

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**39th Day**

**Friday, April 15, 1977.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS**

**DISTURBANCE AT PRINCE ALBERT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE**

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. The Minister yesterday in the period reserved for Ministerial Statements reported on the inquiry at the Prince Albert Correctional Institution as a result of the disturbance there of approximately a month or so ago. I assume that the report came about as a result of the detailed investigation either by ministerial officials or the RCMP and my question to the Minister is, when can we expect to hear that charges have been laid against those inmates of the institution who participated in this disturbance?

**MR. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, at this particular time there is no intentions of laying any charges against any inmates for several reasons. First of all, it was very difficult to establish which ones of the inmates were responsible for the cause of the disturbance due to the fact that most of the disturbance was carried on in the dark. Once the lights in the Correction Centre had been smashed then there was very little lighting available. That is one of the reasons why Mr. Logan recommended that emergency lights be made available and as I indicated yesterday we will be moving in that direction. Secondly, there were no physical injuries caused to either staff or inmates directly related to the time of the disturbance.

**MR. MALONE:** — A supplementary question. May I suggest to the Minister that notwithstanding the fact that there were no physical injuries to inmates or guards, according to your report there is some \$3,000 in damage occasioned to the institution. I suggest to you that if you made a proper investigation in the detailed report you would have some idea of which inmates were involved in causing that particular damage. I suggest to you as well that the people of Saskatchewan are sick and tired of these disturbances and the only way you can stop them . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**PURCHASING OF MOTOR LICENCE PLATES**

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — Mr. Speaker, if I could through you direct a question to the Minister in charge of Motor Licensing. The day before yesterday, Wednesday of this week my wife along with hundreds of other Saskatonians went to the licence outlet at the corner of 8th Street and Acadia in Saskatoon, only to discover that there were no licences available. Could the Minister explain why that

April 15, 1977.

particular instance occurred?

**HON. E. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — Because they were out of licence plates I would think. Actually what happened was they were out of the stickers that go with the licence plates. They had to send to Regina to get some and I understand the people who are issuing licence plates are operating full schedule now. They began again yesterday but they were closed for one day.

**MR. PENNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that yesterday people in that same office indicated to those who were obtaining licences that they were going to run out of stickers again?

**MR. WHELAN:** — I am not aware what the people at every office that issue licence plates tell the public, I can assure you of that. I would have to be quite a genius to know exactly what everybody was saying that was issuing licence plates but I can assure you that we are aware of the fact that some of the areas are running out of stickers but there is a surplus in other areas and that situation will be alleviated.

**MR. PENNER:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that the entire manner in the issuing of licences has in fact been a mess and would the Minister agree to consider seriously, because of the problems the people are having in getting licences, having the final date extended beyond the end of April?

**MR. WHELAN:** — Well, I wouldn't agree that it was a mess. I would agree though that the Opposition Members were trying to make political capital out of it; I would say that. But I think we anticipated that there would be a great many problems because of the type of change that is being made takes time, takes a lot of time, takes more time than usual. The facts of the case are that this took time in Ontario and caused a great number of problems. It took place in Manitoba and caused a great deal of discussion and a number of problems and I am sure the Opposition at that time in those jurisdictions took advantage of it to make statements before the Orders of the Day, but it has worked out well in those areas.

**MR. PENNER:** — A final supplementary. In light of the fact that so many jurisdictions have had so much experience with the changeover why was it that your department was not able to capitalize on the mistakes made elsewhere and make corrections so that we wouldn't have them here?

**MR. WHELAN:** — Well, we did and I think there will be some announcements made in the next 24 hours that will indicate that there will be no need to extend the date. You asked me this question specifically. There will be an announcement today and repeated tomorrow indicating some extension of hours and some other changes which will allow for the time that it takes because of the changeover.

## **FUNDING FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AT GENERAL HOSPITAL**

**MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon Sutherland):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. In light of the testimony of Mr. Helmsing to the Members of this Assembly yesterday, will you today give this House your categorical assurance that the five increased housekeeping positions requested by the Board of Governors at the Regina General will be funded immediately?

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Health):** — No, I will not, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LANE:** — Why?

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Because it is something that has to be negotiated with the SHSP.

## **CONDEMNING OF MAGNETIC SEED FEEDERS**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In May of 1976, the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Testing Institute (PAMTI) published a report condemning magnetic seed treaters. This has resulted in a dramatic loss of sale to the magnetic seed treaters. A Saskatchewan company . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I am having trouble hearing the Member's question.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — . . . Senstek Ltd., of Saskatoon, reports a drop of sales from 576 to 12 to date in 1977. Another manufacturer estimates a loss of \$1 million over the next five years. Would the Minister not agree the report by PAMTI was premature and suppresses research and secondary industry in our province in their search for ways to increase agricultural production?

**HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Agricultural Institute did indicate that there was no value in the magnetic treatment. I think it would have been totally irresponsible for that department to not give that information to farmers and if that happens to hurt the manufacturer of the industry, I am sorry, but I don't think that farmers should be expected to buy something which in the opinion of experts is not going to do them any good. I think that the institute acted properly.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister refers to PAMTI as being experts. I would like to make the Minister aware that Irvin Tetman of the Lethbridge, Alberta research station has completed 20 years of research on magnetic feed treaters . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

## **FIRING OF SECRETARY TREASURER R.M. 490**

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like

April 15, 1977.

to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Some days ago I asked the Minister to immediately appoint an inquiry board into the firing of the Secretary-Treasurer of Garden River, R.M. No. 490. Could the Minister tell us at this time if the inquiry board has been appointed?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, the board has not as yet been appointed. I have informed the Secretary and the municipality that we will be setting up an inquiry and I have asked them to appoint their representatives to the inquiry. So far I have only received one name.

**MR. NELSON:** — Supplementary. Has the Minister made his appointment and if so, who is that appointment?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — No, I have not as yet.

**MR. NELSON:** — Has the Minister issued a permit for an unqualified secretary for the R.M. of Garden River, R.M. 490?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — To my knowledge there has not been a permit provided. One is not required for three months. I informed the Hon. Member of that in a discussion we had earlier, here in the Assembly. There is still time for the inquiry to take place before any permit need be provided to the present secretary.

#### **ANSWER TO QUESTION RE NAMING OF PCS CORY LIMITED**

**MR. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, there are two questions which I would like to deal with, one of them is a question, I believe, raised by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) who isn't here. I just wanted to respond to it. It was raised the other day by the Member for Regina South. The question was asked of the Attorney General; he took notice. The question was with respect to the change in name of PCS Cory Limited to PCS Mining Limited and of the address that was used for that particular change.

The change was necessitated because of the anticipated acquisition of Sylvite which will be put into that particular corporation. It was felt that PCS Cory Limited wasn't an appropriate name for a company which was going to own Cory and Rocanville as well. I am told that the reason for the 300, Bank of Canada Building address in the Gazette, is that this is the registered office for the purpose of the service of legal documents, since it is the address of the solicitors for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Cory Limited, head office in Saskatoon in effect. But that is the legal head office for the service of documents.

#### **ANSWER TO QUESTION RE SYLVITE MINE**

**MR. COWLEY:** — The other question I wish to respond to at this time is one posed a couple of days ago by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Malone) with respect to the agreement with Sylvite and ourselves or the understanding, if that is a better word than agreement, and whether or not it was my opinion that we had a legal position in the event that the deal was not

completed. Whether or not we could sue them was the gist of the Member's question.

I want to say first of all that I am confident that the agreement is going to be signed and I hesitate to say anything that might prejudice or hamper the conclusion of the signing of the formal agreement. However, I am given to understand that while obviously I suppose you can sue in any circumstances right or wrong, I think the Member's question was obviously whether or not we thought we could be successful in suing. I am advised by legal advice that I have, and I suppose that is always subject to another interpretation, that if we announced a sort of an agreement in principle and that the formal agreement would be signed later, that probably we wouldn't have any legal recourse in the event that the formal agreement wasn't signed. As I say that is the rather quick legal opinion that I got on it. If for some reason the deal fell through between now and a week or ten days from now, we probably would not be in a position to successfully take a court action against Sylvite. As I say that is the legal opinion I have, I don't want to stress it too much. I think we certainly wouldn't want to do anything that would hamper the negotiations there, but I thought I should respond to the Member's question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I will take any supplementaries on the first answer which was PCS Cory name change.

**MR. MALONE:** — I have supplementaries on the other answer as well, Mr. Speaker, if I could advise you on that.

On the first answer then, Mr. Minister, I am not just quite clear as to the corporate setup that you are putting together in connection with the acquisition of these mines. You are saying that the Sylvite Mine will in due course, if things work out, be put under the umbrella of PCS Cory Limited and that PCS Cory Limited will have a change of name in effect to show that it is more than just the Cory location. Is my understanding correct?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Yes, that is correct. The anticipated result will be that we will have the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Mining Limited which will own the Cory Mine and the Rocanville Mine and they will be divisions of that limited company.

**MR. MALONE:** — Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would explain the necessity of doing this particular type of corporate setup. Why is the mine or mines not just going to be owned by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, period, just as SPC owns various things in its capacity as a Crown corporation, all owned by SPC within the Province of Saskatchewan. Saskoil owns everything in the name of Saskoil in Saskatchewan. Why is it necessary with the potash companies to have this corporate hierarchy setup which I would assume would lead to greater costs and greater expense to the taxpayer?

**MR. COWLEY** — I must first of all say that from the Board's point of view, certainly from my point of view, the reason why we are having this sort of so-called corporate hierarchy, I think that is a proper description of it, is the advice that we have received from our counsel. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

April 15, 1977.

will be selling a significant amount of its potash in the United States. We will in doing that become subject to American law and American taxes. There is no particular preference or anything else for a Canadian company, publicly or privately owned operating in the United States. Therefore, the arm of the corporation that is operating there, which is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Sales Limited, was set up as a separate subsidiary. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Mining Limited which will own the mines was set up as a balancing subsidiary, both of them under PCS. Now, as I say, the basic reason for it was the operations in the United States, the rationale was given by the legal and tax people whom we talked to, whom I have no particular reason to doubt, although obviously one could possibly find a contrary opinion somewhere that that wasn't the appropriate way to go. But this was the way that we were advised that it was in our best interests to corporately establish the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and we acted accordingly. I think the SPC Cory one at the time when we established the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Cory Limited, that subsidiary, it wasn't clear from the legal and other advice that we were getting, whether we would have a separate company for each mine or one company which would own all the mines. The decision has since been taken that we would have one company that would own all the mines. I think it is simpler and more appropriate. The name was then simply inappropriate and that was simply the reason for the change of name.

