

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**42nd Day**

**Wednesday, April 20, 1977.**

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly 23 Grade Eight students from the Cabri public school. They are accompanied here today by Mr. Monty Bissett, Grant and Jan Duthie. It is my understanding as well that they arrived this morning about an hour earlier than scheduled and had a considerable amount of 'participation' walking around the Legislative Building.

I should like to point out as well that this group of students is sponsored by the Cabri Lions Club and it is an activity which the Lions Club undertakes each and every year. They have had a busy morning and I look forward to meeting with them later on this afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of 34 Grade Seven and Grade Eight students seated in the west gallery. They are from Lake Alma and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Cameron Mitchell, Mr. Ken Johnson and by chaperons, Mrs. Casler and Mrs. Backlon. Their bus driver is Mr. Hofseth.

I should like to welcome them to the Chamber this afternoon and hope that they enjoy their visit, and inform them that we will be meeting with them to answer questions after they leave the Chamber.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**CABLE PAY CO-OPS**

**MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister responsible for Cable TV. As the house well knows, the Government has recently announced a policy that essentially says that the Cable pay co-ops would have absolute control over community programming. The question that I direct to the Minister is that since that is such a wide variance from previous policy and since the Minister has recently come back from meetings with the Federal Government which he thought in Edmonton went very well and were very congenial, I would assume, but would appreciate the Minister confirming, that such a wide variance from previous policy was something that the Minister discussed with his federal counterparts and took up with them or is this as much a shock to the federal counterparts as it is to Saskatchewan people?

**HON. N. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** — Mr. Speaker, I am at something of a loss to understand what and how the Hon. Member for Wascana may have misunderstood our policy. Our policy has been consistent for several years now. We have said that cable TV and closed circuit TV is a resource, a resource that ought to be used to benefit the community and not a narrow group of individuals within the community. We have said that co-ops ought to be the operators of the system. We urged that point of view upon the CRTC and they partially accepted and partially rejected it. With respect to closed circuit TV, which is a provincial responsibility, we have taken the same position. Our position has been consistent for years.

As to the second part of his question whether or not this would surprise the Federal Government, I am not sure what would surprise them. However, I can say that it ought not to surprise them since at the Edmonton conference I told my federal counterparts that we were going to be introducing this legislation and that it had been announced in the Throne Speech. I told them in very general terms what I would be doing. So it ought not to surprise them. However, one never knows what might surprise them.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and a brief one. First, did the Minister advise your federal counterpart that it was your intention to indicate that community programming could only be handled by co-ops?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The answer is, No. Nor is that the intention of the Bill. It is recognized that some people have made the argument that the Bill has the effect of saying that even where cable licensees operated a community channel that that must be done under the auspices of our legislation. That was not the intention of the legislation. I have asked the legal officers to do a review of it to determine if that's its effect. It is not the intention of the legislation.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would not agree that the control of community programming by the federal authority is almost the cornerstone of the CRTC method of granting licences. And if this legislation does what I think a fair reading would indicate it will do, namely force all of this control into provincial hands, won't that mean that the CRTC will be faced with handing control of community programming to the Bev Dycks of this world, and since they are so passionately determined that community programming shall not be controlled under the federal authority, the result will be to put back the advent of cable to this province perhaps for a year or a year and a half until this Government is defeated.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I don't know if the Hon. Member intended to compliment Bev Dyck but I am sure he will accept it. How I wished, Mr. Speaker, that community programming had been a cornerstone of the CRTC policy. The CRTC policy, so far as I can make any sense out of it, is one of pandering to the private industry, paying lip service to a number of ideals including community programming and making very little effort to meet those goals. How I wished community programming were in fact a cornerstone

of the CRTC policy. But beyond that I may say again that the intention of the legislation was not to affect anything done by a CRTC licensee. If that is the effect of the Bill, if our legal officers determine that is the effect of the Bill, then we may have to consider what House amendments might be introduced but it was not the intention of the legislation to affect anything the CRTC licensees do, including the operation of the community programming.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Yesterday I believe the cost of living index figures were published for Canada that show that Regina's rate exceeded the national rate by approximately 30 per cent, in Saskatoon by 50 per cent. Even more alarming than that is that if you take the past year, Regina's rate of increase in the cost of living index exceeds the national average by 30 per cent. At the time we began our anti-inflation program, Regina was declared as being the cheapest city in Canada in which one could live. It may possibly still be one of them, but certainly this gap is narrowing. But because of the dramatic increase in the price of living increase in Regina in relation to the rest of Canada, would the Minister not agree that possibly the federal Anti-inflation Program has been more successful than Saskatchewan's provincial plan?

**HON. E. C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):** — I wouldn't agree except that the federal Anti-inflation Program isn't working at all.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Minister, with this increase it must be working much more satisfactorily than yours if their increases are held below yours. Would the Minister not agree though that some of the increases that we have had through our program in Saskatchewan, such as the increases in telephone rates, the insurance rates and the power rates and some of these, are directly attributable to this increase?

**MR. WHELAN:** — No, I would not agree with that. It is not a good example. We are under the impression that price controls are in the hands of the Federal Government. Perhaps the most drastic increase that you could possibly point at, and it shows clearly in the consumer index, is the increase in postage.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STODALKA:** — I hope the Minister really isn't serious in that response. But certainly I am sure that the Minister must realize that there is something wrong, something that is attributable to Saskatchewan and would the Minister please tell us what he is contemplating on doing in the future so that we could sort of narrow this gap and at least not exceed the national average?

**MR. WHELAN:** — I think we are going to do everything we can to try and see that the Federal Government does control prices rather than talk about it. I think that the main increases were in areas such as cigarettes and liquor and I don't think that we should be protesting those increases, should we? I think that

the increases that are justified in the transportation field came about largely because of the increase in the price of crude oil that was paid to the people of Saskatchewan, which was justified. After all, we should get at least almost as much as we pay the people in Venezuela and other places around the world.

### **SHUTTING DOWN OF WESTERN FEED LOTS AT VANSKOY**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday in Crown Corporations I asked the Minister responsible for the water supply how the shutting down of the Western Feed Lots at Vanscoy will affect them. I now ask you, what effect will it have on the livestock market in this province?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am not aware of the problem that he is talking about. If he could enlighten me a little more I could probably give him an answer.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — A supplementary. Western Feed Lots, which has about 14,000 head produced there for finishing, will be shutting its doors approximately May 1st the employees have been notified. It is owned by the Mendel family at Vanscoy. I am concerned with what it will cause for the feeder market in Saskatchewan, from which they do a lot of buying, and the slaughter market in Saskatchewan, because I understand 14,000 is approximately 5 per cent.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what effect that will have on the feeder market in that area. I am sure that it might have some effect, but I don't know what you really propose that we should do about it. If they decide that they want to close up, I guess we can't stop them.

### **PRICE AND COMPENSATION BOARD RE - WEYBURN EMPLOYEES**

**MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

A recent ruling came out of the city of Weyburn in regard to some 60 employees there of the city of Weyburn by the Public Sector Price and Compensation Board of the province. It has rolled back a negotiated salary for some 60 workers there, from approximately 8 per cent back to 6 per cent. Can the Premier provide us with some degree of assurance that this will be the pattern of percentage which will be followed for the different organizations in Saskatchewan which are negotiating their salaries at the present time?

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise the Member that I can give him no assurance. I don't make the decisions for the Public Sector Prices and Compensation Board. I have a good deal of confidence in the Board itself, in the three members of the Board, taking all appropriate items into consideration. I am unable to say that the percentage pattern which applied to one contract will apply to other contracts, because I am sure in each case there are individual circumstances to be

considered, which the Board is authorized to consider and I am not.

**MR. BAILEY:** — A supplementary question. It seems as if we have gone full circle if we go back to the time of the 6 per cent which was advocated by the former government. It is now public knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the five-man government team has voted against the four-man trustees team in the way of teachers' negotiations. Would it not seem logical then that 12,000 teachers in the province to be granted say an 8 per cent salary increase with no intervention by the Public Sector of Prices and Compensation Board. It would seem that the numbers would frighten off the Board from making a rollback, whereas only 60 people involved, they get a rollback of 2 per cent.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very considerable reflection on the Board. I rather fancy that Mr. Maher and Mr. Wood and Judge Boychuk would make a decision on the merits and would not be scared off, or not be rendered afraid by the fact that the decision might affect 60, 600, or 6,000. I think that these are men of probity and integrity and to suggest that they are going to be scared off, as is the fair inference from what the Hon. Member has said, by the numbers involved, is an unwarranted and unfortunate reflection on these three distinguished citizens of Saskatchewan.

### **MAFIA CONTROL OF BEEF INDUSTRY**

**MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. Earlier this week the Minister had made a public statement to the effect that the Mafia controlled the beef industry and packaging and marketing industry in Montreal and also that a beef marketing commission would not be accepted in this province because of the Mafia.

Does the Minister mean, by that statement, that (a) the Mafia is in operation in this province, and (b) does he have documentation to that effect?

**HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways):** — I have difficulty in discerning the difference between some people and the Mafia. They operate the same way, they talk alike and look alike and sound alike. But, again, the Member has got all his signals wrong. He needs a hearing aid or a reading aid. I don't know what he is referring to, but I did make the statement that the Quebec Crime Commission indicated that the mob was very deeply into the meat marketing in places in eastern Canada. I said that I wouldn't be surprised if they were involved in other parts of Canada and the United States. Any place where there is money to be made, the mob is there. You can make your choice.

**MR. WIEBE:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the voice clip that was used quoting the exact words of the Minister of Highways, he stated at that point in time that a cattle marketing commission in this province would not be accepted by the Mafia if one were implemented. Is he still standing by that particular statement?

**MR. KRAMER:** — I didn't say that! I said that a beef marketing commission in Saskatchewan, alone, would be very difficult to operate because of the fact that we do not have a control provincially of a large share of the market. I am saying that if you are going to move into that marketing area, this could involve enemies that you would make, not only among the packers and the chain stores but anyone who may be behind them, and it could well be the Mafia, because they have their fingers in every business throughout the world where there is a quick dollar to be made. Maybe you will deny that. I am saying that it would be foolhardy for us to try to proceed on a provincial basis, regardless of how much we may need orderly marketing and how much benefit it might provide for the producers, the beef producers of western Canada.

### **RESIGNATION OF PRINCE ALBERT HEAD OFFICE MANAGEMENT TEAM**

**MR. G. N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Forest Products.

I understand that in the past month some of the management team in the Prince Albert head office have resigned. Can the Minister tell this Assembly how many have resigned; how many are left on that team and the reasons for the resignations?

**HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, two management people have accepted positions with other forest corporations. They have given notice. I am not precisely clear whether they have both left at this point in time or not.

**MR. WIPF:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Saskatchewan Forest Products is having some problem in keeping a management team together and that the corporation lost \$4 million last year, is the corporation still planning to build their large office building in Prince Albert?

