

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 14, 1980.

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES
VOTE 39

HON. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Chairman, if I may I'd like to introduce our officials. We've got a real team here. Lyle Lensen, my acting deputy, on my right-hand side, John Burton (3/8 where'd you get to John). Ray McBride back here, George Couldwell (there he is in the back), Walt Bailey, Roger Franklin in the very back row, Frank Hart right over here, George Rathwell. That's it Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege. Last Thursday evening in committee of finance certain references and allegations by members opposite were made to our party, members of our party and members of the opposition referring to racism and referring to members on this side of the House as being racists. I would like to quote to you, Mr. Chairman, those references I refer to.

The member for Regina Wascana in his speech to this Assembly on Thursday evening said (and I will give the various quotations) . . . He says:

Thirdly the opposition engaged in an attack on the minister which has been classed by some people outside this House as racist. Now, I just want to read a part of the two telegrams read yesterday from native and non-native members of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. And just to quote a line or so from one, 'We have heard the racist and personal attack which Conservative MLAs have made against you in this House'. The other one bears the phrase 'the obviously racist tirade of the opposition'.

To quote further, Mr. Chairman, further on he says:

I think you will find it highly relevant. The point I want to make for the benefit of the gentleman opposite is if you look at the attack they are making today on the minister, that type of attack has been made before. Various elections were fought on racial, religious and language issues — no less than three times. The Conservatives finally came to power and when they did they brought in legislation dealing with these various matters.

And I quote further:

Yes, in power the party proceeded to restrict language rights, educational rights and immigration to try to keep out some people it considered undesirable. But I want to point out to you your party was very short-lived, one term, and then every man was wiped out. The point I want to make to you is this: don't feel it was the depression that did this; that's a comforting illusion. People who have studied your party have this to say. The Conservative Party of early years based its campaign on race, language and religion.

And one final quote, Mr. Chairman:

April 14, 1980

Now, if you look at what is happening today under your new leader, you are heading in the same direction. If you continue in this direction you can be assured of two things.

That same evening, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, in one of his speeches said, and again I will quote:

While I listened with interest as my colleague, the member for Regina Wascana accused the Conservative Party opposite of tending occasionally toward racism . . .

Mr. Chairman, that was a direct quote. I would further wish to quote for the benefit of the member for Regina North-West, who is absent tonight. This is what he had to say in the same vein, the same accusations.

It is the same tactics the PCs used in the Regina North-West by-election — statements based on heresy, fear of change and ignorance.

The electors of Regina North-West clearly indicated on October 17, 1979 their indignation at those mud slinging racist statements. They indicated on October 17, what their indignation was for the Progressive Conservative Party as they will do in the next election. And I can assure them of that.

Mr. Chairman, I am as indignant now as I was last October with regard to those racist statements and their attempts to decry the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, I find these phrases, words, of the members opposite very repulsive and very revolting. If the members were to understand the true meaning of racism . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I think I have the gist of your point . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — One thing if I may, Mr. Chairman. I want to point out to the members opposite, to the members who made those statements — and it is part of my argument and not debate, but the argument on the reason why I am asking for a withdrawal of those statements and an apology by those members.

We, in this Assembly, let us hope, Mr. Chairman, are all Canadians, all of us on both sides of this House, and if we are to be slinging mud of this type at one another I think it would be a sad day in this legislature. I find those remarks, as I have said, revolting, repulsive, unparliamentary, and I would ask that the members opposite, Mr. Chairman, withdraw those remarks and apologize for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I have a statement I wish to make at this time on the question raised by the hon. member for Regina South. I had some notice of it and anticipated that you might be raising the question since Mr. Speaker ruled that it should be properly raised here.

To start with I want to take notice of the question that you raised in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Regina North-West. I want to examine the record on these, but I will make a statement on the other.

The member for Regina South has raised a point of privilege concerning remarks made

in committee of finance on April 10, 1980 by the member for Wascana. The content of the member's claim, however, indicates this matter would more properly have been raised as a question of order involving unparliamentary language. It does not constitute a question of privilege.

I have considered the matter to determine whether the remarks in question are in fact unparliamentary. I refer all hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. Fourth edition, page 132, citation 157(3), which reads in part:

It is out of order to read extracts in debate if they contain unparliamentary expressions as no language can be heard in quotation if it would be disorderly if spoken.

I have reviewed the record and note the member for Wascana was referring to and quoting from telegrams which included the following words: 'the racist and personal attacks which Conservative MLAs have made against you in the House' and 'the obvious racist tirade of the opposition.' I find these remarks to be improper expressions in a parliamentary forum, and further, that the remarks impute improper motives to members of this House. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forums, Fifth Edition, paragraph 319, page 104 says it is unparliamentary for a member 'to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case.' I would, therefore, ask the member for Wascana to withdraw the remarks and imputations.

Before I call on the member for Wascana, I would also request the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to withdraw his remarks as reported on page 1646 of Hansard, April 10, as follows: 'While I listened with interest as my colleague, the member for Regina Wascana, accused the Conservative Party opposite of tending occasionally towards racism . . .' I find these remarks repeat the implications of the member for Wascana and I, therefore, ask they also be withdrawn. I call on the hon. member for Wascana to withdraw his remarks.

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — In the light of what you have said, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw without qualification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'll call on the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan.

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Chairman, I unqualifiedly withdraw the remarks found to be unparliamentary, and I apologize to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your decision and I would like to thank the members for withdrawing those remarks they made.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES
VOTE 39 (CONTINUED)**

Item 1

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — First of all, I like the way it's starting out, Mr. Chairman. It looks as though we are going to have a very progressive night. To the minister—I can see why it costs a lot of money to run that department, if those are only some of the

officials. Maybe we'll get all the answers quickly tonight.

Mr. Minister, going back in the records of your department, you had receipts in 1975 of \$7,514,596. Now, four years alter in 1979, your department shows total receipts of \$8,374,841, which is an increase of \$860,245. Now could you tell me why, Mr. Minister, receipts are lower in the year 1979 than in the year 1978, and I don't think I have to give you the figures on that. The receipts are down by \$1,451,103. Why, also, have your receipts only increased by \$860,245 in four years, compared with disbursements which have increased from \$17,157,102 in 1975 to \$25,341,767 in 1979? I think we'll just do those first, O.K.?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the question the member raises is fairly long and complicated and I will try to deal with it in parts. I may have to pick up some more information later on. So, if you'll bear with us, we'll try to answer as accurately as we can and get him the information he wants.

The first question he raises is what is the reason our income for 1979 was lower by one point than the year before? I don't remember the exact figure he used. If you go to page 1 in the annual report, it will show you that the income from fisheries was down from \$739,648 to \$723,839. The reason why that is down is because of reduced royalties. And the reason for reduced royalties is because of the reduction in commercial fish-take. If you go to wildlife, there's an increase there. If you go to the land section, you will see a decrease there. What is the reason for decrease there? We'll get that one for you later, the analysis for that, Jim. Forestry, there's an increase there in regard to royalties that have been coming in under the forestry section. Miscellaneous. It's just unaccounted for. I can't give you an answer for it right now.

MR. GARNER: — One of my concerns, Mr. Minister, regarding this, is under the miscellaneous. I would like explained, not in great detail but just a short answer, why that was dropped from 1977 and I went back to 1975. It's dropped from \$4,679 million etc. down to \$2.107 million. We'll forget the \$100. I mean, we're dealing in millions and hundreds of thousands. That's what concerns me.

MR. GROSS: — I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, the reason for miscellaneous accounts going from \$4,679,000 down to \$2,107,000 is because of DREE (Department of Regional Economic Expansion) funding from the federal government — the fluctuations in terms of the funding, some of the funding is down in that area. That's what accounts for the drop from \$4.6 million to \$2.1 million. That's a significant drop.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. While you're doing the other stuff up. Miscellaneous, quite simply, is the cutback in federal funding. Is that right?

MR. GROSS: — That's correct.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, to go on, while your staff is checking. This means disbursements have increased by \$8,184,000 (and I won't go through the hundreds in your department in four years, although your receipts are \$860,245 in four years. At this rate, Mr. Minister, in four more years your department receipts will be approximately \$9,235,000 compared with disbursements of \$33,526,000. Can you tell me how you and your colleagues on treasury board will ever be able to bring in a balanced budget with this very obvious trend which seems to be developing, when your deficit will be approximately \$24,291,000 in four more years. Your '75 deficit was \$9,642,000; your '79 deficit was \$16,966,000. This is an increase in deficit of

\$7,324,420 in four years, meaning an increase of approximately 45 per cent. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Minister, we're going to have to get the receipts and disbursements — and I know you're never going to go on a break-even period — but sooner or later we're going to have to get those a little closer together.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member asks when we are going to come to a break-even point in the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Well, as we said, that is almost impossible to predict. There is no way we can predict that our parks will make money, for example, or that in the fishery section we're going to have an income equalling expenses, or in the wildlife section, or even in the forestry section, for some time to come. It's pretty hard to answer the member's question when he asks when the amount of disbursements will equal the amount of income. There's no way we can predict that.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, let's not play games here tonight. We can run through this fast. I didn't say break even — I said, sooner or later we're going to have to get them a little closer together. Right now we've had an increase in deficit of 45 per cent. Now, 45 per cent surely isn't breaking even. Why that profit picture is going down . . . I wouldn't mind if the profit picture was coming up a little bit. But your disbursements are just going on and on. And your receipts are down. I wouldn't mind if the receipts were going up, maybe not be the same amount but a certain percentage. That's my question. I didn't say break even.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if I can be a little more specific for the member — he wants to know when we're going to get to a point where they're more even. He should note within the financial statements of the department that the major increase in spending is in the forestry division. The reason there is a major increase in expenditure in that area is because of the DREE forestry agreement which came into effect early this spring. If he's talking about a gap that is widening, that would probably hold a fair amount of information as to why that gap is widening. It's because we have a major expenditure in forestry. That is the one which maybe made the gap appear a little bit wider in terms of the whole picture. It's because of the major increase in forestry expenditure.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Well, we'll just deal with forestry for a minute. I see your forestry receipts are up. But we'll go back to the lands then. Once again, there's a drop in '77 from \$249,000 to \$85,000. Now that's just too much of a drop. Give me more detail as to why there was that much of a drop in two years.

MR. GROSS: — Can I have some clarification of your question? A drop in what?

MR. GARNER: — The drop in lands, page 5 of your annual report. In 1977 it states, for lands \$249,910; 1979 was \$85,859.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it's in regard to cottage lots. The reason for the drop in revenue is because we have adopted a policy not to sell cottage lots. What has happened over the period of the last two, three or four years is that those lots have been sold. Now we're at a stage in history where we do not have vast amounts of revenue coming in from the sale of cottage lots because we have discontinued the policy of selling cottage lots.

MR. GARNER: — Have you run out of lots or why have you discontinued selling these lots?

April 14, 1980

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman I think it's kind of obvious why we have decided not to sell cottage lots. It's a policy decision we've made as a government. We do not want to continue with the policy of selling cottage lots because of the highly speculative nature of the process. Recreation should be available to many people at the minimal amount of cost and we should provide the opportunities for more people. We feel that by discontinuing the policy, the advantage might occur naturally.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Well, Mr. Minister, of course your government has land bank. Now, I guess, we're going to have lot bank. But outside of that fact, are you renting these lots or are you just not letting anyone build on these lots? Or are you going to turn these into parks? What are you going to do with them?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we're making them available to people on 21-year leases.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. While your department is looking up that other information we'll move along.

