism and Small Business should be for all the business men. There should be money there for all the business men, but the only increase — the only increase — is in advertising.

Advertising increased: let's get on the radio with some fancy-coloured ads; let's put on some productions with the TV. Now that sounds awful funny. the member for P.A.-Duck Lake, our Attorney General, thinks that is very funny. He's laughing till he's red in the face because we're doing some fancy production and we're going to spend \$1.5 million more in advertising on political ads — politically-coloured ads is what they're going to do. And I want to tell you, the Mac attack's going to be on, not only in your riding but right across Saskatchewan, right across the province. People are going to do like they did in Alberta in 32 seats this time . . .

Mr. Chairman: — The member is once more straying from the topic and he's getting into political issues. Would he please get back on the topic, or we will go on to the next speaker.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, the committee of estimates is political. I'm here because I'm a politician. And if you don't like . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! The ruling of the Chair is not debatable. Would you please get back to the topic or, as I said before, we will go to the next speaker. Political issues are not part of estimates.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, I've struck a very, very sensitive note. I see about 20 long faces and another . . . I'm not even going to count how many empty seats. We're not going to talk about it. I'm not going to name any of the empty seats this morning.

But if you think that we're going to stand in this Assembly, and we're going to sit back, and we're not going to cheer about what's happening across Canada when people are waking up to the fact, when all the voters are waking up to the fact that you can't buy elections with advertising — increasing the advertising budget to 4.215 million bucks directly spent on advertising — and he sat down and told me that Alberta's spending more . . . (inaudible) . . . And I want to say that that's not the way to sell Saskatchewan for small business.

And it doesn't work in tourism either, because the Minister of Parks is closing down park sites — and my colleague's going to be talking about that in a very short time — closing down park sites along the Trans-Canada Highway. And he's spending \$350,000 more to advertise about Expo, and we're closing down the park sites when people are travelling through the province. Now that makes good sense. Now that is a government that is planning, that has faith in the advertising.

Well I don't think their advertising is geared to bring more people to Saskatchewan. The advertising is geared to try and save about 38 seats over there; that's what they're trying to do. And that's why you're trying to buy the support of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, my people that are in here are chomping at the bit and all want to get into this debate. But I want to raise the issue with you and say, Mr. Minister: what can we expect from your estimates when you spent 10 per cent of what you estimate on employment development? You spent exactly 10 per cent on Saskatchewan small industry development program — \$80,000 budget; \$8,274.84 spent. And industrial technical assistance, 175,000; you spent 70,000. How can we believe you this time when you're that far off on your estimates? How can we trust you? How can the people of Saskatchewan trust you?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I think the answer is relatively simple. I'll try to keep the response slightly briefer than what I've heard from across the way. Employment and development and small industry development are the two subvotes in the blue book that were put in the blue book under the previous administration. We have left them there to end them, and have replaced them by programs that are, in fact, efficient, and not programs that are simply give-aways.

I would point out to the member, if his colleagues would be quiet enough to let him hear — I know it's very difficult — that the employment and development line is a Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) program. Changes were made in the administration of this program which rescheduled the number of projects being paid by us to only business projects. In other words, we didn't put them into those non-business sectors.

Processing and payment of other projects under ARDA were channelled through other departments. I emphasize that — payments through other departments, Advanced Education, Social Services, and Agriculture. This accounts for the differential between the budget and the actual. And I repeat once again: an ARDA project, the money was spent through other departments,

consequently that discrepancy.

(1145)

In the small industry development line, if the member would look at his *Estimates* for last year — I believe he was the critic last year — he would see that the program had been replaced last year completely. So in other words, it wasn't there. If he was so concerned about it, I'd suggest last year would have been a more reasonable time to bring this up.

I think the important point here is that that small industry development program, which for the most part was simply a give-away program, totally ineffectual, not effective in providing for the needs of small business — and that's not an assessment that I made or that my colleagues made — that's an assessment that small business made. And when we set up this department, they asked us for some programs that had some meaning. And so I think it's important to look at what has replaced that program. And we see things like venture capital — \$15 million in tax credits this year for venture capital. That is equity money that will go directly into small businesses all over Saskatchewan.

The small business interest reduction program, or the nine and five-eighths program as it was known before my colleague brought down his budget — now the 8 per cent program — \$15.8 million in benefits to small business are budgeted in that program.

Marketing benefits program, the Saskatchewan Made, for instance — an exceptional program that has been widely accepted. Over 25,000 projects, or products, excuse me, now registered in that program; the business resource centres which we've talked about at some length in the community economic development program — all things that replace that small industry development line in the blue book that simply didn't work.

I would point out as well, and it's important to understand this, that in Tourism and Small Business, to say nothing of the new and innovative programs that I just discussed, we now have dealing with this sector, the Department of Science and Technology, which was unheard of previously; the Department of Economic Development and Trade — again two departments who impact greatly. And it's important to take the whole thing into consideration.

I think however, Mr. Chairman, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. And I think it's important that we look at results and what is being accomplished. And it was interesting to me this morning that we went through question period on the day that was . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The minister is trying to answer the question and there's a constant talk from the opposition benches. It just does not hardly subside for a minute. I would ask the members of the opposition to please quieten down and listen to the answer of the minister.

I'm warning the member for Quill Lakes to please quieten down.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, just to condense . . . The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg doesn't seem very interested in hearing the answer, Mr. Chairman. As you've tried to point out, we're having some considerable difficulty this morning. I assume that the buoyancy opposite is a result of the Alberta election. I would suggest it's a little false bravado.

To get to the specifics of the question, he indicated that some of the budget numbers did not match the estimates last year. I have indicated very clearly to him why those budgeted numbers, the *Public Accounts* numbers, do not match. And in a sentence, it's because the programs were either ineffective and we had to improve them or eliminate them. In many cases, they were channelled into departments where they should have been in the first place, and in other cases they were eliminated. But as I was indicating, when you had problems with the opposition, the fact is that it's a matter of the results that are attained.

