

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

**Deputy Clerk:** — I beg to inform the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present to open this sitting.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Sauder:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move, pursuant to rule 16 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly*:

That this Assembly encourages the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to pursue strategies that will provide access to Canadian, United States and world uranium markets in order to ensure a viable uranium industry in Saskatchewan, to provide employment for northern Saskatchewan, and to protect the significant investment of Saskatchewan tax dollars that has been made.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move:

That this Assembly communicate to the Parliament of Canada its strong opposition to a comprehensive free trade treaty with the United States; and further, that this Assembly sees a negotiation of such a bilateral trade treaty as a threat to the future of prairie agriculture harmful to the continued health of our unique social program and incompatible with Canadians' desire for economic self-determination.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The member for Moose Jaw North.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move:

That this Assembly call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse its harmful and senseless cost-cutting decisions at Saskatchewan's technical institutes including: the dismissal of 140 instructors, the elimination of dozens of programs offered at all technical institutes, and reduction in number of student training spaces at the technical institutes by 1,100; and further, that this Assembly go on record as being opposed to any attempts by the Government of Saskatchewan to reduce the deficit on the backs of Saskatchewan students.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Legal Aid Commission Fees

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Social Services, the minister who attempts to continue to deny his responsibility for the Legal Aid Commission.

Mr. Minister, you will be aware, I'm sure - if you aren't, you should be - that yesterday afternoon a spokesman from the Legal Aid Commission confirmed that beginning on Monday, August 3, a week from next Monday, legal fees shall be charged to legal aid clients in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: can you tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan what that new policy will be? And will you not agree that charging fees for legal aid clients, people who qualify because, by definition, they are not able to afford legal services on their own, will you not agree that that move defeats the whole purpose of legal aid in the first place?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Possibly the member opposite and I both saw the same media report which indicated that a member of the commission had made some statements. The official spokesperson is the chairperson of that commission, or the acting chairperson, and I have no communication or further word from the acting chairperson that they have made a decision.

You will note that the same media report also indicated that legal aid had not yet decided how they were going to go about meeting their budget. So, therefore, once I have the information officially, rather than through the media and as part of leaks and everything else, then I will consider the matter and take everything into account.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Mr. Minister. You are the minister in this House responsible for the Legal Aid Commission, and you are telling us today that following yesterday's question period, in which this was a topic of discussion, you failed to communicate with the chairman of the Legal Aid Commission.

Will you tell this House today, Mr. Minister, and will you tell the people of Saskatchewan, what that new fee schedule will be that is intended to be implemented one week from this coming Monday? Will you tell us the facts, Mr. Minister?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, when the Legal Aid Commission has decided, I'm sure that your sources of information will tell the public. But right now they haven't decided.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — You've got to start coming clean with us on this issue, Mr. Minister. The fact of the matter is, and practically everybody in Saskatoon knows it, that the commission decided to impose a contribution system as early as June 26. And it stretches my credibility that you don't admit knowing that. I mean, what kind of a minister are you if you don't know that sort of thing?

You must also know that the commission met yesterday morning at a meeting that ended before your telephone call with the acting chairman, and that at that meeting all the commission was considering was how this fee schedule was going to settle on certain people - would there be any exemptions. Now I ask you, Minister, to stand in your place and admit that that is a correct statement of the facts.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — I'm not denying it isn't correct because I can only go by what the chairman tells me. All right? I believe that the media reports are accurate. I don't doubt that they will come up with some sort of fee structure, but they haven't decided. And if they haven't decided what it is, how am I supposed to know what it is?

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the whole thrust of your answers has been that you don't know anything about a fee schedule. And all I'm asking you to do for now is to admit that as of June 26 the Legal Aid Commission has decided that there will be a contribution system and that you know that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — I have already stated publicly, and I have stated to the media on television, that I'm not opposed to some form of fee structure for those people who have some money to pay something towards their legal services. Surely the prostitutes of Regina and drug dealers, who have capital to deal in drugs, can come up with a little bit of money towards their defence.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — A shocking statement - a shocking statement from the minister in charge. You know perfectly well . . . I'll wait until the Minister of Finance stops briefing you.

You know perfectly well the kind of people who are coming to your legal aid commission for help, and they're not prostitutes, and they're not drug dealers. They're people without money who need legal services.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Now I want to know what happens; what's to happen under this fancy new plan that you apparently now admit you approve of. I want to know what happens when a person in trouble, without money, comes to the commission and the legal aid clinic asks for its fee, and this person says, I don't have any money.

Now what's that kind of a person going to do who doesn't have the money and isn't able to put up the cash in advance? Are they going to be denied legal representation? Is that the decision that you're apparently supporting, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — No one . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Where's the swastika?

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, I take exception to the

allegations the members are making from their seat, and I don't think they would be proud of them. Publicly accusing the member for Melville of being a Nazi is not parliamentary language, and I take exception to that type of conduct.

With respect to the provision of legal services to those people in need and to families in particular - I'm also the Minister of Social Services - all families will be protected and will be receiving legal services, if necessary. And the Department of Social Services has the ability to allocate special needs, so you need not be concerned; all families will be able to receive legal services in this province.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Well, supplementary, Mr. Minister. Why go ahead with this stupid program then? If you're going to extend legal services without fee to the people who don't have any money, why are we standing here debating this ridiculous idea now?

I ask you again: where are your priorities? What is it that impels this government to seat another \$500,000 out of the legal aid program and put this commission into a position where it has to try and decide whether to cut this or cut that, or charge fees to poor people, or deny service to other people? What's it all about, Minister? You've got all kinds of places where you can make cuts without taking it from the pocket of people who don't have any money.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — I say to the member opposite, who is also a lawyer, that he must have information such as I have that the legal aid system could be run better administratively.

A few days ago I phoned a clinic at quarter to 5. There was no answer. I understand they don't work after 4:30 at that particular clinic. You know that they are one of the only, is not the only, unionized law firms in Saskatchewan. You also know that they have paralegals that are paid substantial sums of money . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. I can't hear the minister's response.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — The member opposite may not have personal experience of court the way I have, but I have personal experience to see what paralegals have been doing all day while legal aid lawyers were practising law. And there are some efficiencies that can be made at legal aid.

And if all of Saskatchewan has to be run efficiently, surely legal aid can be run efficiently, and should consider their 8 per cent reduction and do their best to run their affairs efficiently.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. I am not a person who is easily shocked, but you've shocked me a second time within the last 10 minutes. Now you're telling this Assembly that the staff at the legal aid clinics around Saskatchewan are inefficient, and the minister must know that that's not true. These people are

overworked.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Everyone in the legal system knows the legal aid lawyers have got about four times as much work as they can now handle. And, Minister, what you're saying has got beans all to do with the nefarious scheme to charge legal fees to people who are there because they don't have any money.

Now I ask you to stand in your place in this legislature and assure us that you'll tell the commission that this idea isn't on, and that you'll restore proper funding to the Legal Aid Commission.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — I think the member opposite also knows - he's a lawyer - that we are having difficulty having the criminal court sit on Fridays because legal aid, the lawyers are not available on Fridays. We're having to run a court system four days a week, and therefore we have to examine how these legal services are delivered.

### Collapse of Investment Firms

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Premier. It deals with the negligence of his government and his Minister of Consumer Affairs in the adequate regulation of two collapsed investment firms, First Investors Corporation and Associated Investors of Canada. Some of the 3,000 Saskatchewan investors who have lost their money in the collapse of these two firms are considering legal action to protect their interests.

The latest meeting of investors, which I attended Monday evening in Saskatoon, discussed such action. But only those investors who have the financial resources to pay their share of the legal expenses will apparently benefit from these court decisions. Those who can't contribute to the group are in danger of being left out.

Mr. Premier, why are these investors, who in many cases have lost their life savings, being left to organize and to pay for, on their own, the legal representation? Your government's negligence contributed to their loss. Why don't you have the decency and the fairness to provide these people with assistance in preparing their legal cases so that all the people will be helped?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Allow the minister to answer the question.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I advised the Assembly a few days ago that the Department of Justice is investigating this. I can advise the Assembly that the RCMP are now involved in the investigation of this particular issue and that we will proceed to review any alleged offences that might have occurred in this particular situation.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question was to the Premier, and my supplementary is to the Premier. I

asked a straightforward question and I would like a straightforward answer. Your government failed to adequately protect Saskatchewan consumers who had invested in these two failed companies. Your government's negligence . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I want to remind members that:

A brief question seeking information about an important matter of some urgency which falls within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the specific minister to whom it is addressed, is in order.

It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate.

The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be clear and precise, if I can get a clear and precise answer to the question. Why should 3,000 Saskatchewan people now be left on their own to arrange for legal representation and to pay for it, a great personal expense, to protect their interests? My question to the Premier: do you not feel any obligation to provide these people with assistance?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member with the same question last time, that the Department of Justice is investigating, the RCMP is investigating all offences - all offences, Mr. Speaker. And in that way we are looking into this particular situation in the interests of those people.

### Call for Investigation into Collapse of Investment Companies

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier or the Minister of Justice, and it deals with Pioneer Trust. Mr. Premier . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Principal.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Oh, I'm sorry, Principal Trust. Well, there are some similarities . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Premier, the need, I think, is crystal clear for a full public inquiry into the affairs of the Department of Consumer Affairs, who failed to discharge their clear legal obligation to regulate the two companies to which we've referred.

My question to you is this: will you not agree that a public inquiry into what happened in Saskatchewan, to Saskatchewan people, is the least that your government

can do to assist the many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Saskatchewan people who have lost money because of your failure to regulate these two companies?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member from Saskatoon Centre that there is an investigation under way today, and for some time now, by the Department of Justice, by the RCMP, looking into allegations of breach of the law. That is being done. I think the hon. member should wait that investigation and proceed from there.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Back to the Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Your minister is saying that he is going to investigate the activities, presumably, of people who may have broken the law. What I'm asking you is: who is going to investigate the clear incompetence displayed by your Minister of Consumer Affairs? And I suspect it will not be the Minister of Justice.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, we believe that this particular case is a serious case and we are approaching it in a serious manner. It is being investigated by the Department of Justice. It is being investigated by the RCM Police. And I believe that is the proper way to proceed.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In view of the fact that the public of Saskatchewan lost many millions of dollars with respect to Pioneer Trust, and in view of the fact that no single person was prosecuted for any single offence with respect to that, why do you expect Saskatchewan people to have any confidence that a criminal investigation carried on by your department will in any way assist them to make recovery which these citizens have lost, because of the incompetence of you and your colleagues in the cabinet.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Let's take what the Leader of the Opposition is basically saying. You are saying to this Assembly and to the people of this province that you have no confidence in the RCMP of this country, and you have no confidence in the justice system and the Department of Justice of this province. I think that is shameful, and I think you should apologize to both of those very significant and important institutions.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I don't think I will debate with the minister on who should apologize for what.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — But, Mr. Minister, how can you hide behind the fact that you have called for a criminal investigation in order to defend what is clearly a failure on the part of your government to regulate two companies? And as a result of that failure of you, not somebody else,

but you and your colleagues, thousands of Saskatchewan citizens have lost their life savings.