Mr. Minister, at what date did your office receive the copy of the waterfowl depredation agreement from the federal government for the year 1979? Not the date you signed it but the date you received it.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we received the agreement on November 14, 1979. It was signed by myself and by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy on November 29. It was returned to Ottawa on that same date. On January 4, 1980, we received the document signed by John Fraser.

MR. GARNER: — When did you send it back?

MR. GROSS: — We received it on November 14 and November 29, 1979 we sent it back.

MR. GARNER: — That's different than the information I have, Mr. Minister. Did the Minister of Agriculture also sign this in this same period?

MR. GROSS: — Pardon me?

MR. GARNER: — Did the Minister of Agriculture also sign it in this same period?

MR. GROSS: — He did. He signed it on November 29 and I signed it on November 29. It was sent back on that date.

MR. GARNER: — Well, it has been brought to my attention, Mr. Minister, that it wasn't sent back until some time in January. The reason why I bring this concern up is that there is no way of proving what day you signed it or what day you sent it back. I can only go from the information I received at the other end that it was in Saskatchewan for over two months. My concern is that the ducks eat the grain in September and it seems it took too long before these agreements were signed. Hopefully, in 1980 we can get these agreements signed for the farmers — especially with the high interest rates right now. The farmers need their dollars right away to pay their bills and hopefully this agreement can be signed in a little shorter time and both you and the Minister of Agriculture will work toward this.

I have one other question, Mr. Minister. We'll just slip back to those lots for a minute. What is the average lease? You said the average lease time was 21 years. Is that correct? What is the average cost per lease and how many lots have you, roughly, that you will be leasing on this term?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if I may, I just want to go back to the comments made by the member earlier about the depredation agreement and the compensation agreement. We checked the figures again and for the benefit of the member opposite, I would like to confirm for him that on November 14 we received that agreement and clearly on November 29 it was sent back. So you can't really call that an undue delay. On January 4, 1980 the then federal minister of the environment, John Fraser, returned that agreement which he had signed. So there's no way it could have sat in either Mr. MacMurchy's office or in my office from November 14 to sometime in January because it was returned to us signed by the federal minister on January 4. I would think that the comments made by the member are not quite accurate as the facts of the matter are that we did sign those agreements when we received them, very promptly, and they were returned very promptly.

In regard to the cottage lots — back lots off the lakefront lease for \$70, and lakefront lots lease for \$100. And you want to know how many lots are available right now? Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there are no lots available within the provincial parks. Outside the provincial parks, on our land, there are 120 lots now available.

MR. GARNER: — Well, first of all, Mr. Minister (I have so much help here it almost feels like I have a bunch of officials), where are these lots located? Will you be able to give an assurance to these owners in this lease that this rent will not be going up?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member's first question was, where are the lots available? The lots are available at a place called the Goodwin subdivision. His second question was, can we make an assurance that these rates will not be going up? No, we can't.

MR. GARNER: — What did these lots sell for before? And then we can get off these cottage lots.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the lots sold in the past for between \$250 and \$500.

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Minister, just to follow this briefly about the cottage lots, I am sure you are aware of the situation going on in the national parks. There was this thing at the Prince Albert National Park about the large increases in rental and taxes on the private investment there — also at Clear Lake. I think it is a policy of the federal government all across the country. Certainly I know you can't give an assurance the rates won't go up; certainly they should as time goes on. But what concerns a lot of people with your policy of leasing these lots is at the end of a five-year period, and I could be corrected on that, the rates can go up. What assurance will people have that there won't be exorbitant increases in these areas?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we can't give the member any assurance the rates will not go up. Right now there's a review going on within the department on cottage lots and what would be a more proper fee in regard to cottage lot lease assessment. That is

underway right now. We expect the report in approximately two months. Then we would have some kind of working understanding as to what the rate increases may be. There is presently under review right now a cottage lot increase. You are also correct about the five-year agreement. If they sign, they have a five-year protection where they cannot jack rates.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Just one more thing. Some of the things such as the environmental protection laws and so on in some of the provincial parks (I believe it's probably in all of them) mean increased investment, is necessary for people to put in new septic tank systems and all that. After that comes along at the same time as the review of their rates, and it could be an undue hardship. I would hope the people who are doing the study would take into consideration that in the last couple of years and in a year or so down the road these people will be looking at an increased investment without the rent increase.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member our people within the department have considered the shoreline pollution control situation now in force. They will seriously be considering the extra cost to the cottage owners in regard to the pollution control. That is part of the assessment that is ongoing.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Minister, did you say there are no lots available for leasing in provincial parks to date?

MR. GROSS: — Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. DUNCAN: — At Cypress Hills Provincial Park a new area was opened up and underground services were provided at what I would expect to be a substantial cost. Now, not all of those lots are occupied though they're numbered and staked out. Are you telling me those lots will not come up on the market?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the member opposite the lots that she makes reference to have all been taken. There are some that have been surveyed but they have not been disposed of and they're still pending, but the ones that are services and that are in place have all been taken up in, I believe it's the lottery system, is it not? — a lottery draw that has taken place and the lots are taken.

MRS. DUNCAN: — You mean the lots on the northeast side of the lake where there are newly constructed cottages, the vacant lots are either taken or are not available?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the lots in regard to Cypress Hills, on the northeast side that the member makes mention of, there is a number of them which will not be disposed of and the reason they will not be disposed of is because of the Cypress Hills master plan. The member will recall the public hearings that took place in 1976 and the recommendations which came out of that hearing process recommended we do not proceed with the lots on the northeast corner, therefore they have been frozen.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Could the minister advise me as to the total cost by SPC to put in the underground wiring? There are underground telephones also, plus the water line. What was the total cost of those services being put into that area and the total cost recovered to date?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the ones which were not developed, that we

are not going ahead with, have never been developed so therefore there is no real services charge against them.

MRS. DUNCAN: — What was the cost of developing that area before leasing?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the development charges that took place were pro-rated against the people who received the lots and that information is not with us right now. We would have to provide the member with that information later on.

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister — last year I asked the former minister about campsite lots down in Moose Mountain Provincial Park and he said they would be looking into it and probably developing quite a number more. As you well know, during the months of July and August there is quite an overflow and as a result they park them on the pavement just off the beach. I wonder if any are going to be developed this year and approximately how many?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that last year we started to develop 333 campsites and the work that was not completed last year will continue this year and we will finish the development of an additional 333 lots at Moose Mountain.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, will those be finished by approximately July 1 and be serviced also with electricity?

MR. GROSS: — I am advised that we can say they will be finished by July 1, and a considerable time before July 1 we hope —but not serviced.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Mr. Minister, we'll have to come back to that later on. I have one other member who would like to get in on this. The forest revenue, the total for '77-'78 is \$3,435,506; '78-'79 is \$3,690,480 an increase of \$254,974. In the year of '78-'79 I think the very obvious question is: what area did this increase come from?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I wonder while the minister is looking up that answer if the hon. member for Wascana could have the leave of the committee to introduce a group of Girl Guides? Granted, I call on the hon. member for Wascana.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you and to the House 20 Girl Guides and their leaders, Carol Pearson, Helen Schmidt and Edith Cubbon. They're the Guide troop from St. John's school in my constituency. We all hope they'll enjoy their stay in the House, and I'll be meeting them afterward for drinks and a short discussion.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES VOTE 39

Item 1 (continued)

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the reason for the increase over the year before in terms of the forestry revenue is that pulpwood royalties account for the greatest increase. The reason why they account for the increase is because of

April 14, 1980

increased production — not necessarily increased production, full production of the pulpwood industry. The other increase is sawn timber. It's a minor increase, about \$50,000. I guess it's just an increase in production as well in sawn timber.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., that's fine, but \$50,000 is still a lot of money to me. It perhaps doesn't seem significant to the government, but to me \$50,000 is a lot of money.

Reforestation and tree planting, Mr. Minister — in '77-'78 an amount of (this is trees now, not dollars) 3,001,371; in '78-'79 an amount of 3,515,074. What did it cost your department to plant these trees?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I've been advised that the cost to plant a tree is 10 cents for a seedling and the cost to grow it is about 8 cents for a seedling, so it's a total of 18 cents to put on line and in production a tree seedling.

MR. GARNER: — So, Mr. Minister, to go one step further, that's the cost of the seedling. What about the labour involved in that? If you haven't got that, fine, you can send it to me.

MR. GROSS: — The 18 cents we quoted includes labour and the cost of everything.

MR. GARNER: — That's total cost then? O.K. Who does the preparation of land for reforestation in the different areas?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the preparation of putting the land into reforestation is done by two methods: one is by contractual arrangements with private outfits which do reforestation work and the other is by the companies themselves which are involved in the area. Prince Albert Pulp does a significant amount, SFPC (Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation) is starting to do some now and Simpson Timber as well is doing a fair amount of work.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I don't expect you to have this information here now but could I have a list of the different companies that did this reforestation? If you have them now you can give them to me. If you don't, you can send them to me later.

MR. GROSS: — We will provide the list later if the member agrees.

MR. GARNER: — That's fine. Mr. Minister, while we're on reforestation, how much of the stumpage fee collected goes for reforestation, if any?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the revenue we collect goes into the consolidated fund. The cost of reforesting is not correlated against what we receive in revenue versus what we would have to pay by way of stumpage in terms of reforestation.

MR. GARNER: — It just comes out of the consolidated fund?

MR. GROSS: — Yes.

MR. GARNER: — One other thing, Mr. Minister, while we're still in reforestation. Has your department thought about reforestation in some of the southern areas at all?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only reforestation which has taken place in the southern half of the province is some work that was done in Cypress Hills Provincial

Park. There was an amount of reforestation done down there. The only other reforestation the department undertook was along the No. 1 Highway, the trees between Moose Jaw and Regina — the scenic drive.

MR. GARNER: — But my question is, Mr. Minister, (maybe I didn't state it plainly enough) is your department planning to do any reforestation? I received the question from one of my assistants here.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, there are no plans in the South to do any commercial reforestation at this time or in the foreseeable future.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, we'll move on to the fish in your department. When are we going to see a fish advisory board set up? If my memory serves me correctly, I was at a Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation convention a couple of years ago. I think the former minister of DNS had promised this to the organization and we still haven't heard anything about the fish advisory board. Is there something in the wind on this now?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the member that we are having serious deliberation regarding setting up a fish advisory council. It's very close to happening. It's a matter of weeks before we get all the mechanisms together but it's under serious consideration at this time.

MR. GARNER: — We're going to back up here. One of my deputies tells me there will be lots available early this fall at Delaronde Lake. Is that correct?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, that is correct. Lots are going to be leased late this fall. They'll be out late this fall on Delaronde Lake. They're being set up right now.

MR. GARNER: — Is that in a park? How many?

MR. GROSS: — It's in a provincial forest at this time. It's not in a provincial park.

MR. GARNER: — How many?

MR. GROSS: — One hundred-fifty, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. We'll just slip back to the fish now. Sorry about jumping out of there. How many fish culture stations do we have in Saskatchewan to date?

MR. GROSS: — One.

MR. GARNER: — Well I think, Mr. Minister, due to the increase in water being stocked with all types of fish, do you believe that we can supply enough new fish for stocking all of these lakes for the sport fishermen and the commercial fishermen from one fish hatchery? I mean, are we not going to have an overload? Or pretty soon we're going to end up with a bunch of lakes with a lot of water in them and not too many fish.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, presently we have one fish hatchery, as the member is aware, in the province. We are also at the present time considering and looking at other sites that are under review. It's a fairly complicated process to develop a fish hatchery. The biggest problem we have in the province is water quality. Finding the right and correct site where you get the proper water quality is very important. Water temperature is another very important factor. We have not identified yet another site,

other than Fort Qu'Appelle, for a fish hatchery. But that is actively under review at this present time.