And this morning, this morning we had the employment statistics released in Ottawa. The members chose to disregard those in question period, which is unusual, but the fact is that Saskatchewan has the second lowest unemployment rate in Canada. The unadjusted rate is 8.2 per cent, and on a seasonally adjusted basis, again the second lowest rate at 7.6 per cent, Mr. Chairman. That means to revert it, to put it in a positive sense, over 92 per cent of the people in this province are, in fact, employed, and I think that speaks to the successes of these programs.

I could go through many of the details, and the month to month, and on the year to year, but there have been two areas — two areas where we have been very concerned and we have been trying to target. One was youth unemployment, and it's important to note — and again I understand the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is not interested in this — but youth unemployment dropped 2.7 percentage points since March and is the second lowest in Canada, and that is a key concern, one we have been directing our attention to. And I think again, that that result, with almost a 3 percentage point drop in youth unemployment, putting us in the second lowest position in Canada, and almost twice as impressive as Manitoba's, would indicate we're being successful.

And the final point I'd make, Mr. Chairman, women, which is another concern as far as female unemployment is concerned, we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, unadjusted at 7.4 per cent. It's a drop of a full percentage point over the last year, so when you consider the successes in terms of total employment, in terms of improvement in youth unemployment, and women's employment, it would indicate that the things that we are working on, the programs that we have put in place, are in fact having substantial benefits, and I think that we must take that into consideration.

One other very brief comment. The member opposite continues to indicate that the expenditures we're making on tourism advertising are somehow ill-founded. Since these estimates began earlier this week, it's almost impossible to count the number of calls that have come

into either myself or the department from people involved in tourism, expressing the disgust at the line of questioning that has been taken opposite.

People in the tourism industry understand the importance — the importance of that advertising, and, Mr. Chairman, they understand that those ads are not government ads. Those are ads about our province; they're ads about their business; they're ads that attract people to the province and bring economic well-being. And I can only indicate that the tourism industry, as a group, are very unimpressed with the arguments that are being presented on tourism advertising.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you. I have a number of questions, Mr. Minister, I want to ask this morning, but I first of all want to touch on a few remarks that you had made just recently, in the House regarding taking advantage of the tourist trade that would be going through Saskatchewan on their way to Expo. Your remarks were that the Government of Saskatchewan, particularly Tourism and Small Business and, to a larger extent, parks and Renewable Resources, wanted to encourage the travellers of Canada to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I would like the members to please be quiet to give the minister an opportunity to hear what's going on. And I must add that most of the noise is coming from the opposition benches from his colleagues near him, which is making it very difficult for the minister to hear the question.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Chairman, I know there's a lot of exuberance in the House today, not only from our side, but it's coming from both sides. And if we just go back to 1982 and to 1983, and you go into *Hansard* and you take a look at the type of exchanges that came back and forth across the floor, mostly from that side, when the election was held in British Columbia . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I must interrupt the member again. The member knows he is off the topic, and I would ask him to get back to him.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try and stay on the subject. I just wanted to reflect on what has gone on in other years. And this is a political forum, and all of a sudden we've lost that right to operate democratically in a political forum here today. So I'm going to accept that, but I just want to say that I intend to go back to *Hansard* from 1982, and especially in 1983, and I will bring that back to the House. But I think we have lost our democratic right to perform properly in this democratic parliamentary forum that we have here.

You made statements, Mr. Minister, that you wanted to encourage the travellers that were going through Saskatchewan to get off the beaten path. And you wanted to make sure that you provided services for the travellers that are going through Saskatchewan. Now this is the first time in our history that we've ever had Expo '86 out West. The last time we had it, it was in Montreal. We have an opportunity this year to take advantage of all the travellers that are going to be travelling from the East to the West and are going to be going through Saskatchewan.

And I just say, Mr. Minister, that you're right. We want to encourage the travellers that are coming through Saskatchewan, and we want to encourage them to get off the beaten path and take advantage of the facilities that we have in Saskatchewan.

I had last night an opportunity to take a look at some of the samples that you were giving in your advertising ads, as you announced it up in Saskatoon, and I've seen some of the advertisements, and they were impressive. And they were showing our northern Saskatchewan, the lakes and the rivers that we have. We want the tourist trade, not only from Canada, but from the United States and all over, to take advantage of that. And we wanted to open up . . . or maintain the campsites that we have. I have been asking the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources for the last two weeks to not go ahead with the closure of the campsites, and especially in a year like this, why would you want to close them?

We have been discussing the closure of 37 campsites. Now, in writing, the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources says he's going to close down, not 37 sites, but 75 sites — 75 campsites in Saskatchewan. And he put it in writing, he answered, and I have the letter. He answered the major of Doré Lake, indicating that 75 campsites would be closed.

And Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to get through to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business is that in a year such as this one, he should get together with his colleague, the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, and encourage him not to close down any sites, but to maintain them. And if anything, we should be opening up more sites so that we can take advantage of the tourist trade that's coming through the province.

This morning in question period I talked about a site up in Beauré Lake which has been there for many years. And I indicated that it was an historic site. And I know it's an historic site, and it's been used for 30 years, ever since the road has gone in there. But the minister gets up and says, well, it's not a historic site. But I have a letter here signed by the major of Doré Lake, Robert Snell, indicating to the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources to not close down these sites, and especially the historic site of Beauré.

Beauré Creek is one of the oldest campsites in the area. The first conservation officer for the area resided there. And I'm just asking you, Mr. Minister, to get together with the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources and not to close down any campsites, but to maintain them and to open up new ones, and to take advantage of the tourists that are going to be coming through this province this summer.

And my gosh! you're spending thousands and thousands of dollars to advertise Saskatchewan. You're telling them to go up North and take a look at our lakes and our rivers and the streams that we have up there, take advantage of it, and yet you're going to close down 75 sites. And I think that's working against that.

So I'd just urge you to change that around and work with your colleague, the Minister of Parks and Renewable

Resources, and not close down any sites that are available to the tourists that are coming through this province, and to the citizens of this province who have used them for many, many years.