How can you say that this problem will be met by an investigation by the RCMP? They won't investigate your incompetence; somebody else must. Why will you not have a public inquiry?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we take this particular situation in a very serious light. There's a number of people who have lost their money in Saskatchewan and Alberta and British Columbia and other parts of the country. We take that very seriously.

We are presently . . . the Department of Justice and the RCMP are presently investigating any wrongdoing involved in this particular situation. That is the way the process should unfold, Mr. Speaker. They are investigating any wrongdoing involved.

And I think it is rather unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition somehow says it's all the fault of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and not the fault of anybody else and not the situation of anybody else that should be investigated. And I think that is improper.

#### Call for By-election in Saskatoon Eastview

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll direct a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, it's been close to four weeks since the member for Saskatoon Eastview resigned his seat in the legislature, and there are more than 18,000 eligible voters in Saskatoon Eastview.

**An Hon. Member:** — All Tories.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Allow the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — In view of the fact that your Deputy Premier believes that all those 18,000 are Tory, would the Premier give the people of Saskatoon Eastview an opportunity to express a view. And my question, sorry, is: when do you believe you will be in a position to call a by-election in Saskatoon Eastview?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will inform the Leader of the Opposition and the public about that decision in due course.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We understand that the decision is with the Premier. But in view of the fact that these large number of voters will be without representation and the legislature is sitting, could you give an assurance that you will make a decision so that there will . . . so that these people will be represented at least by, say, October?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will be informing the members opposite and the public with respect to the date of the by-election. We want to make

sure everybody knows the position of the parties on issues that affect Saskatoon a great deal, like uranium and potash, and make sure that they're very clear prior to a by-election, and we'll do that.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In view of the fact that the people of Saskatoon Eastview are really a particularly well-informed group, and in view of the fact that we will be debating many of the issues which you have suggested, including fiscal mismanagement and the resulting huge tax hikes and the savage cuts to health care and the like, would you give the people of Saskatoon Eastview an opportunity to express their views on the subjects I have mentioned, and the subjects you have mentioned, and would you give an undertaking that they'll have that opportunity to express their views at the ballot-box by, say, October?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will assure the member opposite and the Assembly and the public that the people of Saskatoon Eastview will have an opportunity to express their views in the ballot-box, and the precise date is up to me, and I'll let them know in due course.

#### Grant to Ile-a-la-Crosse Pharmacy

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the member from Athabasca regarding the Ile-a-la-Crosse pharmacy. The question was: what conditions were placed on those grants, and if this company leaves Ile-a-la-Crosse, how much of the 60,000 will the taxpayers get back?

The situation is that the Ile-a-la-Crosse pharmacy received a grant of 20,500 under the Northern Economic Development Subsidiary Agreement. That grant was made on December 12, 1985 as part of a total expenditure of \$59,000.

At this point in time, the pharmacy is still continuing. When that pharmacy ceases, under the agreements with NEDSA . . . It is a two-year agreement that they have to keep their pharmacy operating for . . . or the business operating for. If it should go the duration, then they have met the requirements. If they do not, then appropriate action will be taken.

But at this time, to the best of my understanding, is that the pharmacy is still operating on an interim basis. And I know that the Minister of Health and the Health department are working to see if there's some way that pharmacy services can be continued to that area in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could indicate when that two-year period will expire.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Well, as I say, the grant was subject to the letter of offer dated December 12, 1985. So two years from December 12, 1985.

#### Operations at Duck Mountain Provincial Park

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture, and it deals with contracts your department has signed with respect to Duck Mountain provincial park.

Can the minister confirm that a company called Madge Lake Cabins Inc. has been given a contract to administer the publicly owned rental united at Duck Mountain provincial park? And can he confirm that a second company called Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. has been awarded a contract to build a new resort in that park?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Speaker, the proponent is Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. Construction substantially complete, 92 per cent; the new lodge, July 20, 1987, operational; accommodation, May 1, 1987.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

#### The Uranium Industry in Northern Saskatchewan

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise this morning regarding a recent development in the United States which has the potential to seriously affect this province's uranium industry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It also jeopardizes the livelihood of many northern workers, their families, and it put at risk, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the taxpayers' investment in this industry in this province.

The event to which I refer is the decision by the United States Appeals Court to uphold a district court ruling which prohibits the United States Department of Energy from enriching foreign source uranium.

This court case came about when a number of United States producers launched court action in late 1984 seeking a judgement which would restore the viability of their industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the mid 1970's this province committed many millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to expand the uranium industry for the economic benefit of this province, but in particular, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the economic development of northern Saskatchewan and its peoples.

This province's three producing uranium mines currently employ some 1,300 people directly, who took home a payroll last year of over \$66 million. Ongoing uranium exploration activities saw a further \$22 million invested in northern Saskatchewan. In terms of sales, the uranium sector in 1986 generated revenues of \$460 million. And the industry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, paid royalties to the people of this province of some \$30 million. In short, the uranium industry represents an opportunity for solid economic development for this province in terms of jobs, investment, and provincial royalty revenues. The direct benefits of uranium mining and milling are, of course, most visible and most meaningful in northern Saskatchewan. Many of the workers in the mining and milling operations are native Northerners, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and their ongoing employment in the industry is bringing greater stability and a chance for prosperity to those communities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the industry is important to all of the people of Saskatchewan. In addition to the royalties paid by the uranium industry, there is a provincial interest in protecting the private and the public capital that has been invested. The Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation alone has over \$800 million invested in northern mining properties, primarily through joint venture mining and milling operations at Cluff Lake and Key Lake.

Not only is the uranium mining sector important to the province, it is also of importance to Canada and, in fact, the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have a most serious situation on our hands. In short, the impact on Saskatchewan, if the United States producers are successful, is as follows. In the near term, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this ruling will result in a total ban - total - on the import of our uranium to the United States. We will see a complete shut-down. Over the longer term, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and this is assuming the Department of Energy in the United States is not successful in appealing the case - the impacts on the industry are more uncertain.

It also does this, as follows, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Over a billion dollars of investment dollars will be lost, \$30 million annually in royalties down the drain. But, more importantly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, jobs, employment opportunities, will be lost to the northern people - 1,300 jobs and about 5,000 indirect jobs from that.

Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes the potential harm that any form of the United States import restriction on uranium would have for Saskatchewan. While the province is limited in the action it can take, since this is a matter before the courts in another country, the government has a plan of action which it will be pursuing with the co-operation of the Saskatchewan uranium-producing companies.

The government's course of action, Mr. Speaker, includes a number of steps. Officials of our government have already been in contact with those of the federal Department of External Affairs, the Department of Energy, Mines, and Resources, and with the Canadian Embassy in Ottawa, urging action to ensure that Canada-U.S. uranium trade can continue as in the past. We have offered Saskatchewan support for federal supports. Canada has formally advised the United States administration of its objections to the Appeals Court decision. I believe that the sense of frustration that I have seen within the Saskatchewan uranium industry is shared by the federal government. I would hope it is shared by this Assembly.

In addition to diplomatic steps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member from Kindersley, the Minister for Economic Development and Trade, and myself will be meeting with the Saskatchewan uranium industry on Monday to discuss the recent events in the United States, the implications for Saskatchewan and the implications for the industry and the possible steps that could be taken by government and industry together, to address this serious problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government intends to pursue every reasonable course of action available to it to ensure that the livelihood of the people in the North and their families, the large investment of taxpayers' dollars, and government revenues, are protected for the future economic benefit of the North and the province as a whole. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to assure the House at the outset that I will be able to compress my remarks into a little shorter compass than was achieved by the Minister of Mines.

May I say first, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I was puzzled by the assumption in the statement that all our customers for uranium are in the United States. And that any inability to process Canadian uranium in the United States

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I would ask the Minister of Education to be a little quiet while . . . Order! I would ask members - all members to be quiet when the speaker's on his feet. Would the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm puzzled by the assumption that there is no other place where uranium can be enriched or upgraded or reprocessed, and there are in fact a number of others, and we have a number of other customers.

However, having said that, and having made the point that this does not affect the entire industry, I concede, out of hand, it affects a significant portion of the industry. And if this event illustrates one thing with clarity, it illustrates the fact that Canada and Saskatchewan - but I'm speaking not of Canada - should diversify its trading partners and not find itself dependent primarily on one market for any commodity we produce.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — If we had more diversification, we would not have a situation whereby a cabinet minister in this House stands up and reports a crisis because of a single legal decision in a single country which is our customer. So I think that that is illustrated by the statement of the minister.

May I make one comment further. This incident offers an opportunity for the Premier. It offers an opportunity for the Premier to illustrate his special relationship with the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister to illustrate his special relationship with the President of the United States, so that this situation, which is opposed, as I understand it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Canada, and the Government of the United States, can be appropriately remedied so that the particular situation, referred to by the minister . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Members on both sides of the House have been speaking from their seat. It's very difficult for me to hear the person that is addressing

the Assembly, and I would ask you to allow the Leader of the Opposition to finish his remarks.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this offers an opportunity for the Premier to display his particular relationship with the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister to display his particular relationship with the President, since it is clearly a situation which the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Canada, and, if we can believe the news reports, the Government of the United States does not welcome.

We have an opportunity here for the display of statesmanship which has been advertised frequently by the members of the Progressive Conservative Party, and we now will see whether the advertisements were in fact fraudulent, or whether in fact there's a good product behind that which was advertised.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd just like to apologize to the Leader of the Opposition for interrupting. I thought it strange that the Energy critic didn't respond, and I would just encourage . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order! Order! Order! The member from Saskatoon Riversdale keeps talking from his seat. Order. When the Speaker is on his feet no one is supposed . . . Order.