In terms of meeting our requirements for fish stocking at this time, we feel that we're adequate, given the fact of the amount of exploitation that takes place in our Saskatchewan lakes and the amount of fish fingerlings we can provide. But we are seriously looking ahead to the future day when we're not going to be adequate, and we're putting together a package of proposals to identify the areas where we can find the water sources we require in order to run a proper fish hatchery.

MR. GARNER: — Well, I think the obvious question coming from that . . . I mean I would like to know, if possible, what areas you are looking for, outside of the Morse constituency? Are there other areas you are looking at, to establish this fish culture station?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the constituency of Morse will not be receiving a fish hatchery because we have no water areas with proper water quality. I am advised we are looking at all areas in the northwest and the northeast corners of the province. There are areas that have been identified in the general Meadow Lake region. Is that correct? George? There are some possibilities. On the northeast side there are some other areas we are trying to identify. The important factor is trying to identify the proper water temperature and the proper water quality. It's a very select site. People have been on the move now for a couple of months trying to identify those sites.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, you have stated in the Meadow Lake region, is that correct?

MR. GROSS: — In that very, very general broad area. They are all over the place trying to identify a site that would be adequate.

MR. GARNER: — Also you stated the northeast side of the province in that too. Well, O.K., don't forget we have northwest and a little further south, the Wilkie constituency. There are lots of good things in there.

Mr. Minister, moving on to airplanes now. I always like to talk about airplanes. Oh, the Attorney General's gone. How many flights on government aircraft, and I think you know what I mean by government aircraft, did you take personally since becoming the minister?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we would not have record of that. We do not keep an accounting of the number of flights we would take. Where would it be recorded, Executive Council? We don't have records. You'll have to ask the Minister of Revenue.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., Mr. Minister, well I'll most likely have to ask him the other one too, but I don't really think so. Your department, I imagine your own office, should keep track of how many flights you took on charters, whether they be private or commercial aircraft, since becoming a cabinet minister or any of your department officials. Now, surely, you should have a record of that.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised again I'll have to advise the member opposite he'll have to ask the question of the proper minister, the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services who would keep track of those records.

MR. GARNER: — Now, just a minute, Mr. Minister. You're telling me if you or your department officials go out and charter a plane, you don't keep a record of that. That goes into supplies and services? You wouldn't have a record of that in your own office?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, again for the benefit of the member opposite, we do not keep track. We do not do the accounting for all executive flights whether they're charter flights or whether they're CVA aircraft flights. The Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services keeps track of that information and the question would be better put in that area.

MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Minister, this surprises me when it looks like you have enough support staff, but maybe you'll need some more. In the Report of the Provincial Auditor, it states there were no services or bills rendered for \$509,495 of service to central vehicle agency. How much of this money was used by either you or your department officials? I mean, we're talking about \$0.5 million there are no bills for. Now, the provincial auditor's concerned about it. I'm concerned about it too, Mr. Minister.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the information the member is looking for is not within our jurisdiction. We have no idea of what the numbers are that he's talking about. We have no understanding as to what he is driving at or the question he wants. As I said before, it's in relationship to the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. The member should put his question in that area.

MR. GARNER: — Well, you know, we're talking about \$0.5 million, Mr. Minister. Airplane flights, the government has its own airplane . . . Surely to goodness we can go through central vehicle agency, but there is \$0.5 million of the people of Saskatchewan's money. Now, are you telling me you don't know about it? Let me put it this way, Mr. Minister. When you charter your flight or anything else, do you submit all of your bills to central vehicle agency? You see, there are some bills or something lost somewhere for \$0.5 million. I'm very concerned about this.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we submit our bills to the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. That is where the accounts are processed and handled.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, maybe we can approach that question from a different angle. Isn't it a fact you lease an aircraft from CVA the same way as you would lease an automobile from CVA? Therefore, your department would be charged for the use of aircraft as is used by your department. Now, the question I think the member for Wilkie is asking is, how much money were you billed by CVA for the use of those aircraft in the year under review?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman I don't know if the member has made it more clear or not. I don't know he has. The question the members opposite would like to find out is how much money is being spent on government aircraft by our executive branch of our department. The question would be better directed to the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. If he's asking who does the billing, I'm to understand it's the Executive Council that would bill the central vehicle agency the amount or would pay on our behalf.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that reply is totally different than the reply we received in this House last year. I recall questioning ministers — I don't remember

which ones — about how billing was being done. We debated the point on the billing of aircraft to departments with the amounts involved. I can't recall the figure but 30 cents per mile strikes as the amount the departments were being charged by CVA. The actual cost was \$1.50 or something (I can't recall the exact amounts). Anyway there was the difference.

When you lease those aircraft you are invoiced. Your department pays for the use, time or mileage, however it's done. What was the amount paid by your department to CVA or the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services for that year?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if the member is asking me how much money the Department of Tourism spent on executive aircraft which would be billed to our department, we do not have a total readily available. The money is billed to separate branches of the department. If you want to know what is going on you would have to add up the total of the branches. We do not have the total handy but we could get it to you if you want it.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Now we are getting somewhere. A while ago you said that has nothing to do with your department. Now you say it is the different branches of your department. You don't have it with you. I don't believe the member for Wilkie was talking only about executive aircraft, but all aircraft leased by your department from the CVA or privates as well and the total cost paid, with the two separate amounts shown. In other words, how much was paid to CVA and how much private, as a total amount?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the department leases one aircraft. It comes from the Hudson Bay area for that region. That is the only aircraft leased by the department on a lease-contract basis.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You still misunderstood the question. There may be one aircraft you lease on a year-round basis; fine, we'd like to know about that one as well. We are talking about the aircraft you lease from the minister in front of you, CVA, on a trip basis daily basis or whatever way they are leased from for using an aircraft to go to any point in the province. Those must be charged to your department. That is what we are asking for. We want to know the use and cost of those aircraft for you and all the officials in your department.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we do not lease any aircraft from CVA. We simply rent aircraft which are billed to the department for whatever scheduled flight. If the member is looking for the total amount in that regard, we would have to go branch by branch within the department and add up the total. But we don't have the total figure handy.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — O.K., you rent. Rent is the proper term . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, what you are renting. Will you please give us this information as soon as you can make it available?

MR. GROSS: — We will try to have that available as quickly as possible.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, regarding the airplanes — I assume you have a year's contract with so many hours you pay for, plus stand-by, plus additional hours. Is that how it is done, or could you give me the formula used for a leased airplane?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the one aircraft the department leases in the Hudson

Bay region, \$37,000 is the total cost per year for the contract for the lease.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is the minister willing to give us — I assume the lease has X number of hours of flying time and another price for all hours over that.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we will be happy to supply that. We do not have it handy, but in terms of the hours we believe it is approximately 500 hours as the lease arrangement.

MR. KATZMAN: — Does that include pilot and everything, or are you supplying your own pilot?

MR. GROSS: — We are supplying our own pilot. That just supplies the airplane with no fuel.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you lease aircraft as well from DNS?

MR. GROSS: — Yes, we do. We lease some aircraft through the DNS contract. They make aircraft available to us on request and requirement. It is on a one-by-one basis. We do not have a total figure. If you are looking for a total figure, it is not quite handy at this time.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if I am correct, you are going to give us the cost of airplanes by division of your department, by CVA. You will also give it to us from the aircraft from DNS, the leased aircraft, and additional aircraft and how you break them out. In other words, the concern is, how much of it is for forest fire prevention or something? How much is it for catching hunters who are using skidoos and so forth? And the different areas you are using aircraft in?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to supply that information. It will take a little time to put it together, but we will have it over to the member.

MR. GARNER: — Okay, Mr. Minister, we will move away from the airplanes. I guess we will have to get the rest of the information from central vehicle.

Now, I would like to go to some of the downhill ski areas in the province. What facilities and how many does the government own?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we have three areas in the province for downhill skiing — Cypress Hills, Blackstrap and White Track.

MR. GARNER: — What improvements were made on these existing facilities last year?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, there is an extension to the lift at Cypress Hills. At Blackstrap we provided some new equipment in terms of snow grooming. At White Track we have some new lighting.

MR. GARNER: — Are you planning on doing any expansion to these areas this upcoming year?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only planned future expansion in terms of a ski hill for next year will be at Blackstrap. There will be improvements to the slope; there will also be some improvements to the equipment available at Blackstrap, in terms of a

April 14, 1980

snow groomer and an ice tiller they are currently short of.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, we all know the city of Saskatoon built a little mountain called Blackstrap. Does the city of Saskatoon or the R.M.s in the area supply any financial assistance or road construction or anything toward that park?

MR. GROSS: — No, they don't.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, in the past two years did the government sell any of these downhill ski facilities they owned?

MR. GROSS: — No, we didn't.

MR. GARNER: — How many private operators run downhill ski operations in the province?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of private ownership of downhill ski hills, there are two private owners — Hidden Valley and Mission Ridge. Last Oak is a private corporation. I think you asked, did we sell any? No we didn't.

MR. GARNER: — Has the government given these private operators any assistance in the form of grants, etc.?

MR. GROSS: — No we haven't. The only involvement would be loaning through SEDCO, and maybe a number of them have taken advantage of that. I am not aware of it.

MR. GARNER: — You're not aware of any of them getting grants or assistance. Have any of them approached you for any grants or assistance?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only one which has approached us for assistance, I understand, is Mission Ridge, and they were directed to SEDCO. We don't know what has happened since then.

MR. GARNER: — Maybe you have answered this already, Mr. Minister. What improvements have you made at Cypress Hills Provincial Park ski facility in the past year? Are you planning any expansion there this year? I know what you said about Blackstrap, but are you planning any expansion in Cypress this year? The reason I ask is because it was brought to my attention that there is getting to be a great line-up at the lifts and some of these people are getting tired of waiting to ski and they're going south of the border. It would be nice if we could keep these people skiing in Saskatchewan.

MR. GROSS: — It would be very nice if we could keep everybody skiing at all times. One problem we have is that Cypress Hills has a very limited slope. The expansion which would be required just isn't there at the present time. There is a problem of line-ups. We recognize that fact. There is also a problem of line-ups at Sunshine, where there is probably one of the best slopes in Canada. So it's nothing uncommon in terms of the skiing business.

MR. GARNER: — Oh, I can argue with you on that one, Mr. Minister, because I have skied Sunshine and there aren't the line-ups there we have in Saskatchewan. Anyway that's Alberta. We'll let Alberta and their heritage fund take care of themselves. We'll worry about Saskatchewan.

In other words, Mr. Minister, you're saying the only improvement you're going to make this coming year will be at Blackstrap?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, to respond to the question — yes, the only planned expenditure at this present time in terms of skiing will be at Blackstrap. We've mentioned the new equipment that's going in and the slope improvement that will take place at Blackstrap. Other than that, that will be it for this year.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Minister, on the other ski resort at Duck Mountain Provincial Park, I noticed there was an announcement in the Kamsack Times on March 20 about the Lieutenant-Governor opening the new ski facilities. The announcement included congratulations to the many contributors in the financial end of the development, including the provincial government, the R.M. of Cote, the town of Kamsack and the village of Veregin. This development in particular is going to be a massive boon for that area of the province. It was certainly needed and will increase the year-round use of this park. Would the minister advise the House when tenders were called for the development work? How many tenders were received and who was the successful bidder?