(1200)

I have a number of other questions to ask, Mr. Minister, but you may want to respond to my statement.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the opportunity to respond. Just a couple of comments on the numbers. I don't profess to have as good a grasp of the situation in terms of numbers as my colleague, the Minister of Parks, but the fact is, and I think you will admit that, and I think it was another inadvertent slip of the tongue, that the number "75" refers to parking stalls, not to campgrounds. And I think that it's an inadvertent attempt possible . . . or an inadvertent error, but I think it's important that we don't mislead this committee when we do use numbers, and that we don't throw them around in a haphazard manner. However, the comments that you have made, and the tone of your questioning, probably as much as anything, demonstrate the difference between the approach that your government would take to tourism and the approach that this government would take.

I indicated, and I have done it many times, that there is a tremendous opportunity here with Expo, and that the role of the government, the provincial government, is to attempt to provide information that will get people to stay additional time in the province and, hopefully, get them off the main east-west corridors.

Never once did I indicate that it was then the government's responsibility to provide the facilities and the services and the attractions. I've said that that is the responsibility of the private sector. And we have literally hundreds of private sector groups lining up with projects, with facilities, with things that they want to put in place.

And I think what's been clearly indicated to us through our research: that the travelling public want to have clean, well-equipped facilities when they come to Saskatchewan. And the types of things that the member is closing don't fit that bill. They're not well-equipped. They are simply cut out of the bush, and they have not been used. What he is closing are things that people simply have refused to use. They've been under-accessed, and they don't meet the needs.

We believe that our money is better put into our information centres, which we have talked about on occasions in these estimates, to provide information on where these good facilities are. And we're behind; I admit that. I think after two decades of lack of attention to the tourism industry, a complete lack of understanding of the commercial side of tourism, we have some catching up to do, and we are working at catching up.

I'll make two points, and then I'll sit down and let you back. First of all, it seems to me that as the MLA for one of those northern centres — and you've spoken in this House on a number of occasions about the lack of job opportunities for your people up there. Well it would seem to me that you would encourage private sector

development, that you could get private sector people building the facilities that will meet the needs of these tourisms and not be advocating the maintenance of unmanned, inadequate facilities that have not been used on any type of regular basis over time. And I think that would be a thrust that you would take.

And I would relay one other piece of information, and this is extremely factual. At a meeting recently in La Ronge attended by three different ministers, people involved in the tourism industry and in other parts of the economy up there indicated a great deal of dissatisfaction with the attitudes of the two northern members. They felt that the doom and gloom attitude that things are terrible, that we're not getting anywhere, tended to turn people off; and they didn't come to northern Saskatchewan, and a lot of opportunities have been lost.

And you're absolutely right about our ads. We have accentuated northern Saskatchewan, particularly in the American market where that type of holiday is something that American people look at. And I think, if we all work together and continue to promote this province in a realistic manner, that this tourism industry can be a very significant factor in overcoming some of the many problems that in fact exist in northern Saskatchewan. I know my colleagues have on occasion invited you over for a cup of coffee. I won't put it that way, but if there are ideas on how employment benefits and opportunities can be created for your people, we're certainly interested in listening to them.

But I don't think defending or attacking the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources for closing some underused park grounds is really conducive to helping northern Saskatchewan. And part of our objective is, in fact, to do that. So I hope that that provides something in terms of the problems you've raised.

Mr. Thompson: — Just a short comment, Mr. Speaker. When the minister indicated himself and two of his other colleagues from cabinet were in La Ronge that the business community in La Ronge said that they were dissatisfied with myself as a member in northern Saskatchewan — well I just say to you, Mr. Minister, you get up the courage to call the election, and you just let the folks in northern Saskatchewan make that decision, and they will.

You got up here and you spoke, and you sort of suggested that I was attacking the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that at no time was I attacking him. I have been asking him questions in the House, and I have been encouraging him to not shut down any sites. And all I was saying was that yourself and the minister get together and discuss this and see if you can come to some agreements to maintain those sites and keep them open.

You talk about . . . You don't want to get involved; that these sites, the 75 sites that are going to be closed down are underused. Then you go on to say that they're unmanned and unused sites. And that's exactly what you said. Then you went on to say that anything that you can do that you will, to provide jobs for northern Saskatchewan.

Well I want to say that the campsites in northern Saskatchewan have always been unmanned, but they have never been unused. We don't have anybody that stands at the camps, and there's no parking fees, but they are maintained by the conservation officers and the stand-by crew that they have in that certain area. And they most certainly are an important part of northern Saskatchewan as far as jobs are concerned.

And if you're going to close down 75 of those sites, then the conservation officer who maintains a stand-by crew all summer is not going to need that crew. and what is he going to do, because they're not going to be there? They're not going to be manned. They're not going to cut wood and put up wood and maintain it. They're not going to pick up the garbage. They're not going to cut the grass — what they do. Then they're not going to need the stand-by crews. And instead of maintaining jobs and creating more jobs, what you're going to do, Mr. Minister, is eventually you're going to phase out jobs.

Because if we have a wet summer and there's no fires, and they're just going to say to the stand-by crew, well, there's nothing for you to do, so we're going to lay you off. And that's what happens. Last spring it happened in northern Saskatchewan because we had an early spring. They took the react crews who are there to fight fires; they hired them on. We got a snowfall; they laid them off. And these are Northerners, temporary jobs. They laid them off until it dried up again.

So I just say that these campsites are important, not only for the tourists that are coming through this province, but for the senior citizens, the Boy Scouts, and the Girl Guides who use those campsites on a yearly basis. And some of these campsites are only used for a couple hours; they don't stay there all night. There's many, many groups who will go into the campsites, have their lunch, relax, walk along the rivers, or walk along the lakes, and then they will continue on to another site. So they're a stopping place, and they don't necessarily have to stay overnight, and that's why they're so important. and they've been there . . .

There's citizens in this province who have come back to the same sites every year, and some of them sites they'll use two, three times a day. They'll have coffee in the morning, and they'll travel to another one, take their time and relax, and they know that that site is there. They know that the campfire is there. They know that there's wood there, and there's garbage disposal there. And they've always been there, and they rely on them. All of a sudden they're gone. And I just ask that you take a new look at that.