#### TABLING OF DOCUMENT

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to rise for the purpose of tabling a document, and it is a document with respect to a question that was asked in the House with respect to the practices of the international boilermakers and their Saskatchewan content. And it is a communication to their members which I will table and I ask all members to examine it carefully.

It possibly contains contempt of the legislature and interference of citizens of Saskatchewan in speaking to the members of the legislature. It also provides the proof that the union representative asked for, and therefore I am tabling this document today in proof of the allegations.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, if that was anything at all it was a ministerial statement, and I request the right to respond to it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. The minister was out of order, is not allowed to make a statement when he's tabling . . . Order . . . when he's tabling documents. And there's no room for response.

Order. Order. Order! Order! Order. The member for Regina Centre, state your point of order.

(1045)

#### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, you sat in your chair and listened to him make an allegation against a

trade union in Saskatchewan which is unfair and uncalled for. And after it's made and on the record, then you decide that the statement was out of order. If it was out of order, but the statement was made, then it should be responded to, and we should have a right to respond to that statement.

**Some Hon. Members:** Order. A ministerial statement by a minister is a matter of government policy. I listened, and it was a very short statement. I couldn't make a ruling until after he was done. I have now ruled it out of order, and no response is necessary. And with that we move to . . . The point of order is not well taken. Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to ask you a question. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Labour has made an allegation and . . .

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — There's no question to the Speaker. Order. Order. The member's opening remark when he rose was that he wanted to ask the Chair a question. There's no question to the Chair. You can't ask a question of the Chair.

**Mr. Koskie:** — To raise a point of order in respect to . . . My understanding, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that when the minister rose, he did not indicate that he was making a ministerial statement. He indicated that he was filing a document before this House. And there was the key. And what you did is to allow him to go on to make a political statement. And now you're denying this side of the House the right to rebut. And I say it's unfair and you should reconsider your ruling.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order! The Chair has already ruled on this. The point of order is not well taken.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, sir, with all due respect. Given the fact that there

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**An Hon. Member:** — Point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — State your point of order.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, given the fact there is before this House a motion of non-confidence in yourself, and that you have lost confidence from members of this side of the House, and given the fact that we have just gone through a series of events which shows that you have not got the confidence of this side of the House, will you consider withdrawing from the Chair until the motion that is before the House is dealt with?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order. The point of order is not well taken.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Parks, Recreation and Culture  
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 39**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, earlier in question period I put a question to the minister with respect to Duck Mountain provincial park. In reply he read what seemed to be statistics from the building permits. I wonder if the minister can confirm for the House that a company called Madge Lake Cabins Inc. has been given the contract to administer the publicly-owned rental units at Duck Mountain provincial park. And can he confirm that a second company called Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. has been awarded a contract to build a new resort in that park?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, the member's correct.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I thank the minister for the brevity of his response, Mr. Speaker. We would commend the same to him during question period. Can the minister confirm that one Darryl Binkley is a member of the board of directors of both Madge Lake Cabins Inc. and Duck Mountain Lodge Inc.?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — That is correct, hon. member.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — And can the minister tell Saskatchewan taxpayers and this Assembly if this is the same Darryl Binkley who at one time served as chief of staff to the current Minister of Rural Development?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm sorry; did you say current chief of staff? I missed a piece of your question, I'm sorry.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — The question was, Mr. Chairman: is this the same Darryl Binkley who at one time served as chief of staff, the chief executive assistant, political assistant, to the current Minister of Rural Development, the member from Tisdale.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I believe he was a member of the staff of the member for Kelsey-Tisdale, but he was not chief of staff.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Can I ask the minister another question? Is this the same Darryl Binkley who sought the PC nomination in the federal riding of Mackenzie?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I believe he did.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Is this the same Darryl Binkley, Mr. Minister, who was appointed by the current administration, by your government, as a high-priced consultant to the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm sorry, I have no knowledge of

his involvement with other areas other than when he was a ministerial assistant to one of our ministers. He may well have been involved with that. With all due respect, hon. member, you'd have to direct that question to the minister responsible for Sask. Forest Products.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you can comment and explain to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan how a former PC hack, a well-known PC Party supporter, has gotten . . . has become involved in these contracts at Duck Mountain provincial park?

Mr. Chairman, while the minister is trying to find the answer here, I wonder if he can also tell us when the contracts were signed with Madge Lake Cabins Inc. and Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. with respect to both the administration of the rental units and the new development, the new resort that's being built in that part. When were those contracts signed?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to find all of the background information that's being requested here. We're having some difficulty digging everything out - dates, times, process - but I'd like to go through it step by step with the hon. member.

(1100)

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, might I ask then if that information might be made available later today, or when will it be forthcoming?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — In five minutes, hon. member.

Well, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I can't find the paper I wanted to use for you, because it's got the complete chronological history of events leading up to the successful proponent and the construction being at the state it is now, at 92 per cent.

What I can tell you is that in the past we were unsuccessful with solicited proposals for a four-season complex to be built at that particular park. After advertising twice, we eventually accepted an unsolicited proposal. The proponent lessee, at that time, was a Pat Donovan.

As I recall, Mr. Donovan and one other partner had some difficulty once they got started with their financing. They came back to the department, and this is the bit where I want to get the details accurate for you. I'll give you a thumb-nail sketch, but I want to get the details on this one and get it to you. They came back and had added two or, perhaps, three new partners to the venture who were putting in an infusion of capital, and they were going to carry on and finish the contract as it had originally been announced back in Yorkton some two years ago.

The dates were as I read in question period to you; I think I just gave you the dates then.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, without getting into the . . . all of the specifics, can the minister confirm that the contracts with respect to these two companies was signed in early April of this year?



**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, if I can just . . . I've got some briefing notes that I had stuck away in a desk here. I'd like to just quote from some of those.

The construction of rental accommodation at Duck Mountain provincial park was publicly tendered unsuccessfully on two occasions - February of 1984 and November of 1984. Subsequently, an unsolicited proposal was received from Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. - principals are Pat Donovan, Jerry Nelson, Don Johnson, and Jim Twigg - February '86. April 8, 1986, proposal accepted by the department. April 30, 1986, agreements approved by order in council. April 1986 to December 1986, Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. made several unsuccessful attempts to finalize its financing and construction security requirements.

As I recall, they had some trouble coming up with the construction security because the department insisted on a very high security, in cash, up front, before any construction could take place. December 1986, Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. requested permission to restructure their corporation. The request included the deletion of J. Nelson, D. Johnson, and J. Twigg, and the addition of Darryl and Vaughn Binkley and John Dutchyshyn as shareholders. Pat Donovan remained.

The department accepted the proposed restructure, and revised development and lease agreements were re-submitted. Those were approved by cabinet February 24, 1987. Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. is currently constructing, as we know, a 22-unit lodge complex, including dining room, store, swimming pool. The complex is expected to be completed late this summer. Information as I gave you in question period. My information is it is now 92 per cent complete.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I thank the minister for that information, Mr. Chairman. First of all, might I ask the minister, will he table that document that he read from with this House?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, this is a document prepared by me for my use in discussions in question period and at other moments. It's personal. It's my own document, and it's not for tabling.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, I appear to you for a ruling on this. It's my understanding that if a minister of the Crown makes reference to a document in the House, that he is obliged to table that document with this House. And I appear to you for a ruling on this.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'd like to draw the attention of the hon. member to *Beauchesne's*, number 327 where a member would have to table a document if it was "a despatch or other state paper." And then I would also like to refer him to number 390, numbers (n) and (o):

- (n) Papers that are private or confidential and not of a public or official character.
- (o) Internal departmental memoranda.

are documents that do not have to be tabled.

And on that basis I rule that the minister is not required to table that document.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Chairman, if I might just further question on that. And as a new member I appreciate the comments that you've made.

I can appreciate the fact that interdepartmental memoranda and papers would not be tabled with this House, but in this particular instance the minister read from this document, and I wonder, given the fact that he read from the document that he did introduce material from that document into this debate, would he not be obliged to provide that document to us?

**Mr. Chairman:** — In response to the member from Victoria, Regina Victoria, I did indicate that papers that are of a private or a confidential nature are not required to be tabled, and the minister did make that comment.

And a further comment that I might make is that if we are going to start asking for all of these documents that are being read from or looked at, two things could happen. We could have every piece of paper being tabled; and secondly, perhaps no documents would be brought in at all, if this was the fear of the minister that they were going to be required to table everything. So my original ruling stands, and that is the end of this particular ruling as far as I'm concerned. So would you please continue on with your line of questioning.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will, but again as a new member I'm learning the rules here as I go along. And if I just might put a further query to you.

You mention that the document will not be made available because it's a private document. The minister referred to it as private, yet he read from that document and introduced the material into this House. So I wonder how can it be a private document if he reads from it and introduces the material in that document into the debates and proceedings. And I wonder, therefore, if in fact even though the minister might feel that it's a private document, whether in fact it is a private document - inasmuch as he did read from it and introduce material from that into the record - and wonder therefore, again, if given that, that the document should not be tabled with this Assembly.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'd like to just remind the hon. member that my ruling was based on the fact that I perceive that document to be more of a personal briefing note nature. And on that basis I have ruled that you . . . do not need to be tabled, and that is the end of this matter. So please continue.

(1115)

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't pursue that. I'm not a person to go up blind alleys.

The minister indicated, as one point, that these . . . that you had put out proposal calls. Later you indicated that these opportunities, for both the management of the rental units and the new resort, that these opportunities were tendered. Can you clarify for us just what happened

here? Was it a proposal call, or was this a matter of public tender?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Originally, Mr. Chairman, it was a proposal call which, in essence, is a public tender. We put out that . . . it was advertised in the newspapers and say: is anybody out there interested in putting up this particular facility? In essence that is a public tender. Initially there were no responses. We tried twice, unsuccessfully.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, for me there's a difference between a proposal call and tenders. Seems to me if you're asking for proposals on what some corporation might do, vis-a-vis the park, you're not obliged to take, necessarily, the best offer that comes forward. You're in a position to take whatever offer you feel meets your particular requirements and doesn't necessarily have to be the best offer. Whereas a tender - I think things are clear as to what's being asked for, and you're obliged because of . . . it's a tender to take the best product.

