

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Monday, April 13, 1981.

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

MR. HARDY: — I have a problem in my constituency to do with the Greenwater Lake area, and it has to do with an elderly lady that lives south of Greenwater Lake. I'm sure you're aware of the situation — they want to close the gate to the south end of the entrance to Greenwater Park. Her name is Anna Johnson. She's a senior citizen; she's been living there for about 40 years. It's really her only close route into either Greenwater for groceries or else into Porcupine Plain. To go an alternate route, I think, is about an extra 10 to 15 miles for her.

I understand that your department has offered to give her a key to open and shut the gate. But you must remember, she is a lady of 65 years or 66 years of age. And to open and shut the gate probably would be an encumbrance for her at the best, and she feels that if the gate is closed that her friends will not be able to come and visit her — and most of those are in the senior citizens age group. She has requested that that gate remain open. I just wonder what your department has done about it or what it plans to do about it.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm a little bit familiar with the case of which the member makes mention. We have a problem in all the parks with access to the parks. If we're going to control the people coming and going, we have to have some controlled access. The problem with that particular location is that this opens it up to the general public when it has been opened. The member is correct that we offered her a key to the park; the member makes mention that it's inconvenient. It's a problem for her — no doubt it is. But the problem for us is that we have no way of controlling the access to the park through that little gate. To set up an entry booth there so you could control the access and let her through, or her guests through, is a fairly expensive procedure. I don't know if the member would recommend we do that or if we just continue to let people come at their will into the park. That's our problem and we don't know really what, quite frankly, is the solution to it, other than giving her a key to the park so she could come and go as she pleases and has her own way of getting in and out through that process. The member mentions that it's either 10 or 15 miles around; that's true. We can't seem to remedy it because of her location. I think we have talked to the R.M. to try to help out and it still hasn't resolved anything. So that's our problem; it's a dilemma more than it's anything. The only thing we could do would be to leave the park open and let people cross at their will. We wouldn't really have, then, control of the access to the park; we couldn't control the guys who would be coming in free or whatever. That's our problem.

MR. HARDY: — Well, Mr. Minister, I know what you're trying to say. But, at the same

time, that road could be shut off at the gate. You also have an alternate route at the bottom which is almost completed (if not completed) which would give you complete access through the park gate only. The route that she has used was there, I guess, many years before the park was established. If they shut off the route or the gate at the entrance to the golf course, then the other route could be open and it could be free and it wouldn't bother your park in any way. I would just like to know why that couldn't be taken into consideration.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member makes a suggestion about another route. If indeed there is a route, we'll take another look at it. About all I can offer is that we'll take another look at it. We'll seriously take a look at it to see if there isn't a way to solve it, because I'm informed that the way the access is set up it's pretty difficult to solve. If there is another way, we'll certainly do it. And, to the member that raises the matter, I'll take it up personally with my department and try to solve it for him.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you might indicate any of the plans the department may have for expansion of your provincial parks, and particularly within and surrounding the city of Regina?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member asks if there was any expansion in the immediate area of Regina. I have just a little trouble with the question — as to what area he is talking about or what project he is talking about.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would be most happy to explain. I thought you would never ask. I'm sure the member for Regina North-West would be more than pleased to join with me and agree with me over the need for this. Being an avid golfer as I am, and many people today are, we have what is known as the Tor Hill Golf Course in the northeast part of the city. I'm not sure if it is within the city limits or just outside, but it is an ideal location for the government to expand provincial park areas and to develop a really first-class golf course. Do you have any plans or have you given any consideration at all to negotiating that area as a provincial park with the city of Regina?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the park the member makes mention of is Kings Park, and the mandate of DTRR (Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources) is not within the urban area; we are not considered to have a mandate to build in urban parks. In trust of that responsibility is the Department of Urban Affairs and, whether they are looking at it or not, you would have to check with them. I know there have been consultations between our department and the city of Regina in the past with regard to it, but we referred it to urban affairs.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Do I understand correctly that DTRR does not become involved within any urban area, or the Regina-Saskatoon area? Which are you talking about?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only exception to the rule would be the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, and there is an exception made there because of its being a special case, and not a green space as such. We have been involved in the city, and right now I would like to say that we are not involved in the city, but the only city we've been involved is Moose Jaw. Whether it is a Wascana centre or it is a Meewasin project, it has been the policy to deal with it under the Department of Urban Affairs as part of the urban package of recreational opportunities. Kings Park would fall into that category, being in the urban area.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I will probably ask the same question under urban affairs, but are

you familiar with or aware of any negotiations which have taken place between urban affairs and the city of Regina?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I have been aware in the sense that Dan Costea, city of Regina recreation director, has met with our department and has talked to us about it, and that's when he was referred to urban affairs. I don't know what has evolved since then, but I know they were pursuing it with urban affairs, and that's where it was the last time we heard.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I will be happy to discuss it further with the Department of Urban Affairs, and thanks for that information. I want to get back to the question I asked you before five o'clock on the development of recreational and parks facilities. I notice by your estimates that you had \$2 million estimated last year. This year you are asking for \$2.25 million in addition to another \$1.5 million under capital expenditures for recreational facilities. I wonder if you could break that down for us?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'll provide the full breakdown because the member will probably have other questions with regard to it. The breakdown is the following: capital budget, heritage fund – \$2.25 million. The figure the member made mention of is for the development at Cypress. The Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, fourth phase is \$441,000. The money that's in DGS (Department of Government Services) for the fish culture stations is \$1.16 million. Duck Mountain is \$200,000; Regina Beach is \$510,000; carry-over is \$201,000 for a total of \$7.9 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I'm afraid you lost me there. I'd like to try that again. First of all the \$2.25 million is over and above the \$441,000 for the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, not part of it. So would you give me that breakdown again? I missed you somewhere along that line.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member wants the heritage figure for the Cypress Park development. It is \$2.25 million and the Moose Jaw one is \$441,000 for a total of \$2.691 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The whole Cypress is \$2.25 million – what was last year's \$2 million for?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it was for a log cabin complex in Greenwater, a condominium complex in Duck Mountain and a condominium complex in Cypress.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Did you spend the \$2 million or was it less or more? Would you send us a breakdown of that amount?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the total allotment was spent and \$271,000 of the \$2 million went to the Moose Jaw zoo.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, the estimates last year were \$2 million for the park facilities development and \$364,000 for the Moose Jaw zoo. Now, did you spend the \$271,000 out of Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park or is that over and above?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if the figure of \$364,000 for the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park is correct, the \$271,000 was in addition to the \$364,000. The reason why is that we had good weather. We decided we'd speed that up and jump a phase on the development because of the good weather. We decided to move forward with the

April 13, 1981

Moose Jaw zoo because it was obvious we could finish the job before the winter set in. That's what we used it for. The \$2 million was for the accommodation complexes plus the \$271,000 in additional money to the Moose Jaw zoo.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I don't know why you try to confuse the issue. Okay, so in other words, instead of \$2.364 million, you spent \$2.364 million plus the \$271,000 that you're referring to as the additional expenditures under the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. Is that correct?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the total heritage fund allotment was \$2 million for the accommodation project and \$244,000 for phase four of the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. We'll try that again — \$2 million heritage fund was the allotment that was in the book last year. We spent everything except \$271,000 on accommodation. The \$271,000 that wasn't spent on accommodation was put into the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park to speed up the phasing of the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, in addition to the money that was normally budgeted for the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park. So we increased the phase one notch by speeding it up.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. WHITE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce two groups of visitors to the legislature tonight. There is the 52nd Cub Pack from over in the Hillsdale-Whitmore Park area. There are 22 members, and there are three leaders with them: Peter and Marie Graham and Linda Pratt. There are some chaperones, too: David Pratt, Wally Fries and Dr. Matthews. They are here as part of their citizenship studies. For visiting the legislature and performing other work they will obtain the green star for citizenship.

Also in the Speaker's gallery are the Peart 33rd Scouts. There are eight members in the troop, and they are accompanied by Mr. Frank Clements and Mr. John Robertson. They will be in the Chamber for the better part of a quarter of an hour or so. I hope they find it interesting and informative and that they learn something about the functioning of the legislature as part of their citizenship training. The House is now in committee. As you will notice, the Speaker is not in his chair. I'll be meeting them afterward for questions and some drinks in the downstairs area. I would like all members to join me in welcoming them to the Chamber.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the member for Regina Wascana, I didn't realize he was welcoming some guests. I, too, would join with the member for Regina Wascana in welcoming the Cubs here tonight.