**MR. MALONE:** — One final supplementary on the first part, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister tell me where this advice is coming from? You have referred to our advice, our advice, now is this departmental advice, is it from solicitors in Saskatchewan, solicitors in Toronto, would you be prepared to tell the House who is giving you your advice on this corporate setup that you are developing?

**MR. COWLEY:** — I think the advice of the Board is obviously coming from the management. But the legal and other advice is coming from Griffin, Beke et al, whatever the appropriate names are here in Saskatchewan. A Toronto law firm whose name I gave to the Members in Committee, Beke and something, I can't remember that but I will get the Member the appropriate names for both of those legal firms who are the ones whom we have relied on for their advice in these circumstances. I will get them for the Member rather than taking notice of the question. I will drop you a note with the names of the two legal firms.

### **DROUGHT STRICKEN AREAS IN SOUTHERN SASKATCHEWAN**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Minister's department has provided for the transfer of surface water provided or has provided pumps for the transfer of surface water in the drought stricken areas of southern Saskatchewan, but has your department made any provision for the farmers in the drought stricken areas where there are no surface water supplies, the dugouts are dry, the sloughs are dry, everything is dry?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is, we have a government policy which provides assistance to farmers for test well drilling.

That policy has been in effect for some time. Farmers have that available to them. If they are in a difficult position, they can go to the Department of Environment or to our Family Farm Improvement Branch, and they do have a graph there of ground water capacities and the depths to which they would have to go. They should make that information available to themselves and get in contact with our department to see what assistance they can get.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Does your department make any provision for the towns and villages in this drought stricken area for the supply of water in this rather serious situation that we're facing right now?

**HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, we do have a Municipal Water Assistance Fund which is available to towns and municipalities for improving their water system. The Department of Municipal Affairs sent a letter out to all urban municipalities, I think about two or three weeks ago, asking them if they had any problem and if they did foresee having any problem now or foresee any problem in the future, to please get back to the department, so that we can get a grip on the emergency situation, if there is one. We find that there are some emergency situations, so we can consider what assistance we can provide. As a matter of fact, I met with the Midale council yesterday, and they have been doing some work on their own and they had a proposal to put to us which we will be considering.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the two Ministers would consider forming a joint task force to zero in on the drought problem in southeastern Saskatchewan and get these water supplies on stream?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that once we identify the seriousness of the problem then it will be the whole Government that will zero in on an attempt to provide solutions.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **CATTLE MARKETING COMMISSION**

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week in response to a request by the National Farmers' Union that the Government implement its powers under The Natural Products Marketing Act to implement a cattle marketing commission, without a vote, the Minister's response was, that it would be foolhardy at this time to go ahead with a cattle marketing commission because of the Manitoba results. Does the Minister take from those results that they reflect truly the feeling of all cattle producers in this province and that he is taking that as an indication of what the farmers in Saskatchewan feel?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not taking that interpretation. I think we have to recognize though that the vote in Manitoba did indicate what some farmers think and we are asking farm

April 15, 1977.

organizations to be considering the question of beef marketing very seriously in the next few months. I'm looking for some recommendations from them and some of the organizations have indicated to me that they will be giving me further advice on that and I'll be waiting for that. I think that to suggest that Saskatchewan farmers are necessarily going to follow the path of Manitoba, is just not really a foregone conclusion. I know that I've been at many meetings where the farmers have been very actively promoting the idea of a marketing commission. I know I've been to other meetings where they have been totally opposed. I'm still waiting for further direction from farm organizations.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. From the content of the comments which you made to the National Farmers' Union and the power which is implemented under The Natural Products Marketing Act to implement a commission without a vote, can we take from those comments that prior to the Government's implementation of a cattle marketing commission, that a vote will be held by producers to determine whether they wish the commission or not.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, that's not necessarily a foregone conclusion, but we would be very seriously considering whether that would be the route that we should take.

#### **ANSWER TO QUESTION ON SYLVITE MINE**

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition):** — Supplementary to the Minister in charge of PCS in connection with his second answer. Would it be true, Mr. Minister, to characterize the arrangement between the Government or PCS or whatever and Sylvite as really not to be an agreement at all, but just an informal arrangement, whereby you've agreed, hopefully to agree at a later date and at this time there is no agreement either way on behalf of Sylvite or the Government to purchase the Sylvite mine?

**MR. COWLEY:** — I think if I was giving a legal response to that, I think that probably puts the legal position reasonably well, vis a vis suits against one another and so on. I think there is an understanding and an agreement in principle, but not a legal agreement in principle if you like. As I say I would have preferred I think I mentioned in the House the other day, to not have announced it until we had the formal agreement, signed, sealed and delivered. However, there are certain restrictions on private companies which have shares on the stock exchange which require them, at some point in negotiations, to make public where they're at, that they have sort of reached an understanding in principle, although they don't have an agreement so to speak. So I would characterize the sort of legal response I guess to the Member's question, is that I think that properly states it. There is no legal binding agreement.

**MR. MALONE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I assume from the Minister's answer that either party to the negotiations could walk away at any time without any legal repercussions occurring. So my question then to the Minister is, if because of this loose arrangement the Sylvite officials decide that they are not interesting in accepting whatever the offer was, made by the

Government, would it then be the Government's intention in having gone this far with negotiations, preliminary and right down to the last detail, to invoke the powers under Bill 1 and Bill 2 and issue a vesting order to complete the transaction, whether Sylvite liked it or not?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can respond to that question, I think that first of all, as I say, the opinion I have, the legal opinion is that while one can always pursue a suit, I guess, no matter how unsound your grounds are, that we probably wouldn't in answer to the Member's original question, have successful grounds for a suit, in the event that things fell through. I think that's probably true in reverse for Sylvite. Albeit I don't think I can guarantee the Member that there couldn't be, if the agreement fell through, a successful suit by one or other of the parties, but I think that's unlikely, so I want to qualify that.

With respect to the Member's other question, I believe a similar question was asked the other day in the House by the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant), at which time I said that I can't inform the House of what the Government's course of action would be in the event that the Sylvite negotiations collapsed and no formal agreement was signed for one reason or another. I think that's unlikely, but in the event that it happened, we'd have to review our options and make our decision then.

I can say to the Member now, as I said to the Member for Wascana the other day, that the Government has not predetermined a course of action which it would take, and so I can't answer the question because I honestly and frankly don't know what the Government would do in those circumstances. Obviously it would have several options.

#### **WESTERN DEVELOPMENT MUSEUM BOARD**

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we have too much time, but I would like very briefly at least to give the answer. Yesterday, the Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) asked me, in the absence of the Member in charge of Culture and Youth who is attending the STF Council, spring council meeting, two questions which I took notice, relating to the Western Development Museum Board. The question was "Did you in fact name Alex Balych as vice-chairman of the Board and George Dyck as chairman of the Board and if so, why?" The second question was relating to an Order in Council, was this not an express breach of the provisions of the Act, by naming the chairman and the vice-chairman of the Board by Order in Council?

I have not had an opportunity to examine the Order in Council, Mr. Speaker, and the statute and to obtain legal advice from my department respecting those questions. To make my answer as succinctly as I can, it is the opinion of one of the senior solicitors in my department, that the Order in Council referred to, does not purport to designate Mr. Dyck and Mr. Balych as chairman and vice-chairman of the Board. The Order in Council has beside those two names in brackets, chairman and, in brackets, vice-chairman. I'm advised this has been done in the past. I'm advised legally that this does not constitute those persons to hold those offices, nor legally does it purport to do so. In reality, as has always taken place, I'm advised, that the Western Development Museum Board,

April 15, 1977.

regardless of “designations” — I use that word advisedly — the Board has complied with the provisions of the statute, Section 5, namely appointed the chairman and vice-chairman as it has seen fit to do so.

So I hope that in this answer I have answered both the questions put by the Member.

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary to that response? Mr. Speaker, when one examines the Order in Council and I have to say that I cannot accept the advice the Attorney General has been given. The OC, dated April 6, 1977, and prior to that the OC, dated April 27, 1976, both clearly name one George Dyck as chairman. In 1976 it names one R.J. Reynolds as vice-chairman. In 1977, without there having been a meeting of the Board, it clearly names one Alex Balych of North Battleford as vice-chairman, when the former vice-chairman had resigned from the Board. I think what I have to ask the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, is, does he not agree that in fact, the OC does name, contrary to Section 5 of the Act, the chairman and the vice-chairman in the OC and it is very clear that that’s what the OC is doing?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could do not better than to read a portion of, the relevant portion of, an opinion provided to me by the acting Director of Civil Law Services, Mr. Garnet Holtzman, whom, I think, Members and the Leader of the Opposition will know, is a fairly senior solicitor in my department. He says clearly:

In my opinion Order in Council 561-77 does not purport to designate Mr. Dyck and Mr. Balych as chairman and vice-chairman of the Board. Clause B of the operative paragraph of the Order in Council uses the words ‘re-appointing the following members’ followed by a list of those persons to be re-appointed. It is true that the words chairman and vice-chairman follow the names of Mr. Dyck and Mr. Balych, but it is my opinion that in law this does not constitute these persons to hold those offices nor does it purport to do so.

Further the opinion says in relation to this:

Nowhere is there an indication that an appointment or a designation of the two persons as chairman and vice-chairman is being made. And in law the words chairman and vice-chairman would be ignored, and therefore, there is no such designation.

And I must accept that opinion from the solicitor in my department.

### **PRIORITY OF DEBATE**

### **MOTION WITHDRAWN**

**MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview):** — I had proposed in a letter to the Clerk yesterday, under Rule 17 to beg leave of the Assembly to move a motion asking for Priority of Debate on the issue that I had raised in Question Period yesterday and that the Attorney General responded to today.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I accept the Member's word that he had intended to do that and he has two options, either go ahead or back up and back up means sit down.

**MR. PENNER:** — Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is beg your indulgence in light of the response from the Attorney General, to withdraw my request or motion for Priority of Debate in order that I may further examine the answer given by the Attorney General and that I will then determine whether the Priority of Debate motion will go forward next week. I, therefore, at this point in time withdraw my motion for Priority of Debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it's understood that the withdrawal is made in fact, by the Member not moving it. So it's withdrawn.