I just want to ask you, Mr. Minister . . . you say that this agreement was signed in April, or these agreements with these two companies were signed in April, yet, it seems to me that from . . . I gather from your answers that the discussions with this particular company, Duck Mountain Lodge Inc., and Madge Lake Cabins Inc., had carried on for some period of time before that - for a year at least before that - either with the specifically constituted company or its precursors or predecessors. Am I correct in that?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — If I may clarify a point, Mr. Chairman, first whether it's a proposal or a tender. It's always stipulated: lowest or any tender not necessarily accepted. So we're not bound to it.

And as one further point for the hon. member: in terms of allowing private initiatives within parks, we have very stringent, non-negotiable rules which have to be adhered to. And in some cases proponents will come in with an idea or proposal that really we can't accept, for one reason or another - because it won't fit in with the aesthetics of the park, for example, or we don't believe it would fit what the public would require in a park.

So, although financially someone could come in with a good proposal, finance alone or pure economics is not the only determining factor in awarding anybody a contract to go ahead with their proposal. So I just wanted to point that out, that that's the way it's being handled.

Now the second part: you're referring to dates and the events leading up. There had been some discussions with the original proponents - I had never met them - with departmental officials, I believe for, oh, a period of about a year prior to any decision being made.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, forgive my questions about tendering and proposal calls. This is a sore point with the Saskatchewan public. We've seen a great deal of abuse - misuse of the tendering process. I'm very familiar with the tendering process by virtue of some years in city council, where you put out . . . you specify what it is that

you want, and you invite people to submit tenders to you. And you give it to the person with the lowest price, provided that they meet the requirements that you set down initially.

But what we see with this government is something else again, where there seems to be less reliance on that accepted process and a greater one on proposal calls. I think back to the very early days of your administration, when a contract was given to . . . I think it's Brown's auction mart, to sell off Highways equipment. It wasn't the lowest, and these people had no previous experience at all in selling any equipment, or heavy equipment of that nature. And it's still a wonder that Saskatchewan taxpayers got 10 cents on the dollar for all that equipment.

Mr. Minister, I find it very mysterious, very mysterious that within days, within days of Darryl Binkley becoming a director of these two companies, that Darryl Binkley, who was a political appointment by your government - ran for the PC nomination in MacKenzie riding, federal MacKenzie - that that same Darryl Binkley, that within days of him becoming a director of these two companies, an agreement was signed. I find that very mysterious. Even though negotiations had dragged on for a year, the contract wasn't signed until Darryl Binkley became a member of that board.

And I ask you, sir: are you trying to tell people that it was just a simple matter of financial capital, that this wasn't a matter of political capital?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — It wasn't just a matter of days; it was two full months. That's the first thing I should point out.

The second thing I'd like to point out was, this was the only proposal we received. There were no others.

And the third point that has to be made for the hon. member, as I'm sure he is aware - and I hate dragging Mr. Donovan's name across the floor of the legislature, but it has come up and the question begs to be answered. Mr. Donovan could not fulfil the financial requirements that were imposed on him by the government to complete the project. Mr. Donovan, of his own volition, and the other partners or the other people involved, came back with the names Darryl Binkley and Vaughn Binkley. The department then looked at the restructured company; looked at their financing; the financing was in place. The Binkleys are successful business people. They have operated similar businesses in the past, and department had confidence that they could, in fact, complete the project as originally conceived.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Minister, I would submit to you that the public has become extremely suspicious of this long string of unfortunate coincidences - whether it's a former cabinet minister from The Battlefords, or whether it's a well-known PC hack in Duck Mountain provincial park - that the public has become extremely suspicious of these coincidences.

We're beginning to wonder, sir, given all these coincidences, whether you're adding the supernatural

to your department as a responsibility. I wonder if the documents that you've alluded to . . . that all the documents related to these contracts can be made public and can be tabled with this House?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I've been advised by officials and other experts on the proceedings within this Assembly that such documents are normally not tabled. Certainly the contracts are not. Tendered documents at the time of opening are public, and anybody present can peruse them to their heart's content.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Minister, you're talking about contracts which have been signed with private companies but, on the other hand, have been signed by the people of Saskatchewan through you and your departmental officials. And I ask you: does it not seem right to you that any negotiations we might get into that lead to a contract, which involve the public's interest, should not be tabled with this House? Or is there, again, a confidentiality clause that prohibits you from tabling this?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any confidentiality clause. I'm aware of precedents within the House, however, and I made sure to check on that. I don't intend to be the one to set precedent for future decisions. It has been tradition in the past, whether it be your administration in power, before that the Liberal administration, or whomever, that those documents were never put forward on the Table here.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Minister, I just want to get it clarified again that Madge Lake Cabins Inc., which has the same directors as Duck Mountain Lodge Inc., that Madge Lake Cabins Inc. has been given a contract to administer the publicly owned rental units at Duck Mountain provincial park. Am I right on that?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — In part, the hon. member is correct. They've been given a lease to operate on this.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, Duck Mountain Lodge Inc. has been given a contract to build what other accommodations, units, among other things, in Duck Mountain provincial park?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Duck Mountain Lodge Inc., Mr. Chairman, is a company constructing the 20-unit lodge complex - dining room, store, swimming pool; Madge Lake Cabins Inc. is a corporate name of a company who are leasing and administering the rental accommodations at the cabins.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Minister, I think what you have here then is a clear case of conflict.

I can well imagine what Duck Mountain Lodge Inc., who have their own units in the park, if anyone comes to that park looking for rental accommodation, that they will be accommodated first in those units that have been developed by the private interest.

And I would submit to you, sir, that the rental units that are owned by the province of Saskatchewan, but which this company also administers, will become overflow, and that we will not realize the same kind of revenue as

we once did from those rental units, and that what you've done by signing an agreement with what is, in effect, one company to build their own units and to manage our units, that is, the units that belong to the public, that you're creating a conflict of interest here.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, forgive me. We're at odds on the issue, obviously. I don't agree with you.

The existing rental accommodations: a five-year lease with a five-year renewal, and lease fees are 7.5 per cent of gross.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, again, you can't have a company on the one hand and you give them a contract . . . or sign a contract with them and allow them to build their own rental accommodation; then you give them a contract to administer the rental units that are owned by the province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that anybody coming to that park, I have no doubt - I have no doubt what the company is going to do. They're going to try and fill their own units first. They're going to try and make sure that their profit margin is up before they concern themselves about the publicly owned rental units. You are not getting a good deal, Mr. Minister.

I would suggest to you that if this is not the case, as you submit, that you table any and all documents with this House so that the public can be clear that there's no conflict of interest.

Frankly, Mr. Minister, I think the public is getting fed up. They've seen no end of political supports of your party and former cabinet ministers being rewarded with any and all contracts that come along, seemingly. We had the case of Gordon Dirks, Tim Embury, Paul Schoenhals, Paul Rousseau - all former cabinet ministers - being rewarded with cushy jobs or cushy contracts. We see Keith Parker, a former MLA, being appointed to a cushy job at the liquor control commission. The Premier's own brother-in-law, a cushy job. And I think there's a perception here that to do business in this province, the prerequisite is that you have to have a PC party membership.

(1130)

And I would submit to you, sir, that that is unfair - that if you're truly open for business, that you'll take business from all quarters; that you won't restrict it to supporters of your own party. This is just not a question of unfairness; this is also a question of fiscal management. How can you manage the province well in the interest of the people of this province if you insist in making sure that the contracts that are let out are given to PC supporters? There is no certainty here that these people will do the best job for the people of this province, that they will at all times have the interests of the people of this province in mind.

So therefore, sire, I would suggest to you that if you say there is no conflict of interest in signing these contracts between . . . with Madge Lake Cabins and with Duck Mountain Lodge, that you table those documents so that the public can be sure that there is no conflict in this matter.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we're in a very wide-ranging kind of discussion at the moment. First of all, I would like to point out that the accommodation that did exist originally at Madge Lake had been deemed, not by the department but by the public, to be inadequate. There was no winter food service, as an example.

The accommodations, well there weren't enough of them, and some of them were very poor quality. The condominiums were in nice shape, winterized, very pleasant accommodation. But the other cabins were not. And some of them were non-modern. What we have now is a private firm who said they are going to build a four-year . . . a four-season resort with winter food accommodation and a swimming pool and something that the public would like, given that there's excellent skiing out there in the winter, and of course good golfing in the summer.

So that's the first thing. They made improvements to this. Now from there, the hon. member has gone on to imply somehow that if you don't have a PC membership, you don't do business in this province. That's absolute nonsense - absolute nonsense. And what is really ironic is this comes from a member himself who, after he lost running for the NDP in Manitoba, surfaced with an NDP government job in Saskatchewan. Now it's not just a question of the pot calling the kettle black here. I don't like to get into these kind of silly exchanges. But I mean their caucus is absolutely replete with people who were the objects of patronage when those people were in government.

You've got the member from Saskatoon Nutana who was paid over \$2,000 for the Office of the Rentalsman - again, an agent of government - after she'd lost a nomination some place. Well we don't get up and make a big fuss and say, the member for Nutana is somehow in a conflict of interest situation. But one of the members from Moose Jaw, who'd been receiving honorariums from the Department of Education, some time after - he also lost a nomination.

Now where do we serve the public of Saskatchewan if we stand here, back and forwards, throwing allegations like this at each other? I accept what they did in the past. I accept it. I don't necessarily like it, but I'm not going to get into a shouting match about it.

What I can say - and I can stand here and look anybody over there in the eye - I can stand here and say that the contract that was awarded originally on this project was done completely above-board, with no favour and no consideration given to the political, religious, ethnic affiliation of anybody who was involved.

When Mr. Donovan ran into financial problems, he was the one who came forward with an alternative business man to add to his group who was financially secure, who could make the project fly. And that's the bottom line on the matter.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, I'm gong to pick up where I left off yesterday. I have a few more questions on the privatization of the public campsites.

And the first information that I would like from you, Mr. Minister, is the camp ground on Besnard Lake. I wonder if you could indicate who has taken over the campsite there. I know who's taken it over, but could you indicate the agreement that was signed with individual on the Besnard Lake campsite?