I want to come back, Mr. Minister. Either you're very confused, or you're trying to

confuse me. I don't know which it is, but you estimated \$2,364,000 last year. Now, from what you've said, I assume that you did not spend the \$2 million on parks facilities, but you spent \$2 million less the \$271,000, which you spent on the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park development. Was there an order in council to cover the transfer of those funds from one expenditure to the other?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it's well known that the money is vired, and in that case the money was transferred from the normal appropriation to the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park through the normal budgeting process. That's done through treasury board, etc.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, of course, I'm not that knowledgeable when it comes to techniques or methods that are used by the Department of Finance or by the government, but I would think that if you vote an item in this legislature, it has to be expended in that way unless an order in council or some documents are used to transfer it from one vote to another. However, if that is not correct, then I stand to be corrected. My concern is not whether you spent \$271,000 more in the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park development, or whether you spent that much less in the parks facilities department. My original question was this: where did you spend the \$2 million? You still haven't given me that answer, other than to say, I believe, that there were three areas in which you spent the \$1,729,000 and I believe that to be the correct amount. So, can you give me a list of those areas and where you spent the money?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we're just doing some very rough figures (they're not rough, we think they are accurate figures). For the benefit of the member it is: Greenwater, \$507,000; Duck Mountain, \$610,000; and Cypress, \$531,000. Those are accommodation complexes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm just looking at your press release of October 31, 1980, referring to Cypress Hills, where you're talking \$500,000. That's October — did you spend that money before October 31 or after? Why the difference between the two figures?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, that's the \$500,000 that has been mentioned — that's units. The \$31,000 additional is the servicing. That brings the total to \$531,000 and I guess the press release indicates \$500,000, but \$500,000 should be what the cost of the units was.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Condominium units? All right. Now this year you are requesting \$2.25 million in the same subvote. And my question to you (I think you gave me the answer but I don't recall what it was) is in one particular development. Would you mind repeating that or telling me where that development is?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it's the Cypress Hills Park development.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, how about trying to be a little more co-operative. Saying there's \$2.25 million in the Cypress Hills development doesn't tell me or anyone else in this province a heck of a lot. How about breaking that down and telling us where and how and what you are spending it on, and so on. That's what people want to know. It's all very well to say you're spending here, but \$2.25 million is not chicken feed. Let's have some answers as to where and how you're spending it.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member, the \$2.25 million is

April 13, 1981

for a lodge at Cypress Hills. We estimate to have between 30 and 40 units. The final figure isn't in and it will be a lodge with a formal sit-down dining area.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — We are talking about a \$2.25 million motel or hotel, and bar and lounge and so forth. Well, you just spent \$500,000 last year doing the same thing. Are you building a second one?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the project last year was accommodation and it was for a condominium unit only — just a condominium complex. This is a little bit more refined in a different setting and a different operation. This is an actual lodge with a food service unit attached to it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Okay. Again, I'm not sure I heard you right because in some of these cases you mumble your answers. But did you say 30 to 40 units for this \$2.25 million? How many units were involved in the \$500,000 last year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, 10.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — If we use the 30, then, that you are building this year, that's \$1.5 million for that. Is that a \$750,000 bar?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I have his question. I wonder if he could repeat it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I would be happy to. I am glad you weren't on record when you made that last remark.

Last year you built 10 units at a cost of \$500,000, so it is \$50,000 a unit. Now, you are saying 30 to 40. Well, assuming you are building 30 and using the same figures, then you are going to be spending \$1.5 million on 30 units. You are asking for \$2.25 million; that leaves \$750,000. Is that for the bar? What is the extra money for?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member will appreciate that in a lodge such as this, there will be additional costs which the condominiums didn't have. The lodge itself will have a lounge area, a dining area and a number of other areas. Obviously, there is going to be more money involved. There will be a lobby area, a public meeting area and related areas. So there is more cost to it. The price of being serviced and so on is in here. So that is the difference in the total money being \$2.250 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You are still being quite vague. When we talk about 30 to 40 units and you are talking about \$2.250 million, 10 units could represent a lot of money. Is that because you don't know what it is going to cost and you are appropriating that much money? Are your costs going to be that much higher than they were last year? How many square feet are there per condominium unit? The \$500,000 which you spent last year, did that work out to \$50,000 per unit and how big were they? Try and be a little more co-operative and just give us the answers that we are trying to slowly and gradually drag out of you. I have an appointment in four minutes and I can't be here forever. So if you could just provide us some answers, it would save everyone a lot of time.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what kind of answers the member wants because every time you give him an answer he will have a different interpretation of it. The unit itself is considerably different from a condominium complex because the features are different. Architecturally, it is going to be considerably different. It is going to be a very attractive place. It is going to have (again, as I enunciated earlier) a formal sit-down dining room and restaurant attached to it. It will have a fairly large lobby and public area. It will have a number of open areas. It will be a fairly good, nice, neat and attractive place. It will have features that you would have . . . To compare the condominiums unit for unit against this thing is foolish because you are comparing apples and oranges — two different operations entirely. Probably for the value you are getting, it is equivalent to any good hotel which you might get anywhere. The idea is to provide good accommodation and a good public area for the dining complex, etc.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Are you going to be leasing that out? Are you going to run it yourselves? No, okay. Where in the park will it be located?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Get it on the record.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Oh, okay. Mr. Minister, would you answer my original question so we have it on the record. The second question, of course, is: where will it be located within the park?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in regard to the tendering, it is our feeling that we will probably be tendering. The analysis isn't complete of whether or not we want to tender it or whether we would run it ourselves. The options are that we would probably want to run it rather than have it leased out, or have it operated by somebody who is familiar with the business and knows how to operate it. That is probably the option that we would be taking. For me to commit and say, "Yes, we are going to definitely lease it out," or "No, we are not; we are definitely going to operate it," is too early at this point in time. But I would think that we would probably lease it out.

The location was the second part of your question. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member, I don't know if you are familiar with Cypress Hills. It is in the core area. It will be relatively in the area where the present restaurant is right now. It will be within that core area complex, just east of it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Have you tendered this project out yet for construction? Have you any preliminary plans? Do you have an architect working on it? Have you tendered out the work to an architect? What stage are you at now in the development of this facility?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think the question was this: have we sent out for an architect? It is being actively considered. It is just a short time — a couple of days or a couple of weeks, whatever — away from that stage. It is very close to being let out for an architect.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I have one final question, Mr. Minister. You are now going into the bar business fairly heavily. You are going to have one at Cypress Hills; you are going to be opening one at Kenosee. Is that going to change your thinking on liquor advertising in this province? All of a sudden we are really going to be pushing this booze business; it seems you are heading in that direction. Where else are we going to be building these bars? How much money are we putting into the liquor business — bars, booze, lounges and so on — within the province? I am curious to know what direction you are taking in the development of that phase of the industry.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the member is familiar with the resorts in this province and how they operate. We have some outside the park boundaries which are private institutions which have operated over the years. There is booze in the parks whether you like it or not. One way of having it under control and knowing what is going on is to operate the system properly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member makes mention of big signs. No, I don't think that's going to be the drawing card. I think the member knows full well that this is the kind of accommodation where, if you are going to provide a fully rounded program, it's part of the package. That's what we're doing in Cypress Hills, as well.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, when you, "east of the present restaurant facility," you put it in the area of the pool, the post office and the store. Are you going to be building a new store in the near future? Are you going to be building a new pool? I'm sure you are aware that the present pool is not large enough to handle the park population in the summer; also, they have a lot of trouble with it.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member for Maple Creek, I will say that it will be just a wee bit east of the area you made mention of. The store is definitely a consideration and a priority of the department. As time marches on and as money marches on, we will certainly be entertaining the concept of a better store to handle the traffic which is there and available to it. That goes for the pool too.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, I would like to clean up a couple of points concerning this wildlife development fund land. I notice that you purchased 320 acres from the Royal Bank in Esterhazy. I have a concern regarding whether there were other farmers who had bid or tendered on this land. How did you acquire it? Was it acquired through a tendering process or was it an outright purchase from an individual? I would just like a little more clarification on it. Is it cultivated land or pasture?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know whether we were in competition with other farmers for that land. We don't have that information handy. We'll have to check it out and see if there was competition, if it was tendered or what process was used. I'm sorry we can't help him with the answer; we'll have to get it for him.

MR. GARNER: — My only concern, which I remember raising with the former minister responsible for tourism and renewable resources, is that I remember one section of pasture (I'm going by memory) which was purchased through Marathon Realty. They outbid a young man who had a cattle operation. Because of the government buying it, this young man ended up out of the cattle business. One of your hacks there will know what I'm talking about. It did force the young man out of the cattle business, and I want to make sure that that didn't happen to anyone on any of these land purchases. That's my concern.

I would like a breakdown of whether you tendered on this land, whether it's pasture land, cultivated land, etc. — details of all of this package of land.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we've been checking again, but to the best of our knowledge there was no competition for the land. It was invitational. But we have to check it and make sure. If there was competition, we would like to advise the member accordingly. We will check the other ones as well.

MR. GARNER: — One other thing — while you're checking that, will you let me know who inspected this land and who suggested that you purchase it? I would like that, too. Who took a look at these parcels of land, and who made the decision to purchase them?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we will get the information for the member. We will give him a full report on how it happened, and then he will know.

MRS. DUNCAN: — In the 142,000 acres that the province will be putting up for land entitlement, as was announced a few weeks ago, does any of that acreage include regional or provincial parks?

HON. MR. GROSS: — No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GARNER: — In Bill No. 59, it states:

... sell provincial lands to persons other than those described in clause (a) or (b)

Basically, what I am concerned about is: will any of this land fall into that criteria to be resold?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that we do not have bill numbers at our command. In regard to the member's question, the parcels to which the member makes reference in Bill No. 59 would not affect the parcels that we would have in our parks system.

MR. GARNER: — Does any land in your department fit into the criteria in this proposed new bill?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in regard to the member's question, the answer is yes; there could be parcels of land which could come under this bill, but they would be lands which we would be leasing out, and for which we would have no further use.

MR. GARNER: — Well, is it some of your grazing land? Would you be a little more specific as to what parcels of land would be affected by this bill?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with what the member is asking us to distinguish or describe for him. He has asked us which parcels could be affected. There is always the possibility that we might want to sell some land we had picked up or we might want to dispose of it because we have no need for it. That would be the only reason we would want to dispose of it.

I really think Bill No. 59, amendments to The Provincial Lands Act, should really be discussed with the Minister of Agriculture under provincial lands, because the jurisdiction would come through that department. They can identify the areas, if the member has a particular quarter section in mind. They could best advise him as to what land it would be, and what it would come to affect.

MR. GARNER: — Just so that we can have this clarified: none of the land under the wildlife development fund will fall into this, to be sold?

HON. MR. GROSS: — The answer to that is no.