I want to now turn to northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister. I see in your economic development fund you had estimated in 1984-85, \$3,199,540. I'm quoting from *Public Accounts*, Mr. Minister. In '84-85 you budgeted \$3,199,000. That year you spent \$1,407,593, about one-third of what you budgeted. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could indicate how much you spent of what you have budgeted for last year?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I think, Mr. Chairman, the . . .

Although I wasn't the minister at the time, that in the year that you're discussing the rationale or the reason for spending only the — roughly, I'm not sure of the number — roughly a third was that that was when the decentralization of DNS took place, and some of those services went to various departments. And so in order to have a complete picture you would have to line up how those services were reorganized. I think the majority of the difference there is accountable for in the fact of the realignment of the services in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thompson: — Would that apply, Mr. Minister, the same to the grants to the northern economic development branch. I see also, you had \$1 million budgeted and you only spent \$5,000.

An Hon. Member: — \$5,000.

Mr. Thompson: — Only \$5,000 out of that billion. I just wonder, could you explain that one also?

An Hon. Member: — What percentage is that?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Well we don't have the figures with us, so we can't confirm the numbers. The rationale or the reasoning would be exactly the same as the previous answer.

Mr. Thompson: — I want to now turn to the regional offices, Mr. Minister. Could you indicate the number of regional offices that you have in northern Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, to the member, we have three. I believe they're at Creighton, La Ronge, and Buffalo Narrows.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I was listening with some interest to the minister's comments on campground closures. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can outline for us . . . Even though it's not under your department, I would imagine that there would be exchanges of letters or memos or discussions between yourself and the minister in charge of parks. What do you think the impact of those closures will be on tourism? and can you give an indication of how many campsites, actual sites, will actually be closed down as a result of the decision made by your colleague?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I think, Mr. Chairman, that in all honesty there will be no impact on tourism from the program that my colleague has implemented. I think it's important to note a couple of facts. We have 9,000 camping spots in the province — and this information was provided by my colleague, and I think it was provided this morning in question period — and that 9,000 camping spots is the highest number per capita in Canada. What has been closed, as we have indicated, there are some camping spots that were underutilized, that possibly had some other reasons. I don't profess to have them all.

(1215)

The department did communicate with us, and we did provide input, because, as I provided your colleague the other day a complete list of our consulting work, we do

spend a lot of time consulting with, doing studies on tourism, because the whole area has been completely overlooked in Saskatchewan for so long. and we are acquiring a tremendous base of information that allows us to target our advertising, as we indicated publicly yesterday. And it allows us to understand what the people who come to the province want. And the fact is that they want some specific types of accommodation. And the areas that are being closed simply did not meet those requirements, and it was deemed reasonable to make changes, and consequently they determined to close those.

We have seen a significant increase in the amount of facilities that are available. I think of hotel construction in the major cities, for example, not to mention smaller centres. and people travelling today do in fact require certain types of facilities. They have desires. And the Parks and Renewable Resources department came to us and that's the type of information that we provided them, and then they made their decisions. And I would suggest that as far as tourism is concerned, this is really not going to have any impact on numbers or on economic benefits to the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder if the minister would care to answer the question that was put: how many campsites are being closed down?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — As I indicated, that type of information . . . The member has provided me a paper which has a few. Oh, here it is. I'm sorry. We're closing 10 sites. All right? Those sites have no showers, no electrification, and I think it was that type of information that we had provided the department.

And once again, I don't know if it's relevant and I don't want to wander off the topic because I think you're serious on these questions, but people have indicated . . . And in northern Saskatchewan, for instance, in '82 the northern outfitters, when we first met with them, had tremendous problems. and they have indicated to us, since we started the joint efforts with the northern outfitters in terms of our presence at an increased number of sport and travel shows in the U.S., since we started our print and electronic advertising, they are talking about in the area of a 20 per cent increase in 1985 over 1984. And some of them are telling us that for 1986 they're completely sold out for the full season.

And probably more importantly are the number of applications that are in front of the Parks and Renewable Resources department for additions and expansions to those northern camps. And I think that that again verifies the fact that travellers to the province do in fact want a specific type of accommodation. And as I indicated, these 10 sites, that are not electrified and do not have showers and those types of amenities, weren't meeting the need, weren't being used, and consequently the decision.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Could the minister indicate which 10 campsites you're planning to shut down, on the recommendation from your department? You have indicated that you did an analysis and a study and recommended certain things to the Department of Parks. Can you indicate which 10 sites are being shut down in

the province?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information. I want to make it abundantly clear once more that the department that administers them had some problems. They were not being utilized. They wanted to know what information our department could provide them, maybe so they could develop some rationale for why.

As I indicate, we've acquired a great deal of information of that type. We provided the information; they made the decision. I think the question is obviously a good question but I think it's an estimate question for Parks and Renewable Resources.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder: as it applies to the closures or the change, as you would put it, that is occurring in tourism, who did the study for your department, that you then advised the Parks department on? Who did the consulting and made the recommendations? Who did that for you?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, let me make it very clear to the member opposite. We are having a bit of a communications problem here. Our department, over the three years we've been in existence, have done many, both internal and external, studies in an attempt to fill the void of tourism information that had been created by the complete neglect that had been experienced over the past 12 years.

I don't know if you were here when I indicated that in 1981 there was \$149,000 budgeted for advertising in tourism. I mean, that clearly indicates the lack of emphasis that was placed on it. And I've talked about the opportunity and where we're going in the future. So we have done numerous studies and we have acquired a great deal of information.

Now we didn't do any single study to respond to Parks and Renewable Resources' request. We simply took that mass of information that we're gathering and said look, these are the things that our department perceives to be important to travellers coming to the province. And you don't need an individual study to determine that, but it's a collective gathering of information that simply hasn't been available before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — That, as you say, mass of a study or whatever was done, what I want to know is who did it. What company did the . . . Was there a private consulting company that did this research and advised that we should be moving away from campground settings where families can come and have picnics and have a Sunday afternoon? Who did that consulting?

What appears to me, and I'm sure to many people in northern Saskatchewan . . . And my colleague from Athabasca has I think stated it more clearly and succinctly that I ever could because he has a better feel for that part of the world . . .