And then I will be following up with the one at Little Amyot Lake, as yesterday I didn't get all the answers that I wanted there.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, what I have been advised is, Besnard Lake camp ground, it's been run by Red's Camps Ltd. from La Ronge, Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, could you indicate who the owners of Red's Camps are, and the agreement that has been signed - the terms of the agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, Besnard Lake lost \$34,000 last year. And that was the operating loss of the camp ground. Red's Camps Ltd. will be operating it - it's a one-season lease that they have. We asked for a minimum tender of \$100. The successful tender bid was \$112. I don't have the principals' names listed in front of me. I believe it's Ronald and Evelyn MacKay from la Ronge - MacKay or MacKie. I'm sorry, I'm not sure, MacKay.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, it's quite interesting. We just heard the conversation between yourself and a colleague over here regarding Conservative memberships and pork-barrelling, and I see here that Red's Camps Inc. from La Ronge, owned and operated by Ronald and Evelyn MacKay who have leased a campsite. I didn't ask how much money it lost, as we know there are certain campsites in this province that lose money. But they are there for the public and to serve the public.

But to suggest that there was a tender put out asking for \$100 tender, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen tenders offered like this. But they got the campsite for \$112. I think when you talk about pork-barrelling and Conservative memberships one will just check that, one, Ron MacKay and Evelyn MacKay both sit on the executive of the Conservative - the Conservative executive in the constituency of Cumberland.

This is how you're operating. But I think it's a shame that a group like that could take over such a beautiful campsite and one that is well used in Besnard Lake for a \$112 tender. This just doesn't make any sense. And most certainly we know where it went to.

I want to ask another question, and I would like the same answers on the Little Amyot Camp Ground. I asked that yesterday prior to adjournment. I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you indicate . . . I know you said they had a five-year agreement, but could you indicate if there are any conditions attached to the five-year agreement, such as the fees that they're going to charge, and will they keep that campsite open on a 24-hour basis?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm having a little trouble reading my writing. Little Amyot Lake: Germaine, Olivier, Lavoie, and Nicole, Marie Lavoie, lease period June 1, 1987, to May 31, 1992, \$460 a year. The lessee is responsible for all his own expenses, maintenance, repairs, replacement to buildings, structure, facilities, equipment - anything that has to be done, they have to do. They have to supply everything themselves. We don't have control over what they will charge, is what you asked. They will have to charge as they see fit. I would remind you it lost \$34,482 in the last operating year.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, you indicate that they are getting the Little Amyot Lake for \$460 a year. And you also indicate that there's no conditions on that agreement. Could you indicate if the \$460 per year was a tender price, or was that something that was worked out amongst the department?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm sorry. Could I get that one again, Fred?

**Mr. Thompson:** — I wonder if the minister could indicate if the agreement that was worked out with Little Amyot Lake was an agreement that was tendered. The \$460 a year to lease that campsite, was that a tender price or was that a price that was worked amongst your department officials?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, that is a commercial rate set under the resource land regulations. As the adjacent operator, they were approached and asked would they be willing or interested in that campsite under the current land regulations? And that is precisely the same arrangement that was made with Ted Ohlsen from Deschambault Lake.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Mr. Minister, you indicate that they were approached. You have the campsite at Besnard Lake, which is a good-sized campsite, for \$112 a year. The Lavoies are paying \$460 a year for a five-year contract. I just wonder what the discrepancy is there.

But I'm going to close off on this subject and make a few remarks. And as I said before, we take a look at the Besnard campsite which was leased for \$112 . . . And I want to take a look at the resort of the chief electoral officer, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to make my argument here and to indicate to you, Mr. Minister, who is getting these campsites and how they're being privatized.

You indicate yourself that the campsite at Little Amyot Lake . . . And I want to tell you that that is a campsite that is used fully from spring till fall by many, many people in northern Saskatchewan, the rest of the province, and Alberta and across Canada. And you could go in there on any day you wanted, and there was campers and individuals in there from the community of Beauval, going out and barbecuing, and they used that at no cost.

This was a service provided by the taxpayers of the province. You have now turned it over to a private entrepreneur, an individual who, I might add, once again,

is the president of the Conservative association in the constituency of Athabasca, and was very influential as a campaign manager, and the whole family, in the last provincial election. Those are the type of individuals that are getting the private campsites in this province. And they're not tendering it out. You're not tendering.

You just offered the Lavoies the package. For \$460 a year they get a beautiful campsite, completely set up with all the capital that has been put in there over the years, and has been used by thousands of people across this country. All of a sudden they're going to come in there in the middle of the night, and that camp ground is going to have a sign - it has a sign there already - that you have to go and report to this individual who, as I indicated, was the president of the Athabasca Conservative association.

(1145)

They have control. You put no conditions on that lease. They can charge whatever they want, and that's what they're doing.

And the service, I say to you, Mr. Minister, is not there. And this is not the way we should be operating. And I ask you, Mr. Minister, to stop privatizing the public campsites that we have in this province because this just cannot continue. The public at large just cannot afford the increases that your department is charging.

Individual rates to go into campsites have been increased from 5 to \$12 - a \$7 increase just to camp overnight. Your department is charging individuals to tie their boats up at docks, at marinas, and this is just not fair. And I ask you to review that policy, Mr. Minister.

I now want to . . . There will be other questions that my colleagues will be asking on the privatization of our campsites, but I now want to turn to the nurseries that we have. And my first question to you, Mr. Minister, is: could you indicate how many trees were planted last year in the province of Saskatchewan, and how many trees that you plan to plant this year?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Could I just refer, Mr. Chairman, for one moment to a comment the hon. member made about we're now charging for boat docks? That's not new, hon. member. That's in the regulations, and has been there for some long time.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you're indicating that the increases that you're charging for park fees this year is in the regulations, that by regulation they automatically go up from \$7 . . . from \$5 to \$12; that you charge a \$6 fee for parking a boat in a marina - you're saying that that's under regulations?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, two things I'd like to point out. In the first place there have been some allegations that Ron and Evelyn MacKay were somehow given preferential treatment on a bid that they put in of \$112 for Besnard Lake. Mr. Chairman, they were the only bid that was received; there were no other bids, so there was no preferential treatment.

Now the hon. member and I have sparred around a little

bit on this. I feel rather sorry for the MacKays, or MacKies - I'm not sure of the pronunciation - that their name should be dragged into the legislature. Because inevitably - inevitably - there are slurs against their name now that they, because of political affiliation, because they have the wisdom to belong to the Progressive Conservative Party, received preferential treatment from this government. And it obviously and patently is not the case.

I'm sure the hon. member did not realize they were the only bid when he posed those questions, because I know him to be a man of sincerity. And he would not have made that kind of - I won't say allegation - he wouldn't have made that kind of suggestion had he known they were the only bid.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I want to make this very clear, Mr. Minister. You did not indicate that there was any bid. You talked about the offer that you gave the Lavoies at Little Amyot Lake. You said they were offered the campsite. I'm assuming that there was . . . You offer one group a campsite and you put the other one out on tender. And you also indicated that the tender you called for was for \$100, and they bid 112.

Now that seems kind of odd, when you have a campsite, that the capital that has been put into that campsite would run into, probably over the years, well over a million dollars, and they can rent that for \$112.

And I don't go back on my word. I say that you are catering to and contributing to the pork-barrelling of members of the Conservative Party. I don't take that back at all. They bid; they bid \$112. Somehow you indicate that the tender called for was for \$100. You can read *Hansard*, Mr. Chairman. You go back in *Hansard* and you'll see where you indicated in this House that the tender you asked for was for \$100, and they bid 112.

But just imagine, Mr. Chairman, an individual group taking over a public campsite the size of Besnard Lake for \$112 a year - \$112 a year. I can imagine, Mr. Chairman, that the wood alone that was put up on those campsites within Besnard Lake would run well into the 4 to \$5,000 alone. And they put in a tender for \$112. That, to me, is pork-barrelling.

And I say this, and I make it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that the individuals who bid \$112 are active members of the Conservative executive in the constituency of Cumberland, and I don't take that back at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — The other questions I asked you, Mr. Minister - you didn't answer my question - was regarding regulations. Did you increase the fees from \$5 to \$12 through regulations? And is it through regulations that you are charging \$6 to dock a boat at a marina? Is that through regulations?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, let's get back and clarify something. Besnard was tendered. And it said, minimum bid, \$100 - not bid \$100. How could you possibly be so assinine as to think you put a tender out

and say, give us \$100. How could you? It's a minimum bid \$100.

One bid was received, and the minimum bid was exceeded by \$12. They bid 112. And you have a funny definition of pork-barrelling if you think someone, taking over a campsite, lost \$34,000 a year, is getting Conservative pork-barrelling. Of course that might be from your past experience when you people were in office - maybe that was the kind of thing you did. There's no pork-barrelling here.

And you owe the MacKays an apology because they were the only bid. You said they got a tender awarded to them on the basis of political affiliation, and you are clearly, completely, 100 per cent wrong. You owe the MacKays an apology.

And the Little Amyot Lake is an entirely different situation, because it comes under a different set of regulations, because it's adjacent to an existing campsite. So two different things.

Clearly you weren't listening. You weren't paying attention at all. Clearly you had your mind, unfortunately, down in the political gutter, which I really find repulsive. I'm ashamed of you for having made those kinds of slurs and allegations, that you would get down there a level that we associate with some of your other members; I'm really surprised at that.

On the issue of boat docks. Let me quote 1981 *Saskatchewan Gazette* - The Provincial Lands Act in here:

And the boat dock rates were set then for 1981, '82, '83, '84, and '85.

And they escalated each year. And what happens is, they come up for review periodically, and they haven't been approved yet for increase. And boat mooring, seasonal, in parks, not across northern Saskatchewan per se, but in parks, did change. That was a difference.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not me that's assinine, Mr. Minister, I think it's you that's assinine. And I still say that I don't see any difference. You say you put out a tender minimum of \$100. I'm surprised that they didn't bid \$100.01. They knew they were going to get it. They knew they were going to get it because of their political affiliation.

Mr. Minister, you talk about the regulations and increasing the boat docking fees from - well there was no docking fees - to \$6 overnight. That decision would be made by your department officials, and it's not your regulations that they have to increase this. Is that right?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, all fee increases are through order in council by cabinet.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, I didn't get that answer, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I was informing the hon. member that fee increases of that nature are through order in

council in cabinet, whether it be park fees or anything ancillary or associated therewith to the parks.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, then you're indicating that it's the cabinet and the Conservative government who has put the tremendous increase in fees. You go out to Rowan's Ravine and Last Mountain Lake, and individuals who did not pay to dock their boats overnight are now paying \$6 just to moor their boat in a marina, and I believe it's probably a public . . . it's been privatized also.