### **POINTS OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD**

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think the record will clearly indicate that I have not in the past been critical of the Question Period. I think, too, that the records will clearly indicate that at any time that I did, in fact, rise on a Point of Order, that it had nothing to do with the particular ruling that you may have made in the House. At this particular time, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about what is very obvious to I'm sure those who are sitting in the press or those in the gallery, that the Question Period in the past few days has become almost a complete rehearsal, pre-rehearsed at some other time, between the Government and the Members of the Opposition. As a matter of fact it was so very much apparent today, Mr. Speaker, that I kept as close a tab as I could and find that out of the 30 minutes of the Question Period, we find that something like three minutes, less than three minutes, were given to Members of the third party in the House. It's becoming very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that while I agreed with your ruling, Sir, about recognizing a Minister to make a statement or to make a response in answer to a question of the previous day, it is now, Mr. Speaker, leading to further discussion and really distracting from the Question Period itself.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that in the last two days in particular, and it was very well exemplified today, that it would appear that the Question Period has now become a dialogue between the Government and the Opposition Party and it would almost appear that it's a rehearsed type of thing. I'm not saying that, but it's very obvious that today this was the case.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion to you for your consideration. While I agreed, Mr. Speaker, with the Ministers of the Crown being able to answer questions that were asked on previous days, perhaps there should be a place then, at a time, before the Orders of the Day, injected at some other place for that particular purpose, because as it's now growing into the Question Period, it is now consuming as it did today, approximately 50 per cent of the Question Period.

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition):** — On the Point of Order. I

April 15, 1977.

think that the Member's remarks make it necessary for me to rise and make some comment on the Point of Order. It may be apparent to the Member that there is some co-operation between the Government and the official Opposition, but I say it's only apparent to him. I resent very much any implication that this Member is making that there is some little deal between the official Opposition and the Government as to how the Question Period is going to operate. I say to you categorically, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such arrangement and if the Members who sit to my left could think up some questions occasionally that were worthwhile perhaps they would get recognized.

Now, I say further, Mr. Speaker, that I suggested to you yesterday or the day before, I'm not sure which day it was, that the Question Period should be re-examined, and that there should be a portion of time allotted for Ministers to respond to questions that they cannot answer on the day that they are asked. I, indeed, asked you to refer that particular matter to the Rules Committee.

But I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not accept the unfounded allegation from the Member for Rosetown and I must say I'm surprised to have such an allegation come from that particular Member. Perhaps if some of the other Members who sit to my left had made the allegation it wouldn't have surprised me at all. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such arrangement whatsoever and I'd ask the Member to withdraw the comments that he makes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. I rose on a Point of Order because of what was very obvious today, very obvious to me. I've never complained, Mr. Speaker, to you about the inavailability of not being able to ask my questions. If the Leader of the Opposition seems to think that my questions aren't as important in this House, even though I am a backbencher, as his, then he's mistaken in the whole concept of democracy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think we're getting into a debate about the Question Period. Final comment on the Point of Order!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, my Point of Order concerns the implication of the statements made by the Member for Rosetown-Elrose. The implication is, that in order to have a rehearsed Question Period between the Liberals and the NDP Government, Mr. Speaker has to be a party to that. Mr. Speaker, the implication clearly is that you, Sir, are not recognizing the Conservative caucus, in order to have this minuet, to put my word on this, worked between the Liberals and the NDP, because that's the allegation. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that that's a slur on Mr. Speaker. I'm saying, I don't need to be told by any Conservative how long we have fought Liberals and will continue to fight the official Opposition in Saskatchewan and I wish we could fight you like we did on filthy hospitals. That, I think, will continue. But, I say, Mr. Speaker, that's the implication there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm going to interrupt the Member. Order! I'll make a brief comment on this matter. I think I can dispose of it

with that.

The Member for Rosetown-Elrose has every right to raise Points of Order after the Question Period. In the beginning I do not accept any Points of Order the Member raised except the ones with regard to today. He mentioned yesterday and the day before that it became apparent to him. These were roughly his words. I will only accept Points of Order with regard to today's Question Period. Points of Order with regard to yesterday's or the day before should have been raised then. If they weren't raised then, it's too late now.

I will agree that the answers about PCS Cory and Sylvite and the supplementaries which followed seemed to be long, detailed and complicated, a subject better suited to the written question period, unless the Members that are asking the questions and providing the answers can do it in a quicker fashion. It seemed to me that the questioning with regard to that matter was open to all kinds of interpretations and from my point of view would be vague rather than specific. They should be specific for the Question Period.

I would say that the Member for Regina Lakeview, the Leader of the Opposition, has every right to stand up and suggest that he is not accommodating any other group in this House in the Question Period and Members must accept his denial that he is involved in anything of that nature unless there is concrete evidence to the contrary. The House Leader has the same opportunity which he took advantage of today.

With regard to the Question Period I find that there were two questions by the official Opposition and two questions by the third party, another question by the official Opposition, answers from the Government on potash, another question from the third party, a question from the official Opposition and an answer from the Attorney General to which there were supplementaries. So I think the Question Period, to me, is quite evenly balanced. However, I do think that the Member for Rosetown-Elrose did have a valid point with regard to the length of time it took, particularly for those two questions with regard to potash and the answers.

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it would be possible to have the seats of the Members to the right moved over to the other side of the House so we could have both socialist parties sitting together?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't think that's a valid Point of Order. It would be in the category of a facetious comment. The Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**MR. BAILEY:** — I should like to comment on your ruling. I want to make it abundantly clear to you, Sir, that in no way and at no time have I ever in my statements or otherwise made any inference of disrespect to you and your position. I want to make that abundantly clear and the Government Members know very well that that is the case. That is the truth. I just want to make that clear to you, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The record will show what the Member has said and there will be many Members putting many interpretations on it,

April 15, 1977.

no doubt.

## SECOND READINGS

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance)** moved second reading of Bill No. 86 — **An Act to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act.**

He said: Before presenting the Motion for second reading on this Bill to amend The Fuel Petroleum Products Act, I would like to comment very briefly on the proposed amendments and what they are designed to achieve.

For several years we have been confronted as a department with a number of problems in the administration of this Act because of a lack of precision in the law and in the wording of the Act. For example, in the sections governing the use of tax free fuel on farms or by farmers, there is no definition of a farm, nor is there a definition of a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, with the diversification that is presently occurring in the agricultural industry and with the development of agricultural related activities, there is a real need to define with some precision and exactness, what a farm is and who is a farmer.

Discussions are presently taking place between the officials of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Finance in an effort to achieve a definition which will satisfy the needs of farmers and farm organizations and that will facilitate the administration of the relevant provisions of this Act, thus the amendment to clause 2 of the Bill will define a farm and a farmer.

Similarly the lack of precision in the wording of Section 11 of the Act has made it possible for non-farmers to purchase fuel tax free ostensibly for agricultural purposes but with no way of ensuring that it is actually used for agricultural purposes. The use of tax free fuel was introduced initially to provide a measure of assistance to farmers in reducing their cost of production. We think that this is a good idea and there is no intention on the part of the Government to change that. What we do want to do is to stop some of the abuses that are presently taking place at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that during the debate that will take place on this Bill, the Members on the opposite side will remind themselves that they have, on a number of occasions, brought to our attention the need to tighten up the administration and the legislation to prevent abuses. For example, they have called on us to take measures to prevent any abuses there might be in the Family Income Plan. I remember the Member for Rosetown-Elrose bringing to my attention that there are people trying to evade payment of the E&H tax in purchasing mobile homes. They called on us to tighten up the administration as well as the law, to ensure that people who are obligated to pay the tax are not evading the tax.

Mr. Chairman, I note with interest, this whole problem of trying to define a farm and a farmer. The current issue of the Rural Councillor which is the monthly publication of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has an article under the heading of "Definition of The Farmer", they say this:

It may seem like a relatively simple task to define a farmer. I am sure every one of us has an idea in the back of our mind as to what a farmer is but we have never tried to put it down in words. When we try to do so, we find the task a little more difficult than we had realized.

It goes on and says:

Farmers have special privileges under some acts and policies and it is therefore important that we are able to define a farmer. For example, farmers may use tax free fuel commonly referred to as purple gas. In recent years we have heard of abuses of this privilege by people whom we do not feel are farmers in the strict sense of the word. If abuses of this and other privileges continue we, as farmers, may lose them.

So we find that organizations like the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities are calling on us as a government to tighten up the legislation so as to do everything possible to prevent the abuses that are taking place. I might bring to the attention of the Legislature, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time we have a situation where contractors doing farm work, and these are contractors from out of the province, who have contracted for dug-outs, for land clearing, who come from Alberta, who paid the off-road gasoline tax which was four cents and which has gone up to six, now under the provisions of the Act they are trying to make a claim for a tax rebate. This Legislature has never intended that contractors doing farm work be excused from paying the tax on gasoline, therefore we are trying to bring in the amendment to try and tighten up the provisions. We find it very difficult to get the precise wording in the Act we are proposing. It should be done by regulation. Some might take exception to that but a definition of a farm and a farmer is very difficult. As expressed by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities it may be that it will require more than one change in order to ensure that the precise wording is finally set into regulation.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments to Section 19, which are contained in Section 4 of the Bill will give effect to the changes that I announced in the Legislature on March 10th during the Budget Speech. The tax on gasoline has increased from 15 cents per gallon to 19 cents per gallon, a rate of tax, Mr. Speaker, that is identical to the tax rate that we had in 1971 and 1972 when the price of gasoline was 50 cents and 60 cents per gallon. I think that is important to point out, Mr. Speaker, the higher cost of gasoline per gallon today compared to five or six years ago is not due really to provincial taxes. It is due to two factors, first the increase in the price charged by the oil companies on their products, and secondly, the intrusion by the Federal Government into the field of taxation that has traditionally been reserved for the provinces. As a matter of fact, the provincial tax on gasoline expressed as a percentage of the total price is lower today than it was back in 1970. This amendment makes a similar adjustment to the tax rates on other fuels. Mr. Speaker, the tax on diesel fuel has increased to 26.6 cents per gallon and on fuel used for off highway purposes the new rate will be six cents per gallon rather than four cents.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment in Clause 5 increases the penalties which may be imposed on a person who owns or controls a motor vehicle which contains marked fuel in its fuel tank. The

April 15, 1977.

current minimum fine of \$75 for a first offence has been in effect since April of 1970 and is no longer an appropriate or effective deterrent to the illegal use of purple gasoline or purple diesel in a fuel tank of a motor vehicle. Clause 5 increases the minimum and maximum fines for the first offence of this nature to \$200 to \$250 respectively, and the second and subsequent offences to \$250 and \$300 respectively.