April 13, 1981

MR. HARDY: — I have just one question about skiing. Has the department considered, or approved, or is there anything in the making regarding further ski resorts in the area? Have any private individuals approached the department to establish any ski resorts in any of the areas — specifically, in my area?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that we get a number of people asking for information on setting up a ski hill. We can't recall anything of any specific nature last year that has come to us in your particular area, the Hudson Bay area, in regard to a ski hill. We're not really aware of it, but if the question is whether we provide grants to individuals for ski hills if somebody is interested in developing one, the answer to that would be no. Other than that, we would promote them through our normal tourism promotional material, which we do whether it's Hidden Valley or Blackstrap or wherever. Mention is made of it through ski reports and that kind of stuff, but we do not have a program at this time to promote or to give assistance to private operators.

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, you say that nobody has approached you in regard to establishing a ski resort or a ski hill north of Hudson Bay. I understand that your department has been approached to lease (I wouldn't assume purchase) about five or six quarters at Mile 52 with the idea of establishing a ski resort. Is that correct?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what area? You were saying Choiceland, were you — north of Hudson Bay? I'm not aware of any group that formally made an application. People tell me that there have been people showing interest in the Choiceland area, but we haven't had a formal request from anybody with a detailed program.

MR. HARDY: — If these people do approach you, then would it be taken into consideration, and would you deem it a good recreation for that particular area?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that we would certainly take a look at every opportunity which may come open to us. It's just that we're not familiar with the application the member makes mention of; and if he has people who are interested, it would be good to send them down and we could take a look at it.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, as you are aware, I brought this to your attention last year. There is a shortage of campsite lots available down at Moose Mountain Provincial Park. I would like to know how many campsites are available in the provincial park right now.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think we got the member's question correct. The total number of campsites in Moose Mountain Provincial Park right now is 333.

MR. PICKERING: — These are serviced by electricity?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we'll get the breakdown. It's just a matter of thumbing through and trying to find the exact figure here.

MR. PICKERING: — Okay, while you're looking for the breakdown, Mr. Minister . . . I asked the very same question last year on how many sites there were and how many were going to be improved. Your answer was simply this, and I'll refer you to April 14, 1980, page 1727 of *Hansard*:

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.

So, I asked you another question:

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

And your answer to that was:

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.

So that would mean that you've got 666 lots down there, and I failed to see them any time I've been there. I would like you to clarify why you made such a statement. Or were you just misleading the opposition?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I have the numbers in front of me for the 1980-81 total inventory in Moose Mountain Provincial Park. We have 131 electrified sites, 202 non-electrified sites and 50 overflow sites, for a total of 383. But if you take off the overflow sites you have 333. That's the total. I think we said last year that we had 333 and his interpretation is that the total was 666. But the fact, like we said last year, was 333, and at the end or the completion of last year there would have been 333 sites. And the member asked if those sites are in place. The answer is yes, they are in place, with a full complement of 333.

MR. PICKERING: — That's isn't my question, Mr. Minister. Do you want me to read this again? I will read it again, "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 (and I specify, additional) 333 lots at Moose Mountain." Now, there should be at least 666, plus the ones you did develop.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I can say is that there are 333 which was to be the total complement of sites in the area. We developed now a total complement of 333. The member adds the two figures that we supposedly said last year in *Hansard* and totals them up to 666. The facts of life are that we have 333 campsites and they are fully developed up to this stage of this year. Thank you, that's it.

MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that you were deliberately misleading us, to get your estimates over with, by quoting such a figure?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody deliberately misled anybody over the number of campsites there are at Moose Mountain Provincial Park. Far be it for me to want to do that to anybody. The facts of life are, as the member quotes from

Hansard, that we said that there were going to be, at the end of last year, 333 sites developed. We have, as of last year, 333 sites developed at Moose Mountain with an overflow capacity of an additional 50, and that's the fact of life. If he wants to add them up and say that we quoted last year at 666, I guess he may stay here all night and keep quoting that.

MR. PICKERING: — Well, you're the one that made the statement, not me. Your deputy minister and your senior staff were in here and you made that statement. And I'm just going by the record of what you said last year. Okay, I will ask you this question. How many lots did you improve last year, over and above 1979?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have the precise answer as to how many were completed last year here with us, but the best information we can get is that approximately 50 new sites were completed last year.

MR. PICKERING: — Okay, Mr. Minister. I would like to ask you in which year were you telling the truth — last year or this year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Both, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PICKERING: — I would have to disagree. I will go back to this just one more time. Do you want me to read it again? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is this true or false? The Attorney General wants to be in here in July. Then so do I. (I have nothing to do; it's too dry to seed anyway.) You said you were going to have 333 additional lots in Moose Mountain Provincial Park. And the reason I'm concerned about it is the fact that when I go down there I can't find a place to park my trailer. That's why I asked these questions last year. Now, you don't have the 333 additional lots from 1979?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I've said it now going on the 26th time. I said 333 lots is what we had in place at the end of last year and that's what we have.

MR. PICKERING: — How many lots at Moose Mountain are you adding to your electrical service this year by July 1?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member opposite — his point is that he's been turned away. I'm advised that to the best of our knowledge it's been a policy to try to accommodate everybody through overflow. We've been fairly successful at that. I don't think anybody, at least to the best of our knowledge, has been deliberately turned away and told we couldn't find them a place. With regard to the sites, for the information of the member, there are no new sites planned for this year.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Minister, I don't think you understood my question. How many of the lots already there are going to be electrified this year? There are a lot of them not serviced with electricity.

HON. MR. GROSS: — No more than we had last year.

MR. HARDY: — Well, maybe we'll just change the subject for a second here. I'd just like to know how much was given in grants to the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association last year.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised the figure is \$10,000 in total — \$5,000 for administration and \$5,000 for education, for a total of \$10,000.

MR. HARDY: — Well, Mr. Minister, I notice in 1979 there was \$13,000 and in 1980 there was \$10,000, and I think I remember in Crown corporations that there was some \$29,000 taken off for royalties which I was of the understanding were passed back through grants to the trappers' association. Could you maybe fill me in on what I'm not understanding here?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member asked if we would provide money to the trappers' association. The figure is \$10,000 to the association as such. This year (well for three years) we've had an incentive grant program as well — 75 cents incentive grant for beaver, 10 cents for squirrel and muskrat and \$5 for each wolf taken. The total paid out to trappers this year, 1980, was \$82,800 in incentive grants. The \$10,000 we made mention of is in regard to the association directly, and DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) provided an incentive grant as well. We don't have the figure of how much that was.

MR. HARDY: — Maybe you could explain the incentive program you have. I really don't understand it.

HON. MR. GROSS: — We have records of their past year's activities as trappers, and the idea of the grant is to give them a little bit of operating money to get going for the new trapping season. We provide the incentive grant based on what their activity was the year before at that rate. That's the idea of the program.

MR. HARDY: — Do I understand that the \$29,000 royalty money goes into this incentive grant?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the \$29,000 royalties go to the general revenue, and out of the general revenue we decide where the money is to be allocated to various programs in the government. That's the way the government functions; there's nothing going in that robs Peter to pay Paul. It is put into general revenue and out of that the program is established through the department and through the Department of Finance.

MR. CHAPMAN: — I have a brief question to the minister. I think the minister is aware of some of the correspondence we have had in regard to the wading pool at Buffalo Pound Lake. I'm wondering whether or not he has been able to determine if there is going to be a charge for the people using the wading pool in that particular area.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the whole issue is at the present time under review and it will be considered.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would like to direct a question to the minister, but before I do I would like to draw the minister's attention to a particular sequence of events in Ontario, as it relates to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. An employee of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources very recently invented, and was in the process of having manufactured, a new kind of trap which will be far more humane for the trapping industry. I just want to give you a little more information on the issue.

The trap, which works by snaring instead of crushing an animal's foot, will be made by Robert Dickson Mechanical Developments Ltd. of Huntsville, Ontario. The provincial government has given the firm \$150,000 to start production, and \$100,000 to secure patents in other countries. Robert Betz, an executive director of the Ontario Trappers

Association, said he hoped the trap will fill a large need in providing more humane trapping of land animals.

There are two points I would like to make. First, I think it is creditable for the Department of Tourism in that province that an employee has the opportunity to advance his particular ideas and concepts, in this case a new trapping mechanism. Hand in hand with that goes a lot of credit to the provincial government in advancing a total of \$250,000, so that the production can begin, and the patents can be secured. The ministry in Ontario also states that the Novak trap will be priced competitively with smaller leg-hold traps. It is lighter, safer and easier to carry. That would enhance the position of our trappers in northern Saskatchewan – they might be able to carry a larger portable TV, in this case. I see this as being very beneficial to the trapping industry in Saskatchewan, and I would like to know if you made any inquiries to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, if you have any plans to acquire those traps here for Saskatchewan use? If so, I wonder if your government is planning to inject any sums of money to assist the trappers of this province to acquire the traps, which are far more humane? And I think that's the underlying and maybe the more basic element to recognize in this whole matter: the humane aspect of that particular trap. Now, the new live trap, as it's called, works like a snare and does not cause injury. I think that's very important. It's not just important for the sake of humaneness; it's also important, Mr. Minister, in terms of being able to release certain animals that are not required or in fact needed by that particular trapper. It says that as well as being a more humane trap, it allows the trapper to release unwanted animals, including domestic pets which may trip the mechanism. I just happened to be going through the paper on the weekend – it's a Saturday *Leader-Post*, page A20 – and I would ask that you take note of that particular article. Its caption is "Humane Trap Invented."