And camping fees at that same park have increased from \$5 to \$12, an increase of \$7. And, Mr. Minister, it's your cabinet decision to put these types of increases upon the public of Saskatchewan. And one just has to go out to Rowan's Ravine, and you'll find out that due to the high cost of the . . . high increase that you have placed upon the tourist this year, the campsites are used very sparingly. Going back to the Victoria Day, there was less than 50 per cent of the stalls that were used. So that's what's happening. You are charging these exorbitant fees to the public of Saskatchewan, and they just can't afford it in these tough times. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, instead of sitting down with your cabinet colleagues and increasing these fees, you should be rolling some of them back, not increasing them.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to . . . and you may have the answer now. Could you indicate to me the question that I did ask you was: how many trees were planted last year in the province, and how many trees do you plan to plant this year?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, just prior to answering that question, I'd like to touch on Rowan's Ravine because the hon. member mentioned it. There was no marina there before. We just built one, a brand new one, and allowed a private individual to operate it and run it. And that's why there's a fee there now. Sure, there wouldn't be a fee there before. There was no marina there before. It's that simple.

Now we'll tell you about tree planting. Let's get into that one. In 1986, total trees planted would be 8.32 million. That was below our projection for the year. Some contractors ran into difficulty in the spring contracts. They could not complete the contracts. Some walked away from them. They had, in some cases I believe, underbid with some difficult terrain to work on, and they didn't complete. Some contractors did not plant up to departmental standards, and it was unacceptable. Otherwise it would have been higher.

We did put out a fall tree planting contract to try to make up some of the shortfall. This year we expect to plant about six million trees so far, and we may be doing some work with the Minister of Social Services' department. We have some projects in the mill between his department and the federal government. We'd like to do some tree planting with some federal money and some on-the-job training for some of his recipients and client groups.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, once again we go back to a situation where we

are going backwards in the forest industry. First of all, you give away the forest to Weyerhaeuser Canada for not one cent down. He got eight million acres of our prime forest land. Last year you planted eight million trees; this year you're only going to plant six million trees. And I say to you, Mr. Minister: is our forest not more important now than they were before? When we left government we were planting in the neighbourhood of 12 million trees. And the hon. member from Meadow Lake got up and said, well we're going to do a lot better; we'll be planting in the neighbourhood of 14 million trees. We're going to move that up.

What you have done now - and I don't think there's any less timber being taken out of this province; we're still clear cutting in the province - and yet you're planting less trees. Not only are you planting less trees but you're laying off individuals and closing down nurseries and jobs that go with them. You've now closed down the satellite nurseries at Chitek Lake and at McDowell, and along with that went seasonal jobs that individuals have held for many years. And they need those jobs. They worked in the summer so that they could get enough stamps to draw unemployment in the winter, but you have taken that away. And also you have taken away the reforestation that this province really needs.

(1200)

And I say, Mr. Minister, that that's not fair to the people of Saskatchewan. You take, and you take the assets we had, the eight million acres of prime forest land; you give that to an American firm. It's our responsibility to replant the forests, and what do we do? We plant . . . we're going backwards. We're not only replanting less trees, we're also planting less trees, and we're closing down nurseries when we should be expanding the nurseries in this province and planting more trees.

And, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you another question. Could you indicate how many inspectors you have in the field to inspect the nurseries to make sure that the trees that are planted are planted properly, and that they are growing. And also I would like to know what the rate is of success.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'll deal with your preamble latterly. First, I'd like to deal with your very specific questions that you asked, and they're very fair questions.

You asked how many people per project. Normally, there would be three people per project, supervising and checking that things were being done according to our standards. The success rate the department demands is 75 per cent - we like a 75 per cent success rate. And this year I'm pleased to say that, in fact, the success rate is in excess of 75 per cent.

Now in response hon. member to some of the things you said earlier about the decline in tree planting and how it's been going down steadily. I point out that between 1980 and '81, you planted 29 per cent fewer trees in '81 than you did in 1980. So you went down. And then I went and I took some statistics and I took some numbers, and I took the last four years of your administration and I found that

you planted 39 million trees. I took the first four years of our administration, added them up, and we planted 45 million trees.

Now how can these people sit there and say we plant fewer trees than they do when we've planted 6 million more. Well, I'll give you the answer, because I know my colleagues over here want the answer. As usual, your research staff didn't get any further than the *Star-Phoenix*.

And what did they find in the *Star-Phoenix*? They found a story with an interview with an individual, on the inside page, leaning up against a tree - and I won't describe him because you know who he is. And I'll name him. His name is Hector Shiell. Hector Shiell, who happens to live in my constituency - Hector Shiell. And Hector Shiell says since these people got into office - the last five years - fewer and fewer and fewer trees. Now why would Hector Shiell make such a political comment? Well, surprise, surprise! Hector Shiell happens to live on the same commune as the individual I defeated in the 1986 general election.

You remember him. You remember that guy. Some of you came up to his nomination . . . The Leader of the Opposition came up to his nomination. He came up to see old Chris. You remember Chris? He cut his pony-tail off for the nomination. Yes? And you came up to his farm. You know where his farm is, out on the highway that runs from Spiritwood past Medstead. And I've got a photograph here of the sign to his farm. It's a beautiful sign. It's got a big rainbow on it. It's going something about apiaries on it.

But I'll tell you something . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I can't name the farm because it would be unparliamentary and it would not be accepted to put in the record what this individual has on his sign for his farm. And that

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, please. Order. Order. Would the member please put the exhibit down since exhibits are not allowed in the House.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'll send it over to the hon. member if he'd like to look at it.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get down to some more questions here, I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this House, that we have just witnessed a minister . . . He talks about mud slinging. Let me tell you, he has just taken . . . And I don't know who Hector Shiell is, but he has brought that individual into this House and he has "drug" him right across here, and he drug him through the mud. And if you want to talk about mud slinging, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that minister has just taken the former candidate . . . He has just taken Mr. Shiell, and I don't think anybody in this building knows who Mr. Shiell is - drug him through the mud. He's taken him - the last candidate who run against him - and he's put him into the mud barrel. And I see when you talk about mud slinging, you can't get any more mud slinging than is coming from that minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Thompson:** — And you talk about your five-year plans, and you go back on your figures. And I want to say, if you want to take your figures and your five-year plan, that's six million trees a year, in the next five years you're only going to plant 30 million trees the way you're going.

When you came into government, we had just finished building the satellite station so we could increase the tree planting in this province and the capabilities to go out and plant. And you most certainly can't take credit for that. But what you can take credit for, Mr. Minister, is closing down the satellite nurseries that we built so that we could reforestate this province and keep the trees growing for generations to come. But you have decided to take the other approach - close it down, take individuals and throw pictures around in the legislature, take individuals and drag them through the mid. That's not the way we operate. But that's the way you're operating.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, was: how many inspectors do you have? I didn't ask, supervisors per crew; I asked how many inspectors do you have that go out and inspect and make sure what the success rate is when you plant those trees.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Sixteen to eighteen.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, are you saying that these are provincial inspectors, inspectors from the Department of Parks and Recreation who go out and make sure that the trees are planted properly and determine what the success rate is?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Hon. member, these are technicians from the forestry branch of the department.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I now want to turn to a request that has come to your department for the spraying of approximately two acres of land, or a small plot in the Candle Lake area.

Could you indicate, Mr. Minister, who asked for permission to spray and what type of spray are they requesting?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, just prior to answering that question - I was remiss in letting something go when the hon. member was talking about our reforestation plan and what our intentions are for the future. By way of background, the forest industry being a high-tech industry and on the leading edge of technology, and the member well knows this from his own area, there's been many changes over the years. And one of the problems the research scientists in forestry have been gabbling with is: what kind of forest are we going to be looking at 50, 70, and 90 years from now? Because as we know, it takes 70 to 90 years to grow a commercial forest. With the changes, there is a move away from softwood to hardwood. And we're increasingly seeing this. And if we can believe, then, what the experts and the forest industry are telling us, that in fact the future of wood, not just in this province but in this country, is in fibre and will not necessarily be in our traditional softwood lumber industry, although that should continue and should be viable.



So what we've been grappling with the last couple of years is trying to project what kind of a forest are we going to require for our future generations. The indications we're getting now are that we have to do more experiments with hardwood, and poplar should not be the only species. So we're trying to project future use against today's planting.

And I can tell you that the cabinet committed not to 30 million trees, hon. member, but I have a commitment from cabinet three months ago that we are committing to 50 million trees as our reforestation program. That's of a softwood variety. From hardwood, we're looking at regeneration of poplar which can occur naturally, especially in burnt over areas. We have a 50 to 60 per cent success rate of regeneration anyway. But we're looking at doing some planting in that area. So I thought I should mention that to you just now.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you going to answer my question on the chemicals?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's last question, the Canadian Forestry Service submitted a request of a 2.27 hectare experimental proposal to the department for approval. They want to apply a herbicide called Pronone. I believe it's IOG. The application is under review, and all that's happened so far, I am advised, is that my officials are talking to officials from the Department of the Environment, and no final decision has been taken.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the request came from who? I didn't get where the request came from to do the experimental spraying?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, it came from the Canadian Forestry Service.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well, Mr. Minister, as you're aware, I have been opposed to the spraying of our forest to kill any trees, and my colleagues also over here are opposed to that. I've indicated to you in the House before that if there was going to be any thinning out of any trees or any forest, that it should be done by hand. And not only would it be safe, but it would create much needed jobs, especially in the summer for our young people who are out of school and looking for extra money so that they can go back to school in the fall or go back to universities.

And I indicated before, and very strongly, that if you are going to take a look at spraying of our forests, then this is something that we have to put a stop to. As you know, if you go in and spray, and even if it's a test area and it proves successful, they're going to want to take on more forest and spray it. But there's no way that we should be going into a forest and spraying to get rid of aspen or poplar. Because if you have a spray that's strong enough to kill aspen and poplar, then it's going to kill all the other shrubbery that's in there. It's also going to kill the berries. And when the berries are dead, and animals eat the berries, it's just going to have a spin-off effect where it can poison the whole system.

And I say that this is something that has to . . . we have to put a stop to that right away. There's just too many

chemicals in our system today. And to add more, especially into our forest where it's so vulnerable . . . You talk about a forest regenerating itself in Saskatchewan, it taking 70 to 90 years, and we want to go out there and start killing off aspen. You say we're turning over we're starting to take a look at hardwood, and mainly poplar.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to take a serious look at that and not approve any spraying in Saskatchewan. And if they want to thin out that there small piece of land near Candle Lake, then I ask you to hire students for the summer or individuals who are unemployed.