MR. GROSS: — Duck Mountain is not a provincial park. It's a regional park. If you want to scrutinize the operation you would have to ask the regional park as to who tendered, when they tendered and that kind of information. But Duck Mountain is a regional park, not a provincial park.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, don't you handle regional parks any more? How about that! You mean I can't go any further with you on this question? Whom do I ask this question, then?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member would be better if he would put the question to the regional park board. They are the people who are entrusted with the funds in regard to the regional park. It's called local autonomy.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, could you tell me how much money the provincial government has put into that Duck Mountain Park or Duck Mountain ski resort?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of the five-year agreement that was signed with the regional park board, \$82,000 has been expended in total and \$80,000 to go within the five-year agreement.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Minister, the estimates under the heritage fund indicated an expenditure of \$2,364,000 as compared to \$465,000 last year out of the provincial development expenditure. I note there is a \$2 million expenditure on parks facilities development and yet when I turn to tourism and renewable resources on capital expenditures, you had recreational facilities for \$1 million and that's a capital expenditure; I presume the other one is as well. Why the segregation of those two accounts? Why not include the amount shown under parks in the heritage fund account in the consolidated fund? Why are you segregating that from the consolidated fund?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, they are set apart because the \$2 million that you see in the provincial development expenditure account is \$2 million from the heritage fund. It's \$2 million in addition to the present capital that is within the department and it's money that is being transferred from the heritage fund into the park program.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, may I say I am very surprised to get that answer tonight. What the minister has just told us is that in fact the consolidated fund should include that amount of money, the total being almost \$52 million of expenditures which really belong in the consolidated fund. Now, that's the answer which we got tonight from the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. In other words, what this government has attempted to do here is to deceive the taxpayers of this province into believing that they have a balanced budget and to believe the expenditures were in fact \$52 million less than actual consolidated fund expenditures.

MR. GROSS: — The member is very mixed up. If you look in the capital expenditures, the ordinary capital expenditures, the \$2.704 million is ongoing capital that is in the department and it's capital that accrues to the department every year. The \$2 million that he is looking at in the back where the provincial government expenditures are, is new money, new money which is going to go into the parks system from the heritage fund and that \$2 million is from the provincial development expenditure account.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, that is nothing but an excuse because if you look under tourism and renewable resources in the provincial development expenditure under the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park development, that is also an ongoing expenditure, capital expenditure, so what's the difference between that and the capital expenditures you have under tourism and renewable resources?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member makes mention of Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. The Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park is a special project from the heritage fund. It's being directed from the heritage fund to the Moose Jaw Wild Animal park. It's a separate project, a special project going directly from the heritage fund to the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. It has been a staged development. It obviously hasn't happened over night so it wasn't a one-shot transfer. It is an ongoing transfer for a number of years until the project is completed at Moose Jaw.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Then the same thing could apply to other areas, for example, the implementation of the Qu'Appelle agreement. Where is that \$2 million being spent on a park facilities development?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the \$2 million that the member asks about is right now in planning. It is thought the majority of the \$2 million will go toward accommodation within our provincial park system. We have a serious problem in accommodation we should be addressing. We are addressing this \$2 million to accommodation. Your next question is obviously, where is it going to go? That has not yet been determined. It's under planning. There are a number of areas being looked at. It's all in the planning process. In a matter of a month or two or three we should have a little bit better understanding as to what we are going to do with the \$2 million.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I have never heard such inconsistencies in my life. A minute ago you said it's a one-time expenditure under the heritage fund of the planning development expenditures. Now you are saying it's planning; it's for something you may be doing. The same thing will apply next year. It will be further planning. It will be further planning every year. So, in other words, it's ongoing planning as you so aptly put it. All you are telling me is the money being spent under the heritage fund expenditures is nothing more than could be put into the consolidated fund only the Minister of Finance wanted to have a balanced budget. That is not the case you are telling me at all.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member is mistaken. The \$2 million provincial development expenditure is going to be for capital dollars for accommodation. When I say it's in planning, it means the department is planning the allocation of where it is going to go. It does not come out of the \$2 million allocated for a special project that has not yet been identified. When I say it's in planning, it's in the internal planning of the department.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What area? What place?

MR. GROSS: — Well, that hasn't been determined yet. We do not know yet. It's just a matter of time before we have the results back and the department's recommendations and views on where we should put it. It's going to go into the area of accommodation. We are sure of that. That's where we want to spend it. We'll be notified within probably one month or two months, maybe two and one-half months on the outside, as to what we want to do with the \$2 million. None of it is for planning. The planning dollars are within the department right now. They are there. They are constant. They are in the department. The department is planning the expenditure of the \$2 million.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You talked about being mistaken or confused, Mr. Minister. I suggest to you that you are very confused. Two million dollars you said is going for accommodations. Is that \$2 million going to be spent this year? If it is, what kind of accommodations are you talking about — motels, hotels or just accommodations in a park or whatever. It requires planning and knowing where you are going to spend it. If you are not going to be spending it this year then why is it in the estimates?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the money is for accommodation, maybe for a capital facility. You are asking where or what kind of facility? Would it be motels, cabins, what have you? That has not been determined. It will be determined very shortly where we can best put the money to do us the most good. I see nothing wrong with spending money out of the heritage fund on very important expenditures as such. I note members opposite brag fairly openly and out front about Alberta spending money from the heritage fund on their park programs. This is exactly what has happened here in Saskatchewan. I don't see anything wrong with it. I don't see where anybody is being misled. I don't see where anybody is incorrect or don't know what they are talking about because it's money coming from the heritage fund for accommodation. That's the name of the game. That's where it's going.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, if I might direct one question to the Minister of Tourism. Mr. Minister, I would suggest, and I would ask if you would not agree, that it is highly inappropriate for a minister and a department to allocate funds in an estimate as you have done and not know what they are going to be used for. I mean, how can you consider that to be fair management, as a minister responsible for your department, by budgeting for a certain amount of money, yet having no idea what you're going to use it for at this time.

MR. GROSS: — We do know what we're going to spend the money for. We've identified the area we feel is a problem within the provincial parks system. The area is obviously accommodation. We have problems having enough cabins and facilities to be able to reserve for people who want to come in to use the parks, use the facilities within the parks. The area we're planning to spend the money on is in accommodation.

The member for Regina South or the member for Wilkie (I forget who it was) asked if we

could identify where we're going to spend it —with some precision, what is the park and what exact project it's going to be. That has been in the planning now for several months. We're waiting for a report of the department officials in terms of the planning people within the department. That's what they're there for. That's what we're paying them for — to do the proper planning to make sure that we're spending our money wisely, that we're putting it in the right place. We've identified the area as accommodation; that is where the money will be spent. We have identified in a responsible manner and in a responsible fashion where that money will go. The exact location, what park, what building, we don't have but we'll have it very shortly and when we do it will be announced in due course.

MR. TAYLOR: — Surely, Mr. Minister, if you have planned and you have budgeted as my colleague says for \$2 million and you've told us it's for accommodation, I think 12 times —knowing you need this money and you must know where your needs are, what type of accommodation? Are you looking at cabins? Are you getting into the motel business? Are we going to have provincial hotels? Surely you can come forward and tell us. If you have the money, you know where the need is. You're in charge of the parks; you know where you haven't got the accommodations so don't just stand here and tell me it's accommodation. Let's get a little more specific and find out what kind of accommodations, how many, and where they're going to be.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know exactly where it is. I explained earlier why we cannot give the exact information where it will be but if you want more precise information I can say that it's going to be in our destination parks, where we have the greatest demand on our system. Destination parks are Cypress, Greenwater, Moose Mountain, and Meadow Lake. They are our classy parks, the best ones we have, the biggest ones.

What type of accommodation? That's what we're waiting for from our planners. Our planners are going to be recommending to us all the options open. They will obviously be making reference to all of them and they'll finally come down with a solid recommendation on one of them. That could be cabins and that could be motels. I don't know what it could be in total but there's a whole range of options that you could look at and I would expect that within a month or two when we get the report handed down to us, it will be a conscientious report looking at where we can spend our money most effectively and most wisely and they will recommend the type of accommodation it will be. But as I say and I want to reiterate again, it's accommodation and it will be going to our destination parks: the four most important parks in the province.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm aghast at the reply you're giving us. You submit a budget to the treasury or the cabinet but you have no idea of the exact or the approximate amounts of money you're going to spend. You don't know because you haven't anything planned. You haven't any designs; you haven't any blueprints; you haven't anything. Do you just go to them and say well, I'll take \$2 million this year and we'll spread it around the province? Is that the way you budget for your department? Do you not come forward with certain specific planning of the areas that you mentioned? I believe you mentioned four of them. How do you know you don't need \$10 million? Why are you settling on \$2 million? How do you know you don't need \$500,000 in total? Why \$2 million? How do you arrive at a figure of \$2 million, that you come to the cabinet and say, I want \$2 million for this reason and I can't tell you why I want it. Now, that, Mr. Minister, makes absolutely no sense in fiscal responsibility.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know why we picked the figure \$2 million. It was not a figure which was arrived at out of the sky; it is a figure the department feels comfortable with in terms of being able to deliver. It feels it can deliver a program of \$2 million in terms of the estimated cost of providing accommodation within our parks. That is the reason we picked \$2 million. Obviously, it is limitless in terms of the volume of dollars which would be required if you wanted to go into a major expansion. This is a start and we feel that is adequate for our needs for the upcoming year. It is money we feel we can budget; it is money that we feel can deliver a project and make available to the people of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I may suggest to the minister, you are not very smart. Why didn't you ask for \$20 million? Why didn't you ask for \$100 million? What difference would it make? You have no idea, no clue, no conception of what you are going to do with this money. You are just coming to cabinet and saying, I want \$2 million. I am going to spend it here, there and all over the place, and you have no idea at all of how you are going to do it, or where you are going to place it. That you call fiscal responsibility! Let me try it a different way.

Where exactly are you going to spend the money, the \$1,463,000, on recreational facilities under the capital expenditures?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it has been a tradition of the department and a tradition in the estimates of the department that we, at the end of the estimates, hand out a list to all members of all the capital facilities which are being planned for the year. The money that will be allocated, the \$1.4 million, is allocated out of ordinary capital and will be handed to all members. You will have an opportunity at that time to look at where and what exact projects are going to take off this year.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — If that is tradition, Mr. Minister, then why won't you give us the same thing for the \$2 million?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman it is quite simple. We are still in the planning stages of the project. The needs have all been identified. We are not putting together a package which makes sense, so we can spend out money most effectively and most efficiently. When that study is complete, it will be announced in due course and the people of Saskatchewan will be made aware where the \$2 million is going to be spent.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, if I could just direct another question to the minister responsible for tourism.

Mr. Minister, I shouldn't have to explain to you what estimates are for but, firstly, estimates are proposed expenditures by the government of the day for specific items. And it is supposedly the role of the opposition to approve those expenditures for those named, particular items which you want to spend money on as a government, as a department.

Now, what you have done here is said, well we want to put \$2 million away in this little corner here and we will identify it for accommodation — which could be a motel, it could be cabins, it could be a row of tents for all I know. You haven't given us any idea at all, whatsoever, as to what kind of accommodation it might be. So you have \$2 million, and all you are telling us is that it is for accommodation. We have learned that much and we have learned it is going into four major parks in the province. You have identified those four parks. Okay? Now if you know it is going into those four parks, you must have

some idea as to what the needs are, or what type of accommodation it is going to be.