**MR. MESSER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member alludes to the position of the corporation and I don't think that that had any bearing on the decisions of the two management people. They were not the senior management persons of the corporation. They have conveyed to me no concern in regard to the operations of the corporation from their individual point of view other than that they had found positions with other corporations that attracted them. I don't know for what reasons. It may have been better pay and an advancement as far as their personal position is concerned.

The building at Prince Albert is under review by the Sask Forest Products Corporation and the Government of Saskatchewan, due to some change in plans in regard to the design of that building.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I will take the next question.

## CABLE PAY CO-OPS

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of cable television has told us three things over the course of some time. First, if I may just for a second set the stage; the Minister shortly after coming back from Edmonton indicated to the House, in response to a question I directed to him, that he would assure the House that cable licensees now licensed would get the assistance, if I can paraphrase, of the Government to proceed with their licences, that the Government was not trying to change the licensees and was not trying to stop the private licensees from getting the licence. He has told us through legislation, Mr. Speaker, that through a Bill, that I suggest is basically designed to stop the private companies, that he is not prepared to make good on that guarantee. I wonder if the Minister would not agree with me that, quite clearly, if the private companies are not given the right of control over community programming, they would fly in the face of the CRTC regulations, and it would be impossible for them to proceed with CRTC licences: — that it is a sort of a Catch 22, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I have every sympathy for the Member for Wascana in trying to create an issue where in fact none exists. It is a difficult task. What he is trying to do is to turn an error in drafting legislation into a major confrontation between the Federal and Provincial Governments. I am sure that neither the cable licensees nor the Federal Government see this as a major issue, although the Member for Wascana might. I have told the Hon. Member for Wascana once today that the intention of the legislation was not to affect in any way anything the cable licensees now do, including their community programming, and that, if in fact it had that effect, through error or otherwise, appropriate steps would be taken. That isn't a major confrontation in the Federal and Provincial Governments. It is merely, if it exists at all, an error in drafting legislation.

**MR. MERCHANT:** — Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then saying that the legislation, which clearly would exclude the two licensees who are private from carrying community broadcasting, that that legislation was not intended and a change will be made to allow the private licensees to proceed just as any co-op would be able to proceed?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, I am not saying that, but I am saying if the legislation has the effect of preventing the CRTC licensees from carrying the community channel, then appropriate steps would be taken to bring to the House an amendment.

## MAFIA INVOLVEMENT IN BUSINESS IN CANADA

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. You have indicated in question period today that perhaps the Mafia is behind the, and you said maybe, behind the major food chains and you said and left the implication that they were involved in all parts of Canada and in all sorts of businesses. First of all, what evidence do you have and secondly, have you transmitted any evidence that you may have over to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) for investigation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I will take the next question. The Member for Kindersley.

# **REINSTATEMENT OF MR. WILSON AT MUSEUM OF WESTERN DEVELOPMENT**

**MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister responsible for the Department of Culture and Youth. In view of the fact that over the past few days considerable evidence has come to light that would suggest that the Board of Directors for the Museum of Western Development in Saskatoon was to some extent illegitimate, is your Government prepared to order reinstatement of Mr. Wilson, who was relieved of his services by the Board, at least until this matter is cleared up by your Government or the necessary authorities?

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth):** — Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Member asked the question because I was going to try to get your attention to answer the question as it was asked yesterday, anyhow. There are two or three questions that have been asked over the course of the last two or three days, which I would like to give an answer to.

The question that the Member now asks was asked by the Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) yesterday and it dealt with the number of people on the Board of the Western Development Museum. I am making some inquiries about the matter which he raised and as the Attorney General indicated yesterday, we have asked for some legal opinions on this matter and when we have them - and we do not have them yet - I will be making a fuller statement to the House.

Now the Member for Sutherland (Mr. H. Lane) and the Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) also raised a question about a certain study that was commissioned by the Western Development Museum, a study which the Board commissioned as a Board and which it had received, as was mentioned in a reply to the discussion during the question period at that time, I believe by the Premier. The report is the property of the Western Development Museum and not the property of the Government. Nevertheless I want the Member to know and the House to know that I have passed on the requests of the Opposition to the Board that the report be made public. The Board is having a regular meeting next week on the 29th, at which time it will no doubt deal with that request.

Another question that was raised on this matter was dealing with the Executive of the Western Development Museum Board. As I have indicated, the Board is meeting on April 29, next week. It will, at that time, select and name its Executive as that will be the first meeting of the new Board appointed on the first part of this month. There has been some discussion in this Legislature about the mention of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman in the Order in Council appointing the new Board, but I think that has also been explained that because of the form of those bracket indications, this does not in fact appoint a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman. It is clearly understood that the Western Development Museum Board under the legislation, being an independent body, is to make the decision or election of its Executive and this will also be done on the 29th as I have indicated.



**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It is unfortunate that I have to ask the supplementary to get an answer to my first question. I asked you - until you have managed to clear up some of the questions that are floating around about the Board last year and its legitimacy, its questionable authority in relieving Mr. Wilson of his duties, until that is cleared up - are you prepared to ask for his reinstatement as Director of the Museum until a legitimate Board can deal with that employment?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — No, as I said, we are making inquiries into the question raised. It is a decision of the Board and as far as I am concerned, unless I know otherwise, the Board acted in its wisdom correctly and it was a decision of that Board. I think I make that very clear. As I indicated, I will have a fuller statement to make when I have had all of the questions, which I am asking, answered and a legal opinion provided.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You make reference to some general inquiries you are conducting yourself. In view of the fact that the Western Development Museum, Moose Jaw Branch, and the Canadian Museums Association have both supported the idea of holding a formal inquiry into this situation, is your Government prepared to extend your inquiries some small step further to the form of a formal inquiry into the release of Mr. Wilson and the status of the Board at that time? Can you give us an assurance at this time that you will do that?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is something once again, Mr. Speaker, that I will be determining after the meeting of the Board on the 29th. I want to make some comment on the matter of the Canadian Museums Association, which has been requested by some to do some inquiry into the dispute that exists. My officials have been contacted by a representative of the Canadian Museums Association, where they have indicated that they will, in fact, be looking into the matter and I think that until they have done so, we will not be making any decision as the Member requests.

Mr. Speaker, there was another question raised yesterday. May I be permitted to give an answer at this time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think I will permit the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland to ask a question.

**MR. H. W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland):** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Culture and Youth. In your meeting in Saskatoon with George Dyck last Friday afternoon, were you able to come to some resolution of what on the face of it appears to be a conflict of interests, namely Mr. Dyck being a member of a so-called independent board and also head consultant with your department? I ask you if you have come to some resolution of that with Mr. Dyck?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I think it has been made clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is no conflict of interest involved. Mr. Dyck, in the last year, has not been on contract with the department. It was a contract that was in the 1975-76 fiscal year and it was

not on an employee basis; it was on a contract basis to do some specific work which has been very useful to the department, as we are developing a museum policy for the Province of Saskatchewan. So I don't think there is any conflict of interest at all.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The original reaction of your Government that Mr. Dyck was consultant to deal with cable television, when it was funded through the Department of Culture and Youth, was very strange indeed. Could you tell us what, in fact, was the purpose of the meeting with Mr. Dyck and what resolutions you did come up with?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, it was simply for me to get an update of the activities of the Western Development Museum and certainly an update on the situation with regard to the Executive Director and I think that was certainly in order.

### **CATTLE MARKETING COMMISSION**

**MR. J. WIEBE:** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the statements of the Minister of Highways, is the reason why we do not have a cattle marketing commission in the province today because this Government is adhering to the wishes of the cattle producers or because they are afraid of any influence that the Mafia may have on such operations in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the Mafia has not infiltrated into my office at this time.

**MR. R. BAILEY:** — To the Minister of Agriculture. It is apparent from the Minister of Highways that he has some inside information as to very intrinsic things. Does the Minister of Agriculture know how a Mafia sounds?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

### **DELTA HOLDINGS LIMITED**

**MR. G. WIPF:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of DNS. Is it true that the Government of Saskatchewan, through the DNS, at this time, is doing maintenance work on Delta Holdings Limited apartment buildings in La Ronge at no charge to Delta Holdings Limited?

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):** — I can't give you a specific answer, Mr. Speaker, but I doubt that it is true.

## STATEMENT

### INTERPRETATION RULE NO. 9

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before Orders of the Day, I have a statement to make.

Over the past few weeks, there has been some confusion over the interpretation of Rule No. 9, and the matter of standing items on the Order Paper.

I wish to make a statement in order to clarify this matter for all Members. There are two categories of items of business on Orders of the Day. (1) Those items which have been given notice but have not yet been moved, and (2) those items which have been moved and adjourned.

An item which has yet not been moved is still the property of the Member and he cannot be forced by the Assembly to move the motion, but he may, or a Member on his behalf may, ask for the item to stand. If the item is called and no one asks for it to stand, the item will drop from the Order paper; but it may be renewed by submitting a new notice. This is Rule 9(1).

With regard to an item which has been moved and adjourned, this is the property of the whole House. This item stands in the adjourned debate section showing the name of the Member who adjourned the debate. This Member or any other Member may ask for the item to stand when it is called. Yet, on the other hand, the one Member who adjourned the debate cannot block any further debate on this item. For example, if the item was called and even though a Member asked for it to stand, another Member may rise to speak to the matter and if recognized by Mr. Speaker, may take part in the debate. The Member who previously adjourned the debate may re-enter the debate at a later time if the debate has not been concluded.

If there is any disagreement over whether an item should stand, the matter may be decided forthwith by a division without debate. This is based on the principle that an adjourned item belongs to the entire House and whether it should stand or it should not should be decided ultimately by the Assembly.

It must be remembered that there is a difference between the items on the Order Paper which have not been moved and those that are in an adjourned debate category.

I hope this statement will clarify Rule 9 and the practices of the Assembly with regard to orders not taken up when called.

### BILL NO. 87

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have another statement.

Yesterday Bill No. 87 was called for consideration of second reading at which time a Point of Order was raised to the effect that the Bill was out of order under Rule 30. I allowed several Members to comment on the Point of Order before deferring my ruling. I have carefully checked the verbatim record of the Points of Order raised and have re-examined the Bill. The Bill, if passed, would require an economic impact statement to be tabled with the Bill on introduction. It can be argued that the preparation of this statement would necessitate an expenditure of money but indeed all Bills introduced in the Assembly

by Ministers and private Members require work by the department resulting in extra cost, as do all questions and motions for return. It can be further argued that extra legislation being proposed will lengthen the Session, and thus create an extra expense to the public purse. Yet I am sure that all Hon. Members will agree that these expenditures are all part of the functioning of the Legislative Assembly and the departments of government for which funds have already been allotted by the Assembly.