I make a number of points I think are very valid and I would certainly like to see the provincial government investigate – and investigate immediately – the feasibility of acquiring that trap here in Saskatchewan for the trappers' association and subsequently their trappers. I would like you to be in contact with the trappers' association to see if that particular trap is something that they would find desirable, in particular, in the context that it's much lighter, safer and easier to transport. I think that's very important. And I see it as being nothing but beneficial to the whole industry. It certainly would be a credit to your ministry and your department if some measures could be taken in that regard. I see you're very anxious to reply so I hope that you can concur with the remarks that I have made.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member makes a good point. We're quite a bit ahead of him already. We belong to a federal-provincial committee on humane trapping and, through the funding that has come through that committee, the trap that the member makes mention of was developed. We have at this date contributed some \$70,105 to that committee. For this year, \$10,000 is our contribution to that federal-provincial committee. For the trap that the member makes mention of, we already have our orders in. We'll be forwarding a good number of those traps for this year's experimentation and we expect that it's probably going to be a good trap and will catch on very well. So we are anxiously awaiting the arrival of those traps – they're on the way and we've been contributing. In fact, the reason or part of the reason why the trap came about was the contributions to the federal-provincial committee which has funded this project.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I think that it's a very appropriate time for the opposition to credit the minister and his whole department for the initiatives they've taken in this regard. Far too

often the public perception is that opposition and government are far too often at each other's throats. That may well be the case from time to time. I often reply, "Well, did you ever hear of a plane that landed safely? Of course not; only the ones that crash are reported." Only the conflict and the clashes between opposition and government are reported. So, it's a very opportune time and with that, on behalf of the opposition, we give you a lot of credit, and we would hope that initiatives similar to that are taken in other areas. Thank you.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, does the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources receive any money from Crown investments?

HON. MR. GROSS: — I'm sorry. Do we receive any money from Crown investments? No.

MR. GARNER: — Okay. Mr. Minister, you stated to my colleague from Kelsey-Tisdale that you had given the trappers of Saskatchewan back approximately \$80,000 in grants. But when we look at the annual report for the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service, it turned a profit of \$80,160. There's a dividend to Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan of \$80,160. So, in essence, you are taking it out of tourism, you are taking the money from the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service and putting it into Crown investments. Then it comes out of Crown investments and goes into SGI. Then we come back to SGI again. It just seems as though we make the full circle.

You can laugh all you want. The money comes out of the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service and \$80,160 went into Crown investments. We know how much money has been injected into SGI through Crown investments. You turn around and give those same trappers \$80,000 or \$82,000 back in grants. As well, you charge the trappers of Saskatchewan, in royalties, another \$29,000, which you have to admit is a double-taxing structure.

What are you doing? Building up Crown investments through Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service; keeping the trapper happy with some grants; still charging them a royalty; building up Crown investments to pump up SGI. The members opposite go, "Oh, oh, oh." It's still \$80,000 coming out of the trappers' pockets and you can't cut it any other way. What have you got to say about that?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am amazed. The member has been around here for three or four years and he still hasn't figured out how government operates. I will tell him how it operates. The Crown investments corporation pays to the consolidated fund the \$80,000 he makes mention of as a royalty on behalf of the furs it collects — in the same fashion as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan or the Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation would pay royalties to the Department of Mineral Resources. They're accounted through there, but actually paid to the consolidated fund. It is noted then that a private fellow who is in the business of developing oil or potash or whatever it may be will be paying royalties to the Crown. In that same fashion the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service operates: it pays the royalties to the consolidated fund.

MR. GARNER: — It's still there. Granted, it's only \$80,000, but it is coming out of the trappers' pockets into Crown investments plus the \$29,000 in royalties. You give them back \$82,000 in grants, but you are still taking \$29,000 in royalties.

MR. HARDY: — Just a couple of questions. Have you set the price you are going to

April 13, 1981

charge for 1981 game, fishing, and bird licences? Has that been established yet? Also trappers?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, yes, we have in that we are not anticipating any changes in the rates.

MR. HARDY: — They will be the same rates as last year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARDY: — Could you tell me if any centres received funds from your department to produce brochures to advertise the tourist attractions in these areas?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we do provide grants to the tourism regions. If the member wants a copy of all the grants, we have a copy of each tourism region by grant.

MR. HARDY: — How much would the total of these grants be for the year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — \$166,000 in total for the whole province.

MR. HARDY: — Could you tell me what your total advertising budget for tourism is for this year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — \$344,000.

MR. HARDY: — You will send us over a breakdown of that, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HARDY: — Could you tell me what part the government plays in such agencies as Woodland Parkland Association? I understand there are three or four of them around the province.

HON. MR. GROSS: — There are six tourism regions in the province and we support all six regions with a \$20,000 grant to each.

MR. HARDY: — Is that plus administration?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, \$15,000 of that \$20,000 is for administration; \$5,000 is for promotion or marketing.

MR. HARDY: — I had a little brochure or letter about where most of the tourists are travelling. I understand that the majority of the tourists nowadays are travelling within about a 550-mile radius. I just wonder what advertising you have done within that 550-mile radius — mostly within, say, the bordering states like Montana, within a 550-mile radius or 1,000 miles or 600 or 700 miles or something like that.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, approximately 75 per cent of the total budget which you see there is done within a 1,000-mile radius of the province.

MR. GARNER: — Okay, Mr. Minister, what company does your advertising? Do you tender it out? How do you do it? Just who handles the advertising? This information you

sent over is pretty vague. Also, I would like a little explanation of this advertising of farm tours for \$17,000.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the advertising agency is Westcom Communications, Regina. I missed the second part of your question.

MR. GARNER: — Westcom, did you say? Okay. The next question asked for a little bit of explanation on the farm tours for \$17,000. It wasn't out in the southwest part of the province that you had some farm tours, was it? I am just curious about that.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, is the member asking what the farm tour program is? Is that what he is saying?

MR. GARNER: — Yes, that is what I am asking.

HON. MR. GROSS: — It is an association of a number of farm families who have come together over the years and put together an association to which we pay grants. They host people who would like to visit a farm or spend two weeks on an actual farm while it is in operation. Does that answer your question?

MR. GARNER: — There is just one other thing and we may come back to some of this. What about the funding of the information booths? Last year, I guess you got lucky. I forgot to ask you this. You might as well tell me this year. If you are going to be funding the information booths around the province, how much are you going to be increasing it? Who paid the bill last year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that, in total, we provide \$400 for a year-round operation for a tourist booth. For a seasonal tourist booth, we provide up to \$300 worth of grant. It is up to a city or town to apply for it. But we do assist all tourist booths. We provided assistance last year, as well as this year, for those who applied.

MR. GARNER: — Will you be financing that? Did you say \$400 for the year-round and \$200 or \$300? It is \$300? Yes, okay. How long has this program been in place and at this amount of dollars?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, from what we can recall, we've had the program for six years. We don't have the precise information with us, which the member can appreciate. In terms of where it has gone (from what dollar figure to what dollar figure over the years), we don't have that information handy. We can provide a copy of it.

MR. GARNER: — Okay. Basically, how far back? Can you remember? Some of your officials must be able to go back. Has it been this way for two, three, five years?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, approximately two years ago it was \$300 across-the-board. It was changed approximately two years ago.

MR. GARNER: — I know that the government can't pick up all the tab. I think with inflation, you really should be looking at a little more of a cash injection into this. The \$300 is a help but it's kind of a band-aid approach to an information centre when we have people travelling throughout the province and wanting to know . . .

Another thing which has come to my attention too, while I think of it, is on the highway

April 13, 1981

map distribution. I give you one example of a service station operator who gets maps from Alberta, Manitoba, etc., free of charge. I believe it is your policy in Saskatchewan that they don't get these maps free of charge. The service station attendant is slightly embarrassed because people coming through ask for a map of Saskatchewan. He tells them he can give them one from Alberta and one from Manitoba, but can't give them one from Saskatchewan.

What is your policy on this and what are your plans on this? Are we going to keep up with the times? I want a dollar figure on the information booth and on the maps as well.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, to the best of our knowledge, other provinces do not distribute maps to service stations. We have to know exactly which map the hon. member is talking about and what kind of a service station.

With regard to our maps, we have a distribution list to which we send maps on a free basis. That's our process.

MR. KATZMAN: — My concerns are around the Saskatoon area. Last year we talked a little about the Pike Lake area — about the park and the changes you were planning to make. Is there anything happening there this year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I missed the member's question, but I think I caught the last part of it. Yes, we're pumping water, at the present moment, into Pike Lake to help increase the lake level. Did you want to know what the other projects were? Pike Lake: street lighting, campground, \$10,000; potable water pressure system, \$10,000; renovations, irrigation system, \$10,000. That's it.

MR. KATZMAN: — What about the golf course — better known as cactus course?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge there is nothing at this time planned for the golf course.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, Mr. Minister, that golf course has a lot of potential. The city of Saskatoon, of course, has golf courses, but the people in that area are all looking for places to golf. They are now travelling to Borden, Rosthern, Waldheim, and all those areas. This would be an opportune time for Pike Lake to do some developing. It has some good natural hazards, some excellent fairways for width, and some excellent terrain — hills, and so forth.

Have your people done any study at all to see if they can do something to improve the Pike Lake course?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member is from that area and he will be familiar with the operation. The biggest problem we have at Pike Lake is water level and water period. The concentration of our efforts is to maintain that lake level if we can, and whenever we can. If you are going to go into a grass green operation, it requires a tremendous amount of water. Quite frankly, we just don't have enough water.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if I remember correctly, the water is between 12 feet and 14 feet deep at almost any place you would want to put a pump down. I agree the question is water sufficiency, but, to my knowledge, I don't know of any area where you won't get sufficient water if there is a large bore.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we have done some exploring in that area for water. The member says the water table is at 12 feet or 14 feet. Our information here shows we have done some exploring and that there is water there, but it is not a large enough supply for what we would require.

MR. KATZMAN: — You're saying there's lots of water but not sufficient quantity for keeping a green course? Okay, that combined with what you could pick up off the pumps could be enough. If you put your big pump at the northeast side, you will have a small area to pump across from the Saskatchewan River into Pike Lake. If you place a second pump down on what used to be called the Church beach, directly east of the golf course, you wouldn't have very far to pump. There are a lot of farmers who do a lot of irrigation and pump water a lot further than that. I think it's very possible.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member, last year, for example, we could not pump any water out of the river because of extremely low levels all over. Therefore, we couldn't even raise the lake level. The member says we should try it anyway, but we are of the opinion that it cannot be done at this time because there just isn't a water supply there. The cost to develop an extremely deep water well in that area would be very expensive and beyond our capability in terms of recovering costs.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you're suggesting then that Lake Diefenbaker does not have sufficient volume to be let down, and that is really the reason you are holding back. Is there any consideration to improve the course by any other method rather than just watering?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, not immediately.