The other point I want to make is that surely you should have a report in to your office before you draw up an estimate for your department so you can go to treasury and say, this is how much money we need for accommodation. We need this much for cabins; we need this much for motels and we need this much for campgrounds, and identify that so treasury knows you are making a fair request on the taxpayers' purse strings. Surely, Mr. Minister, that makes sense; so two points there. Now, since you have identified the four major parks this \$2 million is going to go into, do you have at this point a breakdown as to where that money is going in those four corners? Now, for instance, Moose Mountain Provincial Park — are we going to get half of it down there, or three-quarters of it or 10 per cent of it or what percentage? Can you give me the percentage each area which you've named tonight is going to get? Can you do that and answer the other questions I have raised and I think fair arguments that I have made?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in regard to setting out or specifying what we're going to spend the money on, for the benefit of the member opposite if he wasn't paying attention or listening, we have identified the area. The area is accommodation; it is an important area within our provincial park system to recognize as being a problem area. We have recognized that as being a problem area; we have identified accommodation; we are now saying we have four areas within the province where we have the most pressure on our system — that is in our destination points. Those destination points, as I mentioned, are Cypress, Moose Mountain and so on. What we identified in the process is that accommodation is the problem. The money will be allocated for accommodation, whether the project will be one project in one park or whether the project will be four projects in four parks; that's what we have planners for and that is what they are getting paid for.

They will be making a recommendation to us very shortly, saying because of the construction, we recommend this type of unit in this park, or these other parks, or whatever it may be, or they may be recommending one unit in one park. They will be looking at the cost-benefit ratio of the projects and when they have finished their analysis and their study, we will get the report and at that point we will make a decision and an announcement will be forthcoming. For the benefit of the members opposite (and I stress again) the decision has been made that our area of concerns within the provincial park system is accommodation. We have people now in the planning stage of putting together a proposal. We will spend the \$2 million that has been allocated to us from the provincial development expenditures for a very worthy project, namely accommodation in the provincial park system.

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K., Mr. Chairman, can I just ask a fairly straight forward question? Do you have any indications at all from this report as to whether or not any of the \$2 million will be used to build motels or hotels?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, again, for about the tenth time, all the options are being studied whether it's motels, whether it's cabins, whether it's hotels, whatever it may be I'm sure the planners and engineers studying the project will be looking at all the cost-benefit of all the types of construction which are available. They will be recommending to us whether we should be having several projects or just one project, given the amount of money we're spending. When we get their report as to what is the best option for us, where we can spend our money most effectively, we will make the decision in due course and it will be announced accordingly. That is all we can say. It is in the planning; it is very close to completion; it has been in the planning for several months

before this so the planning is now almost completed; it is on its way. When it's complete we'll announce it accordingly.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we are talking about \$2 million here. I'm the first one to admit that these parks do need this, but I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Minister, we're talking about spending \$2 million. Until I get a little more specific information — I don't care how many planners, how many officials you've got on it — we're going to be here until the snowballs come again unless we get a little more specific information on where \$2 million . . . Mr. Minister, until we find out where the \$2 million from this heritage fund is going to be spent . . . now its entirely up to you, Mr. Minister, I mean . . . as I say I'm the first to admit we need expansion in these parks, but I want a little more specific detail. You tell us one time it could be in the four. You could be spending \$2 million in one park. Is it going to be for hotels? Is it going to be for cabins, or tents, or whatever? Let's be a little more specific with this \$2 million. It's a lot of money, Mr. Minister.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I note the members are very concerned about this issue, but I would like to point out to them that back in the days when Moose Jaw Wild Animal park was being designed the same process was followed. I don't know if there were objections at that time, but the process laid out and identified in terms of the needs of Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park is the same as we're doing with this one. We identified the need to upgrade the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park; the money was appropriated out of the heritage fund, X number of dollars it was felt by the department could get them off and running; the planning and studies took place thereafter; tenders were let and the plans were set and accordingly the project was allocated. There's nothing different in the way we're doing this project from the way we did the one at Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, so I do not know why we're so concerned at this point. I think it's been a fairly successful project as I'm sure this one will be.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I don't know what happened in the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. I can guess. But, Mr. Minister, here we have \$2 million. I think you're the first one to agree it's a sizable figure. I stated earlier in our estimates that the disbursements are going up at this record level and the receipts are going down. I'm quite willing to pass these estimates, because as I stated before it's a good thing; these parks need it. But I would like to know a little more about the specifics. You can talk about a planning board bringing this in. Well, it could be a month; it could be two months; it could be three months.

Then again, why only ask for the \$2 million? You might need \$6 million. How can you make the evaluation beforehand that you're only going to need \$2 million. You might need \$8 million for this expansion in these different parks. This is what I'm trying to get at. I'm not trying to stall our estimates or anything else. Just be a little more specific as to whether it will be hotels. Will it be hotels?

MR. GROSS: — I cannot say whether it's to be hotels, motels, cabins, you name it. We will be able to say that when we have the design in and a recommendation made as to which would be the best way to go.

The other point the member makes is in terms of the funds, the \$2 million. That money is frozen in the heritage fund until such time we produce the plans. When we produce the plans and identify the precise objects, the precise design (what it will look like, what complex is recommended to us as a department to follow), then we will proceed and the

allocation from the heritage fund accordingly will be made. That is the route, and there's nothing new or sneaky or something going on here. It's quite a normal procedure when allocating the funds out of the heritage fund for such a project. So that's the route we're following. There's nothing wrong with it that I feel is causing anybody such great concern. It's straightforward and direct.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I'm not saying it's sneaky. Don't get that interpretation. All I'm saying is that you can have these studies, but why wasn't this study done beforehand, before you budget for this? My point before, which is well taken, was that you're asking for \$2 million. Whether it's frozen in the heritage fund or not, the \$2 million might not be enough. What, Mr. Minister, are you going to do if the \$2 million isn't enough for these plans? Will you just build half a hotel, then wait for next year for another \$2 million? You can see my concern, Mr. Minister, that you can't give this House any guarantee the \$2 million will be enough. And you can't tell this House what it's going to be for. That's my concern.

MR. GROSS: — I think it's the knowledge of everybody that the department has to budget annually, and annually we will be budgeting. If it is felt the following year we need more by way of accommodation and it's felt in the interest of the government that we want to proceed with more accommodation, I'm sure the government will want to proceed with more accommodation. If the project we get under way and off and running is a success story, which I'm sure it will be, and the need is there and identified as being clearly there for more accommodation, I'm sure the government will want to consider it. The government of the day will no doubt recommend we continue with expansion in that area and that will be the normal procedure. It's done and followed quite normally by government. I see nothing wrong with it. The \$2 million fund we have established for this expenditure, I think is a good one. It's a start. It's been identified by people who've been planning our system for quite some time, as a good start. It will get us off and running in a very important area within the park system.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Just a quick question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, since you have set \$2 million aside for accommodation, it follows then you must have done some studies that would indicate you're going to require \$2 million for accommodation. So I suppose the obvious question, the, is what increase in park attendance have you anticipated as a result of those studies I am assuming you have completed? You must have done an evaluation study to ascertain what the increased park attendance would be. Since, of course, gasoline prices are lower here in Canada, we expect more people to stay home in Saskatchewan to have their holidays. We expect a lot of Americans coming in. I would expect, Mr. Minister, that in particular Moose Mountain Provincial Park, accommodations there, being so close to the American border, are going to be just at a premium all year long. Now that must have been, surely, one of the first parks you went in and did an evaluation study. Now, maybe you haven't got them done on all of them but you must have one on Moose Mountain Provincial Park, being so close to the American border. We have a lot of Americans coming up there as it is. That difference right now in the gasoline prices alone is just going to bring a lot of people into that park. I understand at peak season it's the third largest place in the province of Saskatchewan. Now it could well be the largest place in the province of Saskatchewan. I can't imagine \$2 million doing enough to offset that increased accommodation if you put three-quarters of that money into Moose Mountain Provincial Park.

That's why we're asking questions in this particular line. I think it's very important to ascertain where approximately you're going to put that money. Since we can't get that information out of you or we haven't been able to at this point, the obvious question

then is what evaluation studies have you done? Can you give us any indication whatsoever in that regard?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we've had for some time within the department an internal task force that has studied the present needs of the provincial park system, studied the projected needs of the provincial park system, and has put together, I think, a fairly accurate and detailed analysis of what our current needs are in every park we have in the province. That data we have internally. Based on the data we have internally in terms of our projected and our present needs within the park system, we feel this project is of necessity of high priority. Therefore we have recommended government proceed with such a program. We don't advocate at this time it's the end-all, that it's going to solve all our accommodation problems in the entire provincial park system. I don't think anybody advocates that. But it's a start and an important start in redirecting our park system. So we feel it's a good start. It's off and it's running. It's based on our own present needs within our provincial park system. We feel very confident that whatever the project will turn out to be in terms of what the final recommendations come back to us as we will have a great use for such a project.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, first of all, we don't disagree with you that it's a worthwhile project or whatever term you used a few minutes ago. What I can't understand, you indicated this amount was frozen in the heritage fund. We are asked in this Assembly to approve estimates for the year; they're called expenditures for the year 1980-81. Now unless I sadly misunderstand, what you're trying to tell us when you say frozen is that it could be spent next year. If that's the case, what are they doing in this year's estimates? Why don't you ask for that amount next year?

Secondly, you've indicated to us you have these plans near completion. They are near completion, ready to proceed with the project. Then why will you not tell us exactly where you're going to spend it, how much you're going to spend on that particular project this year and what kind (when you say accommodation) of accommodation? Why are you so reluctant to inform the members of the Assembly? You're asking elected members of the legislature to approve an estimate blindly, without telling us why. I can't buy that and I don't think the members of the opposition will buy it, until you tell us specifically, why, where, how and when you're going to spend it. If it's not going to be this year, then what is it doing in this estimate?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, as the member will know, the money from the provincial development expenditures is in the heritage fund. The line departments have been allocated money. We have been advised we are able to go ahead and plan a project of that scale and magnitude. The department is right now, and has been for some time, in the process of developing these plans, of looking at all the cost-benefit options available to us and trying to make a solid, concrete, and efficient recommendation as to what would be best for the government to go ahead with. When that recommendation comes forward, obviously we'll make our plans and recommendations from the heritage fund. And that's the route. I don't see anything so terrible about that. You have to plan the projects. It's not a stab-in-the-dark operation. We are very carefully analyzing and assessing what is the best proposal for the \$2 million, where we can get the most effect for our dollars. That's what's going on. As I said earlier, I'll make the information available to the members opposite when the studies are complete, which should be very shortly. We'll make them available. It will be announced in due course. I don't see

anything wrong with that. I think it's a very straight forward, normal practice, and we'll be doing that accordingly. It will be made known to members what the project is when the studies are complete.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the minister hasn't answered my question. I asked you why you were reluctant to tell us exactly when, where, how and so on. You haven't answered that. I won't dwell on the question. This is my final one. I'm going to get off it, because obviously I'm not going to get anywhere with you. I still can't believe you'd have an amount of \$2 million in that area in the heritage fund as an expenditure, which is what it is — capitalized or not — because you have capital projects under the consolidated fund. What it tells me or what it will tell the people of this province is that it's just a blatant attempt by the government to mislead them into believing what the consolidated fund, what the expenditures and the taxpayers of this province are in fact really paying for. Putting it in that area is nothing but a deception.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I hope the member doesn't feel we planned a deception here because we didn't. It's a very conscious decision made by the government to put new capital dollars into our parks system. It's a very well developed idea, because of our needs, and I have identified those needs as accommodation . . . and I have identified the areas in general where that accommodation is most critically needed. When the plans and studies are complete, the proposal will be made public and everybody will have an opportunity at that time to know with some precision what it is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we're not asking anybody to vote blindly. I think everybody is aware of what it's for. I think members opposite will appreciate that we have a tremendous need in our system for this type of improvement. I think members should be very happy to see us going ahead with such a project. We will be announcing, as I said earlier, in due course, exactly where and what it would look like.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you one quick question. You now have a motel at Moose Mountain Provincial Park. Are you going to add to that motel to construct a new one this summer at Moose Mountain Provincial Park?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we have the chalet. It's a very beautiful building down at Moose Mountain Provincial Park. Is it the motel? Are you talking about the motel? The one on the hill? O.K. No, there are no plans right now to reconstruct the motel in Moose Mountain Park for this year at the present time, or extend the other one.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, we're talking about hotels. At Pike Lake Provincial Park there are no rental accommodations other than private places. Is there anything being considered by your department?