I refer all Hon. Members to Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, pages 779 and 780. Since Bill No. 87 does not impose a new charge on the public revenue, I rule that Bill No. 87 is in order.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, just on that point. I, of course, accept Mr. Speaker's ruling, but surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a point which you have not addressed yourself to, and that is the point that I make and the point that the Provincial Secretary makes. No one argues that there is an additional effort in terms of printing or whatever, as you have indicated. The argument that has been advanced by the Provincial Secretary and the argument that is advanced by myself on the Point of Order is that if that Bill passes, somebody is going to have to do an economic analysis, in the estimate of the Provincial Secretary up to a million dollars. That is a charge, an obligation. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is something in your ruling, unless I didn't hear it carefully, you made no mention of. I agree that every order that is passed places a charge on my people doing more work. They have to dig out the crime statistics and all of that; I can't quarrel with that. But that is one issue.

The issue is whether or not, by the passage of that Bill, there will be an economic charge on the province. I am saying how else could one interpret but that there has to be, because someone is going to have to do the economic analysis. Who does it? I think that is a charge on the public purse, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I believe the matter is covered in the ruling and the Attorney General is making essentially the same argument that he made yesterday. Consequently I will have to stay with the ruling.

### **POINT OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD**

**MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives):** — Mr. Speaker, a new Point of Order, if I may. It is merely a clarification. It is our understanding of the rules of the Assembly that when a bill is placed on the Order Paper that questions pertaining to that bill should be raised during the course of the debate of the bill, and that questions during Question Period about the bill are therefore out of order.

In today's Question Period, I believe all of the questions pertaining to cable television were pertaining to a particular Bill that is on the Order Paper presently of this Legislature. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, for our information, if it is satisfactory

to ask questions pertaining to bills during Question Period. We would like to know, and we would also like a ruling on that particular aspect.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It is clear that the debate with regard to the principle or the detail of the bill should take place in second reading and in committee. I think all Members understand that. So there is nothing new there. However, the fact that a bill appears on the Order Paper and is in some stage or other of development or progress through the House, doesn't preclude the possibility of some question on the bill or relating to an aspect of the bill. However, I will attempt at all times to prevent discussion of the principle of the bill or detail of the bill.

Members may raise questions with regard to some aspect of the bill which they think of urgent public concern and seek some clarification from a Minister. However, I would make an attempt to exclude a general discussion of the principle of the bill or fine details of the bill.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, with deference. Today, the Minister answered at least two questions with the phrase, the Bill, the legislation will be changed if certain implications are in order for that Bill. He furthermore suggested that he had turned the Bill over to the legal department for examination and surely that is a discussion of principle. This is really for our guidance, Mr. Speaker, we have no quarrel with the question being asked. On previous occasions we have been ruled out of order by discussing a bill that is on the Order Paper. We would just like some clarification. Perhaps it is possible that Mr. Speaker might be able to review the record today and perhaps come up with something that is a little more definitive in terms of discussion of bills that are on the Order Paper as to what kinds of questions might possibly be asked.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If my recollection is correct and I believe it is, the Member for Wascana felt that it was of urgent public concern that a certain section be clarified, namely the section dealing with the licensing of closed circuit television as it relates to federal licensees. The Minister, as I recall, responded that that wasn't his interpretation of the Bill and if it was, there would be a change in the Bill. I felt that that wasn't getting too deeply into the discussion of the principle of the Bill.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES - VOTE 39 (cont'd)**

#### **ITEM 1 - (cont'd)**

**HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Chairman, there are a few more here from the staff. I should like to introduce at this time Freda McEwen, the Budget Coordinator, and behind me is Walt Bailey, Director of Forestry.

Mr. Chairman, at the time we broke up last, we were on the forestry subject and there were I think several questions asked by the Hon. Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) that we didn't have complete answers for. I would like to, at this time,

explain the questions that were asked and clarify some of the answers.

I believe one of the questions asked was why is the permit information not contained in this year's report? The reason for the information not being contained in the report is because we found it to provide a misleading picture of sawmill operation. The number of permits in fact bears no relationship to the sawmill production because many of the permits issued are not fully used. There are situations where log production in the forest is carried forward to the next year.

One of the other questions, if I interpret it correctly, was, why was there less production in the Hudson Bay region in 1975-76 as compared to 1974-75? My answer to that is, in 1974-75 year, the figure represents, for the most part, Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation production in bush mills and lumber finished at the Carrot River planer. During 1975-76, Saskatchewan Forest Products was phasing out sawmill production in bush and building up a log inventory at the Carrot River Mill site. If the Hon. Member is comparing the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation annual report with the department report, it is most difficult to get a true comparison. The fiscal years are different. Saskatchewan Forest Products' year ends October 31, while the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources year ends March 31.

Another question, why was the sawmill production so much greater in the Prince Albert region than in the Hudson Bay region? The old Big River Mill in the PA region continued production until the new mill was ready for operation. The new mill started up in the fall of 1976. The only operations in the Hudson Bay region prior to the opening of the Carrot River Mill were the bush sawmills and the farm permits. In the PA region the increase in sawmill production in the 1975-76 over 1974-75 was primarily due to the improved sawmill operation at Big River.

Another question, are there to be any changes in the volume of white spruce timber to be pulped by Papco from 1975-76? There are no changes insofar as this department is concerned. We do expect some reduction in the 1976-77 year. I believe the Member asked, how about 1977-78? We expect there is going to be a drastic reduction in the white spruce production for pulpwood. Because of Papco's inability to sort sawed timber as required by our department under the authority of The Forest Act, Papco was required to go into pulpwood stands, taking other species along with white spruce. The white spruce stands are those that will not develop into saw timber. These changes should not have any bearing on the volume of pulp production.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, that raises a myriad of questions. I would like the Minister to quickly give me - I accept the argument that perhaps the figures given in the annual report for 1975-76 were misleading - I wonder if the Minister could give me the figures that he has in thousands of board feet for the Hudson Bay region of the white spruce utilization in saw timber, for the years 1975-76-77 and 1974-75. What I would like to know is how many feet were actually sawed. You said that these figures represented the amount that were let on permit. I would like to know actually how many feet were sawed. Now I know you have those figures available somewhere.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, the number of feet actually sawed would be found in the tables of the reports for 1975 and 1976. Table 4 in the 1974-75 report and Table 12 in the 1975-76 report.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Can you tell me then how many feet in that year were let by permit for the Hudson Bay region, particularly for 1974-75? You're saying that the figures here indicate the actual production is what I thought and I was somewhat confused by your statement that the report here indicated that there was some confusion because it showed how much was let by permit, not how much was cut. You indicate in 1974 and 1975 that there were 5 million board feet cut and I would like to know how much you let by permit; does that represent 50 per cent of the timber left or . .

**MR. MATSALLA:** — For the 1974-75 year, we would have to refer to Table No. 3A and that would indicate the number of board feet under permit.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Here is the point I am getting at. You indicate, Table 3A indicates, that there are roughly 3 million board feet of spruce under permit, that is for a given fiscal year as far as your department goes; am I correct in assuming that?

All right, this Table refers to the fiscal year of 1974-75. It said your department let 13 million board feet of white spruce permits for the Hudson Bay region. Am I correct in assuming that? That was an allowable cut for 1974-75. I will deal with these figures because they are here. All right, on what basis do you let those figures? How many years did that 13 million board feet allow for?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The 13 million that you are referring to is the volume that has been permitted for that year. It is not the annual allowable cut.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Would you tell me then why you would issue permits for sawmill production of a larger volume than your annual allowable cut. That is the indication that I can get from your remarks.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I am informed that the annual allowable cut for the Hudson Bay region is 110 million.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — We are going to have to be careful here and my fault more than yours, I am sure.

You are suggesting that the annual allowable cut, or that cut which that Hudson Bay region could withstand on an annual basis, would be 110 million board feet of white spruce, is that correct? And in 1974-75 we see that, actually cut, there were only 5 million board feet of white spruce. Now that would have to leave me with the impression that we cut about one-twentieth as much white spruce or actually sawed one-twentieth as much white spruce in the Hudson Bay region as we actually could have done and still maintained our forest reserves in Northern

Saskatchewan. Okay, your official shakes his head; I would like to know where the discrepancy falls.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The 110 million annual allowable cut includes the saw timber, the plywood and the studs.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Okay, my question then to you is, I will try to simplify it a little bit, what percentage of that annual allowable cut was not utilized? You say your annual allowable cut for white spruce is 110 million board feet. Did you utilize that in every respect - Simpson's timber stud mill, sawmill and your plywood mill? Did they utilize the total 110 million board feet?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The question was, Mr. Chairman, how much of the 110 million feet was utilized; 83 million feet were utilized for the purpose of manufacturing studs, 2.5 million for the purpose of saw timber, and 12.5 million feet for the purpose of plywood. Converting that to cords, 110 million feet is roughly equal to 220 cords and then you can say 165 cords were used for stud purposes, 5 for saw timber purposes and 25 for plywood purposes, giving a total of 195.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Forgive me if I deal in thousand board feet, because it is the only way I am familiar with in dealing with the timber business. We are talking about 97 million board feet having been utilized out of a potential 110 million, is that correct?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I said 195.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — You are talking about cords; I am talking about board feet, 97 million board feet out of 110.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — 98.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Okay 98, I won't quarrel with you there. But we are talking about 12 million board feet in this one region alone that was not utilized, that we could have safely utilized in Saskatchewan. The point I would like to make is one that has been made to you before, but I suspect never using your statistics that you published and that you are well aware of because I believe you are responsible for this happening, or at least were sitting in the Cabinet at the time certainly in the Government. Forty one independent sawmill producers in this province operated under B21 permits in Saskatchewan up until the year 1973 and what these people did was go into the bush generally with small portable sawmills, sometimes with small sawmills set up on farms or in small sawmill yards, they were permitted a very modest percentage of the annual allowable cut of white spruce in Saskatchewan each year. I would suggest that it was between one and three per cent of the annual allowable cut and these people in many cases supplemented meagre farm incomes or made their living sawing white spruce in Saskatchewan. In 1973 your Government told these people, the people who have now come to be known as the White Spruce Cutters Association, that they would no longer qualify for sawmill permits under B21 of the Act. You put them out of business, 41 families. Now I understand that four families are still operating in the Meadow Lake



area which is an exceptional contradiction to your policy that came out in Crown Corporations and we may discuss that in a few minutes. The fact remains you put 41 families out of business in 1973, your reason at that time was that there was not enough white spruce in Saskatchewan and this was your primary reason. There wasn't enough white spruce in Saskatchewan for these people to utilize.

Now we were talking about a province, the Province of Saskatchewan, as a whole, these people wanted an annual allowable permit for their operations between one and three per cent and you told them it wasn't available, couldn't do it. Right here we have in one region alone, 12 million board feet of white spruce that was not utilized that could have safely been utilized. I don't know where it was, it may have stood in the bush, maybe it was salvage timber, burned out timber, maybe it was small pockets of mature timber that were not utilized, maybe it was sawed and left sitting in a yard somewhere.