And I use the example of Pine Cree Park down in my constituency. There's no electricity; there's no facilities to have electricity or showers. But I will tell you that that is

one of the most used campgrounds anywhere in the Shaunavon constituency. My family and I have gone out there many Sundays for barbecues. We go there at noon and spend the afternoon wandering around and have a barbecue and then go home. And while I'm there I see many tourists who use the Red Coat Trail to travel from Manitoba to Alberta on their summer holidays and choose to take some time off and spend maybe an extra few hours. and as a result of doing this across the province, they may spend two or three extra days in the province.

But that unserviced campsite is part of the formula to keep people in the province for an extra day or two days. And as a result they may stop in Eastend and do some shopping and buy a steak and go to the small-business places and use them.

But I simply don't understand how a big government . . . And maybe it's because their cabinet members are so used to flying and staying in Hyatt hotels that they don't understand families that want to go out and have a picnic any more. Maybe they're that arrogant. Maybe they're that out of touch with reality that they think what we need is \$3 million in advertising.

Well I'll tell you, the people that use these campsites don't need to be told. And besides that, the people who will see the ads on TV, on TV on an ongoing basis, are not going to be the people driving through the province. Because how can you see the ads on TV when you're driving your car? This is the stupidity; this is the stupidity of this government.

Well I'll tell you what the \$3 million is for, Mr. Chairman. I'll tell you what the \$3 million is for. This is a failing government. I think we all have agreed on that today. I can tell by the whipped look of the members opposite that this is a failing government. I'll tell you they look like whipped goats; that's what they look like. You could herd them around with a wet noodle today, they're so down.

But I want to say about the issue at hand, Mr. Chairman, about the issue at hand here, Mr. Chairman, that this advertising, this 3 million advertising . . . And I know where you're getting the money from. I know where you're getting the money from. You're closing the campgrounds in the Department of Parks and taking it and putting it into Tourism to advertise for the next campaign. That's what's going on. The people of the province know that.

They have watched you birds for the last six months try to turn your fortunes around, using their money on television and expensive ads, and they are saying, please call an election because we can't afford six more months of \$3-million-a-shot advertising. I watched those ads. Do you know what the main colours are in those ads? They're the Tory colours. And they're being done by a Tory ad agency. And they're being done months before the next provincial election.

Now you can sanctimoniously stand here and try to explain that these ads are being done for tourists who are going to Expo. Well I'll tell you, you're planning a little late; you're a little late getting into the action. And believe

it or not, there are those who would believe that this is being done for political reasons. There are people who are that cynical about the Conservative government; they actually believe that.

They've been phoning us and telling us, after that news conference you had yesterday. And even the line on the story . . . And I listened to it on CKTV. When it was all over, that we're going to spend the \$3 million, do you know what the final line was? But we don't know whether it's going to make any difference because we think these people are going to come anyway. That was the final line. That's what they said.

So I say to you, in the most honest time of the day, do you ever think that there might be people out there who are cynical about this government, who may just think that this is a political ad campaign that's trying to turn a failing government around — a failing government that is not able to increase itself in the polls?

And my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has talked about what has happened in other provinces, and they have tried that there. Prince Edward Island, they tried it in the Department of Tourism, to run political ads, and I say to you that government was turfed out. In Alberta, the minister has admitted they spent even more on tourist ads, political ads, that were referred to by many people, and we've seen what happened there.

And I'll tell you, in Saskatchewan, as soon as Premier Devine screws up his courage to call an election, we'll see what happens. But \$3 million of self-serving advertising . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. I'd ask the member to stay away from any references to elections. We are talking about Tourism and Small Business.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I'm sure if the chairman would . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Opposition members, I would ask them to please quieten down.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I would say that, if the chairman would check the record, he would see that thousands of times over the history of this Assembly elections have been referred to. And I will abide by your ruling, but I'll tell you that you haven't read all the *Hansards* if you're saying that it hasn't been allowed. And maybe we are changing the rules today because of certain things that have happened, and I'll abide by your ruling.

But elections have been mentioned, elections have been mentioned hundreds of times, both positively and negatively. I remember after the '82 election and you and other members were chairmen, members talked about the '82 election over . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I believe that the member is, in effect, debating the rule of the Chair, and I would ask him to get back to the topic.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I'm going back to the topic at hand, but I'll tell you, the elections that happen in a

province have a lot to do with . . . Elections, that's what the debate is about. This budget we're dealing with is an election budget, where you close campgrounds that the families of the province would use with their families for picnics on Sunday and put it into political ads to get your re-elected., that it has something to do with elections. It does. Believe it or not. And maybe because we have such an arrogant government, such as the minister who runs this department, you really believe your rhetoric that these ads don't have anything to do with the election. Maybe you believe that. You may believe that. You may be that out of touch with reality that you're actually believing your own political rhetoric.

I've seen that happen before. I saw it happen with the Trudeau government clinging to power into their fifth year. And I'll say in Tourism, in the Department of Tourism, we have \$3 million that is being used in the same way as Trudeau used money, the taxpayers' money, to try and win elections.

And I say that it's not fair. It's not fair to the people of the province and the families that want to go to these 10 campsites that they will be closed — that they would be closed — and that that money would be used for political ads. And you know what's going to happen? You know what's going to happen? I was part of a government, and I believe we advertised too much. I just think we did. I think we did. And you know what happened? It doesn't work. In all honesty, I'm trying to give a message to you people, that those political ads you're running are going to be your death knell. They're going to be the end of you. In your fifth year to put out a \$3 million ad campaign to try to pull you out of the fire, it's going to backfire bad.

(1230)

and you know what people are going to say to these ads that look so beautiful to you who are frozen into the past, who think those ads that are flowing water and canoes? Do you know what people are going to say? I'm paying for that ad and I can't put food on the table for my kids; and I have to go to the food bank to get my food because this government hasn't provided jobs.

And if you think those ads on TV are going to get people to vote for you, you're way out of touch — you're way out of touch. Because when the people who have to go to the food bank for their food see those ads on TV that they're paying for, they are going to be terribly upset with you and Premier Devine. Do you know what they're going to do? They're going to kick you so hard at the first opportunity . . . I hope it's June, but I think after last night it may be October or it may be next April, because I think what we're seeing here is a government clinging to power well into their fifth year. And you know what has happened to other Saskatchewan governments that stayed beyond five years, into their fifth year.