Mr. Speaker, those are the three amendments that we are introducing to this particular Act. I hope that I have explained adequately their purpose. I think they are fairly straightforward, nothing devious about them. With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — A few brief comments today in regard to this particular Act, and let me say at the outset, that I intend to ask for leave to adjourn debate on this particular Bill because I would like to have an opportunity to look at what the Minister has said, and also to discuss with the Minister some of the aspects of the Act. There is no doubt that there are some minor abuses taking place throughout the Province of Saskatchewan, in regards to the use of purple gas and I emphasize that they are minor. I believe that some of these minor abuses can be corrected under present legislation which to a point has not adequately been enforced up to this time. There might be some difficulties in enforcing parts of the controls that may be there and maybe this should be looked at instead in this particular manner. This is one of the questions that I have in mind.

The aspect of the Bill that bothers me, and I am very, very concerned about it, is the need to define a farmer and a farm. I say, fine, if the Government feels that there should be a need to define a farm and a farmer, but that definition should be written in legislation. I am very cautious to say that something as important as a definition of a farmer be left up to regulation. The Government up until this point has been able to define a farmer in terms of tax-free purple gas under The Vehicles Act and that is written within the Act and that is the present Act that is being used today. It is my understanding that to determine whether a farmer qualifies for an 'F' plate which allows him then to use purple gas, or whether he applies for an 'R' plate, which is a farm plate but he uses bronze gas instead of the purple gas, that definition is there. Part of the definition which the Member used that appeared in the SARM magazine, was taken from, I believe, legislation from within the Provincial Government, and I understand some definition from the Province of Alberta.

I would like to discuss this with the Minister of Finance, as to why it has to be done by regulation, and why we cannot write into this particular Act what a definition of a farmer is because, as he said, there are so many different areas that have to be looked at in this regard. I believe that those of us who do represent rural seats, who do represent farmers should be afforded the opportunity as legislators to contribute to what that definition will be. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan)** moved second reading of Bill No. 84 — **An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act, 1974.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the problems of economic and social development in the northern part of our province, have been the focus of this Government's attention for some time since 1971. On taking office in that year we found a local northern economy which was modelled basically on fishing and on fur and to a much lesser extent to the use of the forests. The heritage of this subsistence life style resulted in rates of mortality and illness and illiteracy far in excess of those which we would accept for ourselves in the remainder of the province. In short, Mr. Speaker, we found a society with characteristics of underdevelopment closely resembling those in the poorer corners of the world. The promise which this Government made upon taking office some six years ago, a promise which we have kept, and one which we will continue to promote, is to bring to the residents of the North so far as our financial and human resources will allow, a level of social and economic opportunities which will somehow be equivalent to those available to all of our citizens in the remainder of Saskatchewan. I am proud of our record thus far in the areas of local government, in health and social services, in education and in public facilities and I know that we haven't gone far enough. Nevertheless I am satisfied and I am proud of the progress which we have made. These were our first priorities upon taking office.

I believe that our success speaks for itself. It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to increase health facilities and to install sewer and water systems. These are services which demand only a commitment of energy and of funds. They are concrete items that have a physical presence in the communities and they have some immediate effects on the people who live in those communities. They are a direct response to what are clearly visible problems that have existed, and do continue to exist. But this is not so with the longer term objectives of nurturing a climate for some sort of economic self-sufficiency. Ironically enough, centuries of combating the elements, of coaxing a subsistence from the natural environment while creating a reservoir of pride and independence among people in the North, has done little to prepare them for the rigors and realities of what we find ourselves involved in in the development of economics and the development of an economic society in which they might develop. The business opportunities and the facilities which we in the rest of the province take for granted, for years and for centuries have lain dormant in northern Saskatchewan. Even today, it's little appreciated in the rest of the province, I would believe, that banking facilities are non-existent in most of the northern communities. Only recently has there been any means for the northerner to acquire the rudimentary skills required to operate a business successfully. The hard work and the long hours which have always characterized life in the North are not sufficient to guarantee business success in the modern world of commerce.

For years, Mr. Speaker, economic life in the North has been characterized by absentee ownership and management. Job opportunities for northerners were restricted to the manual and unskilled categories. While northern resources were being exported to the South and to all parts of the continent, economic and social benefits were leaving the North with them. Those key resource areas which offered the greatest potential for improving skills and incomes were controlled by corporations

April 15, 1977.

primarily interested in deriving the greatest profit. While fortunes were being made from the northern wealth in forests and in mines, the native northerner basically was primarily shut out of employment and investments in those kinds of opportunities in the past.

This then was the situation that faced us in 1971. Not enough personal income to generate a local commercial base or any infrastructure for commercial development, restricted employment which were entirely referred to as the pick and shovel jobs, restricted employment in the key resource sectors that a heritage of illiteracy and inexperience continued to promote or propagate that kind of an existence. The legislation which we are introducing today is an attempt to bridge some of those misfortunes of the past and the promises of the future. There is no question about the fact that the eyes of the world are now turning towards the resources of northern Saskatchewan. The coming decade promises increased prosperity for northern people but it does so only if they are able to retain the best of their culture while they are able to take something or the best from ours.

The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is three fold. Firstly, it will enable the Government to initiate new business opportunities into the North with the aim of training local people to take them over and secondly, it will allow the Government to support existing businesses which are threatened with closing down and putting people out of work. Thirdly, the legislation will allow publicly assisted and managed enterprises with a substantial northern payroll to expand their markets and thereby increase the employment opportunities for northern people. The activities will be restricted to those areas which have traditionally been and otherwise been inaccessible to northerners such as forestry, farming, mineral exploration and tourism. The implicit policy of successive governments of relying on individual northern entrepreneurship is no longer valid. It just hasn't worked; it's not going to work unless we are prepared to make some accommodation in the areas for those people to get into business and to be able to compete with the economics and the business economics that are now moving into the North as opportunities for development to open up. Substantial evidence suggests that individual initiative is not sufficient in itself to change the employment patterns of decades past. We can't wait for future northern generations to become more versed in southern concepts or in concepts which are unfamiliar to them and methods which, out of their own experience, they have to develop in order to be able to wrest opportunities from the established hands of those who are there now in business enterprises, as well as those who will increasingly move north as the opportunities for economic gain become available to them. We must begin now to establish a base for some local ownership and there seems to be little way of providing that opportunity for local ownership unless the public through the means of these amendments to this Act provide for them, providing public assistance in the development process.

The Government will, by means of this legislation, promote a two-prong approach to economic development in the North. We will maintain our commitment to individuals and organizations by budgeting almost \$2 million in 1977-78 for grants and loans to businesses operated and initiated by northern people. And secondly, we will begin a modest program of new business development opening new areas to northern employment, and in this way

we hope to reverse or to at least establish a foothold to economic opportunity for the people living there, for the people residing in the North wishing to remain there, that it might provide for them some opportunities for the future that they may become the established entrepreneurs in some of the smaller mining ventures, that might, to some extent, mean very small ventures.

We must provide the opportunity for northern people to become the entrepreneurs in the harvesting of the forests and the delivery of much of the forest products to the established operations now. Similarly they must be able to take more advantage, to become more involved in the participation of tourist outfits, tourist economy, which is now basically and primarily in the hands of those people who have come from a variety of provinces of Canada as well as a variety of the states of the United States and have established in northern Saskatchewan the basic tourist industry. Again, because of that fact, northern people find themselves as the people on the pick and shovel jobs or the hewers of water and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I am therefore pleased to move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** — I have studied this Bill and have some apprehension towards it; however, I should like to have some time to study the Minister's statement and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES — VOTE 39**

### **ITEM 1**

**HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce to the House — to my right Tom Harper, Deputy Minister; Art Hartwell, Associate Deputy; Lyle Lenson, Director of Regional Administration and Ray McBride, Director of Administrative Services.

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a few questions.

I wonder, a couple of years ago, or maybe it was last year, we were, I think, caught short on the hiring of students. Here is an industry that is a good industry and one that I think should be growing every year and I have great sympathy for the Department of Tourism's budget. I wonder if we are going to get caught short again in the summer hiring students, as one point. I believe that we got caught short and we did not even have people on the gates. I know that down in my district, at Kenosee Lake, there were about 7,000 people there that day and I think they had one person on the gate and all they were able to tell the people was that they didn't know what the fees were going to be this year. I wonder if we are going to be better prepared and I wonder what the situation on summer students is for this year.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, we hope that we could be in a much better position this year

April 15, 1977.

in order to get our parks and recreational sites underway. I should like to point out one thing with respect to students.

Many of the high school students, particularly, aren't available until later in the spring, somewhere in the middle of June or end of June. Nevertheless the university students are usually available about the middle of April and every effort is being made to place them. Last year we had something like 1,200 labor service people working in our parks and in the various park activities. About 300 of these were students.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I realize, too, that high school students don't get out until later, but there are university students. I am thinking of key positions, such as manning gates and, of course, the desirability of getting concessions especially if you get a warm June, or getting them open early.

I am wondering in a park, for instance, like Kenosee and White Bear — White Bear is manned by their own people — in the case of Kenosee where the thousands and thousands of people come in there would seem more like a self-paying park, or self-sufficient park. I am wondering if we shouldn't be looking further. I understand that in certain positions it is running short-staffed each year, and I wonder, in a park like that I realize there are regional parks and other parks in the province where you do have problems as far as financing goes and that it really doesn't pay; that is why you are carrying it as a service to the public. But in a park like this and in other parks that are getting tremendous numbers of people in there, we really don't watch the staff closely enough; couldn't we do a better job on this?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, Kenosee Park as well as many of our other provincial parks, as a matter of fact, all of the provincial parks, don't pay their way. We have to look for other revenue in order to pay for the various services that are being provided and maintained in the parks. So if we do hire more students, more people in the park, it is just going to cost us more money. The revenue that is being obtained at the park would not cover it.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Chairman, would you not consider the hundreds of millions of dollars coming into Canada through tourism as being part of it. I am wondering if there shouldn't be more priority placed in this department. I wonder if we shouldn't be more priority placed in this department. I wonder if we shouldn't be taking a longer look at tourism. I am sure the deputy would agree that he would like a larger budget. But I wonder if we shouldn't be looking closer at our tourism business and it is really growing fantastically. If it means more money in the Tourism budget, possibly the Government of Saskatchewan should be looking at this.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but agree with the Hon. Member with respect to trying to get as many people in the parks in order to do the job properly. Nevertheless we have to look at our budget money and because of that we are having this difficulty.