My point is two things: number one, your treatment of the B21 operators in my estimation, and I suspect in the estimation of those people in Saskatchewan that are familiar with the timber business, is a disgrace and the reason for that is because the reasons you gave them for moving them out of the bush are a joke. You told them on the one hand there wasn't enough timber available and in the one region alone in one year, there was enough timber there that wasn't utilized that would satisfy the entire 41 families that used to operate under B21 contracts, in one region alone. Now I ask you what about the Prince Albert region. We can go under the figures there if you like. That was the one thing. The big reason at that time was that you refused them one or two per cent of the annual allowable cut.

The other reason your department gave them was that they were not efficient enough. They were not efficient enough to operate in the bush and I will tell you one of the reasons that you still have 12 million board feet of your annual allowable cut sitting in the bush somewhere and that's because it's uneconomic or impractical for a centralized sawmill operation to build large hauling roads back into small pockets of salvage timber, haul those logs out in an unprocessed form all the way to Carrot River or to Big River for processing. The salvage timber used to be handled by the B21 contract operators who never went in and took the meat of your white spruce operations, never. Their primary usage of the white spruce timber in the bush was salvage or small stands or scattered stands.

I suspect that if one got looking very closely at the North, and your cruisers could certainly tell me this if they were willing, that there is a lot of timber standing out there now that isn't being utilized, maybe 12 million feet in the Hudson Bay region this year, maybe 10 million feet in the Prince Albert region, maybe 15 million feet in the Meadow Lake region, I don't know. I suspect a considerable amount of timber is left standing, mature timber that is rotting, burnt timber that is of no good to anyone standing there for the next four or five years. I understand it can be utilized up to four years after it's burnt out before it becomes worm-eaten or damaged beyond use in any other way. So you have taken 41 families and you try and figure out the logic in this, 41 families who certainly didn't offer any great threat to Saskatchewan Forest Products as far as competition for good timber went because they used marginal timber anyway, 41 families that you took and put out of business. You said, well go apply for jack pine permits, saw jack pine if

you want. Fine, you know what kind of business that is. Saskatchewan Forest Products does a very limited amount of it because it doesn't pay. You said, If you want work, go contract logs for Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, saw white spruce for the Government. Forget your small independent sawmills and the income you people had from the rough cutting lumber; they aren't selling all these to Saskatchewan Forest Products. So you put them out of business for what reason? You suggested at one time it was because there wasn't enough timber to go around. You turn around and suggested that, secondly, when pressed on that issue, that they were not efficient enough. And now I suspect that because your large centralized operation in Saskatchewan is not efficient, much of the timber that these small operators use is not now being used. So in fact your department has made a move which, instead of increasing the efficiency in the usage of our white spruce in Saskatchewan, has decreased it. There is even some considerable question about the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation with their utilization of timber and with what kind of management practices they have, with a \$4 million loss this year. I would like you to get up here and tell me today if you still have a reason in Saskatchewan for preventing private sawmill operators from operating under what used to be known as the B21 segment of your contract. Could you tell me that?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all let us get the figures straight. There were 43 permit holders rather than 21, I believe it is; 26 of them were for white spruce and another 14 or so had mills. Only 14 of them had mills, and a total of some 72 employees. I want to first of all say that I think the Hon. Member had indicated this a year ago when we introduced the Amendments to the Forest Act. He indicated that he welcomed the Amendments to the Act because they would give better control of forest to the people of Saskatchewan and he felt too at that time, that we do have a responsibility to manage our forest property. And I might say too that this Government has been elected on a forest policy that will put the control of our forests with the people of Saskatchewan, and may I interpret and repeat the policy to the Hon. Member. The policy is to restrict the harvest of white spruce saw timber to improve the utilization of the timber resource. The operation of the portable sawmills, that he was referring to, has resulted in poor utilization of the timber resource, the slabs and edgings were burnt, the large sized logs suitable for plywood were used up for studs and saw timber. Using all logs in a licensed area for simply one purpose is certainly not good utilization of forests.

We believe that if the timber is suitable for plywood purposes, it should be used for plywood purposes. If it's suitable for dimensional lumber, it should be used for that purpose only and not stud lumber. The rest could be used for pulp purposes.

So, therefore, the point I want to make is that the small sawmills that are being referred to have been wasteful and haven't utilized our timber resources to the best possible use. Now this policy was undertaken by this Government in order to provide the greatest possible economic and social benefit to the people of this province. In order to control the harvesting of timber so that there is no over-cutting, we certainly had to restrict the use of the timber resource. At the same time, I might say too, that the reforestation, since our new forest policy has come into effect, has been stepped up.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Minister, you have explained to me here inadvertently, because you never directly answered my question, that the reason that private sawmill operators in Saskatchewan are not allowed to operate in this province in the cutting of white spruce is because they are inefficient; yet there are four of them that are doing it in Meadow Lake now. You might check with your officials about that. They may have suspended operations in the last two weeks.

Well, let me make two suggestions to you, maybe more. Firstly, I'll tell you what's inefficient. You suggest that a stand of timber that's fit for studding should be used for studs and one that's got high enough dimensions and is fit to be utilized for plywood should be utilized for plywood, and general saw timber should be used for general saw timber and pockets that should be rotted in Saskatchewan should be rotted and that's the logical conclusion to your statement. I've suggested to you that because of your policy, there is timber in northern Saskatchewan, right now, that is rotting because you won't allow people to go in and saw it. The people who used to saw your marginal timber, scavengers in the timber business is what they amounted to, they went and took everything that the government didn't want to give to their own people or that their own government operated mills didn't want to use. That's what those people sawed.

We find there are 12 million board feet of that sitting in northern Saskatchewan right now or last year. It was never utilized. I assume it sits there to rot or get worm-eaten or to mature beyond use. That's the first question of efficiency. Is it efficient for your Government to leave that timber in the bush and I refer specifically to scattered stands and burn-overs? Is it efficiency for you to leave that there, rather than have someone go in and salvage it? The answer is obviously no. I say that's happening right now.

Your second remark is about inefficiency of cutting the timber that these people did utilize and you've suggested that. Burning of slabs, etc. You obviously haven't been in contact with those people who operated the private sawmills. I'll tell you what the difference is between them and your government operated sawmill right now. When the government operated sawmill is given a contract, they are given a block or an area and it is said there are 22 million board feet in here or four million board feet, go in and take your timber out. They go in and they start cutting timber and they take timber out until they've got their 22 million board feet. Private sawmill operators were never allowed to cut unless that timber was cruised and marked for them. So if your cruiser went through there and marked that timber and said there are 500,000 board feet in there, I've marked the trees, any timber they went in there and wasted, came off their allotment. Much unlike the case with Saskatchewan Forest Products, that just keeps hacking away until they get their allotment, up to the limits you establish.

You talk about efficiency. Every time a puff of smoke went up from one of those private sawmills back in the bush, one of your men was in there to find out what they were burning. In many instances, those people hauled slabs out of the bush at a loss to themselves, in order to dispose of them with the public rather than burn them, so that they wouldn't be penalized by your department for lack of efficient work. You had control over that. You had absolute and total control and your men did a good job of seeing that those people didn't waste timber or the

by-products. They did a good job and are probably far more efficient in the way they utilize slabs and edgings and tree tops than the way they do at the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation mill at Carrot River right now, where they are chipped and sold to the pulp mill for \$20 a ton. There is some considerable argument about the merits of that.

I'd like you to stand up and answer those two allegations. Number one, that we have timber standing in Saskatchewan now that is not being utilized, that could and would be cut by private sawmill operators. Secondly, I think that your accusations about their inefficiency with the timber they did cut are totally unfounded.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order, please. I would like to draw to the attention of the House and to the Member who just took his seat, I can't recognize him as altogether a new Member anymore and I know he knows the rules of the House, but this applies to all Members in addressing their remarks, I would appreciate it if they would address them to the Chair. I think it assists and helps the decorum of the House and this applies to all Members. Please adhere to it as closely as possible.

Member for Shellbrook.

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):** — Mr. Chairman, the Member doing the questioning, in talking about proper forest management procedures and conservation of forests, is really like KOD (Keep Our Doctors) Liberals talking about medicare. It really gives us about the same kind of an impression on this side of the House. He talks about a \$4 million loss in the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation as being something tremendously significant. Tremendously significant. He has forgotten, maybe he never knew because he probably wasn't around at the time, he has really forgotten that when his government put together in this province an industry, a pulping industry, that they inaugurated, and even to this day we are still committed to that corporation, a million dollars a year in roads. You never talk about that. You never talk about the million dollars of roads that are committed in the forest agreement to Papco, that we build every year for these people. You don't talk about the benefits given to Papco with respect to hauling up there, 128,000 pounds over roads which farmers and other people in the forest industry business can't haul. Mr. Chairman, 75,000 or 78,000 pounds, but they get a permit to haul 128,000 or 130,000 pounds. No mention of that.

We don't have any mention either of the \$1.5 or \$2 million that is given to the Prince Albert Pulp Company in the price of dues that we receive. You know we only get 75 cents or 80 cents a cord for white spruce timber that, if you sell it to Saskatchewan Forest Products, you'll pay \$2.50 or \$3 a cord for. You don't talk about that. No, you wouldn't want to talk about that. Maybe you didn't even know that that existed.

**AN. HON. MEMBER:** — You want to talk about that?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, I'd like to talk about it. Be happy to talk about it in fact. I know, I'll sit down when I get ready.

You don't talk about the \$4 or \$6 per cord subsidy which we

paid to have timber hauled into the Prince Albert Pulp Company through your government, Your government that was in office. You don't talk about that straight subsidy for a half a million cords a year, where we guaranteed to deliver those cords of wood to the Prince Albert Pulp Company for a fixed fee, regardless of what the cost was in the bush. We picked up the tab. In fact, the tab was picked up by the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. That's who it was picked up by.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Change it.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Oh, change it. We did change it in fact. But you don't talk about that. You get all upset and you get all nervous about trying to dramatize what you think and what you try to suggest at least is a proper forest management program. You talk about the white spruce wood producers' group. Do you know, and you probably don't know and even if you did, you probably wouldn't admit it, and that is that these people, the 21B permit holders were first written to and told that their operations would cease, were first written to by your government. Those wood permit holders were advised that they would be out of the woods in another year or two. Now you forget that. Maybe you didn't know it, but if you don't know it, you should know it now. If you would inform yourselves about the facts, you wouldn't stand up here and demonstrate your ignorance.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order please. May I just draw to the attention of the Minister for Shellbrook to please address the Chair as well.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to address the Chair.

This Member who stands and attempts to demonstrate his party as being the party which implemented or attempts to implement a sound proper forest management program, is just as I say, like KOD Liberals adopting the medicare program.

With regard to white spruce wood producers, and I want to repeat it again for your benefit, that they were first written to by your party, then the government, by your government.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Table the letter.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Oh, the letters can be tabled and you've got access to them because your running mate out in the Kinistino constituency provided you with them, and if he didn't, he wasn't honest with you.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I saw the letter.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — That's right and therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Member shouldn't really be too concerned about having them tabled in the House at this point in time.