MR. GROSS: — The answer to your question is no.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if a private individual was attempting to get permission from the Government of Saskatchewan and running into all kinds of problems with municipal affairs, would you help him get through the red tape with your department to assist the building of a motel or hotel type of establishment at the fringe of Pike Lake Park, which would help the park in attracting more people?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's been no great secret that the department is always very willing to assist anybody who wants to improve the recreational opportunities in the province. If there's such an individual interested in doing that, I think if he would make his plans known to the department, maybe we could get together

and see what his proposal is and maybe we could help him in this regard. But I am not aware of what the member is talking about, I don't know what the proposal is and if he could forward one to us or advise we would be happy to take a look at it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, for almost a year and a half the municipal department has given the run-around to a young lad by the name of Mr. Pippin at Pike Lake. You will find his proposal has been approved by the council of Pike Lake, by the R.M. of Vanscoy and he has his financing and everything ready. It was for a skidoo complex for trails and so forth in the winter, ski trails in the winter, a motel-hotel complex with many other features. Unfortunately the government of Saskatchewan has thrown all kinds of problems at him. Yet, at the same time, one application by the potash corporation asking permission to change something was immediately approved. I am asking you to contact the Pippin family and see if you can assist in getting through some of the red tape.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think if the member wants to be of assistance to one of his constituents he should be directing his question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, rural or urban, whichever one it may pertain to, and get his answers there. I can't speak for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Pippin proposal you are talking about hasn't surfaced in our area. If he wanted to make his constituents known, maybe our planners could assist him in whatever he may need. I would be happy to do that. But until we see what it is that he's proposing, we really can't comment any further.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that private enterprisers have tried to do something and have run into trouble from other departments. As you are suggesting, I will give him your name and all the information will be forwarded to you, and hopefully you can do something where I can't seem to get past the red tape.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we will do what we can. If he wants to forward the name of the constituent and if he has a good legitimate proposal, we'll see what we can do and if we can be of assistance, fair game.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I'd like to move along now to page 32 of your annual report where it states — the recreational potential of lands offered for sale is also investigated. Will you please explain to me what you mean by this in your annual report? It's down under research and evaluation on page 32, bottom of item 1, the recreational potential of lands offered for sale was also investigated. Investigated by whom?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if I read the last line correctly, what it is saying is that if there is a major portion of land somewhere in the province that has good aesthetic value and has some recreational potential (we very actively pursue those requests when they come forward), our people go out and follow it up. If there is some potential in the area we make note of it. If it has real potential and interest, we'll make an offer to purchase it for recreational purposes. That's basically what the sentence says.

MR. GARNER: — In that same sentence it says lands offered for sale. Have you bid or tendered on any land anywhere in the province regarding this?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, all the parcels we have bid on in terms of land that could be used for recreational potential is a substantial list and we would have to take some time to dig it up. We would be happy to provide you with a list of every quarter section that we've been involved in.

April 14, 1980

MR. GARNER: — Just so long as I can have a copy of the lands you bid or tendered on and by whom they are owned. I don't expect you to have that information here but if you would send it to me.

How much money was spent on advertising by your department in Saskatchewan?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member would have to be more specific in what kind of advertising he may want. Is it circulars? Brochures? The whole package? O.K., we'll have it for you in a second.

MR. GARNER: — The money I asked for was advertising by your department spent in Saskatchewan. How much money was spent in other provinces? Also, in radio, TV, newspaper ads, and the same question pretty well, while they're doing that, outside of Canada too. I would like to know the total advertising package but I would like it separate for the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of the numbers the member is looking for in-province the total (that's all advertising inclusive) is \$95,000 (if we're understanding your question correctly). Out of province advertising has been handled by the Celebrate Saskatchewan people for the tourism promotion outside the province because of the 75th celebrations to invite everybody home. So that's really been covered by Celebrate Saskatchewan in regard to out of province and out of country.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., out of province then and does that include out of Canada as well? Are they handling that out of Canada as well?

MR. GROSS: — That's correct.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Minister, I believe you identified the Meadow Lake Park as one of what you call the destination parks. I think Cypress Hills was another of those. I notice in perusing the list on page 44, the visitors in the last three years at the Meadow Lake Park have been going down in terms of the number in the park. Certainly it's identified I think by all officials in that district and in your department as one of the best parks in the province. Is there anything in your internal study to determine just what would be the reason for that? Why do you believe it's going down?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised there's no way we can calculate with any precision why the numbers are going down. But one guess at reasons why numbers have gone down in Meadow Lake for example is that weather conditions of the last year or two have been factors in regard to gate openings and good weather year-round. Park year-round seasons have been a contributing factor. It's one factor. The other factor is we lack good accommodation in Meadow Lake. It's one of the areas identified as an accommodation problem. We've had to phase out some of our accommodation because of it being old and out-of-date. So that could be another reason, not the total reason by any means. It's believed that weather was a serious contributor to the downfall in population in Meadow Lake. That's the reason we contribute right now.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, Mr. Minister, I was glad to see that you had a smile on your face when you were saying that. Certainly the weather conditions there were no different than in other parts of the province at that time. In fact, the weather has been fairly good in the last year or so but across the province there was over 9 per cent increase in usage of provincial parks and yet a major park like that, the usage is going down. Would you

not agree (well, I would like to hear you deny) the reason for the lack of use of that park is the road conditions, the highway conditions going into the Meadow Lake Park. What have your officials to say about that aspect?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, that no doubt is a factor and I'm sure the Minister of Highways is trying to remedy that problem right now. But it was just pointed out to me that if you look over the years from 1972 to 1978 in terms of Meadow Lake Provincial Park, it's a very fluctuating table in terms of visitations; that it's up and down every year. It's either up or it's down. It's not like the other parks where it's more static. My deputy just pointed out to me the last year figures are available. We had a situation of cold and snow on the date of the park opening. In fact, there was actually snow and that definitely deterred quite a few visitors from the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. Because of snow and cold, a good week, I think it is safe to say over a week was lost in terms of what would be normal visitation for the park. Apparently that is very common at the Meadow Lake Provincial Park because of its location.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — One more question, Mr. Minister, you were in the park last year on a tour, I believe. I think you were quoted in the Grande Centre newspaper, on the Alberta side of the border, regarding the potential for development in the west end of the park, Pierce Lake, Lac des Isles, that area and other parts of the lake. What is your position now? Can you give your position now about the possibility of upgrading or expanding the facilities in the west end of the park with this extra pressure from the Alberta side of the border?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say we have been following the master plan that has been developed for the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. An area identified in the study is that the Lac des Isles area is an important key area to the park with great future potential. There is no doubt about it. I think anybody who has travelled that area, as you have done, can identify it as being a very beautiful spot in the province and a very important spot and study is currently under way as to how we can improve it. It is definitely in the planning because of its recreational potential.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I am sure, Mr. Minister, you will also be cognizant of the fact when the master plan was developed and the public hearings and that process went on (I am not sure of the year but I remember very well when it took place) there was no proposal on the Alberta side for the large population increase proposed for now. We are talking about 8,000 jobs which you can translate into a population increase of about 25,000 people on that side. Certainly there will be a great deal of pressure on that side and, hopefully, you will be planning some other expansion either in the park or expanding the park to accommodate that.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it is a serious concern to the department. The department is very aware of the extra pressure put on that area because of the oil situation. There will no doubt be great pressure in the area and recreational —so will definitely unfold. It is part of the master plan. It is well into gear and planning is going on accordingly.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, you indicated to the member for Meadow Lake that perhaps the drop in park attendance in his area was due to adverse weather conditions. To what would you attribute the drop in attendance in Cypress Hills, another very popular area in the province? We had a drop of approximately 30,000 from 1977 to 1978. You indicated to the member for Meadow Lake that perhaps highway conditions do play a role. If you feel this is the reason for the drop in the attendance in Cypress Hills

Provincial Park, have you put any pressure on the Minister of Highways to upgrade Highway No. 21, say from south of the border right straight north?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't agree with the assumption made by the member for maple creek that the highway is a major problem for the reduction in park attendance. I don't think it is a fair comment to say that is the reason why park attendance in the year 1977 to 1978 went down 30,000. The year before that they were higher and they were down the year after that and they were up the year after that. The preceding two years they were up every year. So, it is sort of all over the ball park in terms of the numbers.

I don't think the road is a major contributing factor in Cypress Hills. I think the travelling public has identified Cypress Hills Provincial Park as a very beautiful spot. It is one of the nicest spots in the province and, accordingly, they come if they have any intentions on having any recreation in that area. I don't think the highway is a major stumbling block to that. No doubt the Minister of Highways will be making considerations in the years ahead if reconstruction is necessary. We don't feel, as a department, it is a major stumbling block. At least there have been no blockages on the road which have been attributed to weather, whether it is rain or snow or mud or what have you; it has always been open and available to the people. I have travelled the road many times myself and it is not all that bad. I don't think it is a stumbling block to the members.

MRS. DUNCAN: — It is interesting to see that the biggest drops in park attendance occurred in all of the parks on the west side of the province. If highways aren't a contributing factor, and perhaps the weather isn't do you think part of the reason would be that a lot of Saskatchewan people are travelling to Alberta where gas is cheaper and there is no education tax?

MR. GROSS: — No.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Did your department let the contract for the new cafeteria constructed in Cypress Park? Does that come under your department?

MR. GROSS: — No, we haven't. And yes, it does come under our department.

MRS. DUNCAN: — It comes under your department but you didn't tender . . .

MR. GROSS: — We do tender but it just hasn't happened yet. It is in the process but it hasn't happened at this time. I'm advised that it will be tendered within two or three weeks. It will be out and available to the public.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I think you misunderstand me. Did your department tender the contract for the construction of the cafeteria?

MR. GROSS: — Sorry. I was under the impression that you were wondering about the service contract inside the cafeteria. No, we didn't contract the cafeteria. Government services contracted the cafeteria.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Let's get back to your tendering of services. The park is scheduled to open within a month, I would imagine, and you are saying you haven't tendered contracts. It is just for Cypress Hills or is it for other services in other parks also?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, a number of contracts are out. There are 33 contracts

for the whole park system. A good percentage of them have not yet been tendered. They are all within a week or two of being tendered and a good number have been tendered so it is just a matter of time before they are all complete. A week or two weeks should see the completion of all the tendering of all services within the park system.

MRS. DUNCAN: — How many are completed to date?

MR. GROSS: — We don't have the exact number with us. We can provide the information to the member opposite if she wants it later. We do not have the total number which have been tendered because of the various negotiations they are in. Some are extensions and some are brand new tendering and so on. We don't have it; we can provide the information later.

MRS. DUNCAN: — On the brand new ones, would this be in Cypress Hills? Is this an extension or is this a brand new one? Do you always leave the tendering process so late?