With respect to tourism, certainly my department would like to do all it can with the money that it has, in order to promote tourism. There seems to be a bit of concern, I might say, that

at the moment there is a tendency for out-of-province tourists to end up in our parks and cause a bit of this overcrowding and difficulty that we are having. But, hopefully, in the promotion of our tourism we could direct these tourists to other attractions that we have in the province and perhaps this will relieve some of the overcrowding that we do have.

**MR. LARTER:** — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Department of Tourism is doing all it can to assist in making it easier for people flying from the United States and points south, in flying into Saskatoon to overcome the customs problems that they are having. Are you making overtures to the Federal Government? They have insisted that it is going to take some while before these problems are all ironed out. I wonder if anything is being done towards helping out on this?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, when the problem first arose I made representation to the federal authorities with respect to providing better facilities, custom facilities, at our airports, both Regina and Saskatoon. My understanding is that the federal authorities are giving consideration to it and, hopefully, this will improve our tourist trade.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Chairman, have you had any indication from the Federal Government when they can solve this problem? Is it going to be this summer or this fall?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Member's question, yes, we had indication from the Federal Government that they will be improving the facilities at Regina this summer or this fall.

**MR. LARTER:** — I wonder if there are any thoughts on this as far as Tourism is concerned. Are there any thoughts of linking Estevan or Weyburn in your plans to the various aviation authorities on getting us on stream, because I believe there are numerous people in the South that would fly into Saskatoon and into northern Saskatchewan on fishing trips and so on, if this was the case?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Are you referring to custom facilities in Estevan or just a stopover of a flight?

**MR. LARTER:** — Stop over.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well at this time there certainly hasn't been any indication that this would happen. Nevertheless this is something that I think would have to be taken up with the federal authorities. Certainly we would like to have stopovers at many of our major centres in the province, and I am sure that this will not only help the in-province but as well the out-of-province travel.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe certainly the customs people in Estevan are one of the key points in the southeast. I believe that certain promotions on fishing trips and tourism could be done by your department and if we had this extra service

April 15, 1977.

available it certainly would help. I am not asking for a reply on that.

There is just one more point I want to make and that is on the Wildlife Department. We keep people on temporary contract and we know about 100 people working out of the Wildlife Research in Saskatoon who have been on staff for at least two years and will continue to be on staff, but as they are not considered permanent, it has always been a contract and I suppose one advantage would be that these people can be let go or reduced in staff at any time and they are not on tenure.

Regions have increased incredibly. The seven regions together have an increase of only two permanent employees — this is summing the whole report up — but costs are up a total of \$2,515,000 over actual cost of 1976-77. After adding the \$500,000 in supplements to the Estimates, the total budget for 1976-77, including supplements, was about \$6 million; total budget for the regions has increased about 41 per cent with only two permanent post increases in this area. This sounds like hogwash when I am wishing that you would have more money, but I am wondering, just for an explanation on the increase of only two permanent positions and in these regions about 41 per cent increase in the budget?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply, with respect to the people on contract, normally these are the people who are contracted to work on special projects. There is always an end to these projects so some of these people continue while others do not. Those who continue are transferred to the temporary position.

Mr. Chairman, I think there was another question that the Member put forth and that was in regard to the increase in permanent staff of two and an indication that the dollars available are fairly substantial. That, of course, is to look after the increased wages that are necessary, not necessarily of the two permanent staff.

**MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):** — Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we find that our regional and provincial parks are quite crowded in the summer, we have areas in the province that are not being used for tourism to the extent that they are available. We do find, I think you will agree, that a lot of our tourist traffic is through traffic, maybe one night or two night stops and so on, going through the province, and in view of this problem, does the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources have an overall plan for development of the tourism industry in the province?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, what we have in place now with respect to assisting the tourist when he or she comes into our province, comes under the tourist information program where we have tourist information centres set up. These are strategically set up along our two major highways, the Trans-Canada Highway and the Yellowhead Highway. The purpose of the tourist information programs is not only to provide information to the tourist in the manner that he might request but we hope to promote the idea of the tourist coming off the highway and either going south or north. This is an area of tourism promotion that we have in place at the moment.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister if the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, about three years ago, commissioned a study called the Regional Approach to Tourism, Promotion and Development in Saskatchewan by Balmer, Crapo Associates from Ontario?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, that is correct.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, has the Minister received the report and has the department digested the report and what are your conclusions as to the report?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, yes, the report has been received and you are probably aware that the travel industry of Saskatchewan had held a conference last year to review that report. Now since that time we have had a lot of discussion with respect to the report and our travel industry in the province. We are hoping that we can put in place this year, the program on a regional basis. One of the problems that we do have, like with any other program, is the fact that we don't have the kind of funds that we would like to have in order to do a good job on the program. Nevertheless, we are allocating some funds with respect to setting up this program and assisting the various regions of the province to promote tourism. We are hoping that the communities involved will take an active part and co-operate and co-ordinate their activities in order to promote tourism in their area. We think that this is a much better way of promoting tourism in our province rather than the sort of a piecemeal and fragmented basis in which it has been done in the past. We do not know how this thing is going to turn out. There is a pilot project. One of the zones was set up last year, and it has been operating fairly successfully. The zone is three and it is in the area of Kindersley and North Battleford. We are hoping to assist our tourism promotion in this manner.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the subject of the report was well accepted and that the private industry sort of challenged to undertake the start on their portion of the divisions. They started into this and I am pleased to hear that you are considering the implementing of the report as soon as funds are available. I find there has been a certain amount of worry from the private industry in the regions, tourist operators and what not. The pilot projects have been in but there have not been many reports come out if in this study a regional approach should be adopted. I am very pleased to hear that you are, as I understand, heading into this direction. Do you plan to implement it, as you have started now with your pilot region and add other regions or would you try to go from the pilot project to implement it on a provincial basis?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, this is correct. We are hoping to expand our program this year. I am not too sure whether we will be able to cover the entire province. A lot, of course, is going to depend on the local interest and regional interest. We are certainly working very closely with the travel industry in trying to work out the regional program. If the Hon. Member doesn't have a copy of the Balmer Crapo report, I thought I would pass one to you; you do have one?

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, are there any plans being made or any consultation being done between Tourism and Renewable Resources and, for instance, SEDCO or DREE on a small loan basis in areas where accommodations are poor. I am thinking particularly of my area. There are accommodations in a string along Number 1 Highway and a couple south and from there you are in a very difficult position because there are no motels or hotels to speak of, or campsites. One of the problems that did arise was that there is no incentive to build because there is no plan in a zone area or an area basis to draw traffic into the area and because of this the people who would upgrade facilities for tourists or build new ones have found it very difficult to convince lenders. There should be a plan to build into this regional approach to work with areas so that they know they would get advertising on a provincial basis. This would direct traffic and tourists would probably be attracted from other regional areas. It would be on a basis of the area's points of interest. Is this part of your plan? As you co-ordinate you would have a brochure type of thing and information that would show them where you would have accommodations listed, where you would have routes listed, something that we really don't have covered now.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that this is going to happen. As I mentioned earlier, we are trying to get local people involved as much as possible, call it local autonomy, if you would like. Should the region decide that it would like to have a regional brochure, and we are hoping that they would, because I think that is one of the best ways of trying to promote and advertise your area, it is their decision. So all these kinds of decisions would pretty well have to be made by the regional board or the regional staff that is going to be set up. We are certainly hoping that this is something that they are going to do. I am quite certain that this is one direction they are going to take because we now have some communities in our province presently that are promoting their community and some of the attractions around the community. Therefore, I think that this will probably be one of the essential programs of a region in promoting its area.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to know what steps is your department taking towards getting these local autonomous boards or regional boards set up, because in many cases I don't think without outside direction they are going to happen that quickly? Are you setting up a definite plan of trying to get them set up or assisting them to?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, what our department is going to do with respect to this is to provide leadership, if you want to call it that, and provide advice. But we expect that the travel industry of Saskatchewan, which is a provincial organization for the promotion of tourism, is going to do most of the ground work, rather than the Government. I think that they have done a very commendable job up until this time. They have worked with us. They have put a lot of effort into it. They are very enthusiastic, and they have certainly gotten as far as setting up a number of tentative regional boards. I think the next step that they are waiting for is for some kind of assistance from our department, financial as well as administrative.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — I understand that the association has set up their type of zoning. Have you proceeded to the same degree in the overlapping zoning that you have? Are you following that with smaller zones on the locale where your zones are overlapping the larger ones for your administrative purposes, such as game management, park management? Have you proceeded on that basis?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, we are working very closely with the regions. I might point out that the boundaries that are suggested in the report are certainly not something that cannot be changed. This certainly is entirely up to the region, or regions in the area if they feel that the boundary doesn't quite cover the area sufficiently enough to include a certain attraction in the area. I think this could very easily be worked out, and our department, of course, is working very closely with the regions in getting the region set up, boundaries, administration, and the like.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — You, I suppose are going to be spending money. I suppose you would intend to increase the budget for this purpose. I find it quite interesting that in comparing two zones of comparable population, the tourism zone 1 in Alberta, Lethbridge area, their budget is \$142,000 for that zone and, I understand, the budget for the Regina City area is around \$56,000. Do you, in time, hope that more of your budget will be able to be put into zone development or are you heading in that direction?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Member where he got those figures? Are those figures suggested in the report?