With regard to the access and the availability of white spruce or a commercial forest to the people of this province, let me remind you that it was your government which committed, by agreement, Mr. Chairman, it was that Member's government, that committed 98 per cent of the commercial forests of this province to two corporations, Simpson Timber Company and Prince

Albert Pulp Company. Ninety-eight per cent and now he's up here trying to dramatize the idea that he's the great crusader for the white spruce wood producers of this province, when 98 per cent of the commercial white spruce of this province was committed to two corporations. One, Simpson Timber Company, which controlled 22,000 square miles of forest on the eastern side and the remainder of the commercial forest committed to Prince Albert Pulp Company, or Parsons and Whittemore. In two blocks. One, Prince Albert Pulp Company and the other, the one that you lost the government on, was the proposed Athabasca Pulp Mill on the west side of the province.

Now, for the Member to get up here and suggest that somehow we're not managing the forests of this province, we are having some difficulty in getting out of the agreements which you fellows put together, having some difficulty in getting out of the kinds of agreements which you people put together and committed the people of this province to. Your white spruce wood producers, if any government made a decision to put them out of the forest, it was your government from 1964 to 1971.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, I'd love to take the time to respond to the Minister, but I don't know, it would sort of be like discussing the way a baseball game is going to go to some one who has just been thrown off the team. The Minister has been removed from any responsibility he has in management of our timber resources, with the exception of that stuff that he's messing up in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and we may get some discussion about that in DNS Estimates.

I have a lot of questions that I would like to direct to the Minister regarding the Papco operations and if you want to heap grief on my head for anything that was done by a previous administration, I accept all that you can unload on me, because it's expending any useless energy you might have.

The Minister has had a chance to respond to the allegations that I made and I only want to add one further point before you respond, for your consideration. When we talk about general forest management in northern Saskatchewan and I've sat and talked to the Minister before and I told him that I was confident that he had enough principle to see that Ministers who were responsible for Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation and Members that currently are, he wouldn't be allowed to be pressured into allowing a greater cut in the annual allowable cut and I say there is a significant danger of that happening in northern Saskatchewan and I'll be discussing that in a few minutes. That's one of my concerns.

In a positive note, and I think the Minister and certainly his Government must have this as an objective, it seems he, in some perverse way, refers to the B21 contracts in this light, that it's the intention of this Government to try and make maximum efficiency or maximum use out of every board foot of white timber that is sawed in northern Saskatchewan. I assume the Minister refers to the question of labour intensive operations, etc. and I want you to consider, before you stand to respond, that the number of employees you suggested . . . I'll tell you what prompted this . . . your suggestion that there were only 72 employees that were related to the whites, the B21 operators, anyway in the Hudson Bay region, probably in the whole province, so there was no problem there, that you weren't really hurting anybody. The number of employees that they employed directly

and indirectly was far greater than that. You are well aware of that. The one figure you should be interested in today is the one that shows that the number of people employed in the Hudson Bay region, in the sawmill industry and forest based industries as well, for 1975-76, is down significantly from the number that were employed the year previous. I'd like to know, that's another rock out of your foundation of efficient timber use, I'd like you to get up and explain to me how these things have been in the best interests of timber utilization. I'd like you to explain to me how putting the B21 operators out of the bush was in the best interests, how the labour thing is in the best interests, how Saskatchewan Forest Products utilization of the timber industry is in the best interests?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to remind the Hon. Member that during the Liberal years, tough, tough seven years, 1964-1971, things hadn't been that rosy for private operators. I think the Hon. Member knows well the Parsons and Whittemore group and the Simpson group who were going to take control, or pretty well had control of the entire forest area in our province. Certainly that wasn't in the best interests of any private operator or the people of Saskatchewan.

I might say, too, that the Parsons and Whittemore proposals were such that they were going to curtail all sawmill operators in time.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Not curtail, were going to kick them out.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Kick them right out, the Member says.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, I think we can do with a little less crossfiring and a little assistance here. I think if we could answer the questions directly and through the Chair, here, I think things would be expedited very much.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — With respect to the 21B permits, things really aren't that serious as the Hon. Member describes it. About 50 per cent of the operators are operating in the forest. They are not out of a job. They are cutting pine, black spruce and poplar and their livelihood hasn't really been taken away from them.

With respect to the salvage material in the forest, or the forest that might go to waste, I just can't see how that is happening. I just indicated to the Hon. Member that last year over 6,000 cords have been picked up by the forest operators and brought in for timber utilization.

Another point I should like to raise with the Hon. Member is that the small sawmills were not able to cut to as close a tolerance as the large centralized mills are able to do. In that sense certainly there is waste and was waste. The centralized mills are designed in such a manner so as to create as little waste as possible.

With respect to the number of employees, I should like to indicate to the Hon. Member, Mr. Chairman, that the decrease in employment in the Hudson Bay region was due to the curtailment of the Carrot River operators awaiting the operation and

the opening of the new mill.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, that last statement is inaccurate, but I will deal with a few things at a time.

You suggest that things are fine for the former B21 operators because they can cut pine and black spruce and poplar. Your own government operations, with tremendous financial backing from the Provincial Government, interest free backing, the finest equipment available on the market today for sawing timber, and some of the highest technology available in western Canada today, can't cut poplar and black spruce and make a go of it. How you expect someone with exceptionally limited resources, limited in every area except labour, is supposed to make a dollar cutting - do you know what black spruce looks like? It's about that big around, in swamps . . . haul it out of swamps. I asked the Minister who was responsible for the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation how much black spruce Carrot River cuts, and do you know what the answer was? You issue the permits.

Another thing I would like you to answer for me is, what percentage of your annual allowable cut is salvage timber in the Hudson Bay region?

Another point I would like to make, and you suggest that the private sawmills can't cut down to very detailed size and for that reason they waste timber. I explained to you the procedure they had to go through to cut timber; there was a built-in incentive for them to cut timber. Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation's operation at Carrot River now, I believe, can cut down to five inch diameter logs. I am under the impression, from the results of answers given to us in Crown Corporations, that they are cutting down to 10 inches and not taking anything else. Now that argument still doesn't stand up.

I should like, in a short answer, for you to stand up and tell why you don't allow private sawmill operators to operate in Saskatchewan? A very simple answer. Is it a question of efficiency? Secondly, I should like to know what percentage of your annual allowable cut in Hudson Bay is salvage timber?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first question, I believe I have answered that one. So I am proceeding to the next one.

What percentage of the annual allowable cut is salvage? That is about three per cent in the Hudson Bay region.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Can you tell me why you don't allow private sawmill operators to contract white spruce in Saskatchewan? Very simply tell me what it is, there is some confusion.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I think I have indicated to the Hon. Member why we don't do it. We don't allow the small sawmill operators to continue operating in the forest because of the fact that we believe that we should have complete utilization of our forest industry. From our observation, the small sawmill operators are not necessarily inefficient operators. I don't like to use the word "inefficient" but I would like to say that the results of their operation have contributed to a lot of waste of timber material.



**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, that point has yet to be proven. My point to you is, and something that I think you should consider is, the different nature of the two different operations lent themselves in many instances in favour of the B21 operators as being more efficient because they had portable sawmills. They could provide for their own transportation back into small and scattered stands without building large haul roads for contract timber. The advantages are many. I hope that you won't reject those out of hand.

I am sure that you had some problems with your own conscience when those people were first put out of business in 1973. I don't suspect that this suggestion came from you or even from members of your department. I suspect that the initiative came from the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. As far as putting them out of business and the fact that they were put out of business before, I will only say to the former Minister in charge of the timber industry, of sawmill operations, if he would have the courage to go before any assembly of private sawmill operators, former or those who presently operate in jack pine, and ask them what they thought about the way they were treated under this Government and the previous government; if he had the courage to go and ask, I would suspect he would get his answer. I don't think it would be the one he wanted.

I should like to know how many private sawmill operators are operating and contracting white spruce in Saskatchewan for sawmills, sawing it themselves, aside from farm permits that are issued?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, there are four operators in the Meadow Lake area. Then we do have some small operators operating in vacant Crown land, land which has forest that is being disposed of because of agricultural interests.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Could you tell me how many are operating in that second instance, Crown land. It's all Crown land, but . .

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The land that the operators are operating on is not provincial forest land. We are unable to give you any exact figure. The numbers aren't that great.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — All right, can you tell me why the four private sawmill operators are in contravention of your determined policy to eliminate private individuals from white spruce stands, are sawing timber in Meadow Lake?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The four operators in the Meadow Lake area are operating under contract for Saskatchewan Forest Products. These operators are going to be phased out over a three-year period.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Technically, when people were given a permit to log and saw white spruce and then were forced to sell it through the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, previously they were operating under contract to the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation in many instances. Can you tell me why they are

being phased out of operation?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The reason why the operators are being phased out is the same as the B21 permit holders.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I am not going to bother the Minister with the issue any further. I think he is probably very well aware and I am sure he has had second thoughts on many occasions about the elimination of the private operators from the timber business.

I can only say at this time that I hope in the future, if it comes to your attention and if it already hasn't I am telling you that there are stands, scattered stands of timber in northern Saskatchewan and burnt out areas of white spruce that aren't being logged under your conventional policy, that you will give serious consideration to allowing someone who is willing to go in there and utilize that timber by going in. I hope you will give that consideration.

I have another question for you now. I would like to know if Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation pays you stumpage fees?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation is paying stumpage fees. I'll give you more information than what you have asked for. The stumpage fees are \$6 per thousand on saw timber, \$1.50 per cord for pulp, \$1.50 per cord for pine, and approximately \$9.60 per cord for plywood, depending on the market.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Of the stumpage fees that Saskatchewan Forest Products paid to your department in this past year, did you retain those fees or were they disposed of in some other manner?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The fees were transferred to general revenue.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Were they simply sent to GFO or were they returned through Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The fees are payable to the Crown, that's where they end up.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — When you draw up your budget in the year to determine the reforestation program that you would like to undertake or would like to subsidize other people to undertake, would like to initiate, when you approach the Budget Bureau for funds, do you base your application for funds for reforestation on the amount of stumpage fees you received in the previous year?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I have some other questions about a different matter at this time.

I should like to know if - we have heard some inane

babbling about Papco (Prince Albert Pulp Company) from the former Minister over there a little earlier - Mr. Chairman, I direct my comments through you, I should like to know if Papco pulped any saw timber, white spruce saw timber, last year to the best of your knowledge?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, they have operated in stands where there was some saw timber.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I know that the Premier has made reference to this issue several years ago about being no different than making hamburger out of tenderloin. I think all Members of the House would agree that it is a practice that shouldn't be continued if it can be avoided.

I would like to ask you, firstly, why the practice has been allowed to continue since 1971, if, in fact, you people suggested it was improper at that time? Mr. Chairman, the Member suggests some reference to contractual agreements. I find it strange coming from him how he can put any emphasis on the validity of a contract or a lease when he has been party to tearing up so many of them as to make their use, as far as the Government goes, almost worthless.