There was one government that had a department of tourism, or were looking at it, back in 1934. They stayed five year. And do you know how many seats they got after clinging to power, the only other time we had a Conservative government? Do you know how many, Mr. Chairman. They didn't get any seats. Not one.

And I say this kind of advertising, this kind of advertising is symbolic of a government that is desperate, that is arrogant even in its dying days and is trying to tell the people of the province that they have no responsibility to call an election, no responsibility to account for the millions and millions of dollars they're spending on self-serving advertising. We had yesterday SGI spending 2.2 million on political ads, politically directed ads. Now we have the Minister of Tourism saying, we're going to shut down campgrounds but we're going to spend 3 million on tourism.

Well do you think the people of this province are that naive that they will look at a government that shuts down the family campgrounds on the one hand and spends that money on advertising, that this isn't a government that's politically desperate? Politically desperate.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that I don't know how you can be that arrogant. I really don't. I thought that the minister who was running these estimates through was not that arrogant — was not that arrogant. But I say that we have 53 or 54 members now . . . I don't know how many have crossed the floor to the WCC already, but they're fleeing this party, as everyone across the province is, because they see the kind of spending priorities are shutting down campgrounds, taking the food subsidy away from northern people, and putting it into political advertising.

The estimates are that in the coming year \$20 million — get this number — \$20 million will be spent in the Crowns and the departments on political self-serving advertising. And I say, can anyone believe this government when they see what they do? Can anyone believe it?

In 1982 they were opposed to advertising. They were opposed to advertising in the Crowns. Do you remember that? And, Mr. Chairman, you will remember it because you were part of that campaign team. You were there. And now we see the government doubling the amount of spending on advertising in their last year, in a failing attempt to pull them out of the morass that they now find themselves in along with their right-wing colleagues from across Canada.

Every right-wing government is in trouble in this country — every one. We've seen it in Prince Edward Island — part of it because of tourism and the political ads they ran; I've already established that. In Ontario . . . and I remember the ads that they showed on tourism in Ontario. I remember those political ads, and they went even beyond (believe it or not) what these birds are doing here. They flooded the TV with tourist ads. They were advertising everything.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, this is the same government that has told us in another committee that TV ads don't work. Do you remember that line? Alcohol advertising. But it doesn't work, they say — let them advertise — it doesn't have an impact on people. But today we're going to bring tourists to the province by spending \$3 million of taxpayers' money.

Well, I'll tell you this is a government that's flying off in

different directions. I think it's a government that has four wheels falling off and the steering disconnected. They're going this way and that way.

Alcohol advertising is all right because it doesn't work. Like we can advertise booze and have kids drinking on the TV, young people . . . and then we have this report here that says, "The problem with alcohol and drugs has increased to a record problem in the province," but yet TV advertising doesn't work for alcohol.

Well, I'll say to you that this is a government that's out of touch, and not only out of touch but is deceiving the people of this province to an extent that I'll tell you better call the election soon. If you want to have any kind of a working opposition in this Assembly, I would encourage you to go to the people now, because it's important to have an opposition in this Assembly.

And I think that the kind of action we see here, \$3 million, and the minister going on TV bragging about it, and the commentator at the end of the interview says, but we don't think it's going to make any difference because we think they would have come anyway. That's what they said. That's what they said to you.

But we're going to spend it anyway, because we've got an election campaign on. This is part of our pre-election campaign, and we've got to do her. We've got to do it. Because I'll tell you, we've got to do it because we want to keep our jobs. We like flying around the world. We like flying around the world. You know that.

You've seen the numbers, Mr. Chairman, that show very clearly, in this department and in others, the amount being spent on world travel by these people. And maybe that's why they don't understand campgrounds in the department. Maybe that's why, because the ministers have been spending too much time in Los Angeles — in Los Angeles at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. Do you remember that, Mr. Chairman?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: — I believe that the member is simply playing verbal games, and I believe that he should get back to the topic and ask his question, or we will move on.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Would you define for the purposes of the use of your interpretation of your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: — A ruling of the Chair is not debatable. And the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to continue on. I want to continue on talking about the spending priorities of this government — the spending priorities of this government.

And I'll tell you, I'm not going to be dissuaded from talking about the spending priorities of this government. I'm not. I'm not going to stop now after four . . . over four years of bringing out problems with this government. It's not going to be stopped.

Nor will we be able to stop the public who are demanding an election. You can run from it, but you can't hide. And you may get away with it in here, trying to shut down a small opposition. But I'll tell you, we're going to keep working away, the way we have for the last four years, because there is a story to be told. And it's got to do with the spending priorities of this government where they may be out of touch to the point where they're shutting down campgrounds — that's what we're talking about, shutting down campgrounds, and we have already established that clearly — in order to save money so they can do political advertising.

And maybe I was making the point because ministers who are clinging to power don't want to give it up because they enjoy staying at the hotels, such as the Beverly Wilshire in Los Angeles, at great expense to the provincial taxpayers. And I remember the minister at that time, the high-flying minister, who said at that time when we brought up the issue that over \$200 a night was being spent on that hotel room, that it didn't matter whether it was \$1,000 or more, he would stay where he wanted. And I say that this is part of the problem. This is part of the problem of arrogance.

And I'll tell you, there has been more governments turfed out in this country because of that kind of arrogance than for being down . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know, and I see it happening here with these people, laughing in their seats today when we're talking about this important issue. And they can laugh. You can laugh all you want. We're going to keep talking about the issues. Absolutely. We're going to keep talking.

Three million dollars is a lot of money. No, we're not going to be shut down, whether they laugh or not, because we think the story that we have to tell is a legitimate one. And all governments get kicked out. It's not a question . . . There's nothing to be embarrassed about getting kicked out. Every government gets kicked out. And if you make mistakes in tourism because you spend \$3 million of hard-earned taxpayers' money, and you're defeated on that, that's fine. You have to live with that.

But I would make the point that for the minister to stand here and say it's all right to shut down family campgrounds and to use that money to do political advertising, that is stretching a long bow — that's stretching a long bow. And I'll tell you, it's going to backfire on you — it's going to backfire on you.