**MR. ANDERSON:** — No they are not.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I am not too sure of where he might have . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:** — No those figures are for Regina, for convention development and what not, and as I understood they were funded from your department. If I am wrong then I am sorry. But I was using a comparison, that in a comparable area that of the Lethbridge area they are using more money for promotion, and a larger tourist usage seems to be resulting from this. I was wondering if you have plans to increase the budget to the zones? Why I was asking is when you implement these zones there is going to be a certain number of staff needed. Do you have now a plan for training this staff? Will you have to use untrained staff or trained staff or will you pirate staff from other provinces or other areas, which is expensive? I wonder in setting up these zone areas, to implement and administrate them, do you have a plan now for training staff and do you have a timetable for having these in place?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the staff that may be employed in these regions, this is something the region itself would have to attend to. As I said, we don't want as a government to get involved too deeply in the actual regional administration. We hope to provide guidance, some leadership and administrative requirements with respect to training, that you have pointed out. We are prepared to assist in the matter but otherwise we expect that the region is going to look after its needs with respect to staff and any other needs. The regions

April 15, 1977.

are going to be making the decisions. We would like to leave it at the local level. We think that by doing that, we can get the people interested and involved in this tourism industry. It would be something that will make the industry grow much faster rather than having the Government too deeply involved. We hope to provide some financial assistance. We hope to provide some guidance and provide some training if this is asked for, but otherwise the staff is pretty well put in place by the region.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am glad to hear that you are proceeding and I wish you luck.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. Are you presently using some land under your department that was purchased out of the Wildlife Development Fund for agricultural purposes?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, yes we are using or we are utilizing some of the Wildlife Development Fund land for the purpose of grazing and haying. This, of course, is monitored and managed very closely so that there isn't the over-grazing that often does occur. I want to also say that any of the leases that are granted under this program are on a one-year basis.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, who will have the jurisdictional right to decide whether or not cattle graze on those lands after the Bill regarding stray animals is passed. Will that be yourself or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding)?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Our department will have jurisdiction over the lands.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Okay, thank you, Mr. Minister. The other question that I wanted to ask was with regard to the increase in the number of employees to offset some of the vandalism that had been going on in the parks. This was brought to the attention of the Legislature. It referred primarily to vandalism in the summer months and I would like to know if the Minister is aware that there is, to some extent in some of our parks, in particular Kenosee Park, vandalism in the winter time primarily with regard to snowmobiles. Are you aware of any conditions there? Have you had any reports?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the vandalism that may be occurring during the winter time, we do, in most of the parks, have snowmobile trails and, of course, we are hoping for co-operation from the snowmobilers to follow these trails and do their snowmobiling for recreation purposes only. Knowing that there are deviations from that, we do have the parks patrolled. I know that there are times that our staff is not on hand when the vandalism is occurring, and this often does happen. But we are doing the best we can in patrolling our parks during the winter time to try and alleviate some of the vandalism that may take place in the winter.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — You haven't had any reports though in the last, say the last year regarding that problem in the winter?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We didn't have any reports with respect to any serious vandalism. There have been several reports with respect to some vandalism of a minor nature in parks outside the major cities.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Just one other area of concern. Do you have any assessment of the fish numbers, if you like, in Kenosee Lake. Have you any figures on that? Mr. Chairman, maybe I will make it a little easier for the Minister to answer the question. Would you say that there are adequate fish in that lake to make it an attraction to people that like fishing?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — My officials feel that the fish are quite plentiful there, but nevertheless, in order to maintain the population we have developed a pike spawning area adjacent to Kenosee. With respect to your first question asking for the fish number in the Lake, we do not have that with us. We could provide you with an estimate, a fairly close population number, but we don't have a figure. But generally speaking, the population is okay.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Yes, I would appreciate that if you would give me a very rough estimate. I realize it's hard to count fish. Let me ask you this, have you had any reports of very dramatic reductions of the fish numbers in the last two years in Kenosee Lake?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, we haven't had any reports during the last couple of years that there has been a decline in the fish population. As a matter of fact, there has been an increase in the perch in that lake.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Okay, that was the answer I wanted. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could tell us the status of the proposed Prairie Park, just where are they?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, at the moment we are attempting to get a meeting with the Federal Minister, the Hon. Allmand, to review the 19 recommendations covering the park, and following that, it depends on the outcome of our discussions respecting the recommendations. We are hoping we can come up with a decision, say in June some time. In the meantime, we have set a deadline date for a decision as of June 30th, so hopefully by that time we can reach a decision on whether or not we should proceed with the establishment of this park.

**MR. NELSON:** — Mr. Chairman, the report has been out for I am sure it is six months. It is not too detailed a report. These people down in that area are in a state of not knowing what to do, where they can go, or what is going to happen to them. I just don't think it's fair for the Minister here or the Minister in Ottawa to sit on their laurels and waste six months when they could have been making decisions. I don't know whose fault it is. I think it is the fault of both departments and it is long overdue that they get moving on this thing. Tell these people if there is

April 15, 1977.

going to be a park or tell them if there isn't going to be a park. You have no idea of the confusion that you are really causing in that area.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment in reply. I have sympathy with what you are saying, and I realize that the people in the area would like to have a decision as soon as possible. I understand it has been some 16 years or so since the discussions with respect to the park arose, so therefore, I have every sympathy with respect to the people's feelings in that area. Certainly I will do my part to try and speed up the decision.

**MR. NELSON:** — Would the Minister say what his thoughts as far as grazing rights or grazing leases in the park are, if there is a park? What would his policy or stand be as far as this is concerned?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't think I am prepared to take a position on any of the recommendations that are before us at this time. I think it is only fair that we sit down with the federal authorities, have our discussion and following that make announcements of the various positions and the announcement of our decision.

**MR. NELSON:** — Have you presently any date or meeting set with the federal authorities?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — At the moment our tentative date to meet with Mr. Allmand is April 28th or 29th. As a matter of fact I should probably mention to you that there was a date set earlier and it had to be cancelled for various reasons. So hopefully I can meet with the Hon. Mr. Allmand on the 28th or 29th.

**MR. NELSON:** — In Regina?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, this meeting would be in Ottawa.

**MR. NELSON:** — Could the Minister tell us, have there been any plans or discussions regarding the regional parks outside the proposed park area with the local regional parks as far as expansion or help? They are already getting quite an influx of extra people in the park and it is certainly costing them quite a little extra money.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — In making that point, I am assuming that the Hon. Member is talking about, in the event that the Grasslands National Park is established, whether or not we would consider the expansion of our regional parks program in the area. I think this is something that is very difficult to say at this time, but it is something that we will have to keep in mind and follow it through and see just what the pressures might be for additional recreational facilities in that area.

**MR. NELSON:** — The Minister didn't answer my original question of why the delay of the six months over the winter? Why hasn't this gone ahead a long time ago as far as the Prairie Park itself

is concerned?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, may I first of all say that there has been a change of ministers federally and we had to renew our communications with the new Federal Minister and, of course, he wasn't placed until last fall sometime, when he took up the post. Therefore, in our communications with him, it has taken some time and I don't think it was really possible to get this done any earlier. Certainly I would like to see the Federal Minister be prepared to discuss this. I think it would be unreasonable to put undue pressure on the Federal Minister to sit down and get the decision made without him having an opportunity to review all the recommendations and evaluate them.

**MR. NELSON:** — Is the Minister telling us that the Federal Minister has been dragging his feet?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, I don't think I have even implied that. I think I indicated that it would be only fair that we did provide him with sufficient time to become acquainted with all the ramifications.

**MR. NELSON:** — Well, I am suggesting that both Ministers are dragging their feet. I would like to know just how often you have communicated with Mr. Allmand on this; how often has he communicated with you to try and initiate a meeting to get the report looked over and gone over?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I might say that my personal communications weren't that often. I have written to him on at least two or three occasions, but our officials as well as the officials of Parks Canada have been meeting very regularly and having discussions on this.

**MR. NELSON:** — What have you discussed? What have your officials discussed with the federal officials? What are the detailed discussions? What has gone on? What is planned?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is very difficult for me to give all the details with respect to the discussions but generally speaking the discussions were based on the recommendations, and, of course, these recommendations are based on the various conditions and in the discussions there has been, of course, a difference of opinion on some of these recommendations. It also differed with the memorandum of intention and, therefore, in order to try and resolve the differences and come to some sort of an acceptable agreement, it was necessary to meet on a number of occasions. I would like to suggest to the Hon. Member that I think that the decision whether or not to establish the park is not a very small decision. It is a major decision. We are hoping that our decision is going to be the one that will be acceptable to the majority.

**MR. NELSON:** — Certainly it is a major decision and it's certainly a major decision to the people that are in the area. Now will the

April 15, 1977.

Minister give us the items that need to be resolved, the differences; you say there are differences of opinion between Parks Canada and your people. Will you tell me what differences there are, the items that need to be resolved?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I just can't give you the answers as to where our differences of opinion are. I think these discussions are carrying on and they are going to continue to carry on. Once we come up with a decision we will make the announcement in due course. But I think at this point in time I don't think we can discuss our differences that have occurred. Hopefully we can iron out these differences and come up with an agreement on all of these recommendations with some modification.

**MR. NELSON:** — You say there are differences in the memorandum of intent. What differences are there? What changes in the memorandum of intent doesn't go along with either your department or the other department besides the overdue date?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Perhaps I wasn't too clear when I answered your earlier question. What I really meant to tell you, if I didn't say so, is that the recommendations of the Hearing Board differed from the memorandum of intent.

**MR. NELSON:** — Could you tell us which one of the 19 does differ?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — In our discussions there have been differences I would say in most of the recommendations. There are certain conditions that have to be ironed out. One, for example, is the compensation to the municipalities in lieu of taxes, the water reservoir and the like. I just couldn't give you all of these and I couldn't just tell you what position the Federal Government took and what position we took at that time because, as I say, this is still in the negotiation stage, and I don't think it would be proper for us to openly discuss the position of the Federal Government or the position of the Provincial Government at the present time.

**MR. NELSON:** — Would the Minister at this time tell us the provincial stand as far as the acquisition of land, if there is a decision to have a park, will be on a voluntary basis or will it be on an expropriation basis?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Our position with respect to the acquisition of land at this time is on a voluntary basis.

**MR. NELSON:** — So I can assure my constituents that your stand will be definitely on a voluntary basis. There will be no land taken for a prairie park except for the voluntary agreement of the individual that now has that land.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier that this entire matter is under discussion and in a negotiating stage. Therefore at this time I cannot say firmly that that is going to be our stand. However, we are taking the position of a voluntary

basis, and we are hoping that this is the way it is going to be.