I would like to know why it has taken this Government, if in fact you have taken steps to eliminate this practice, why it has taken you six years to do so? What has been the problem?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — May I first of all indicate to you that it was the former government who had negotiated an agreement with Papco that allowed them to operate in all stands, big and small. We have taken steps, this Government has taken steps, to change that, with the hope of providing better utilization of the timber.

We have now required Papco to operate in pulp stands only.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, I'll switch to a different subject.

I am satisfied that, despite the derogatory means in which the Minister has referred to me on several times, by association with previous administrations, I would like to say that I am confident that he is going to try and do a good job, at least of conserving our timber in northern Saskatchewan. We obviously have a quarrel about utilization. I hope, as I said before, you won't bow to indiscreet pressures from other Members of your Cabinet to overcut in areas where the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation is starved for good saw timber.

I would like to switch to a different area now. That's the area of game management, and ask the department if they have anyone contracted this year, or used any means by which to manage predator control in Saskatchewan? I refer to coyotes and wolves.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, no, the department hasn't contracted anyone for that purpose. The program is really a co-operative program at this time between the municipalities and the department.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Have you in the past contracted people to undertake predator control for you?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, we simply employ people for the purpose, but we do not contract.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Okay, would you tell me what means are used for predator control by the people that you employ?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, the means that are being used for predator control, particularly with reference to coyotes and wolves, - there is den hunting, and the use of poison baits, 1080. I might say with respect to the use of poison baits, that this is used at the request of the municipalities, in areas where coyotes are a problem.

In the North, in the remote locations, where there is a need to control wolves, strychnine poison is used.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — I would like to know as well if you put out any permits or allowed permits either last year, or in the upcoming year if you have any plans to do so, of allowing individuals to shoot wildlife from aircraft? I refer here specifically to coyotes and wolves.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, this has been done in the Swift Current area, and this has been done on the recommendation of the local livestock association.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Could you tell me if the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources was involved in any way in remunerating these individuals on a bounty system per animal taken, or if all you did was issue the permit?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, we didn't remunerate anyone. All we did was issue permits.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Have you done any studies to determine the overall effect of your strychnine poisoning program in northern Saskatchewan as far as the kill outside of the species you are directing it at? I know it is of considerable concern among some of the more bleeding heart members of our wild life associations, etc., that while game management in some manner might be a necessity, bait poisoning often has the effect of reducing or having unpleasant side effects on other species. I refer to whiskey jacks, coyotes, foxes, fishers, martins, etc., the potential for damage there. Have you done any studies about the results of your strychnine poisoning in that respect?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, we had a study and the study did indicate that there was other wild life that would get to the bait and therefore have its harmful effects. So out of this study, what the department has done is to set up baits in the middle of the

lakes (of course this was in the winter time) in order to discourage other wild life from getting at the bait.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Minister didn't mean exactly what he just said, but I think you are probably referring to wolf bait poisoning. You just finished saying that you like to set the baits up in the middle of the lakes so that wild life can't get at it. I'm not sure that is your specific intention. I would like to know if you have some accurate study of the number of wolves that were killed by this means last year in Saskatchewan, and if you have a study or have any idea of how many that you have taken by that means over the past winter and just where does your wolf management program stand in regard to numbers, etc.?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The statistics with regard to the program, I have it here by regions, the number under the kind of poison used - 1080 and strychnine poison. If you would like those figures, I can give them to you. Any particular area? The province as a whole? I would say about 125 under the 1080 bait; and about 104 under the strychnine bait. The first two figures which I gave you are the number of bait and the known kill figures are: — coyotes - 79, fox - 30 and wolves - 116.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well, I have another question regarding game management in a different area. It is a concern of mine with regard to your new moose management program, which I view with some optimism and some skepticism. I would like to point out to you some of the areas of that program that people have brought to my attention, which they are concerned about. Those areas generally regard hunter abuse and the potential for hunter abuse under the program. And it can only then be taken as a word of caution from hunters and wild life people in the province to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, something which I hope you are already aware of, but I am sure it could use considerable attention as far as preventive means from the system being abused. As you are well aware, your new moose management program allows, during one given period of the hunting season, for moose licences to be purchased by anyone who makes application in Saskatchewan. Within the requirements, you have in effect an open season on bull moose and young of the year. It is something which I think is very worth while looking into. A concern of not only myself (and my concerns are guarded), the concern of people who operate camps in northern Saskatchewan, residents, your own game wardens, is that that system of moose registration will be badly abused by over-enthusiastic hunters. You are well aware of the abuses that have taken place in your mule deer season, particularly in the Sand Hills, east of Fox Valley, the abuses of people receiving mule deer licences and shooting the first deer they see, and praying that it is a mule deer, and in many instances leaving white-tailed deer lying to rot in the bush and in the hills. That has been the system that has been badly abused. It is extremely difficult to enforce a 'mule deer only' permit. I suspect that you have made some prosecutions under your regulations for abuses of that, but a minimal amount compared to the amount of abuse that goes on. My concern is that the same thing will happen in the moose management program, only to an exceptionally higher degree and it is the question of hunter identification of the moose and whether it is a bull moose or a calf moose. I would like to

know what steps your Government plans to take in the upcoming hunting season to try and prevent any abuse of that hunting privilege that has been given to hunters in Saskatchewan.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of the Hon. Member with respect to wild life management and particularly with reference to our new moose management program. With the introduction of this program, certainly we had concern with regard to this, and I think that regardless of what program you may have, there are bound to be abuses. We, to a degree, tolerate abuses that are of a normal nature. Now we are hoping that with the implementation of the new moose management program that the hunter abuse is not going to be too great. We are hoping that the hunters who are mainly sportsmen, who understand wild life management, will give us their full co-operation. That alone, of course, is not going to be the solution to proper moose management. We are going to continue to maintain enforcement, as we have done in the past, and if need be, we may have to reinforce it. With respect to the hunter abuse with the mule deer, I don't necessarily agree with the Hon. Member that the abuse was as serious as he indicated.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Well I have spent enough time in the Sand Hills during the mule deer and white-tailed deer season to see the abuses which go on, and it is difficult to get an overall picture, but when one hunter out of several thousand comes across several instances of it, I can only assume that it is quite wide-spread. I know that the department has taken extraordinary means to try and control any abuses, you patrol it regularly with choppers. I would like to know if you are considering that kind of protection of the moose population during that open season in northern Saskatchewan. The problem is, of course, that the potential for abuse is so much greater in northern Saskatchewan in that moose management program than it was in the Sand Hills and other isolated areas when you had the restricted seasons there. The problem, as you are well aware, could be tremendous.

We have had, the Government has had, experience in the past in northeastern Saskatchewan in an area where they opened the elk season and there was an exceptionally high moose population in the area. It was open to elk only, and the hunters who walked through that bush up there, legitimate hunters, found, time after time, carcasses of huge bull moose, cows and calves that were shot and left during an elk season only. And that's an elk season, when identification between the two species is not difficult. It came to the point where apparently the legitimate hunters were upset about seeing moose meat in the bush and went and mentioned it to the game warden and the guy said, Well, if you accidentally shoot one, or if you come across one that has been freshly shot and still usable, haul it out and we will let you take it home for meat. There was a real problem and there may be some problem of clarification and details of that program. I only want to extend to you my fears and I would like to know if you have any plans to try and enforce this program. When you send hunters up into the bush, (the legitimate hunters I have no concern about, they are responsible people, they want to conserve the resource, but a large percentage of the people who do undertake to go North with hunting licences aren't as responsible as members of your department would like all hunters to be) the problem of patrolling the North and the problem of hunters shooting cows and leaving them in the bush during the bull and

calf season is going to be an awful one. I would like to know what steps you are taking to try and prevent that.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — One of the first things, and possibly a very important aspect of prevention of this abuse, is going to be the providing of information to the sportsmen. As I mentioned earlier, I feel that many of our hunters are good sportsmen. I think this is the case. We are also going to have to depend on people, like yourself and many others, to report to us any abuses that you may find in a particular area and the kinds of abuses. I know that people aren't apt to report about their neighbours, or possibly for that matter others. But I think this is one of the important aspects in trying to make this program work, providing information to the sportsman and asking for his full co-operation on it, and also depending on the public to provide us with reports where abuses may take place.

**MR. MCMILLAN:** — Well, I won't pursue that matter any further. I'll suffice it to say that I am hesitant about thinking that that alone will be enough. I hope you give some consideration over the summer to the means you might implement during the fall hunting season to try to prevent the kind of abuses that are sure to happen.

I have one further question on game management, and it is a problem which has been brought to my attention, and to the attention of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka), regarding the goose hunting season. Is your department giving any consideration to reinstituting a pit only shooting area for geese anywhere in Saskatchewan. I must say, just in passing, that when he handed me the note to ask if I would put that question to you, I read it, and it looked like 'pet' shooting, and I thought, boy we are going to get on a wild one here, but it refers to pit shooting of geese and the problem of eliminating pit shooters.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, with regard to 'pits only' hunting, I might say that this was set up as an experiment about five years ago, and I believe this was in the southwestern part of the province, in the Sceptre area. We have evaluated the experiment and we have come to the conclusion that it wasn't very successful. It tended to provide hunting to the relatively few privileged and some of the landowners did not like to have the pits on their land. I think, in the experiment, pits had been dug and perhaps not restored to the natural level. At this point in time, in view of this, we are not considering going into the 'pits only' hunting.

**MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** — I would just like the Minister to elaborate on what he means by the 'pit shooting' had a tendency to cater only to the privileged. Certainly a shovel isn't that expensive. I have dug goose pits and it is a very tough task to do it, but I can't see how he can say that that caters to the privileged.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, you will realize that if you have a special regulation in a particular area, then of course the goose hunter would have to go in and request permission from the landowner and the landowner could simply say, the fact that you are not going to use a pit for hunting purposes, I will give you no permission to enter my land.

**MR. STODALKA:** — You mean by privilege, not then one of sort of a class type thing. You are saying it is whether or not he can get on the property. Is that what you are suggesting?

I would like to ask the Minister then, there is some question about the validity of that study that you did down in that area, about the way it was conducted, and where it was conducted. Could you just give me some information as to how it was conducted?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! Order!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, first of all the department has designated a certain area for this experiment. This particular evaluation has taken place over two fall hunting periods. The landowners and the hunters who hunt in that area were contacted and questioned with respect to this regulation. On the basis of the contacts and the results of the contacts, we came to the conclusion that it wasn't too acceptable.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that really answered the question. I was just wondering how they went about actually doing the study. The people up there in that area have put a lot of pressure on me, as the Minister is aware; you have received a petition from the people in that area indicating that they are entirely dissatisfied with goose hunting in the present way it is being handled. They just say that the validity of the study that you did is highly questionable and the way in which some young fellow conducted it. I was just wondering exactly how did he conduct the study?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I'm not too sure whether I can provide the Hon. Member with all of the details of this study except to say that the conservation officer and the patrolman were involved. This was done in conjunction with the Canadian Wildlife Service.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Well, just in concluding my remarks, I should like to suggest to the Minister that from what I can understand, I'll tell you what they tell me is going to happen in that area this coming year. You are going to see an awful lot more land being posted, and if you are worried about the privilege and the right of the individual to hunt, well certainly with the posting of more and more land, that privilege is going to disappear even further. Now I don't know whether these people are going to carry out the threats that they are making but the threats are there. They say simply that they will post their land and they are going to keep these people off the land by posting. I understand that they can do so. Whether you are going to go on the land to dig a pit or whether you are going to go on the land to hunt, you are still going to need permission. So I would hope that the Minister would take this under advisement anyhow.

**MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Chairman, just a couple of general questions. We are demanding of cottage owners in the provincial parks to put up more and more money for capital expenditures, either for sewage or effluent cutbacks or septic tanks. We are asking these people to make some maybe very major capital outlays as



these demands increase, and they may be legitimate. Do you not think it is somewhat unfair to ask these people to make these major capital outlays and continue to lease, and would the Government consider selling to the cottage owners their property in light of these increasing demands?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, no, our department will not consider selling. We intend to continue leasing the property, unless it may be outside the park area. But anything that is within the park system at the moment, we are not prepared to sell any of that property.

**MR. LANE:** — Would the Minister then consider any type of a grant program for any cottage owners who perhaps can't afford the investments in septic tanks or effluent disposal.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, at this time, no, we certainly do not intend to set up an assistance program for this purpose. I just want to point out that my personal feeling is that how fortunate is the person who has a site in one of our park systems. I think there are many who would like to have a site near the water's edge or even further away from the water's edge, but they are unable to obtain one because of the fact that many of the sites have already been taken up unless there are new areas, new subdivisions opened up. I personally think that the cottage owners perhaps could be considered a privileged group. Privileged, from the fact that they are able to have a site in a particular park.

**MR. LANE:** — My next question is, and this will be my last series of questions, there has been, I suggest, a rather dramatic cutback in tourism and recreation expenditures, cutback in the number of staff, cutback in the expenditures. There is a very obvious contradiction in the Government policy. On the one hand the Government talks about encouraging tourism as an industry in the province and it has taken some efforts in that regard and then has cut back in this year's estimates. Now if tourism is an income or revenue producing industry for the province and we are getting strapped for funds, then surely the positive approach would be to increase expenditure. I have had complaints, and I am sure the Minister has had them, that the provincial parks system is deteriorating in the form of capital projects within the provincial parks, that not enough is being spent for upkeep, that not enough new expenditures are being made for capital needs in the provincial parks. Now would the Minister not admit that the cutback in expenditures this year, as set out in the estimates, is really a complete contradiction in the Government's previously stated policy in encouraging tourism?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that it is a change in any philosophy with respect to promoting tourism and providing a recreation atmosphere for the people of this province or for that matter tourists outside the province. I think the Hon. Member understands that our entire Government is exercising responsible financing and, therefore, there likely are some cutbacks, not only in this department but in other departments as well. Let me say that the fact that there are perhaps less amounts of funds for a particular purpose within the department,

is certainly not a change in our philosophy. It is just a matter of exercising responsible spending.

**MR. LANE:** — Well a cutback is a cutback and the Minister cannot get away from that. I will give you an example that has been brought to my attention. I am advised by a constituent, and I will vouch for the letter, that there has been a master plan study in the, I believe it is, Good Spirit Lake Provincial Park, since 1969. Then people were told that there was a new plan, that the original one that had been started in 1969 was ended and there was a new plan to be studied and now they are told that there will be no appreciable amount of funds for capital improvements in the parks generally and that none can be expected for at least the next five years.

Now, first of all, is that the long term intent of the Government to restrict capital improvements in our parks and if so, in particular, what happened in Good Spirit Lake Provincial Park?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I don't know where the Hon. Member got his information. Good Spirit Provincial Park happens to be in my own riding, and it is only about 20 miles away from my home, and I do have a special interest in this provincial park. Certainly the information that the Hon. Member has obtained with respect to no extra capital funding for the park for the next five years is not correct. We, in setting up our budget and the capital spending for provincial parks, do it on a year-at-a-time basis.

**MR. LANE:** — Well, how much of Item 17 would go for capital improvements, capital expenditures? What you can supply me with, and I don't need it right now, Mr. Minister, is the capital expenditures of each of the provincial parks prior to the end of the session.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will supply the Hon. Member with the information.

**MR. LANE:** — Just one final comment. I noticed that you really didn't answer that seeing there will be no appreciable capital expenditures in our provincial parks in the next five years - and again I reiterate, I think that that is bad, any cutback in tourism is a bad decision by the Government and I think it is a wrong decision - if we are to accept tourism as being one of our industries, then a cutback I don't think fairly can be considered a more appropriate expenditure of funds. What you are admitting by implication is that you have wasted money in the past, in which case you are to be condemned and/or at this time you are not spending enough. Either way I think that the Government stands to be condemned for its approach to tourism.

### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I should like to beg the indulgence of the House to introduce a group of students, if I may, who just entered the gallery. This is a group of students, and I am introducing them on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Thibault, the Member for Kinistino, a group of Grade 12 students from the

Kinistino High School. These students are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Merlin MacFarlane, Mr. Richard Fresson, and Mr. Larry Newfeld. As you will notice, they are sitting in the gallery and Mr. Thibault's wife is up there with them as well. I understand that these students have already visited the Leader-Post Building, the RCMP barracks, and the Museum of Natural History and are now visiting the Legislative Buildings. I am sure that all Members join with me in welcoming these students and expressing our wish that their visit here may be educational and pleasant and that they have a safe journey home.

I might add that I think the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Nelson) will speak to them briefly on behalf of Mr. Thibault once they leave the Speaker's Gallery.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES - cont'd**

**MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, if I might through you direct a remark or two to the Minister responsible for Tourism and Renewable Resources. I should like just briefly to go back to cottage owners. I can appreciate your comments; they are possibly a privileged group to be able to live in such a scenic area. On the other hand, they, for good reasons, live there on a permanent annual basis. They are not eligible for homeowners' grants and it is a problem that you are going to be confronted with by the cottage owners associations if you haven't been already. I should like to know if you are going to take any measures in the future to accommodate them in this area.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, when you speak to the question of providing assistance to cottage owners in the parks, I think we must consider other people as well. By assisting the cottage owners to install sewage facilities or whatever, it may be we must also be prepared to assist those living outside the park. I think that is an important consideration.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that that is already accepted, as the Minister should be aware, through the family farm improvement grants. That is already being done and I am referring specifically, as I said before, to these cottage owners who are living there on an annual basis, on a permanent basis. They are not living there for the benefit of the park and for the benefit of the lake front or the scenic view that they may have, they are there for a good reason, that they are working in that area and that is where they choose to reside. And I think they, to a large extent, have a real argument there and I think that you are going to have to come to grips with that problem. It isn't a matter of providing for other groups in the other parts of the province, you already are. If you could just respond just once more on that to clarify that.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, at the moment we certainly don't have any assistance program for permanent residents in the park or in the lake area. What we may consider for the future I cannot tell, but at the moment we certainly do not have any assistance program.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Well, I might just ask one further question in a different area regarding preservation of wild life, namely, the hunting licences as pertains to the white tail or mule deer population and for that matter moose in the northern part and in the Moose Mountain Provincial Park. One of the problems is that a group of people like to hunt together, four or five individuals, Mr. Chairman, like to get together every year, as I am sure the Minister is well aware. It may be two or three who drive a couple of hundred miles to a certain area to hunt on an annual basis. So let's just think about that for a minute. Five guys go out and they each get a licence for a one-deer zone. As soon as you get a deer, it may be at 10 o'clock in the morning, then your hunting privileges are finished for that given year and really all you can do now is travel around with the group and you can't really participate in the hunt. What they do, and I am sure you are aware of this, Mr. Chairman, they do not tag that deer, they just simply gut it and leave it wherever it was shot and they continue hunting as a group for the duration of the day, maybe two or three days, maybe it is a certain weekend or whatever. Quite often at the end of that day or a couple of days, they will say, well it was just a little one we got back there, we won't bother going back and pick it up. I wonder, would there be any possible way that a group licence could be issued to a number of individuals, maybe four or five, and that it must be fulfilled in a set length of time, maybe seven days or you might have a variation of that, so that the group could go out and hunt and put a temporary tag on that deer when it is shot. It wouldn't cancel their licence, they would still be able to go out and hunt because you have got five guys and you only have one or two temporary tags but those licenses wouldn't be cancelled until such time as all five had their deer within that set length of time, and that group could hunt then as a group and they wouldn't have to break the law in the way that they are doing now.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, we did at one time have a system of that kind and tried to attempt to have the system work. This was for moose. Our experience was that it wasn't practical enough and hasn't worked out, but I want to suggest to the Hon. Member that if he feels very strongly that it should be reconsidered, I would suggest that he take this up with the local Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation and see how acceptable the idea would be. I want to say that our department is working very closely with the Wildlife Federation in setting up the various regulations for hunting purposes.

**MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):** — Mr. Chairman, I am not a goose hunter so I would like just a clarification. When you are talking about ditch shooting, do they shoot in road allowance ditches? When I hunt big game and on my licence it says that I shall not discharge on or across road allowances with a rifle, as I recall, so how could you do ditch shooting out of a road allowance ditch? This is what they tell me, I am not a goose hunter, but it would be strange because if I take my rifle and it usually says on my licence that if you discharge your rifle when I am out hunting deer on a road allowance or across a road allowance it's illegal, it's an offence. I might be wrong, unless it has been changed as I haven't hunted for about two years now.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — What we were referring to, Mr. Chairman, is pit hunting on private land. It is not hunting out of a ditch, a road ditch. We weren't referring to hunting out of a road ditch. The pits that we were referring to are pits on private land.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, when you are zoning a zone for just pit hunting, what are you doing if you are not zoning? What's this pit hunting bit that you were speaking about - I am not a goose hunter, I'm serious, the only ditches I know are road ditches in a field unless it's irrigation land, so what are you ditch hunting if you are not pit hunting. I mean you've got to go on a person's land and it's illegal to shoot if you are not on a person's land according to my knowledge of big game hunting. I can't go out and shoot on a highway; I have got to be off a road allowance. So pit or no pit, can you shoot geese from a road allowance with a shot gun? Maybe it is a different ruling.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The regulation of the law is that you cannot discharge a gun along or across a road allowance.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Chairman, to pursue that a little bit further, that doesn't mean you can't shoot then from a road allowance, does it, as long as you don't shoot along it or across it? If you are shooting away from it, it is permissible.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — That is correct.