MR. GROSS: — I'm advised that in the Cypress Hills situation because it will be a brand new building and because the old contract was a fast food contract and this will be a sit-down restaurant, it is a new facility, a different type of facility. And legally, I guess we are obligated to retender the whole contract. It will not be an extension of the old contract but it will be a new tender because of the fact that it is a new facility, a new outlet.

MRS. DUNCAN: — With regard to the Great Sand Hills which are situated east of Fox Valley, there is talk of a highway going through the Sand Hills. Will your department be involved in any of the tourist aspects of that?

MR. GROSS: — It is a rural municipal road. Whether we will be asked to be involved or whether we will be involved has not yet been determined. I believe there are a couple of rural municipalities out there. I forget the names of the R.M.s that are actually building the road, or proposing to build the road. I understand there has been a great amount of controversy over the situation because of the environmental nature of the Sand Hills. But we have not been involved at this point with any of the R.M.s in the promotion of the road.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I would like to go back to the topic for a minute that my colleague was mentioning. You took it a little on the facetious side. I think it's quite important. That is the drop in attendance in your parks along the western border of our province. You mentioned Meadow Lake is up and down a bit, to which I will say perhaps that's right. But looking at your figures from 1972 to 1978 for The Battlefords, it seems to be rather constant in its drop of considerable number of visitors. The same with the Cypress Hills. Now, these are all along the border of Alberta.

I heard you say something about weather conditions. We know that the weather conditions in this province are general in areas and the same weather doesn't always happen in Meadow Lake as happens in the Cypress Hills. I can't accept your answer of weather. I think more importantly, you should be addressing this and I would like to hear your answer, that the difference in gasoline prices is a major contributing factor. The people are not coming into the western part of Saskatchewan for recreation and they are not coming into the western part of Saskatchewan because of our E&H tax. I think that's another factor. We understand that a good portion of the trade in Medicine Hat comes from western Saskatchewan.

I think these are probably reasons and real reasons why the parks on the western side of this province have a decline in '77 as to '78 whereas all the other parks in Saskatchewan had an increase, especially the parks close to the cities. I see Echo Valley with the people coming out from Regina and Buffalo Pond were the ones that increased the most. I think this is something you had better be looking at. I would like to hear your reply and don't give me the weather answer because that one is not quite acceptable enough. What do your officials and their planning see for this coming year? Do you think this trend is going to continue?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the report in terms of the figures available is up to 1978 only. The new report which brings us up to 1979 will indicate just the opposite. The Battlefords Provincial Park you made mention of is down from the year '78 and that is correct. For 1979, we don't have the document I am quoting from. In 1978 it was at 255,000. It is now at 279,000. If you go to Cypress Hills, in 1978 it was 222,000. In 1979 it was 226,000, up. If you go to Meadow Lake, the one you quoted earlier: 356,000 in '78 and 300,000 in 1979. That would be the only one that has a little bit of a drop. Comparing the calendar of '78 to the calendar of '79, we find the parks have gone up on the west side. While it was true for '77-'78, it isn't true for '78-'79.

We still stand by our comment on the weather because the weather is a very important factor in visitations to parks. In the case of Meadow Lake we had a snow problem at the opening of the '78 season. We had a snow problem for a week where we hardly turned a wheel. That would obviously affect a week's worth of visitations and obviously affects the total numbers of the park. I can assure the member that '78 or '79, numbers were up in all the parks on the west side with the exception of Meadow Lake. And I may add if you ever go to Meadow Lake Provincial Park, I don't care what year it is, all you see are Alberta cars anyway. Alberta certainly isn't an attraction to the people around the Meadow Lake area. I think the member for Meadow Lake will agree to that. The Alberta people come to Saskatchewan because in Alberta they have no parks in that area.

MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for bringing those figures to our attention but the only real increase is in Battlefords. The other one, 4,000, is not that drastic and Meadow Lake is down but that's only showing part of the picture. To really look at that we would have to look at it in the perspective of what happened to all the other parks in Saskatchewan. Were they all up and where they up it a greater amount also. Then, of course, the converse to your argument of the Alberta cars being in Meadow Lake is that the western cars were over shopping in Calgary (the western Saskatchewan ones), or I suspect they were.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the facts show the west side is up in the '78-'79 calendar. I'm sure if you wanted to do a proper analysis of all the parks, you'd find all kinds of conflicting information. We make no apologies for the fact our west side traffic is dropping off, because it isn't. Our west side traffic went up in the last calendar year — and that's a fact of life, so obviously the cost of gasoline (as you indicate), or sales tax or what have you, has not been a factor in 1979.

MR. TAYLOR: — Your general increase for all your parks was 9.1 in 1978; what was it in 1979?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think this is the information the member is looking for. The number of entry permits to the parks — the number of daily entry permits issued in the province was up 46.1 per cent to 104,630 permits used by 418,520 visitors. So

there were roughly half-a-million visitors, and our permits were up 46.1 per cent.

MR. TAYLOR: — I don't know if we're on the same wave length. I'm looking at a figure here which shows your yearly increase of visitors. Going back over the years — 8.6 plus 11.6, minus 8.2, plus 9.1; what would be that figure? Is that 46 per cent?

MR. GROSS: — We got the wrong information for you. That was entry permits into the parks. Visitors you want? The information you're looking for (for the member for Moosomin) is 2.26 per cent. The figure for 1979 is 2.26 per cent.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I heard the minister allude to the fact that when he was in a park . . . I know you were in the park last year at Meadow Lake. At the time, I read some statements attributed to you that all you saw there were Alberta licence plates, and I hear you say the same kind of thing again. I mentioned a little bit about the Alberta pressure, which is anticipated because of the population that will be coming in there. I would just ask you, Mr. Minister . . . when I go to the park I see more than just the yellow licence plates. I know a great number of the people with those Alberta licence plates, because they are people I went to school with and who I know are from Saskatchewan and have just come back home for the bloody weekend.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I would like to move back a little bit to these fast-food facilities and your tendering process. I would like information with regard to the one at Saskatchewan Landing. It is a new facility and you did put out tenders; I know you had at least two people who bid on it. The concern being raised is that you're offering for lease to a private individual a government-built facility, but these people are then told they are going to have to work under SGEA rules. I just wonder how you can bring the two together, and how do you expect to operate these things so people can at least make enough profit in the short term if they have to go that route?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member is correct that a private person taking over a new facility (a government facility) is required by The Trade Union Act to hire unionized people. I think that is a straight fact of life.

MR. SWAN: — All right. The concern I am raising is that this is a very part-time occupation. At best it will open May 24 and run till Labour Day weekend. The gentleman who bid on this (at least one of them) tells me he had enough students available to operate that facility this summer, but if he has to go the union route it's not going to provide employment for the local people. It's going to provide employment then for someone who is going to have to be bussed into the district. He doesn't feel he can make a profit by operating it under these conditions. He wants more information. He wants to know why, as a private individual leasing it, he is going to be bound by The Trade Union Act?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member raises the same question basically. I think he's aware that all work done in the parks has to be certified under The Trade Union Act, the people who are employed. That is a fact of life. That is the way it's operated. We feel we want trade union people, people who are paid good salaries, people who will do a good job for their salary. We feel we get a lot better service out of those kind of people than having people who are on wages substandard to that. So we feel trade union people are the route to go. We've obviously endorsed that concept. That is the policy of the government.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, your comment to the member for

April 14, 1980

Rosetown-Elrose was that the law of The Trade Union Act required these people to be SGEA. Am I correct?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the work in the parks system is certified through the SGEA. I think that would answer your comment.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, Mr. Minister, your comment was that the Trade Union Act called for SGEA people to do this job. I think the member for Rosetown-Elrose made it quite clear this was a brand-new place, had never had anybody working there before, therefore there were no certified employees under SGEA working on that site.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, that is correct. It's a brand-new facility on a brand-new site, a first-time operation. The union can opt out at that point. It can allow anybody else to come in to provide the services. In this case the union has been notified accordingly and duly and the union has refused to opt out. They've requested to stay in.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I think we're working on the wrong aspect. I don't think the union has the right. Let me explain that. It's a new operation. It's not like you're taking over an operation which existed before where SGEA employees were there. So that right isn't there for SGEA. You've got your rules mixed up here.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we haven't got anything mixed up. It's a fact of life that the union has the option on a new place, on a new facility whether or not it wants to certify the people. It has so chosen. It's been checked out. It's very clear that that is a fact of life, and the union is acting in a responsible fashion.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I think you're totally wrong. You're working on two different concepts. If that place had existed before and SGEA employees were there, or there were any unionized employee there before, you are 100 per cent right. But because it is a new facility, I believe you're wrong. I don't see the Minister of Labour backing you up so I believe even more strongly I'm right. I'm suggesting you've missed the boat here.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the information the department has available to it, the queries it has made, say that is a correct and responsible action of the union in what it's doing. Those are the facts and the knowledge we have at this time. That is why the union is in the operation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if the individual got the contract is willing on his own to bring in his own help and let it go to the fight to see if you are right or he is right. Are you going to interfere and say you can't open unless it is SGEA? Are you going to interfere?

MR. GROSS: — Yes, that is correct.

MR. KATZMAN: — So basically you are now saying, you have the contract and you must hire SGEA employees — no matter what the law says, we think you have to, therefore we are forcing you; we are signing this over to them.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the person whom the member is referring to (I don't know who is tender on the contract but the contract hasn't been let) is in full knowledge before he takes the contract or takes the tender, that this is a requirement of his contract. It has not been let and therefore he will be very knowledgeable and very

conversant on the facts of life; so it is not a situation where he picks up a contract and finds out he has to pay union wages. That is not the case.

MR. SWAN: — This gentleman tendered and at the time of the tender was not aware that SGEA was involved. It was after the tender was in that he was advised. So the information you are giving me is not correct.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member opposite says is correct too, that he wasn't aware of it before he tendered, but as soon as he tendered he was made aware of the fact that this is a requirement and so he was knowledgeable when he went into it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, are you suggesting then that you will adjust tender because of this, or are you going to retender, or what are you going to do because of this mistake? It will change, I think, the bidder price.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we have made the person aware of the fact and he has been allowed to adjust his tender accordingly if he is interested in providing the tender. So, the adjustment will take place and if he wants to he can adjust it.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., Mr. Minister, we will move along. How much land do you have per region under the wildlife development fund?

MR. GROSS: — O.K., Mr. Minister, we will move along. How much land do you have per region under the wildlife development fund?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the total in acres is 59,500. Sorry I don't have the hectares, but 59,500 acres is the total. I think you want the breakdown by region, is that correct? We don't have the breakdown by region but we will get it to you.

MR. GARNER: — How much land then also was purchased per region; for what prices and from whom was it purchased? Did you tender on any of this land that you purchased?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, there is a fairly long list of people from whom we have purchased land. If you want I could send the sheet over, if that would be O.K. and give you all the information because some is sold and some is tendered, some is traded.

MR. GARNER: — As long as I can have a copy of all of it, Mr. Minister. Now, one other question, this wildlife development fund land, is this classified as Crown land?

MR. GROSS: — Yes, it is.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, if it is classified as Crown land and I am not saying that you are going to do this, but I mean this was land which was bought and purchased for habitat, prairie chicken, the deer pastures all over Saskatchewan. Can you assure me in this House, and especially for the hunting public of Saskatchewan, this is not on the bargaining table of the Indian land claim settlement?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the land in question is land specially designated for a wildlife habitat and will remain as a wildlife habitat.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., Mr. Minister, but it will not be put on the bargaining table for the Indian land claim settlement. That's the key. That's what I would like to know.

MR. GROSS: — That's right.