(1215)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, as we're all aware, this is a very touchy subject, and I have responded in question period in the past to the former member from Cumberland, I believe, it was, on this issue.

Since that time some two years ago, when I was asked a question in question period, and I'd said that I didn't believe any spraying should take place until such time as we were absolutely satisfied there would be no danger to things such as berries or to other particular shrubs, and certainly to animals in the forest, there has been a very comprehensive herbicide task force report which has been tabled. And I believe the members opposite, certainly the ones who requested it, do have copies. I believe I sent the hon. member from Athabasca a copy at one point.

And all of the collected data, and all of the knowledge that has been available, comes up with no adverse effects at all. Now that doesn't make me rest easy, thinking about it. I happen to have serious concerns about spraying, whether it be for food or forest or for anything else. And I think most of us share those concerns.

Now I'm not sure that the hon. member would have the complete support of his caucus on this particular issue of spraying. And you may recall, I quoted the former member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg on the use of sprays in the past. I could quote the member from Quill Lakes, page 3738 of *Hansard*, November 27, 1985, who said, and I'll quote:

Well I'll tell you in *Saskatchewan News* here, back on April 21, 1979, and this is when Mr. Nollet was the Minister of Agriculture, and when that problem was apparent, a million-dollar war was launched against the hoppers. In storage there you will see hundreds and hundreds of cans of chemicals to address the problem - ready to go. And this year the program the Minister of Agriculture introduced was a disgrace in assistance to the farmers. I want to close, Mr. Speaker, in saying how very disappointed I am in this debate today that we did not have some of the front-bench members of the government who would stand up and address with us here today the crisis in agriculture.

The member was referring to chemicals being stored up, supplied by the government, to use in a war against

grasshoppers, which as we all recall was prevalent at that time.

I'm not criticizing the hon. member for Quill Lakes. I'm just saying that somehow we have to achieve some kind of consistency here. I'm saying it's okay to take the very same spray and take it and spray it on food. But you can't take that same spray and spray on trees, particularly on trees under completely controlled conditions, where there will be no people there, where specific precautions will be taken.

Now as I said, Mr. Chairman, it does worry me, and it does concern me. I've always had concerns about chemicals and about sprays. But in the face of the scientific evidence, I'm somewhat reluctant to say that I could not support the proposal to spray a two-acre test site to see what happens.

And another thing, when you spray the trees, it's once in the lifetime of a forest. If you're going to do manual thinning, it's an ongoing, ongoing continuous basis. And it may very well - and I think the member from Regina Rosemont is making this point - it would be very labour-intensive. It is also very costly. But perhaps it's an option that should be explored with the companies.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, we're discussing here today, and at the present time, the spraying of our forests in northern Saskatchewan. It's got nothing to do with grasshoppers, and I don't know why you would want to bring that in here.

But we're dealing in a forest that's very fragile. We're not dealing with the type of land that we're dealing with in the South, where they have to compete - they have to make sure that the grasshoppers don't compete with the crop. Up North, if you spray those trees and you spray them once, then you kill the competition. And you can talk to anybody that knows anything about forestry, and trees have to have competition. It doesn't matter if you spray them once or 100 times - once is going to do it. And you are going to destroy the competition and, as a result, you end up with a stunted tree. And that's a fact of life.

And you can go to Candle Lake and you can talk to individuals who have been in the forestry business for many, many years, and they'll tell you that. If you put spray in there that's strong enough to kill the poplar or the aspen, then you're most certainly going to kill the rest of the competition and you're going to end up with one species, and you're going to end up with a bunch of runted trees. And you can go into the fragile area of northern Saskatchewan where you have one type of tree in a sandy area but no competition, and you'll see that they roots will become bar and they become stunted. You have a big trunk and no tree to it. And that is what's going to happen up here if you're going to go in there and spray and kill the competition, because forest and trees have to have competition. That's what the other trees are in there for.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that regardless of what you believe in, I say that you should not allow spraying to take place in the forests in Saskatchewan. Our forests are so

vulnerable. We live in climatic conditions in this province that are far different than the climatic conditions in Alberta and farther west and out in the East coast, and you know that yourself. You indicated that it takes 70 to 90 years for a tree to mature, so we are dealing with a different situation in Saskatchewan.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, and in all fairness to the citizens of this province, don't allow any spraying of our fragile forest because you are taking a chance of destroying it, and once that's done, it takes, as you indicated, 90 years for it to recover.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I should point out to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that spraying is but one tool - but one tool in forest management. There are others, and I have by no means discounted them.

But I would like to say that perhaps taking an experimental two-acre site could be worthwhile and take a look at it. They are registered sprays. They are degradable within a very short time; therefore, the competition to which the hon. member alludes should not suffer.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. As I indicated, I would ask you to take a serious look at any spraying commitment that you make to the Canadian Forestry Association because as I indicated in my arguments, I think Saskatchewan is far different than any of the other provinces that we live in.

I now want to turn, Mr. Minister, to another subject, and that is fire suppression, and sort of an update on what is happening this year. Could you . . . I know you have the new water bombers in the fleet right now. Could you indicate if that is the only two new water bombers that Saskatchewan is going to get, or are we going to be adding more to that fleet. And what do we have now for fighting fires in the province? What type of a fleet do we have now?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give a detail on this to the hon. member. The fleet that we have currently consists of six Trackers, three Cansos, three Barons, two CL-215's, the new ones; and we've got two more CL-215's which are due later this year, probably in November.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. The CL-215's, the new water bombers that I believe . . . they do not belong to the province of Saskatchewan. Is that right? Do they belong to the Canadian Forestry Association?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I just wanted to be completely clear on this. We have a one-for-one purchase arrangement with the federal government. We buy one and they give us one for a dollar, and it becomes ours. So the arrangement we've made is we purchase two and they're giving us two. And that's the arrangement.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Well, Mr. Minister, are you indicating then that the provincial government, Parks and Recreation, are the sole owners of the new two aircrafts

and not the Canadian Forestry Association?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, that would be the property of the property management Crown.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I want to ask this question, Mr. Minister. I see that they carry the Canadian emblem on the aircrafts, which would indicate to me - and the name on the aircraft is not the Saskatchewan government's name - I may be wrong in that. But I believe that they have a Canadian emblem and a Canadian name of the aircraft. Is that not right?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, on all cost-shared items the federal government do like to get some recognition. And on these two particular machines, built by Canadair, they do have a Canadian emblem. I find no difficulty with that. Maybe we should put a Saskatchewan flag on alongside, too.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. No, I have no difficulty with that at all. I just assumed that, with the Canadian emblem on them, that they were the property they were still the property of the federal government. But I have no problem with that at all.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We do share them.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Right.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could indicate - I know this has been a very bad season to start off with, with fires in northern Saskatchewan - could you indicate today, if you have those figures with you, how much has been spent on fighting fires to date? And if you could indicate could you break that down in how much we have spent on labour, and how much has been spent on aircraft in fighting the fires.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. member, yes. As we all know, this has been a very bad year, a very severe year for forest fires. A combination of factors, very dry early in the year, and a number of lightning strikes, and certainly a bad year.

To date, as of yesterday, there've been 663 forest fires. We can contrast that with, to date, last year, 349; fires burning at the moment, 26. So, as you've indicated, the member from Athabasca, this has been a tough year.

In terms of the costs, I can give you a ballpark figure of \$11 million to date spent on fire-fighting and fire suppression. To break that down would be very difficult. A ballpark figure would be five million in fire-fighting expenses, wages, food, and sustenance, and six million on equipment. We won't have the final figures, because we're in the middle of the season right now, until the end of the season. What I've asked the officials to do is to see if they can pull together something, say, for the end of July so we know what it's cost us to that point and see if we can get breakdowns.

(1230)

Sometimes the bills are slow in coming in. We buy groceries from various stores around the province, and

sometimes those bills comes in quite late. So it won't be particularly accurate. But I think, for your purposes, it will give you an idea of what the costs are, if that's acceptable to you.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Minister. That's acceptable to me if you provide me with the information in writing whenever you can get that information.

I want to close off the fire suppression by saying that the figures that you gave me for the money spent up to date is \$11 million. And five million of that has gone into labour and food, to fight, the equipment, and six million for aircraft.

And I want to say that this has been a contentious issue in years past and mainly the fires were fought with aircraft and they're just . . . the local people were not being used to fight the fires.

This year I got no complaints from my constituents because most of them have been out fighting the fires, and of course in a depressed area they appreciate these type of jobs. I know it's not a good job to have, but it's important, and it's important that you utilize the fire-fighters that we have in northern Saskatchewan because they are experienced fire-fighters. And I think that it's a lot better to fight a fire with experience, and fight it the way it should be fought, after the sun goes down and before the sun comes up in the morning.

And that is being carried out now. And I appreciate that and I just urge you to continue to ask your officials to continue fighting fires in that manner because I think it's important that we utilize the experienced forest fire-fighters that we have in northern Saskatchewan. And I'm very pleased. I know we go back a few years, and that figure would be about one million for labour and then million for aircraft. And I see that has changed around, and I appreciate that.

I also have watched the new water bombers operating and watched other water bombers coming in from other parts of Canada when we have the serious fires up there, and they most certainly are doing their job properly, too. It's just too bad that we had to have such a serious outbreak this year. It's not only a high cost to the treasury for the year, but it's something that scars the province and sets it back for generations to come.