The member from Lloydminster knows very well that there's trouble with this kind of a policy of shutting down campgrounds. He looks across the border to the West and sees the tide coming. He sees it coming as a result of arrogant government and taking money out of family campgrounds and putting it into political advertising. And I'll tell you that we have a great deal of difficulty accepting this kind of a change. And when we ask the minister: what kind of analysis went into shutting down these campgrounds; who did the study; who did the planning? I don't know, he says; don't know who did it; don't know where it came from.

But yet we have the member from Regina South, who was from Regina North, the former minister of Tourism, standing up Tuesday, I believe it was, on a rule 16 motion, talking about tourism and how we were going to benefit by having people coming through the province, taking side tours off the Yellowhead and the Trans-Canada, to camp. That's what he said. Now can you believe it, that Friday we're in the House saying, but we're going to shut the campgrounds down.

The former minister of Tourism, I think, understood. I think he really was sincere on Tuesday when he said he wanted the people driving through the province to take side tours to northern Saskatchewan, where my colleague from Athabasca and Cumberland would welcome them with open arms, would welcome them there to spend their money at small-business places and buy some steak or some food, and then go out to the campgrounds and help the small-business people, and buy their gas.

But would you believe that three days later we're in this Assembly and the minister in charge of tourism says he's going to allow the campgrounds to be shut down? Now I think that that is disgusting. I think any government, any government that tries to play both sides of the street in that manner, saying we want people to come here to camp, that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Lloydminster will shout from his seat that we're losers, and I can take that; it's no problem. But I'll say that kind of arrogance, after last night in Alberta, shows where these people are at.

But I want to get back to the issue of tourism and camping. The former minister of Small Business and Tourism, the member now from Regina North who's planning to run in Regina South, I think he had a concept of tourism that was a good one. He kept the campgrounds open; in fact, if I'm not wrong, he expanded them — he expanded them. He stood up in cabinet and fought for them to be extended, and I say to you that that is a laudable minister. And when they wanted to do political advertising with his budget, do you know what he said? Do you know what he said? He said, no way, you're not taking my budget for political advertising. And do you know what Grant Devine then did to him when he wouldn't give him the money? — kicked him out of cabinet. That's what he did; that's what happened.

I can see it on the faces opposite that that's what happened, because they're embarrassed — they're embarrassed. And the former minister of Tourism and Small Business can't even hardly come into this House any more — can't even hardly come into this House any more — because of the way he was treated by the premier of this province for doing a good job.

And I was in Prince Albert not long ago, and we did a tour — and other members of this caucus are well aware of it — where we talked about what was done by the former minister in your department. Other members may want to comment on some of the individuals we met with. Other members may want to comment, and I think we will after a little while.

But what they were saying very clearly is, they couldn't believe that Premier Devine had kicked . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well we can talk about Premier Devine all we want, and I don't know why the members don't want his name mentioned any more. I don't know why. They don't want to mention two people any more — Premier Devine and Brian Mulroney. They don't want to mention their names. They don't want to mention their names any more.

They want to hide their leaders. Can you believe it, Mr. Chairman? Both of them, who won massive majorities not long ago — they now shout and holler, don't mention his name, when I say Premier Devine. they say, don't mention his name. For God's sake, don't mention the name of Premier Devine because we have a different strategy. We're not going to run him this time. We're going to run a tourist campaign about boats and rivers, and we'll run that ad campaign, and we'll keep Premier Devine out of it.

(1245)

But I say to you that they can't believe, the public can't believe what they're seeing here, where campgrounds are being shut down . . . And the members can yell from their seats all they want. No, no, they can yell all they want. And I'll tell you, the chairman can allow it to go on, but we're going to continue on anyway. We're going to continue on anyway — that the public cannot believe, when they look in the *Public Accounts* and see the spending that was done in this department and others on travelling around the world, on hotels, on expenses, on liquor — yes, believe it or not, on liquor, paid for by the taxpayers — the great amount of money that is being spent, and then when we come to the little campgrounds that my friend and colleague from Athabasca has referred to, they close them down. That's what's happening.

And I have here a letter from the northern hamlet of Doré Lake, just to prove the point of what is happening and how this government is so arrogant — stays at big hotels in Los Angeles and the cities around the world.

But this is a question of two cities, Mr. Chairman. This is a story of two cities. One, where the rich people live; one which is bright and shining where the rich people of this province live. And then there's another city where the people from northern Saskatchewan, the people who have to go to food banks and the people who use the little campgrounds that these people think they should shut down. That's what this story is about.

And I'll tell you that there are many people, who can't afford entry into some of these bigger parks, who use the little campgrounds. and this is another example of how you treat those people. But the only problem is, the only justice is that these people vote. They vote. And this kind of arrogance and treatment is going to get your birds defeated.

Now I want to refer to this letter. I want to refer to this letter. And the minister says there has been no opposition to this plan, that it's been a study done — probably by some political firm that is being paid for without a

contract, the way many others have been done in that department — saying that we can close the campgrounds down and there's no problem.

But here is a letter. And my colleague from Assiniboia was good enough to hand this over to me. It's a letter from the northern hamlet of Doré Lake. And it's dated April 18, 1986:

The Hon. Colin Maxwell, Minister, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources. (And this deals directly with tourism.) Legislative Building, Regina, Sask. Dear Sir:

Now this is addressed to the minister in charge of Parks, and the Minister of Tourism will well know that there's a direct relationship between the two departments.

Now I want to read this letter because it reflects a local concern about the closing of parks. It relates directly to the issue we are speaking about here, whether or not in fact we should keep these 10 campsites open. We should keep them open. That's the policy, and I'll tell you, after the election they won't be closed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — They won't be closed. We're not going to close them. And I would say you don't have a mandate to close those campsites. You have no mandate. You're in your fifth year; you should have had an election last month and you got scared off. Why not leave them open until June and then let us decide whether or not, or how many more we're going to put into the system . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. We want to decide how many more we're going to add to the system. That's what we want to know.