MR. KATZMAN: — What about the minor improvements which are required along the old beach area? There have been some done over the past few years. What about an access to the Old White Beach (I guess that's the proper name) rather than having to come in the way you do, going so far south and then doubling back north?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if I understand the road the member is questioning. Right now we have a controlled entry system and to open it up would mean additional problems there. We're trying to keep a controlled entry system if we can, that's our problem.

MR. KATZMAN: — Basically, you're saying that you only want one entrance to every park? That way you keep total control?

HON. MR. GROSS: — That's right. That's the idea.

MR. KATZMAN: — Switching to another park in the vicinity of my constituency. I believe Eagle Creek is also a provincial park?

HON. MR. GROSS: — It's a regional park, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's correct, sorry. I understand there was some question, via the grapevine, that it was going to become a provincial park?

HON. MR. GROSS: — No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KATZMAN: — I have two more questions concerning the Rosthern regional park

April 13, 1981

and the Waldheim regional park. The funding for these two parks is completed from your department I believe, and is there a grant at all that comes each year from now on?

HON. MR. GROSS: — For both of those parks, they're in the final process of negotiating their new five-year agreement.

MR. KATZMAN: — Their new five-year agreement — they're just starting negotiations? The old contract expired 1980-81, correct?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the agreement expires this year — 1980-81.

MR. KATZMAN: — The new contract will be a five-year and will be signed in due course?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the R.M.s in the area have to go through all their meetings in council to sign up, and that's always what takes so long in negotiating the five-year agreements.

MR. KATZMAN: — In the Waldheim park for example, the special track in it does make a considerable amount of funds toward the upkeep and the improvements because all profits are donated to the regional park. Do you recognize that with additional funds, or not at all?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we do recognize it for additional funds. I tried to get the figure of how much money it was. I thought it might be the next question. We don't have that here, but we can get a copy for you.

MR. KATZMAN: — Because they put in these funds, do you match additional funds? I'm not asking how much they put in, that I'm aware of.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if the member is asking if we match funds, we don't match funds. It's on a percentage basis.

MR. KATZMAN: — One final question. The fish stocking that you're doing in both cases, is that to be upgraded, or are they left on their own to do their own stocking of fish in both regional parks, Waldheim (which has the big dugout stocked) and the creeks that run in the Rosthern one?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if the two regional parks are having problems that we're not aware of in terms of fish stocking, they should know the process. They just ask our department and we send somebody out to make an assessment, and if there is more stock required we'll put it in.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, what vehicles and equipment were purchased by the department last year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we rent our vehicles from CVA (central vehicle agency), and those other pieces of equipment that you may want a list of, we don't have one handy. I thought we had one here, but we'll make sure you get a copy of it.

MR. GARNER: — Okay, outside of your cars, your park equipment, you must buy some of that equipment.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of vehicles, half-ton trucks and cars are supplied by central vehicle agency. The equipment the member wants to know about, we don't have that list here. It's a very long list and we'll certainly supply a detailed list of every mower (or what have you) that we have in our inventory, if you want.

MR. GARNER: — Okay. Do you insure this equipment.

HON. MR. GROSS: — No.

MR. GARNER: — Well, okay, we can talk about airplanes, Mr. Minister. Let's talk about air travel in the province of Saskatchewan. I kind of like that one. We need fire control, too, my colleague tells me. Well, we'll wait. The critic is a little tied up right now. Mr. Minister, we're going to talk about airport fires. Now, let's be nice here. Well, let's just take it easy here now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Get out your spray can and go to the back.

Mr. Minister, we've an example of North Battleford sitting there with an over \$300,000 expenditure in an airport terminal facility. We have no air service out of there yet. We finally got the connections from Saskatoon and Regina into the States, but once again they don't have rights to fly between Saskatoon and Regina. This is almost my yearly question; it's cost me one on a question period. But there's no air service in the province of Saskatchewan on the weekends between the two major cities. Now, we've been after this year after year. As Minister of Tourism, what have you done; who have you approached; who have you contacted regarding getting some air service in the province? Norcanair no longer flies to Meadow Lake; that's cut.

I can see us very soon, Mr. Minister, having the province of Alberta supplying the air service for the province of Saskatchewan. And where are the people going to get the jobs from? People from Edmonton will be flying into northern Saskatchewan because there is no connection. Mr. Minister, it's quite simple and quite plain. Tourists can fly into Saskatoon and Regina on the weekend. How do they travel — rent a car, ride a bus? There's no air service. Mr. Minister, surely to goodness you have to be concerned. It isn't just the members here who are concerned about this almost non-existent air service in the province of Saskatchewan. Have you had briefs from anyone regarding this? You must be aware that there is a problem in Saskatchewan and we're going to have to do something about it. Could you respond and bring me up to date? Maybe you have some surprise announcements for me. Let me hear them.

HON. MR. GROSS: — First of all, regarding this first question: have we received any briefs from anybody regarding air service in this province? The answer is that the only brief we received from anybody was in regard to a north-south connection, the Denver connection. And we received it from the Saskatoon Board of Trade (or the chamber of commerce; I'm not sure). Those kinds of groups have approached us about north-south connections and you've seen the results for north-south. We have the Frontier jet service starting May 2, and that is a direct accomplishment.

The other question about intraprovincial air travel in regard to any of those provinces — the member had better direct it, if he would, to the Minister responsible for Saskatchewan Transportation Agency. He is responsible for air travel and transportation matters in that regard. In regard to the problem of who's causing it, Norcanair could advise the member that it is private enterprise and not the government. I don't know what his solution is. Maybe I should be asking him what he has done to convince

private enterprise that it is time to give some good airline connections. Private enterprise has failed us miserably in this area. I agree with the member that we do not have service. We should have better service and we should have more, but we don't have it. And short of beating private enterprise with a club, we don't have it and we probably aren't going to get it in the future. If the member suggests that we set up another Crown corporation for airlines, I guess it's another matter because that's probably the only way that you are going to get it.

MR. GARNER: — Well, that's all you birds are locked into — a Crown corporation of everything. Pretty soon you will have a Crown corporation of getting married in Saskatchewan. And you say, "Ask the question of the Minister of Transportation." Mr. Minister, you are the minister in charge of tourism in this province. You can't keep passing the buck because he'll pass the buck back to the Minister of Tourism. Let's bite the bullet on this thing and admit that we have to have some air service in this province. It's quite fine for the members opposite. You have the government jets and you can take the zero boys from the back benches home with you on the weekend. But, let's start accepting the responsibility. You have your connection on Frontier, but you cannot fly on their schedule over the weekend. You cannot get a seat to fly from Saskatoon to Regina or Regina to Saskatoon and you and I both know why that is. We know who you're in bed with. You don't have to make a Crown corporation of it. But have you not, as Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources in the province of Saskatchewan, approached other air carriers in Canada, if necessary? You should be approaching the ones in Saskatchewan right now to come in and give us, for an example, Lloydminster, North Battleford, Saskatoon and Regina connections. How about connecting to Meadow Lake?

You just can't throw this over to the minister in charge of transportation. Sooner or later you're going to have to bite the bullet. If you can't do it, let somebody else do it, but don't keep passing the buck. You don't need a Crown corporation. You need a minister who's going to go out there and assume his responsibilities. You're doing pretty fair as the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I'll compliment you on that, except for some of these aspects where you're not doing the job.

You have Frontier. Good; I have no complaint. Still, you have two major cities in the province of Saskatchewan. You must be hearing this from other people. This isn't just coming from members opposite. You must be hearing it from the people from North Battleford, Meadow Lake and Lloydminster. Do you know what's going to happen, Mr. Minister? We're going to see a flight come into the province from Edmonton to Lloydminster and North Battleford. It may even go into Saskatoon. Where do the dollars then go? They go to Alberta. They don't need any more. They have enough. Let's get the people moving around in this province. This is 1981, not 1930.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know what we've done in order to promote tourism through the airline business. I think we've demonstrated what we have done in the biggest airline tourism market: the Frontier to Denver connection.

In regard to the intraprovincial connections, I can only suggest to the member that he blames us for not promoting something in that regard. I don't know what it is we're going to promote. We have promoted, pushed, begged and done everything possible in the years past to get private carriers operating in this province. For whatever reasons they may have, obviously profit being number one, they haven't been able to stay in business in a lot of areas. Either they haven't been able to make a profit on it or else haven't been able to run an efficient system, whether it is jet or prop jet or whatever.

That's a fault of private enterprise. It has not been successful in regard to that.

The only solution, and I offer it again to the member, is this: if you want to provide service, I think you're going to have to go more than just the private road. There would have to be something in addition to that. Peter Lougheed in Alberta has demonstrated that very well with PWA (Pacific Western Airlines). The member will be aware that PWA is a provincial Crown corporation which provides jet service to Alberta and other provinces throughout Canada and does a very good job of it at that.

Short of doing it yourself, pushing somebody has not been all that successful. The private enterprisers know that this province is alive. They know we have centres like North Battleford, Yorkton and Swift Current, but they have not been able to make a go of it. Norcanair is a private operation. It has discontinued service to a number of points. Either they don't have the expertise in the business sense or they haven't been able, in terms of profit, to make a go of it.