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Chairman, just a couple of more points. I believe I checked on this last year, Mr. Minister. I know you are interested in the fishing camps in the North for bringing tourists in and in assisting them. You mentioned I believe last year that you do have brochures in different cities with the different Chambers and Boards of Trade. I wonder if in conjunction with the fishing camps if your department is actively, even with cost sharing or whatever, pursuing the course of public speaking engagements with Fish and Game Leagues, with Chambers of Commerce, in points throughout the United States, even here as a government or on a cost sharing basis with the camps and promotions of this type?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We are conducting sport shows in the northern part of the United States. Shows have taken place at Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Chicago and Toronto, as well as we have a tourist information trailer that we do take around to the various locations. I am not too sure where these go — these go to the northern part of the United States.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe this probably is where we basically draw our fishermen from, the midwestern states in this area. I am not suggesting it would be a proper thing to do, but I wonder if we are encouraging — if we do, and the department knows more about this than I do — if your department wouldn't be wise in working with the fishing camps in actively suggesting and promoting this very thing tied right in with a series of speaking engagements to fish and game groups throughout the area where we basically draw our tourists from, and not just depend on the people getting out to the shows. I realize you do put on some good shows and you have some very active fishing camps in the North that I know would probably be interested in going further.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, up to this time we have not been participating in the various speaking functions — speaking to the wildlife groups in the northern part of the United States, but we have been participating very closely, working very closely with the Northern Outfitters Association in their sport shows and promoting our province in that manner.

**MR. LARTER:** — Would you consider looking into this other aspect of it and possibly seeing if this isn't another approach for doing this thing?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we will make a note of this and see what the possibilities are in this area.

**MR. LARTER:** — I have one last question, Mr. Chairman. Is your department in charge of the Boundary Dam in Estevan as far as anything to do with stocking of fish is concerned.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, we are.

**MR. LARTER:** — I happen to have a cottage on Boundary Dam and just

April 15, 1977.

recently, over this past week and one-half, I have been in touch with Sask Power. We have a white scum that is appearing on the water; in the bays it is forming three or four inches thick; it is like putty. We have noticed on Boundary Dam that there are no muskrats around this year. We are wondering what is happening with this scum and I was talking to the Manager of Sask Power this morning who advised that they are presently conducting tests on this material. I brought a sample into the lab. They can't determine what it is. I am wondering, since your department is affected, if you wouldn't work closely with the Manager at Boundary Dam. They are taking samples today, I believe. I brought a sample in last week and we can't determine what it is. It looks like putty. I, at first, thought it was an accumulation of fly ash on the lake, and with no flow off the lake this year, I thought maybe it might be accumulating. The Manager tells me that fly ash sinks and it doesn't stay on the surface. This is quite a mess and it is something I would like to see your department follow up and work with SPC. I think there should be some real concern over it, not that I like the muskrats cutting down our trees but it is very noticeable that there are no muskrats on the lake this year.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Member has brought this to our attention. Our staff from fisheries and wildlife will make a check on this. If we need to, we will work closely with the Department of the Environment as well.

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question the other day concerning some of the problems which the various parks had experienced in the way of some very undesirable behaviour by certain individuals and, during that particular time, you assured me that there were some steps being taken to cut down on the abuse in the way of noise and, shall I say, disorderly conduct at times.

Did you in fact, Mr. Minister, have a cut back in park staff, I am talking about last summer, was there a cut back in the staff at the various parks?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — You mean last summer? Yes, there was.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Would you attribute this cut back in staff in any way due to this problem that I raised? Was it that the staff couldn't control it? Would you care to comment on that?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, I don't think I would attribute it to that. I think you have to realize that the more people we have in a certain area the more problems we are bound to have. Our visitations have been increasing right along. Last year was a very favourable year insofar as the number of visitations to our provincial parks were concerned.

I think one of the problems that we probably have with respect to this, is that there are only certain people who can enforce the regulations or the law, and that is the parks superintendent and the conservation officer. I must say here that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the area have been giving us very good help. I must commend the work that they have been doing. I think that if our parks are going to

continue to be visited by more and more people we are bound to be running into more and more problems. Certainly because of that I don't think it was really the cut back in staff that caused the problem. I think it is probably that we are having more visitations into the park areas.

**MR. BAILEY:** — During last summer I didn't make use of any of the parks because I was busy and didn't have an opportunity to do so. On occasions I listened to a number of complaints that people brought to my attention which I did not bring to the attention of the department because I felt that there was probably no basis for the complaint and I would still like to think there was no basis to the complaint. I want to bring the complaint to you. I want to also say, Mr. Minister, that this complaint came to me, I would say anywhere from six to a dozen times by different people. They said it was impossible, even early on a Friday to get a site in one of the parks because they were already pre-booked. My understanding was that it is on a first come first served basis; is that correct?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, that is correct. That is the policy we follow.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Minister, has your department received complaints from tourists, from Saskatchewan citizens, that they feel that the park superintendent is allocating or making reservations in advance for individuals? Have you received that particular complaint?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, we did have several complaints and we have checked these out. We found that there really wasn't any basis to the complaint from the point of view that probably there was a mobile home and there probably weren't any people around. But there may have been a mobile home in the site with no one around — the occupants having the intention of returning. But this is the result of our investigations. But we did have a few complaints.

**MR. BAILEY:** — What you are saying, Mr. Minister, is that on a Thursday evening or Friday morning it is possible to take a mobile unit and park it and then return Saturday morning for the use of it. I think that is where the complaint area comes in. Am I not correct on that assumption that they are going in on a Friday or a Thursday, paying for the fee, parking the vehicle and then returning to their place of employment so that they are guaranteeing themselves a spot in the park for the weekend; and at the same time that vacant unit is, in fact, denying the park to someone who needs it on that particular night.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — What you are saying may be true, but it is very difficult for us to tell whether or not that is the intention of the person or of the camper when he enters the park. He certainly would have to pay for the site. We do have in our regulations a 48 hour vacancy period. So if you do take up a site you can leave in 48 hours and return. If you don't return by that time, I am not too sure just what happens, whether we remove the trailer or what it is, but that is our regulation.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to make

April 15, 1977.

it abundantly clear to the Minister that I am simply re-echoing the information that was given to me and I did not think as an MLA that they were that important or I would have brought them to your attention last summer, because I knew of the problems you were having. I talked to several park superintendents and they indicated that with the reduced staff they were in fact having some problems. I think they came through very, very well. Our parks, as I understand it in talking to park superintendents, had the best year ever last year. I believe that is what two of them told me.

Mr. Minister, this idea of coming out on a Thursday and leaving your camper there and then coming back on the Saturday so that you have the spot for the weekend and so on — have you had complaints that people were doing this? You mentioned that you had complaints from the public that this was taking place. Have you also had with those same complaints that the public felt that somebody was being paid an illegal fee to maintain this particular stall?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — My officials tell me that at no time did we have that kind of a complaint.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Minister, in my question to you several days ago, you indicated that you had met and were making contingency plans to deal with the particular problem which I mentioned to you. Do you have an increase in staff this year in the parks over last year?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, we do; we have a slight increase.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Would that amount to say one extra individual per park or two? What would be the general increase?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — There is about a two or three per cent increase and that could mean about two more people in a park — 25 people perhaps altogether.

**MR. BAILEY:** — You mentioned you are not going to let anyone in the parks after 11:00 o'clock, if I remember correctly. Is that right?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We are considering that.

**MR. BAILEY:** — You are considering it. You haven't formulated that as a policy yet?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, this hasn't been formulated. This is one of our considerations in trying to alleviate the pressure and the vandalism that has been occurring in the parks. Certainly if we do have sites available then we would be prepared to lease them. But in the event that there are no sites available and perhaps there are people wanting to come in as visitors after 11:00 o'clock, we are considering that we would not allow this. We are hoping that this could alleviate some of the rowdiness that has been occurring in the parks. Up to this point this

is a consideration. We have no definite plan as yet.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Could you, Mr. Minister, besides this point, describe to the House any other tentative plans that you might have? You mentioned the 11:00 o'clock curfew type of thing. Can you think of any other plans that you have at the present time? Obviously your park superintendents are going to be very interested in what proposals you make

**MR. MATSALLA:** — There are at least a couple of things that we have in mind. One is the designation of sites without exception. We designate the site to the camper, rather than have him go into the camping ground and select his own site. We are also considering the use of control gates, electric control gates. We think that could assist us in controlling the pressure on the park and vandalism. Some consideration has been given to the putting up of the 'no vacancy' sign. I am personally not sold on that at this time. But nevertheless that is something that we have been thinking of. We have been thinking of a lot of things in order to try and improve the conditions in our parks. These are some of the things. I think the designation of sites, we might be able to go along with, and the use of control gates. But the question of whether or not we should put up 'no vacancy' signs is sort of still in the air.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Keep in mind, Mr. Minister, that the difficulty in making proposals to curb a particular problem may be very difficult on the park employees themselves in trying to carry out the regulations. I want to assure you in talking to them they are looking to your department for some guidelines because they did run into some difficulties. Do you have an estimate or an approximate estimate of the amount of vandalism in dollars and cents which took place last year in the parks?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We have a round figure. It is an estimate of course. We think it might be in the neighborhood of \$40,000 to \$50,000. That is one problem; I don't think we can completely alleviate it. But one of the big problems and that is the one that the Member had referred to earlier and that is trying to control the visitors in the park so that the people who have come into the park to relax and so on, could have that feeling of relaxation without having to listen to some of this rowdiness that takes place. So vandalism is one concern, but I think we are more concerned with rowdiness.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Mr. Chairman, \$40,000 to \$50,000, when you think of it, cuts back into your budget. It could do a great deal for your park expansion. I think the Minister would agree to that. Of this \$40,000 to \$50,000 in damage, how many convictions were there? Do you have any idea of how many convictions there were?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Insofar as vandalism convictions, yes, there were some, but we just don't have the figure here to give you. I think we could get it for you. I am not too sure whether we have it or not. There were a number on restitutions.

**MR. BAILEY:** — We have a problem and it is not just here in Saskatchewan. It has become a universal problem, the destruction of public

April 15, 1977.

property. I must tell the Minister that \$40,000 to \$50,000 is a bit surprising. I am pleased to hear that it was not a higher amount than that. Most of the repairing of the damage that was done by vandalism was done by the park staff itself. Is that correct?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Most of the damage was in the parks closer to the major cities. These are Pike Lake, Echo Valley and Moose Mountain. These are the three that suffered the most in vandalism damage. What was your other question?

**MR. BAILEY:** — Most of the repairs were carried out by the park people themselves.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, this is exactly right. Most of the repairs, unless it is some very specialized type of repair, perhaps plumbing that has gone wrong or it has been broken, then we may have to get a plumber, but outside of that most of the repairs are done by our staff, the maintenance people.