MR. GARNER: — How much work was done on habitat improvement on the wildlife development fund land per region and at what cost? I want to know the cost put into this land per region and the type of improvement generally —not too lengthily, just generally.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, again I'm sorry, we don't have that information at hand. It's a very lengthy list of all the improvements and what has happened to it. We will forward a copy to the member.

MR. GARNER: — O.K., that's fine. No, I don't expect that. I would just like to back up one step, Mr. Minister. Your advertising — I think you stated to me it was \$95,000 for Saskatchewan. How do you do your advertising? I mean through whom? Do you tender it out? Do you just go to a company and say do you want an advertising package? Will you please give me a little detail as to how you do that advertising in Saskatchewan?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, all the printing as required for advertising layout, for the brochure layouts, and the circulars, etc. is done at Queen's Printer. The advertising firm we engage is Wescom Telecommunications (Regina) Limited.

MR. GARNER: — Wescom. Is that private enterprise? It is private enterprise. Do you tender this out?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised by our people in extension services that they review all the advertising people in the business. They look at who can do their job. By invitation they have decided on Wescom Telecommunications as the people to do the kind of work they want done.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, that's just certain officials' viewpoints. I mean there could be quite a cost spread in there. Could you give me a detailed lists, and I don't expect you to have it here now, of what other companies you dealt with, costs etc.? If it wasn't tendered, I'd like to know who you talked to and what their costs were for the same package. But I do think, Mr. Minister, it should maybe be tendered out.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the way we place out advertising is in the following manner. If we are going to take out an ad in a magazine, for example, Maclean's, the process is that we pay directly to Maclean's for a layout, whatever it may be, and then Maclean's pays back to the advertising agency which places the ad — which lays it out and puts it together — it pays them back a commission. So actually we deal directly with the magazine companies or the people we're advertising with — the firms, television, radio, what have you.

Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I think I may have had that a little bit backwards. Let me go through it one more time. We pay the agency to place an ad and the agency places the ad and the commissions which come out of the placing of the ad; we pay the cost of the placement of the ad, whatever the company wants — if it's Maclean's or if it's a radio company or whoever it is. If it's \$50,000 for the ad, we pay out a bill to the agency of \$50,000. They pay the company and the company pays them back. So that's why the tendering process accordingly.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, you've explained something very obvious to anyone who has anything to do with advertising. The question I think that was originally intended was

this. When advertising, you don't tender advertising. There's no such thing as a tender for advertising, but there are such things as submissions by various agencies to show the kind of work they can provide for you and the costs, which are based usually on commission. The difference in the cost between one and another would be strictly commission — nothing to do with the placement of the ad — because they have no control as to the amount that Maclean's or anyone else would charge. The only difference in the cost would be in the commission itself. So the question is, did you receive more than one submission from advertising agencies to show you the kind of work they could do and at what cost?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised the work is reviewed. The people in the advertising business are reviewed by information services. It makes an analysis of the kind of services available to the government and, from there, parcels the work out to the agencies from the departments interested in having the services. So in terms of deciding on this advertising company over the other one or the one down the road, we readily aren't involved in that area. Information services provides that service to us and we take their recommendation on who should do the work for us.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — On the advertising? Do you have anything to do with the type of ad that goes in? For example, a newspaper ad or a magazine ad —do you present the idea, or does the agency present the idea to you?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised it's a co-operative approach. They have ideas and we have ideas. We use the benefit of their knowledge and understanding of the situation and we put the whole thing together co-operatively.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I don't know whether you can answer this question or not, but did you say Wescom was the agency? Do they happen to be a contributor to the NDP by any chance?

MR. GROSS: — I haven't a clue.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Could you find out?

MR. GROSS: — I can.

MR. SWAN: — I would like to ask you again, and I would like a little bit more detailed answer this time, why do you use the Saskatchewan Department of Highways pictures in your advertising and advertise the minister of the Department of Highways rather than advertising the parks and the beauties of the province? The Minister of Highways has lost his beauty. He's a little too old to be on display.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the Minister of Highways has a very pretty face. But besides that the poster is a poster of the Department of Highways. It's a cover poster for their maps. They also have a poster variation of the cover. It's a Department of Highways poster so it's really not our poster. It belongs to the Department of Highways.

MR. SWAN: — When I came to your department and asked for advertising items that you use to advertise the province of Saskatchewan, that's one of the things they handed me — a poster advertising the Minister of Highways. I believe you're heading in the wrong direction if that's the way you're going to publicize the beauties of this province.

MR. GROSS: — For the benefit of the member opposite, if he would take a visit over to the shop tomorrow he would find that we have nine new posters that are now available. On the date he was there, it was the only poster available and he was looking for some promotional material for whatever purposes he might have, and that was the only poster handy at the time. The other ones were being printed; now they're printed and if he wants to pick up the nine new variations of posters, we now have them available.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I believe you provide an interdepartmental service, and perhaps rather than me running across you can deliver them tomorrow. I'd ask you to provide me with them, and if it's good information and good material then I'll forget the other part of it.

MR. GROSS: — I don't know if I have the time tomorrow. I'll see how much time I have tomorrow; if I can accommodate it, I'll see what I can do.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Minister, I'm particularly interested in Moose Mountain Provincial Park. I think you know we've gone through quite a few years where we are really extremely overcrowded at Moose Mountain. The ongoing run you had here a while ago on that \$2 million — I'm really interested to know how much of that \$2 million is going to be spent at Moose Mountain Park because we do have a real problem on weekends as you know, and it's getting so that even during the week in the summertime Moose Mountain is just jammed right to capacity. Do you have any idea what is going to happen there in the way of new facilities?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member for Estevan that we do have a lot of people visiting Moose Mountain Provincial Park. There's no great secret to the fact that last year on the long weekend we had 50,000 people out there. That's sort of a mini-city all in itself. There are a great many people making use of the park. In terms of the capital that will be available to Moose Mountain, we'll be tabling at the end of the estimates a copy of the capital lists and you will be able to find out at that time what is going to happen in Moose Mountain Provincial Park.

In terms of the heritage fund which you were talking about earlier, again I reiterate cannot tell you with any precision what exactly we will be doing in Moose Mountain Provincial park because we haven't got the study done. As I said earlier, it's a matter of a month or two before it's complete and we know with some precision what it will be, then we will inform you accordingly. I can assure you, you'll be the first one to find out.

MR. LARTER: — Another question, Mr. Minister. I am sorry I was out; I was busy. There was an NHL hockey game on and I was out taking a peek at it when you brought up the business of SGEA, that they are going now to run the concessions at the parks. Was this mentioned tonight?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it is not SGEA that has been running the parks, the labour. They will be certifying the people who will be working in the parks. It is not their having a labour force out there. They will be certifying the people who are going to work in the provincial park system in parks where there are new facilities or a new agreement, where there wasn't a trade union before and there is now a change of ownership or whatever. It will be a union membership certifying it.

MR. LARTER: — I am sorry, Mr. Minister, that is what I meant; it would be people who would be under SGEA.

I am very disappointed in this. Over the years, these parks, and I think all provincial parks, have been free to hire students for summer employment. Generally speaking they are families that have been, maybe, going up there for years or who live in small communities around there. I am sorry to see that the Government of Saskatchewan is letting this happen, is letting this control stretch out into your park areas. If this is a bargaining point in negotiations, I would say it is a very, very poor one. If you let this one go through, I think you are letting the people of the areas where these parks are located . . . I think you are making a very bad mistake.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the member that students will continue to be hired. There is no change in policy whether or not students will be hired; students will definitely be hired. The reason we want them to be hired is the reason they are being certified. We want them to be paid a decent salary because they have costs, they have to go back to school, whatever, and they cannot afford to work there for nothing. They have to be responsible and have some kind of revenue, some kind of income for their following year's studies.

So, there is no change in policy. Students definitely will be hired again, but they will be certified at union wages.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, pardon me, but I didn't quite catch what you said before. Did you state that after the estimates were over you were going to table this survey on the \$2 million expenditure? Now maybe I didn't hear you correctly. What were you going to table, Mr. Minister?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it has always been a sort of ritual, if you like, of the department to table the copy of the ordinary capital budget of the department at the end of the estimates. That is what we will be tabling to all members of the House.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, on the SGEA situation again, you made reference earlier to trade union law. I suggest you are wrong. So tomorrow or whenever we get back to your estimates could you bring with you either . . . I think it is a copy of the SGEA contract that says they have the right, not the labour legislation. Could you show us where you get the information, or what rules cause SGEA to be the bargaining unit for a new place which didn't exist before? Could you bring back that information and what advice you had which made you decide that?

MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a part of the SGEA agreement with the government that all work done in the parks will be certified by the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association and that is a fact of life. I think it is well documented and well-known. I don't know what kind of information you want us to bring back tomorrow because that is the situation and that is the law.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, then you misled the House earlier. Just let me clarify it and you will understand what I said. When you said it was labour legislation, what you meant is that it was SGEA contract. Am I correct? You just got your terms wrong? Well, it wasn't intentional I don't believe, Mr. Attorney General. But I think you had your two things crossed. Am I correct?

MR. GROSS: — I don't know what wording the member is referring to. Whatever might have been said I think the record will show we said it's part of an agreement under The Government Employees Association. That is the ruling. That is the understanding I

have.

MR. KATZMAN: — You're going to supply that section of the act when we come back in, I understand. Correct?

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I was listening to you when my colleague from Estevan was talking about the employment of student sin the summer. I heard you say rather a strange thing, I thought. You said we want them to be unionized so they get a decent wage. Not it seems to me your department is paying these students. They are working for your department. Are you telling me your department is going to pay these people at a lesser wage if they're not unionized. Is that what you're telling me?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member has his facts incorrect. It's always been the policy of the department to pay the going union rate, and that is the case.

MR. TAYLOR: — In all due respect, Mr. Minister, I paid particular attention and you said the words I mentioned. You said we want them to have a decent wage. Does that mean if they weren't in the union, your department wouldn't pay them a decent wage?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the member is referring to. If they are under contract with a contractor or a concessionaire at a stand or something like that, they are then on contract to the contractor or whoever's running the concession. He may be paying a wage less than the union rate. But the department is paying the union rate.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, still on the advertising. What is the cost going to be on a series of TV programs to be aired via cable television? Hopefully, we won't have these blocked out.

MR. GROSS: — Can the member specify what ads he's talking about? I'm sort of left in the lurch here.

MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would have to go through the annual report where I got these questions. I can move on to another one and we can do it another day. But it has to do, I've very sure (I don't have the exact section where I read it) with a series of television programs you are planning. Are you aware of what I am talking about?

MR. GROSS: — I think we're aware of what you're talking about. If you are referring to what we think you are it's the service of the stations in the province. And there's no charge for it.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. Here we are. It's on page 14 under communications division. Preparations were undertaken during the year for a series of TV programs to be aired via cable television. That's my thing. Are you going to have to get special permission from the minister of Sask Tel or anything like that before you can air these? What stations will they be aired on? Will it be cable television, etc.?

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the service is provided free of charge by the cable operator.

MR. GARNER: — Well, then the natural question is, which cable operator? It wouldn't be telecable out of Saskatoon channel 8 hopefully? Or maybe if it is, it would be good.

MR. GROSS: — The information I have is the programs are produced by Cable Regina

They are provided free of charge to the other stations: the production costs were by Cable Regina to cable operators in Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, North Battleford and Prince Albert.

MR. GARNER: — O.K. On the different trade shows Saskatchewan TRR is attending all over, whether it be in Canada or the States, I would like to know the costs to the department in each case and who is attending them. How many officials? This is my concern.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.