We can stay here all night and argue it back and forth, but I think we've done everything in our power. Not only myself, but the Minister of Transportation in this province has done a tremendous job in trying to promote some of these intraprovincial carriers. He has tried everything except standing on his head to move these guys and it's pushing deadwood. I think the member will appreciate that that is our problem; at least, he should appreciate it because I think every attempt has been made to provide service. The private carriers are not prepared, or if they are prepared, they haven't been able to deliver the service we need.

MR. GARNER: — You just stated that every attempt has been made. Who have you contacted either in Lloydminster or North Battleford — we'll just deal with those two for an example. Who have you, as Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, contacted in the Lloydminster or Battleford area regarding providing air service. You stated there was a private charter in there. To my knowledge, there has never been a private charter there; there has never been air service provided from that area. What have you as Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources done, or whom have you approached, either in that area, or from another province to service that area?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know which carriers we have talked to. We have talked to Norcanair, and have promoted Norcanair to make a hook up with the Frontier connection from the south, which will bring in a tremendous amount of traffic in the summer to go north, and to other points, thus making the other points they have on their schedule viable. I know the Minister of Highways and Transportation has spoken to many people in the airline business. We have had consultations with regard to providing better airline service throughout this province, and we have come to the conclusion we need a lot more than we have now. Those are basically the contacts we have made. There have been contacts made with a number of carriers.

The Swift Current connection to Calgary, Red Deer, Lethbridge and Regina — the Canadian Frontier — lasted 18 months, and it folded. There was a Frontier connection in Lloydminster that we helped activate and promote, and it closed. Southern Frontier has been the latest in a series of many carriers that have made a good attempt in trying to run a good service and have not been able to do it.

MR. GARNER: — I can see we could be here for two hours and we still aren't going to get anywhere. Send me a copy of some of your correspondence that you have had with these different companies, so I can decide for myself how much communication you

April 13, 1981

have really had with them. I think we will have to leave it at that; you can send me that anytime. The fact is we are going to be another year at least without air service, and without weekend service between the two major cities, and Lloydminster, North Battleford, Meadow Lake. We might as well forget it – they are not going to have air service. Just send me the copies over.

HON. MR. GROSS: — We will send you a copy of the contacts we have had with the other people as well.

MR. HARDY: — One subject we haven't touched on yet is fish hatcheries or renovations at the fish hatchery in Fort Qu'Appelle. I have a copy of a letter you sent to Mr. Johnson, your MLA for Turtleford, and I quote:

The Fort Qu'Appelle facility has deteriorated through use since the construction in 1956. It's now time to renovate the hatchery in order to maintain its current production, and \$750,000 has been appropriated and work is expected to begin shortly.

On this budget you appropriated \$1.25 million, which would be about \$2 million. Am I to assume the \$2 million will be spent – the \$750,000 as well as the \$1.25 million?

HON. MR. GROSS: — The figure I think the member is looking for is \$1.16 million for this year in the fish hatchery.

MR. HARDY: — I think, if I'm not mistaken, about two years ago there was \$700,000 allocated for that renovation and last year \$750,000 and this year \$1.25 million. When can we expect these renovations to begin? How much will they total in the end?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member is correct. Last year we had set aside \$700,00 for the fish hatchery. When the studies took place, we discovered that it would be very difficult to build the kind of facility we were looking forward to for \$700,000, so we decided to hold back on the project and do it this year with a different allocation at \$1.16 million and do the job that we wanted to accomplish in the end.

MR. HARDY: — I also note that you had sent Mr. Lalonde a letter saying that after long, careful study the government decided that major renovations at Fort Qu'Appelle would be the most effective solution.

It says (and it was dated last year):

This will begin this year. At the same time, we are examining the feasibility of building another hatchery at a more northerly location.

Could you tell me if any study has been done on that, and where it may be located?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the studies have not been done. They will be done this year. That's the idea.

MR. HARDY: — Could we assume that next year we can look forward to a new fish hatchery in the northern areas?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes. The fish enhancement program

in the North has not been identified yet.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, I would like to have some clarification pertaining to leasing out concessions in provincial parks. On Friday, you said that (and I'll quote from page 2076):

It is our policy in the leasing program that when we have a completely different and new facility, the business community in total has a chance to tender on that lease.

Could you tell me exactly when that policy was put in place?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact date that the policy was put into place, but it was many, many years ago. We don't have the precise date here. It was reconfirmed, I believe, in another policy manual dated October 1, 1979, but it is basically the same policy and it has been in place for a long time.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Okay. The original lease that was signed at Cypress Hills with the couple in question, and with whom you are familiar, was for a sit-down restaurant. They spent many thousands of dollars equipping the original building, only to find out that next year a fast food facility was put into Cypress Hills. Could you tell me when the fast food restaurant was built — it was a brand-new facility with different criteria — and why wasn't that tendered out?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is that the original restaurant which the member makes mention of was closed down by public health, and in its place was a temporary facility, quickly erected. On a temporary basis, it doesn't necessarily go out for retendering. It is only in the case of a brand-new, permanent facility that you retender.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Now, I call that double talk. You built a different facility; yet it wasn't tendered out. Last year you opened another facility. The couple in question had contacted your office for a lease renewal form. They had a two-year option left on the facility; yet they were never informed, even though you stated on Friday that they were informed. Could you tell me when they were informed that the project would be retendered?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the facility in question was a temporary facility. It was not a permanent facility. The permanent facility at that time was a facility which was condemned. It is the policy of the department that when we have a situation such as that, where we are moving into temporary quarters until new quarters are provided, the lease is extended. But if it's a brand-new permanent facility, a facility with a different purpose, which this one was (we were changing from a fast food facility into something else and it was of a very permanent nature and a fairly expensive little project), it is part of the policy to have it retendered.

MRS. DUNCAN: — you still haven't told me why the people who had the original lease were not informed that the new facility would be retendered. Now, I would like to know and I want that answer. Why were they not informed when they filled in their application for their lease option? Why weren't they informed in January that it would be retendered? And why were they told on three separate occasions that it was on your desk waiting for your signature, that that's all it would take?

April 13, 1981

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I know what the member makes mention of. The facts are that the people were informed that, in terms of the new building, it would be definitely retendered.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Would you repeat that? Did you say they were informed or weren't informed?

HON. MR. GROSS: — They were.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Okay. When were they informed?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they were informed in January that the facility would be retendered.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Who informed them?

HON. MR. GROSS: — One of the park officials, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Could I have his name, please, and how were they informed — by letter or by mouth?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised they were informed verbally and the official was Clark Gabel.

MRS. DUNCAN: — He's been dead for a while.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's pretty incredible.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Now yes, that is incredible. It was Clark Gabel who informed them on three separate occasions after January that the lease was sitting on your desk waiting your approval and everything was fine. Obviously, he doesn't know the policy in your department.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the confusion that exists — if there is any confusion that exists in this matter — is that the lease the member may be making mention of or is informed of is a lease that we left open because we did not know whether or not in the earlier part of that year the new facility would come on stream in time for the park season, which was May 15 — around May 15 or May 1. We left it open and there's a good reason for it. It's a normal procedure. We had no guarantee that our new facility would be in place and operable during that period. So the temporary facility would continue until such time as the new lease would come in, and that was the lease that the member is referring to, a lease that was in the department — "on the minister's desk," is what the wording is. The lease that the member is referring to was a lease that was being held, but it was because of the temporary facility that might have been required. And it was a good chance because the facility was only finished a matter of days before the opening of the season, and, had there been any mechanical problem with the building, we could have been delayed a month, two months or a year. And so that lease was not effectively terminated. It was still in place until there was a guarantee the new building was going to be in place. That is standard. The member is trying to insinuate there's something behind this all, that there is some cheeky scheme; it's not true. It's definitely not true; it's the fact that we kept as a safety margin or a safety valve the possibility of using that temporary facility. And if we did, we could instantly renegotiate the lease and away it would be. But when the new facility was obviously

going to be ready, they were advised the new tender was called.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't believe that for one minute, because how could you use an existing facility when the old fast-food restaurant was moved prior to the park opening and converted into an outhouse? Cripes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member is correct. We converted that building (as the member has said, it was a very temporary building) and we had a building in mind that we could have moved in very quickly; it was ready for the people in case we had to use temporary facilities. The store manager's store would have been used in the absence of another facility.

MRS. DUNCAN: — You know, I think, Mr. Minister, this is the typical case of a book written by Bureaucrat X, *Cover Your Ass*.

MR. HARDY: — I have a few questions I would like to ask about the Woody Lake fire. Could you tell me the cost of the fire suppression on the Woody Lake fire?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we don't have a breakdown handy yet. We will keep looking and see if we can get you the exact figure for the Woody Lake fire. In aggregate, for the entire fire program this year, \$15.5 million was for Saskatchewan. You will be happy to know that for Alberta it was \$45 million; Manitoba, \$15 million; Ontario, \$55 million; and Northwest Territories, \$15 million.

MR. HARDY: — You can send that copy of the breakdown over to me when you get it, okay? I would like a complete list of the breakdown for the Woody Lake fire, specifically, and the other ones. Could you tell me what is going to be done where there was a lot of lakeshore damage at Elbow Lake, Clear Lake, up in that area? Could you tell me what has been proposed and what is going to be done in the coming year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the first priority will be to get replanting going. It is our first priority in a burn area. In particular in a recreation quarter, if there is one in that area, we will make every attempt to speed that up. In regard to Elbow Lake, I am not sure what the member is asking. If he is asking if there is compensation for cottage owners there, the answer would be no, because everybody has the option of carrying insurance.

MR. HARDY: — There is one thing I would like to know. What are you going to have for fire fighting and suppression this year in the lines of planes, helicopters or whatever, mainly in that area?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I guess maybe I can very quickly read off the list. In terms of the air support, team 1 has three trackers on line; team 2 has another three trackers for a total of six tracker aircraft; two Beach Baron bird dogs, three Cansos, six helicopters and four Cessna 185s are ready to go. That is the present line-up.