You have no mandate to close these campsites down. You people are finished. Not only have you used up your first four-year term, but you're now into your second one which you're taking without asking.

And I say spending \$3 million in your fifth year on advertising is simply improper and not a fair way to use your massive mandate. It's not fair. It simply isn't fair, and I can tell by the looks on the faces of some of the back-benchers, the member from Moose Jaw South, that he agrees.

I believe if you would let that individual into cabinet to help make the decisions, you wouldn't have these kind of decisions being made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I think they have some honest members who would say to them and pull them by the shirt-tail or maybe sit them down in a chair or back them into a corner and say, look you, I'll tell you we shouldn't be closing these campgrounds down . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I know. Well the minister says that we look stupid. The minister says we look stupid. Well that's fine. You can say that all you want and try to get into a personal attack — that's fine. You've been doing it for four years, and it hasn't bothered us, and the indications are that you're getting into deeper and deeper trouble, but I want to get back to this letter. I want to get back to the letter.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I'm sure that the minister is having great difficulty hearing the question. Would the members please quieten down on both sides of the House.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I'm glad the members of the government benches have finally settled down and that you laid the lumber to them a little bit to bring them back to order here in this Assembly.

I'll tell you, the shouting and hollering that has gone on here for four years from the massive majority government, I'll tell you, is something to . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I believe that the member is commenting on the ruling of the Chair. I don't believe he has any right to do that, and would he please get back to the question at hand and ask the question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I wasn't challenging the Chair in any sense of the word. I think your ruling was that I was challenging the Chair isn't proper. What I was clearly . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Are you challenging the Chair? Are you challenging the Chair now? Then please get back to the debate.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, if I was challenging the Chair I would say, I challenge the Chair. Obviously I'm not challenging you, otherwise I would say it.

No, what I'm trying to do is point out to you some important facts that you're not willing to listen to. That's what's happening here. We're being cut off at every turn from trying to defend some people who use little campgrounds. And at every turn we're being cut off from the debate. And that bothers us. It bothers us a good deal because it's been happening for a long time.

What I'm saying is that I have a letter here — and I'll start again because I keep getting interrupted — from the northern hamlet of Doré Lake, dated April 18, 1986:

Honorable Colin Maxwell, Minister, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, Legislative Buildings, Regina, Sask.

Dear Sir: The Council and residents of Dore Lake are extremely concerned with the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources' decision to close the camping facilities at Beaupre and Shirley Lake, and respectfully request that this decision be reversed immediately.

Now here's a council pleading with the government, local people, locally-elected, pleading with the government on April 18th — not even a month ago — pleading with a big government, a massive government that has \$20 million for advertising, \$20 million for advertising but doesn't have money to keep these little campgrounds open. This is what they can't understand.

Now these people are — I don't know what their occupation would be but they may be fishermen, or they may be farmers, some of them may be unemployed — but

pleading with a big government in Regina, a big arrogant government in Regina to keep their little parks open, two of them. And they say closure has not been publicized. And I understand why: because we're only going to advertise what's politically good. No opportunity for public input; get that. No consulting.

Now you say you had consultants out there studying this. They're saying you didn't, that you had no consultants out there. Here's the issue, here is the issue. In this letter, dated April 18th, the council . . . and this letter is signed by the mayor, Robert Snell, says this: "No opportunity for public input." Now the minister is clearly away off base when he stands here in this Assembly and he says . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This is on page 1. And I say to you this, that this minister when he stands and says clearly that there was no opportunity for input, that there is a great deal of difficulty in believing you — in believing you, sir, that you are honest in your attempt to defend your position of closing these parks.

A suggestion has been made that the hamlet of Dore Lake take over the campground of Beaupre. We would like to point out that this is beyond the jurisdiction of the local Hamlet.

Reasons for keeping the facilities open at Beaupre and Shirley Lake: (and they list out a number of them).

Considerable cost was incurred to construct these campgrounds, i.e., holding tanks, washrooms, (and here I thought the minister said that there were none of those facilities) barbecue stands, garbage disposal cans, fish filleting facilities, camp kitchen. Removal costs would be very high.

And I understand why the minister is embarrassed. I understand very well why he's embarrassed when he has misled the House — when he has misled the House. That's what he's done, misled the House. And he gets into yelling and hollering from his seat. But I'll tell you, you've got a little problem. You've got a big problem.

And I'll tell you that when you say that there are no washrooms at these campsites and then we have a letter from the mayor of Doré Lake saying in fact that you are not correct, you've got a problem with the council, because you've misled the House. And it says:

These campgrounds are a necessary recreation facility both for the community and the tourists coming into the area.

For the local community, the families that would want to come out, as well as the tourists who maybe, as the former minister of Tourism has said, maybe want to go off the yellow coat trail or the Trans-Canada Highway to have a little camping trip . . . the Yellowhead highway, sorry. I want to correct that for the minister who is getting confused again. And it also goes on to talk about increased local commerce, and I've referred to that. People who use these campsites go to town and buy their grub and maybe a little fuel for their camp-stoves and fill with gas. Now they're going to drive right on by because there's no campsite — there's no campsite any more.

And my colleague from Cumberland, who is an expert in that area, knows very well, watching people come through and stopping at these campgrounds, how important they are to the local community.

Now the letter goes on. This is another point, “Detrimental if closed — increased fire hazard”; now that is something that I hadn’t referred to or even thought of. But increased fire, because there’s no one there looking after them. They will grow up with weeds and grass, and somebody who is driving by, not stopping any more, may throw a cigarette out; the campground will catch on fire and burn all the forest down in that area. And I say that that is an excellent point that they are bringing up.

“Increased garbage and pollution” — now this could be what they’re doing here. “People will still continue to utilize these sites and the destruction to the environment would be extreme.”

Another point: “Historic site — Beaupré is one of the oldest campsites in the area.” . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The members are shouting that it isn’t. This is the mayor writing this letter, and they’re making fun of it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They yell to shut up, but I don’t think that should be allowed in this Assembly, Mr. Chairman. But if you want to allow it . . . If you want to allow it, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I believe that the debate is getting a little out of order, and I believe that the noise level is a bit too high from both sides of the House. Order.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:01 p.m.