**MR. BAILEY:** — Just one last comment to the Minister. I want to say that I think, we, in Saskatchewan can be very proud of our provincial parks. I have drawn to your attention some of the problems and some of the questions that have been asked of me. In travelling across Canada two years ago, I found that the conditions in Saskatchewan parks to be as good as, if not better than, in most of the areas across Canada. I think that is a real credit to Saskatchewan and to your department. I would hope that in looking at some of the problems, that we have certainly every confidence in the world that your people are going to try to curtail the negatives about camping in the parks in Saskatchewan. It is a real plus in Saskatchewan, the parks that we have and I think that most Saskatchewan citizens will agree with that evaluation.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I appreciate the remarks made and I am sure that we, in Saskatchewan certainly have something to be proud of when we look at the kind of park facilities that we have throughout the province. I want to underline, “throughout”, because I think we have some very fine park facilities in the southern part of the province as well as in the central and northern parts of our province.

**MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Chairman, the Minister has had representation made to him from a large number of the more senior people in Moose Jaw for a boat launching ramp on the old No. 2 Highway at Buffalo Lake. I wonder if it has been possible to include that in the budget this year?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I am very happy to inform the two Members for Moose Jaw that that is in the budget.

**MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Mr. Chairman, I have several questions to put to the Minister regarding forestry aspects of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

I was looking through your annual report 1975 and there was some interesting information there regarding the number of permits that were issued for forestry purposes and the amount of timber that will be allowed to be cut under those permits. In checking the 1976 annual report that information I have been unable to find in the report. I wonder if you have that information available, the number of board feet you let out in permits in the different areas of Saskatchewan?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I am sorry to reply to the Member that we don't have that information available here but we can easily provide you with it.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Is there any particular reason why you didn't include that information in this year's annual report when it was printed very clearly in last year's annual report?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question why this information was not included in the report, I think it was just a decision that was made with respect to the preparation in streamlining the report. Nevertheless the information is available and I would be very pleased to provide it to the Hon. Member.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I would appreciate it if you could do that. I should like to ask you as well, in your annual report for 1975-76 you list total sawmill production by zone. You have listed, for the Hudson Bay region, a total of 3,602,014 board feet of lumber that was sawed in sawmills in the Hudson Bay region — 2.138 million board feet of spruce. The figure is down considerably from figures provided in last year's annual report. I should like to know if you could give me an explanation of that.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't have last year's report here with us, but nevertheless the information was provided by the Member indicating that there has been a reduction in the number of board feet that have been sawed. I think one of the reasons for that, of course, would be the time that there has been a work stoppage in the sawmill production. I think another, too, that we might consider is that the sawmills haven't gone into full operation.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I am not sure, exactly, how you arrived at your figures. The fact of the matter is that the reduction according to your response would be hard to comprehend in view of the fact that in the year 1974-75, when there was 5 million board feet sawed in that northeast region, there was no Carrot River sawmill in operation and in the 1975-76 I believe it operated for the majority of the fiscal year and yet there were only 3 million board feet sawed and I wonder how you compared those figures? I know that the Carrot River sawmill, for example, sawed 9.2 million board feet of lumber, according to information supplied in Crown Corporations and in the annual report. I am having a little trouble comparing these figures that are provided in your annual report and the ones received in Crown Corporations.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Let us get clear as to what

April 15, 1977.

report you are looking at in this annual report. Is it on Table No. 12? Yes, well Table No. 12, I am informed applied to the private sawmill operations in the Hudson Bay area. These are primarily the farm permits.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — When you say primarily farm permits, if in fact your remarks suggest that in the Prince Albert region, as well, that the only figure shown, for example, 18.5 million board feet of spruce and I assume that that is 95 per cent white spruce, was sawed in the Prince Albert area and I can only assume that that was done under farm permits. Would you tell me, firstly, what the limit is on lineal board feet allowed in permit to a farmer, under a farm permit? How many thousand board feet are they allowed to cut?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — With reference to the report, Mr. Chairman, in the Hudson Bay area that was primarily farm permits production while in the Prince Albert area it is different because we do have the Big River sawmill in place. With respect to the other question asked, as to how many board feet is allowable under a farm permit, it is 5,000 feet per year to a maximum of 30,000.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Your remarks make absolutely no sense at all. You say as far as the Prince Albert area is concerned the reason the figures are so high there is because they include the Big River sawmill. The new Big River sawmill was not operating in 1975-76 year; it operated and manufactured 4 million board feet of lumber. You just previously indicated that the reason the cut was so low in the Hudson Bay, was because it didn't include the Carrot River mill and the Carrot River mill and the Big River mill are effectively twins. They are both owned and operated by Saskatchewan Forest Products and have the same rate in capacity by Saskatchewan Forest Products. So that certainly doesn't explain the lack of consistency between the spruce cut in both those regions.

As far as the farm permits go as in the Hudson Bay region, the spruce cut was responsible largely for farmer permits. That may be a possibility in the Hudson Bay region but I think that if you divide 18.5 million by 5,000 that you had a large number of farmers who were applying for and receiving spruce permits. I am only sorry that I don't have the kind of computer-like mind that the Minister of Health has, because I think the results of the division of that type would be fairly interesting. What I am saying is that you haven't solved my question of why only 2.1 million board feet of spruce in the Hudson Bay region, which you say was cut by private individuals. At Prince Albert I assume the same regulations from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources apply to the Prince Albert region as to the Hudson Bay region. How could you have 18.5 million board feet cut at the Prince Albert region by private individuals? I find that to be an inconsistency.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — In the year 1975-76 the old Big River mill had been operating in that area. Certainly the new one didn't go on stream until late 1976, just the same as the Carrot River mill in Hudson Bay.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Who operated the old Big River mill?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Sask Forest Products.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — You said that the reason that the Hudson Bay region only showed 2.1 million was because the figures applied only to those lineal board feet that were cut by private individuals and now you are telling me that the reason there are 18.5 million board feet in the Prince Albert region is because the old Big River mill cut a lot of material and that it was not operated by private individuals, but by the Government. I still don't understand that. You are saying on the one hand, in one set region, you will include figures from the Government sawmill and in the other region, Carrot River, which operated nearly a full year with the new mill that you wouldn't include those figures.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — In the Hudson Bay area, as I indicated, well, in both areas, the farm permits are included, but in the Prince Albert area the sawmill operation has been greater than in the Hudson Bay area because of the fact that the Big River sawmill, the old mill, has been operating. The new sawmills went into operation in the fiscal year 1976-77.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Okay, you are telling me in fact that you did include the Government owned sawmill in your production figures here?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — . . . the Prince Albert one particularly.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — You are saying that in the 1975-76 fiscal year for DTRR that there was a limited amount of cutting done by the Carrot River sawmill. When did your fiscal year run for DTRR, to what date?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — To March 31.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — 1975 through to March 31, 1976.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — That is right.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Okay, I should like to pursue this to some degree. I'll accept that; I don't accept the fact that the reason the cut was higher was because of the number of farm permits.

Your production figures for sawmill operations in the Hudson Bay area were only 3.062 million for 1975-76. Could you tell me if you have any estimate at this time of what they will be for that, that was for all species, what they will be for this coming fiscal year? I am sure that you have some idea.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, I don't think I will be able to answer the question the way that he put it to me. Nevertheless, I could give the projected forest production for the year 1976-77. Now this is going to include the following items: saw timber, ties, pulpwood, stud bolts, fuel wood, fence posts, rails, poles, piling, pealer bolts, lap bolts, and trees. Okay I will give you that figure in cubic feet, 77,648,322 cubic feet.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, I should like to ask

April 15, 1977.

the Minister if he is trying to tell me, and maybe you are, I don't suggest that you aren't, that you don't know how much white spruce timber is going to be taken out of that Hudson Bay region in the coming year for the purposes of saw timber? Is that what you are explaining to me?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I don't have that information but I could give you the information with respect to the annual allowable cut for the year. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, we just don't have that information at hand right now.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, you were able to supply it in 1975 under forest products issued under permit, and I am sure that you keep those statistics available somewhere in your department. Can you endeavor to provide those to me on Monday, next, when we come back in?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Would you repeat your question?

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I should like to know what you expect, and I want to know your annual allowable cut for each of your regions by species. Now I also should like you to include in that what you feel, what your department designates its use as? I am sure you break that down as to whether it goes as pulp or saw timber or whatever?

I have another question as well. When you include in the Hudson Bay region in 1975-76, 2.138 million board feet of spruce by private individuals, does that include the timber that went to Simpsons' operation in there?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — We will just review your previous question and give you our answer to it. I think what we will have to do is get the information on that too. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the forestry director was unable to be here with us this morning so we are at a bit of a loss here. Hopefully we can provide you with those answers.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Fine, I am almost unable to be here myself. I would like to know if you could at this time provide me with a list of, or some indication of the number, permits that were issued to private individuals or corporations in Saskatchewan for the purpose of sawing white spruce timber or utilizing white spruce for any reason? I know that there has been some discussion in the past and some considerable criticism over the fact that the Papco pulp white spruce logs, and it has been apparently always a question of economics, and I would like to know if that procedure or process is still being carried out by Papco, if white spruce is being pulped and, if so, how the figures this year compare with the ones for last year, 78.9 thousand cords pulped last year by Papco and I would like to know if there has been any significant change in that figure this year?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — One of the significant changes with the Papco operation in the forest was that they are operating in pulpwood stands only because of their inability to arrange for sorting.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, in the past they have never been that concerned about sorting. They were given their total lease by contract and I am not aware of whether or not your Government has broken that lease in the past but the explanation that has always been given was that it was two questions. One, it was within the rights of Papco, as their contract stood for them to pulp white spruce. Secondly, even as they had a desire to sort white spruce as it was being fed, roll it off the line, it was uneconomic for them to do that and have it delivered to a saw mill at some location, and my question to you, you say there has been a change. Have you changed the contract that was held with Papco regarding the use of saw timber out of their lease or have you forced a change upon them? In other words have you broken their contract or has it been an arrangement that has been agreed to?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The change in the operations in the contract operations was done by negotiation.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I am sorry, just before I sit down may I ask you one following question that is very simple. What was the change?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The change was that if they were not able to do the sorting in the forest or in the bush then they would be required to go into the pulp stands and take their timber, pulpwood timber, from that area.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — So in effect what the change has been, very basically, is that you have informed them that they are no longer able to pulp saw timber, certainly white spruce, is that correct?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, this is right and, of course, our policy is to have the timber utilized in the best way possible, and I am quite certain that Papco has always been aware of this policy. The fact that they were unable to do the sorting in the bush required them to go into the pulpwood stands.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 o'clock p.m.