MR. HARDY: — You will send a copy of that over to us, please. There is one other thing. How much is left to harvest and how much had been harvested out of the area which was burnt over? You must have an estimate of it now.

April 13, 1981

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I am told that the total timber salvage to date is 204,000 and an additional 10,000 in the bush. Simpson has left to harvest out of that cut 30,000 cords and SFP (Saskatchewan Forest Products) has 4,000 cords.

MR. HARDY: — So, you are telling me that there are 238,000 cords which is loggable timber to be taken out of the burned-over area? I thought the first estimate of the area was around 400,000 to 500,000 cords. I just wonder how much of that is going to be left in the bush. I am quite sure there is a considerable amount left in there. Have you any idea how much is going to be left which isn't going to be logged, or isn't going to be harvestable?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we cannot give an accurate, precise answer as to how much is not usable. I would suggest there is very little that cannot be used at all. We let the majority of it out. We don't have an exact figure to give the member. We won't know for another five months or so. It will be five or six months before we will know precisely how much is not usable.

MR. HARDY: — Well, I have one thing I want to bring to your attention. I have a letter written to the R.M., to Mr. Richard Dolezsar, and it is signed by your Mr. B. I want to read a bit of it to you. It says:

I might point out, in addition to costs incurred to the R.M. of Hudson Bay, my department expended \$150,000 to the suppression of an airport fire alone. It is my understanding that the airport fire resulted from spring burning on pasture lands under lease to the Erwood Grazing Association and that your reeve, Mr. Neal Hardy assumed responsibility for having it extinguished on April 23, at which time the remaining fire was about one acre in size. Information which I have before me indicates that on April 28 it broke out and . . .

I would like to know where Mr. B. got the information that I assumed responsibility for that fire?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member made a statement with regard to the airport fire. He asked who advised him that the R.M. did not act in regard to the airport fire which cost \$156,000. The answer is: the report came in from the field staff.

MR. HARDY: — It seems to me that he made a direct accusation in naming me. I am not very happy with that situation because in no way would I assume responsibility for that fire. It may be the R.M.'s responsibility. I don't know if it is or not. Now, it was pointed out that there was a fire there, and we did send some people over, but in no way did I assume that responsibility and in no way did he have the right to make that accusation. I would like to have it withdrawn.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the only information which I have is that on April 23, Mr. Spreitzer and Neal Hardy flew the fire with one of our choppers and walked the fire, which was about one acre in size. The fire was burning in the ground with a crown cover of spruce and poplar. Mr. Hardy was advised that some action should be taken on the fire. Mr. Hardy advised that he would have a crew in to look after it.

On April 28, 1980, five days later, at 3 p.m., the fire started to crown and went out of control. Town crews and staff members were used to fight the fire. On April 29, 1980, local crews from Saskatchewan Forest Products and MacMillan Bloedel and the town

were used to work on the fire. The fire crossed No. 3 Highway. At approximately 5 p.m. tracker aircraft were used to lay the guard on the north side of the highway.

It is a field report and we can go on and on with regard to the fire situation.

MR. HARDY: — What you've said there is true but I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Minister, that in no way did I assume responsibility. Showing me the fire does not make it my responsibility. Sending a crew out there was all my responsibility. We have a fire crew which looks after it, and that's delegated by the council. Pointing out that I was responsible for it was a misrepresentation of facts, and I don't feel very good about it. I'd like to see you look into it and have him withdraw that point.

I'd just like to continue. There was one other thing that went along . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I didn't. When I met with Mr. Kaeding earlier in the summer regarding this fire suppression, he agreed to assume at least part of it if not all of our cost of suppressing fires. He told me that he had turned it over to your department, and that you were looking into it, and that you would see that part of it was paid. I understood that. Now I have a letter here saying that you're not going to pay any of it. I just wonder where it stands.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member, and I'm sure he's quite familiar with it, the ground rules are that fires which start outside the provincial forest areas are the responsibility of the rural municipalities. If there is a threatened danger to the provincial forest, we'll insist on acting in that regard. But fires outside the provincial forest areas are the responsibility of the rural municipal governments.

MR. HARDY: — I hope you realize that these fires we put out would have matured into a major forest fire. Every one of those would have, had we not put them out. While you were out fighting the major fire, we were putting out fires that would have amounted to major fires. That's why we asked for reimbursement for it. I still feel we're entitled to it, considering that when we talked it over with the Minister of Rural Affairs, he agreed to it, and said he'd talked to your office and you had verbally agreed to it. I just wonder why you don't continue with the commitment.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, all I can say in answer is that on April 18 we advised the R.M., mainly through the reeve (who is the member sitting across the way) that we had located a fire which was burning in his area. Five days later, April 23, it was still burning. We were concerned. We sent in a chopper, picked up the reeve and he inspected the fire. I think the member will admit to that. On April 28 the fire went out of control, and there were 10 days between the first spotting of the fire and the fire going out of control. I can only add that it was a long time before anybody took action in that regard. We would have been happy to assist earlier, but there was nothing done by the R.M. It was clearly their responsibility, and as a result caused a fair amount of damage. We incurred \$150,000 worth of costs to put that fire out.

MR. HARDY: — I want to clarify one thing. To begin with, the fire that I was shown was put out. The fire started almost a mile and one-half from the original point where that fire was. That's just to clarify that point.

Secondly, as far as being called goes, I was away on holidays. They probably phoned the municipal office, which I wasn't even at. And when I was called, I went out in the chopper with Mr. Spreitzer and we looked at it. That fire was put out. If you had checked your records, you would have noticed that it was a mile and one-half to two miles away

April 13, 1981

from where the fire started that nobody was aware of. In fact, to be truthful, we had put out probably 20 or 30 other fires in the area prior to that. I don't know where they started from. Some started from airport facilities.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the member will know (I hope we don't drag this out forever) that fires will burn for a number of days underground, and one has to keep his eye on the smouldering stuff on the ground. Five days went by before anything was done.

MR. LANE: — Do you want to table that field report, please?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, this report's an internal document.

MR. LANE: — I didn't hear you. Would you repeat the answer?

HON. MR. GROSS: — I said that the report is an internal document, and no, we will not table it.

MR. LANE: — You read bits. Well, I'm going to accuse you of deliberately misleading the House, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! The hon. member has accused the minister of deliberately misleading the House, which is unparliamentary, and I'd ask him to withdraw that.

MR. LANE: — I'm prepared to withdraw my allegation if he will table the document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The hon. member knows that you can't accuse another member of deliberately misleading the House. I ask the member to withdraw that.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I think an . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. There is no point of privilege. I'll let you raise your point of privilege as soon as you withdraw the statement.

MR. LANE: — I will withdraw that, Mr. Chairman. I'll withdraw that unequivocally. Now, I want you to table that report, because I don't believe the information you gave is the least bit accurate.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, we have our own internal records as to what happened. I don't think members would quarrel with the facts — at least the member for Hudson Bay doesn't quarrel with the facts. I don't know what the problem is with the member for Qu'Appelle.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, if you are going to stand in this House and read bits and pieces from a field report, trying to condemn the member here, then why won't you table the whole thing so that we can see what the whole report says, rather than quoting it out of context?

I remember this minister, a few days ago, going right after the member for Rosthern and making a big case about quoting out of context. I say that the same thing is happening here. Now, come forth and table it like a man.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale asked the question. It was in reference to the airport fire with which he was involved. We simply provided the information to the House to clarify what happened at the airport fire. I don't think there's anything wrong with that.

MR. LANE: — I think the minister would be prepared to admit that he doesn't have the intestinal fortitude to table the documents.

MR. TAYLOR: — Then, if that's nonsense, from your seat, table the document in the House. Put your money where your mouth is.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I can only say that internal documents are just that — internal documents. They are documentation for the department to work from on a day-to-day basis.

MR. LANE: — Why are you afraid to table the documents?

MR. TAYLOR: — You're telling us that it's okay to read bits and pieces out of an internal document, but that you're afraid to table the rest of it. Is that correct? Then, do it.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, if you go back you will find that the member was commenting in regard to the airport fire. He was doing nothing more than commenting on the airport fire. He is indicating what things happened in regard to that airport fire. All we simply did was confirm what he was talking about, in detail, as to what happened from our account on a day-to-day basis.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, we can ask you the questions. You won't table the document. You read from some document and yet your deputy minister will make an accusation against a member opposite, and hang it on his head. Table that document so that we can find out. Or, table the document and withdraw the statement that Mr. Neal Hardy assumed responsibility for having it extinguished on April 23. Now, withdraw that, and table the document.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult for the members opposite to understand the fact that fires, in regard to a rural municipal area, are directly the responsibility of the rural municipality. Unless I'm wrong or don't understand the process very well, the person who is responsible for any rural municipality is the reeve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I want to refer all hon. members to section 327 from Beauchesne's, "Documents Cited," which reads as follows:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the Table. This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents that have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in.

I think, on this particular point, I would ask the indulgence of the House while I look into it to see whether or not an internal report can be considered a dispatch or other state paper, and I'll bring a report back to the House on that at a later time.

April 13, 1981

MR. BERNTSON: — Except, Mr. Chairman, this one little point – and it matters not how the process works. The fact is this letter clearly says that Mr. Neal Hardy assumed responsibility for having it extinguished on April 23. You show me where Mr. Neal Hardy assumed responsibility for having it extinguished on April 23.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member asks where we got this idea that he assumed responsibility? I repeated four or five times in this House that areas outside of the provincial forests are the responsibility of the rural municipality and (correct me if I'm wrong) the reeve is the person who is responsible for actions of the rural municipality. The reeve in this case actually viewed the fire and informed our people on the ground, because there was concern of the fire spreading into the provincial forest fire area. They informed the reeve about the fire. The reeve indicated to the people on the ground that he would have a crew in to look after it and I just, in response to the member opposite, advised him that we were aware that the member took action and he went out and visited and looked at the fire – walked the fire. After that, he advised our people that he would look after the fire. The member is asking an important, intelligent question about the airport fire. We simply advised as to what was occurring and what was the status of the events and that's exactly what happened.