I now want to turn, Mr. Minister, to the big game surveys that are carried out in the province. And I wonder if you could indicate to me how many big game surveys was carried out last year, and could you indicate what the populations are? And I refer specifically, Mr. Minister, to the moose, the deer, and the elk, and both the woodland caribou and the barren-land caribou. Could you indicate if there was any surveys done on those particular groups, and could you indicate if there's an abundance of those species in the province?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, fairly rounded figures for the hon. member: moose population of approximately 50,000; white-tailed deer, 250,000; elk, 8,000; woodland caribou - we've just started the surveys on those but it would appear that they're down

from last year, so we're going to be closing the season on them. It looks like 1,000 - tops. And again, barren-ground caribou- we're working in conjunction with the Northwest Territories to establish a figure there. We're not really certain of that number yet either, because surveys are ongoing.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You indicate that there's . . . the surveys show you that there's 50,000 moose population in the province and 250,000 deer. I wonder, could you indicate if that moose population is levelling out, or is it going down, or what is the 50,000 figure mean?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, the moose population has been going up. The deer population has been stable, and elk is a stable population. The one that probably causes the most concern is woodland caribou because it has been going down.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I wonder, Mr. Minister if your officials could indicate to you if there is any reason why the woodland caribou herd would be going down so drastically, because we did have large herds of woodland caribou. And I notice, when I fly around in northern Saskatchewan, very seldom do I seem them any more. And I wonder if the officials could indicate, is there any specific reason why the woodland caribou would be decreasing the way it is?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they've been declining since the 1950s as access to the North became easier - more roads and easier to get in, more people were getting in, more hunting, hunting pressure, and herds have been going down. And that's why we're closing the season on them now.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, do you consider the woodland caribou to be more vulnerable than the moose? I just wonder because I know the range of the caribou is mainly in the muskeg areas. But I'm just wondering why the moose population would be increasing so much and the woodland caribou would be declining so fast - especially so fast that you've decided to close the season on them.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, one of the problems with the caribou is they travel in herds, and it's much easier for groups of hunters to take large numbers and take them easily. And the decision on the season was not unilateral. It was made in conjunction with the wildlife advisory committee of the Northern (Saskatchewan) Outfitters Association.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That's right. They do run in herds, and you'll see herds . . . you used to see herds when they were plentiful, right out on the lakes in February.

I'm glad to see the moose population coming up. We've had some good winters, and I notice for the first time trappers and fishermen are telling me they're seeing moose with three calves this year, and that's quite unusual. It would indicate that the feed has been good, and a good winter, and another thing it indicates that . . . and trappers are telling me this too, that the wolf

population has declined along with the moose population. And the moose population is starting to recover and recover very well, especially when you see a cow with three calves. You don't see that too often.

I now want to turn to the black bear, Mr. Minister, and I know that the black bear . . . the hunting in the province of black and brown bear is becoming very popular, and we do have a lot of hunters that come in from Sweden and many other foreign countries to hunt bear up in northern Saskatchewan, especially up in the Green lake and the Beauval area in my constituency. And it's just fantastic how it's growing.

And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if your department is going to put any controls on the issuing of licence to outfitters who are coming in and setting up their portable tree stands from out of the province. As I've been told, the way it's operating right now, individuals from Alberta can come in, get an outfitter's licence, bring in their portable tree stands, go any place they want for a small fee, bring in their tourists, and then they leave. They bring in their gas. They bring in their groceries. They bring in everything and then they just move out.

We have local individuals in Saskatchewan who are trying to take advantage of this situation, and most certainly they can't go across the border to Alberta. And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, if you would confirm if that's in here and set up and then just, you know, bring the portable stands in and then move out, and if you would consider putting some controls on this.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, we are getting strong representation of the nature suggested by the hon. member to discontinue the practice of allowing people from other provinces in to set up and do precisely what he indicated has happened. We've had a series of consultations with the association, and there is a discussion paper that has been circulated - I don't know; are you familiar with the discussion paper? Could one of my officials undertake to make sure you get a copy of it so you know what we've been discussing.

On the subject of the black bear . . . black bear-brown bear intermingled species in Saskatchewan, we do have a very healthy bear population. It's been estimated at a minimum of 40,000 in the last couple of years, and does seem to be growing. There have been a few problems experienced with bears, just in the last week, just south of the hon. member's own area around Meadow Lake, Loon Lake, perhaps around Green Lake as well. We've been having some problems with them. I think that's probably in part, due to forest fires in the North, and the bears are being forced to come out of the forest and move farther south.

We had a similar problem in 1977 where a number of bears were found burned in forest around my own area, and I remember in the fall people bird hunting were carrying one slug in the shotgun, as well as shells, in case they surprised a bear in the bush, because they really had become a very serious problem. But the bear population has been growing in recent years. It is very healthy, and I think it's something that could be put to our good use in

the North with our northern outfitters.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That's right, it has become very popular, and we do have an abundance of bears in the province. When you see the type of clientele that is coming over here . . . Actually they're coming from many European countries, and many of the individuals that are coming are from Sweden. And they bring their own camera crews, they bring their own cooks, and then they . . . It's becoming a fairly big business.

I have some operators in the Green Lake and Beauval area who are - and the Keeley Lake area, where there was 80 bears taken out alone, just in Keeley Lake, last year - who want some protection, the Saskatchewan outfitters who want some protection.

(1245)

You take an Alberta operator who can come in here and get a licence for \$100, set up, really contributes nothing to the province, and can set up right in the same area that we have individuals who are starting up. And I speak specifically of that Green Lake, Keeley, Beauval area where individuals are just starting up.

But lo and behold, they go out and here the baits and everything has been set up by an operator from Alberta who comes in for a \$100 fee. And our Saskatchewan operators cannot go into Alberta and do the same thing.

So I would ask you, Mr. Minister, and your officials, to check this out very closely and see if it's something that can be stopped and that we can, you know, give encouragement to our Saskatchewan operators rather than allowing the Alberta ones to come in.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the points the member made are well taken. And I can agree in principle with what he's advocating, and it's something that certainly the department will be looking at. We want to make sure that we protect our viable industry in the North for our Northern (Saskatchewan) Outfitters Association. It will play an important part, an increasingly important part in our efforts towards economic diversification and the encouragement of tourism within the province.

Certainly fishing and wildlife generates some \$350 million worth of economic activity within this province, and we don't want anything to happen that would in any way diminish that return. So the member's points are well taken, and we certainly take his advice on it.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Now I want to turn to another survey, and that is the survey that has been taking place regarding the black duck or the cormorants.

You indicated that there was a survey being done in 1985. I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that the black duck population is increasing drastically in northern Saskatchewan. And one of the arguments that was used before was that they fed mainly on suckers, which was referred to as "rough fish".

But I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, if that is the case, suckers are no longer considered rough fish in northern Saskatchewan. It has become a commercial fish, and more and more the demand for the rough fish is coming through. And you see our fishermen supplying the corporation with hundreds of thousands of tonnes, now, of suckers.

So if that is the case, then I would ask you . . . And, Mr. Minister, I want to turn over to you a study, or some information that I have got for your own information. I would ask you to take a serious look at how we are going to control the black duck population. And you can talk to old individuals - fishermen who have been around for many, many years in northern Saskatchewan - and they indicate that they have never, ever seen the black duck population the way it is today.

And I, myself, being a commercial fisherman, and seeing the tremendous population of the black duck . . . You go out on the lakes and you'll see thousands of them in a flock, and dead fish just floating up all over. And the pelicans and the seagulls, who will go right in amongst the black duck, because they feed on the fish that the black duck has either got too much and had to get rid of them, or they have wounded them and the fish pops up and the seagulls and the pelicans feed on them.

And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to ask your officials to go out and discuss with the commercial fishing industry, sit down with the commercial fishermen and the tourists - the tourists also should be involved in this because the cormorants are now depleting stocks that the tourist operators rely on and the commercial fishermen rely on. And I would ask that you take a serious look at the population of our cormorants - ask the officials, the conservation officers, to go out and meet with the tourist association, with the commercial fishermen, and somehow work out a plan to cut down on the cormorants.

As you will see in the information I passed over to you - and this information was compiled by a commercial fisherman and in conjunction with commercial fishermen and tourist operators - and they feel that the best way to control the black duck is to go to the nesting grounds and take a certain amount of eggs away every spring. In that way you would eliminate the population by just taking so many eggs out of their nests. And I think you would not run into any problems with any interest groups by doing it with this method. And you will see that the information that I passed on to you, Mr. Minister, indicates that that is the route that should be taken.

Not only do the black ducks destroy the fish populations, but they destroy prime nesting areas for our blue herons. And blue herons come back to the same islands every year. And all of a sudden the trees that they use are gone because of the black ducks who congregate on these islands. And there's many aspects that one has to look at. And I would urge you and your department officials to take a serious look at controlling the cormorants in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Once again, Mr. Chairman, the comments of the member are well taken. As I believe he knows, we do sponsor a graduate student, University of

Saskatchewan, who's doing a study in this whole area. Her thesis is expected this fall. her thesis is going to be used as a basis . . . it will be a scientific report, in the form of a scientific report, that we will use in discussions with the groups to whom the hon. member has already referred - certainly tourists, outfitters, and commercial fishermen.

The incidence of cormorants eating other than rough fish has increased. I believe the percentage they are now taking of game fish is in the order of 5 per cent. And as the hon. member and those who are familiar with the North knows, a 5 per cent tolerance is too much. In terms of . . . I could take the instance of Lac La Ronge where the tolerance of trout was set at 254,000 pounds. And we already know of 253,000 that are being harvested. We know from angling and commercial fishing, 250 . . . If we know of 253, we can be sure there's a lot more than that coming out of the lake.

And that is not an uncommon happenstance across the North. We know that, in some instances, some lakes are being overfished. And when you have a population such as described by the hon. member - which is absolutely true, it has grown in recent years tremendously - accounting for 5 per cent of the game fish, we really can't tolerate that situation.

However . . . And I could point out that as evidence of the growth in the population of cormorants in recent years I'm finding them in my own constituency of Turtleford, and I'm a long ways south from where the hon. member lives. And I've seen quite a number of them on the lakes in my area when I've been travelling through the constituency.

So they have been breeding quite prolifically and spreading. They also are not content, as the hon. member pointed out, to settle around one island on one lake. They will spread out and do considerable damage to other bird populations. The one caveat we have to face . . . and this is something that we're going to have to approach in a semi-delicate form because we're going to have to discuss it with the Canadian Wildlife Service and some other groups.

In other areas the cormorant is considered a rare and endangered species. Now I know in Saskatchewan that would bring a smile to many faces of northern residents, who wouldn't believe that they could be rare and endangered. But by the same token we see many pelicans flying around in certain areas of Saskatchewan, and it's difficult to believe that they've only recently been removed from that designation.

So we do have to take that into consideration when we are dealing with the results of the report, at which time we also intend to consult with the northern groups to whom you have already referred, that it is regarded as a rare and endangered species in other parts of the world.

Now I don't know if there would be any market in us saying we can move eggs to other areas. I think it might be well worth exploring. As you and I are both aware there are a number of federal agencies, whether it be the Canadian Wildlife Service, to Habitat Canada, to

international groups, who may be interested in some kind of proposal. We are over-populated with something that's rare and endangered in other parts of the world. Perhaps we could be getting together on this, exporting them, so that they do have them in another country, and they can survive there if they are compatible with climate.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:56 p.m.