**MR. STODALKA:** — In other words, it is possible to sit on the road allowance and shoot geese. That's what I think Mr. Anderson is indicating.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Is it then, as I understand it, allowable to discharge or fire from a road allowance away from it? If I am out deer hunting and I can be on the road if I am 50 or 100 yards down the road from my car, which you have to be now, I can then discharge my rifle from the road allowance? That's what I gather by your answer.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, I have an interpretation, I hope we have it right this time. I am informed that one cannot shoot along or across a numbered highway but you could shoot off a highway. And with respect to the road allowance, apparently there is no law that says you cannot shoot across, along or off a road allowance. In other words, you are permitted to shoot off, along or across a road allowance.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, this means that if I come and shoot across a grid road or a municipal highway, I won't be charged? We have neighbours paying fines for nothing down home.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, I would interpret it that, unless it is a numbered highway, but then of course it is not a grid road.

**MR. WIEBE:** — Mr. Minister, has this law just been changed? You

know I would hope that the Minister would check into it a little bit further because I remember a couple of years back a constituent of mine was quite irate when the RCMP official charged him and took his firearm away for shooting at ducks from the ditch of a numbered highway. He was not shooting across the highway or along it but he was shooting away from it. He was shooting at the ducks that were taking off from the lake which happened to be on the south side of the road. So as far as the RCMP are concerned, they then don't know that this exists, that this particular law exists. So I would hope that the Minister would check into this. Possibly the Attorney General should maybe check into that as well.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, we will certainly take a very careful look at it as well. We are hoping that too much of this shooting off the highway or along or across the road allowance doesn't take place.

**MR. ANDERSON:** — Mr. Chairman, according to the Act now, it is not legal. I am interested because not over two months ago my neighbour shot a coyote, not from his truck but down on the road allowance and he lost his rifle. They fined him quite a lot of money. It's funny, I'm going to check with the Attorney General's office on that one because he would like to have his rifle back, I know that.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I think there is one other point that comes into play here. There might be a possibility of some municipal bylaws that we should be checking into.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Minister, if we discover through our investigation, excuse me Mr. Attorney General - Mr. Chairman if you would ask the Attorney General to be quiet please - can you give this House the assurance that if we discover in our investigations that some of our constituents have been charged and prosecuted for discharging a firearm on a road allowance or highway, can you give us some assurance that they will be reimbursed for any fines that may have been imposed if we find that they have been improperly prosecuted?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that I am not in a position to reply to this one. You would have to perhaps check with the Attorney General when his Estimates come up.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister a few questions about the Lombard North Study that was done on the Cypress Hills Provincial Park. It has been approximately a year now since you had the study and which you held hearings on in the area, maybe not quite a year. I was just wondering how close you are to developing a master plan for that provincial park and when you have developed the master plan and have decided what you think should be done, are you going to bring the master plan to the area in the Southwest so that the people of the southwest can get an indication of what you intend to do with the Cypress Hills Provincial Park?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, the results of the hearings have now been completed and they are

at the printers. As soon as these become available, we will certainly be communicating with the people in the area.

**MR. STODALKA:** — You say the results of the hearing are at the printers. I thought I got a copy of all the briefs that were presented and a summary quite some time ago of all the remarks and everything that came about at those particular hearings that we had in the area last year, so what's at the printers?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, when the public hearings were held then, we had the transcripts done up, now it is the recommendations of the hearing board that are at the printers. We are waiting until they are ready.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Mr. Minister, after these recommendations from your hearing board reach your department and you make a number of final decisions, are you going to go out to the area as I indicated and seek more opinions from the people in that particular area? Before anything is actually done, are you going to go back to the public?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is our intention. As a matter of fact, I think we have some plans to come into the area early and discuss some of this with the people of the area. So, very definitely, we will be coming into the area to discuss the recommendations of the board.

**MR. STODALKA:** — One final question. What sort of a time frame are you operating under? When do you expect to complete your master plan for the Cypress Hills Provincial Park?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — My officials inform me that we expect to get back to the public some time this summer and, hopefully, following that, within a year we can see some action.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 - 5 agreed.

## **Item 6**

**MR. McMILLAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister by what means the department spent its \$200,000 a year on fires. What means do you take to prevent fire in your timber stands, etc., or fight it when it does - \$200,000 doesn't seem like a very large amount of money to spend on fires.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, we set aside \$200,000 not because we have a very good idea or have a close estimate of how much fire suppression for that particular year may cost. We do not know. I think it was the year before that we had a very good year since only a few small fires occurred. Last year was a little heavier year and this year we do not know. Nevertheless, we think that it may cost us approximately \$200,000, maybe less, maybe more.

**MR. McMILLAN:** — What do you do for financial resources if in fact as it appears now, there is some potential for serious fire hazards in northern Saskatchewan? What do you do if your funds are used up earlier on in the season; what sources do you draw on for reserve funds? In fighting fires, do you just quit throwing water on them when you run out of money?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Well, the only thing we have left to do is, of course, to ask for a special warrant.

Items 6 - 12 agreed.

### **Item 13**

**MR. WIPF:** — Would the Minister outline some of the expansion or some of the projects they intend to expand on up there in the Prince Albert region this summer, in some of the campsites and what campsites?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Is this the capital projects, the large capital projects, because this isn't included in the subvote. Any of the major developments would be in Government Services budget.

Mr. Chairman, may I indicate to the Member that the capital expenditure vote, out of our department, is on page 91, vote 40. Would you wish to wait until then and I could outline the projects that we are planning to undertake in the Prince Albert region? For that matter I had indicated to one of the Members that I would be supplying the Member with information regarding capital project developments and I could do this for all of the other Members. Is that fair enough?

Item 13 agreed.

Items 14 and 15 agreed.

### **Item 16**

**MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current):** — Mr. Chairman, a fairly substantial increase in expenditure, yet no increase in staff. Could you explain that please?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Are you referring to any particular item in that subvote?

**MR. HAM:** — Mainly the total.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Most of that increase takes in the salary increases and the salary increments.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — It is in the "other personal services" and "other expenses" that the really big increase is, not in the permanent positions.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The majority of the increased funds in that subvote are



for the purpose of offsetting increase in administrative expenses including wages and salaries, particularly under the Commercial Advance Account.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Last summer there were severe cutbacks in the number of part-time people, the summer employees, working in the provincial parks. This year, are you going to try and operate the provincial parks with roughly the same summer staff that you had last year, or do you intend to increase the number of summer employees at the provincial parks?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that I replied to a similar question the other day. There is going to be a slight increase in staff. I don't know what percentage - about a three per cent increase in staff.

**MR. HAM:** — Mr. Chairman, to what do you attribute the number of only eight employees in that area? Why so low?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I am informed that the Swift Current region is a region that is smaller in size than some of the other regions that we do have. I would also like to point out that the staff number really hasn't changed over the last number of years. There hasn't been a cut in staff. The staff that we have in place right now is the regional director, resource technician II, conservation officer II at Maple Creek, conservation officer I at Swift Current and conservation officer I at Kindersley. There is a park superintendent IV at Cypress Hills, a park superintendent I at Saskatchewan Landing and park maintenance foreman II at Cypress Hills.

**MR. HAM:** — Just one further comment, Mr. Chairman. I know from discussions that I have had with some of the employees in that area that there is a deep concern respecting the lack of available help during hunting season. I am wondering if the Minister can make a comment on that. Are there any plans to increase the policing staff during hunting season?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, during the hunting season what we do is redirect staff from other areas to assist wherever there might be a problem. I think that this is one of the areas that we do bring in additional staff and particularly during the antelope season.

**MR. WIPF:** — You have a \$26,000 increase in your permanent positions due to staff increases and increments. You have a \$93,000 increase in the other personal services and other expenses an increase of \$144,000, about a \$237,000 increase there. Can you explain that to me?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, to explain that further, we require an amount of \$127,000 to cover the increased administrative expenses which I mentioned earlier, under the Commercial Advance Account. This is in accordance with Section 23 of the Tourism Renewal Resources Act; salary increases \$87,910; upkeep in the Cypress Lake Recreation area \$11,490; tourist information centre at Maple

Creek \$7,050; an additional thirty-two man months under the time certificate labour \$28,920. This should add up to the total increase.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — In “other personal services” it is approximately a \$93,000 increase. I am asking if that is for part-time help, an enlargement of your part-time help for this year.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Is it the \$93,000 that you are referring to, or the \$87,000?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — The personal services, which is up \$93,000. Is that mostly wages for part time help?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, that is mostly for wages as well as travel and sustenance, all in one package.

Item 16 agreed.

### **Item 17**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder what item maps and brochures expenses are incurred under.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — No, it wouldn't be under this subvote, it would be under Extension Services. That would be Item 4 that we have gone by.

### **Return to Item 4**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Return to Item 4.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — I think that something that is very important right now in the Province of Saskatchewan is the availability of Saskatchewan road maps. I understand that the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources put these road maps out to the various parks. I think that the Minister may advise the Minister of Highways, as well, that it is a very important area inasmuch as the cost of fuel now has increased another four cents a gallon and people who are touring our province are surely going to want to take the shortest routes. I am wondering what costs does your department incur in making the maps available? Do you have any figures as to how many maps you make available annually? At what cost?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The road maps, Mr. Chairman, are printed by the Department of Highways and we obtain our supply from them. At the moment I just couldn't say how many maps we obtain from them, but I am quite certain that it is a fairly large supply.

I believe the Hon. Member has a good point because I have

run across it, too, that some of the areas have gone short of maps. I will take this up with the Minister of Highways.

**Return to Item 17**

**MR. WIPF:** — Mr. Chairman, one question on this. Is this the item that the Saskatchewan River Heritage Project comes under?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, the Heritage Program that we had in our department has been transferred to the Department of Culture and Youth as of December 1, 1976. So, therefore, it is handled under that department now.

**MR. WIPF:** — The total program, there is nothing from Tourism and Renewable Resources in there?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The only part of that program which you might say we operate is in connection with recreation sites and information centres.

Item 17 agreed.

Item 18 agreed.

Item 19 agreed.

**Item 20**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me how much land has been purchased through the Wildlife Development Fund.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member's question, there were 137 individual purchases from 65 to 4,678 acres in size. Total acreage purchased is 47,893 and the total cost is \$1,312,774. It is an average cost per acre of \$27.41.

Item 20 agreed.

Items 21 and 22 agreed.

**CAPITAL EXPENDITURE - VOTE 40**

Items 1 - 3 agreed.

**Item 4**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Could you define the airfield's portion of that please?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I think there is an error in that title to that item. Really our department doesn't have anything to do with any airfields any more. The entire expenditure is for road purposes.

Item 4 agreed.

Items 5 and 6 agreed.

**MR. STODALKA:** — Is the Minister going to make available the capital projects, the entire list, did I hear that earlier? Will you give us a copy of that?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, it will be on your desk tomorrow morning.

### **SUPPLEMENTARIES**

Item 27 agreed.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, page 92, we have forgotten that item there, or do you do that later?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I might just inform the Member that he is certainly within his right to ask questions on it, but there is no voting for this item.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — If I could have the air weapons range agreement, some information on that please.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — I will send that to him.

Vote 39 agreed.

Supplementary Estimates agreed.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:11 o'clock p.m.