MR. BERNTSON: — I've never heard such a line of double talk in my life and I suppose next you're going to tell me that Neal Hardy fell on his knees and said, "Please, let me be responsible for this fire." I'll tell you what you've done here today. You've just assured his re-election from now until forever more, and for that, we thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — I'll tell you, we're going to say that John Burton, defeated member, signed that report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

MR. ANDREW: — The question on whether item 1 is agreed, Mr. Chairman, relates to the ruling that you could come back to it, that it would have to be tabled and, of course, then further questioning could arise out of that tabling – if you ruled that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, suit yourself. I don't know if my ruling would have anything to do with whether or not the minister would lay the document on the Table. The question is whether or not he can quote from it without being willing to lay it on the Table. In other words, whether or not he should be able to do that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't have the ruling ready yet. I'm in the hands of the House. Do you want to continue on with this?

MR. ANDREW: — What I think the situation (as I understand it) is that basically the estimates relating to DTRR are just about completed, subject to, of course, your ruling potentially coming down and saying that that must be tabled in view of the fact that he has read from it and referred to it. If you go back to the ruling of law, clearly, if you are referring and reading from something in law, then you have to present that to the court. Therefore, if the ruling followed that, then the document would be tabled and some questions could emanate from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, suit yourself. If you want to hold up the estimates in tourism just to get that ruling, it's fine. I'm easy.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think we will agree to item 1 until you've agreed on a ruling. We'll stay on item 1 until you do come up with a ruling on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. BERNTSON: — To make it easy, Mr. Chairman, I would move that tourism and renewable resources estimates be held in abeyance or set aside and then we can move onto some other department, until such time that your ruling is brought in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think he's moving that we stand this. That motion requires unanimous consent. Is consent granted? No.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Go ahead and make a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I can't make rulings off the top of my head on something like this. I think it's important that we have some precedent. Maybe we could take a short adjournment and come back.

Order. First of all, I would like to thank hon. members for their indulgence. There are two questions that must be determined regarding this matter. The first is whether or not a minister should quote directly from departmental document during debate in committee of finance. The second question is whether he can be compelled to table such a document that has been quoted. I will refer all hon. member to Beauchesne's (Fifth Edition) citation 327 as follows:

(1) A minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from despatch or other paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table.

I further refer members to a precedent of this House dated December 4, 1973 and February 4, 1935 of the *Journals* of Saskatchewan, where it was ruled that a minister who quoted from a public document or state paper during debate could be required to lay such paper on the Table, but this did not apply to confidential documents or documents of a private nature passing between offices of a department. These rulings were based on references on Beauchesne's (Fourth Edition), citation 183, and Erskine May (Seventeenth Edition), paragraph 421.

I therefore rule that in this case the document in question is an interdepartmental report and the minister cannot be required to table it. I would like to caution ministers that while such documents may be referred to in debate, direct quotes should not be read from them, and this practice should be avoided in the future.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, what is your new policy on posting of provincial lands where trapping of fur-bearing animals goes on?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think it refers to an issue she raised with me some time ago. I think we advised we will be posting all the provincial park land and advising people when we know there are traps in the area. That is about all we can do.

MRS. DUNCAN: — The people in question, upon raising the issue with you originally, were less than pleased with the response they got from your departmental officials. I would have to say they did not only lose a cherished family pet, but it was also an extremely well-trained and valuable show dog. The first letter they sent to your officials

was ignored, and the second one they sent states they could have gone directly to the media under the circumstances and created a scene, but they thought it would be better to go through the proper channels. What they received was a sarcastic and humiliating letter from a senior official in your department. I am not going to name him, even though you named a name a while back. They also say that we feel this person acted in an irresponsible, power-oriented manner, and he discredits the position he represents. We would like you to discuss with him his actions and assure us in the future he will not be in a position to bully individuals with concerns such as ours.

Have you taken up your official's actions and discussed them with him, and what disciplinary action are you taking, if any?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, for fear of not using a departmental document I will try and report from memory, because you can't table that. The member says no one responded to the initial request; that's not true. It was followed up immediately, or very shortly thereafter, by the park superintendent on a verbal contact. He either telephoned or he met with the people at a meeting and discussed their problem with them. Later on — I don't recall the events and I dare not look at the paper to find out. Sometime later, they wrote again to the department and contacted the member in regard to the problem. I don't know what the member suggests we should do. We're suggesting we post the provincial park site, "Beware of traps or trapping. Trapping permitted in this area."

Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to talk over and above the large member for where ever he's from.

Our people have advised the people involved in this situation and have decided that we would post the lands in question if we know there are traps. The problem with that (as the member can appreciate) is that a lot of times we are not aware of people setting traps on provincial park lands, because they're public lands and people can enter onto those lands. If they happen to place a trap, we may not be aware of it. And if somebody's dog falls into it, we're not going to assume responsibility for that. But, where we know there are traps, we will post them and we'll make it obvious to everyone that there are traps.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I realize that. But my question was: what action did you take with your departmental official? And I would just like to reiterate that I have the same complaint with the Minister of Health, where a civil servant acted in a very high-handed, arrogant fashion. I would just like to say to you that, as the owner of a small business, if I had employees like that, my business wouldn't succeed very well. But people in high positions in government feel that they can bloody well do what they please and say what they please, without any recourse.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, without referring to the letter or knowing exactly what was in the letter, I can only say the letter was a straightforward reply from our department in regard to the problem. And, it was not, as the member says "snarky." It was a straightforward, honest, sincere answer to the problem. I don't think anybody was high-handed.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I'd like to raise a concern about the Outlook game preserve. It's located on the west side of the river and there's one-half section right in the center of that game preserve that the people have been wanting to put back into the preserve for a number of years. They indicate to me that there have been a number of letters back

and forth between them and the minister. The one-half section concerned has been requested by the owners to be put into the game preserve. I'm referring to the northwest quarter of section 17, township 38 and the northeast quarter of section 17, township 38, west of the third. I have letters here again requesting that you put that land back into the game preserve. I have a brief from all of the members who have land in the existing game preserve asking that you put that in. I'm willing to send these across to you. But I would like to have some comments from you and your department as to the reasons why you have not to this point in time agreed to accept this half section into the game preserve.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, I think we've got the right parcel in question and I'm advised that the parcel the member makes mention of is a private piece of land; it's a deeded half section of land and is cultivated as well. And because of the low habitat population in that area, and because of the cultivation, it has not been felt by the department that it is necessary that we place it into the game preserve.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, most of the land in this particular game preserve is deeded land. Of the half section in question, one-quarter is all in grass and the other quarter has been cultivated. They tell me that they have large numbers of geese in that particular game preserve and about 150 deer on this 12 sections of land. This particular half juts out within a quarter of a mile of the river itself. And people are coming in there to hunt. They're hunting basically right within the game preserve — a perfect spot really to clean the existing animals out. I'd like to know what your concern is about taking this half section in? The farmers that own it want it in; it would just straighten out the boundaries so there wouldn't be that opportunity to come in and to hunt and to harass the game so that they leave the district.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, my last comment is that it is a feeling of the department, after having looked at it very carefully, that there is not sufficient habitat in that parcel of land to warrant declaring it a game preserve for that area. It's as simple as that. It's not felt that there is adequate habitat in that area for the game preserve. So it has been decided that it's not a viable proposition. I don't know what else the member would want.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, there's a lot of concern in that district and I think it's about time that you listened to the people a little bit. Every man that has land in that particular game preserve has signed a petition requesting that this half section be brought in. Because of the problem that exists, they tell me that in the hunting season that often you will find 30 people lined up along the road allowance shooting into the half section, that the people who farm there really can't go out and work on either side of this half because of the hunters who go in. They said that it would make it very much simpler for your game wardens to supervise that particular area.

You say there isn't enough habitat. I don't know how much there has to be. They say as a very minimum they have 10,000 geese. That should be enough to raise your concern a little bit, I would think. And when you have the South Saskatchewan River as a major source of water for waterfowl and this particular half section is coming up almost to the river — within a quarter of a mile — I think that you should rethink this one.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, just in the event that we may have got the parcels mixed up, I'd be happy to review that. Perhaps the member could at some later time forward to me the copy of the petition he has from the people, because it could be, possibly, that we're talking about apples and oranges. And if we are, I'd like to make sure

April 13, 1981

that we know exactly what we're talking about. And so I will accept the member's suggestion to review it. We'll review it and take a look at it and I'll report back to him on whether this is the same proposition we're looking at. Maybe we can do something about it.

MR. SWAN: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'll get a photostat of this made and send it across to you.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 4 inclusive agreed.

Item 5

MR. HARDY: — Mr. Minister, other expenses went up from \$333,000 to \$1.021 million. Just explain the increase, please.

HON. MR. GROSS: — Mr. Chairman, the reason for the increase is in regard to the advertising program for the 50th anniversary of the parks system. We're going to be commemorating the 50th year of the system this year. The other reason is a number of items of a miscellaneous nature in regard to advertising across the entire branch: the printing of all departmental materials, brochures, posters, etc., other miscellaneous promotional materials, like souvenirs, displays, pins, flags and that kind of stuff. And, pardon me, it's also for the senior citizens program that we announced two weeks ago, the new senior citizens bus promotion: one-day tours during the summer and three-day tours during the off-season.

Item 5 agreed.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7

MR. HARDY: — One moment. Would you explain why it's only \$200,000 for fire suppression this year?

HON. MR. GROSS: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we put in an amount of \$200,000. If there is a bad year, obviously we'll spend a lot more than \$200,000, but the idea is to put an amount in the budget. Because there is no way you can budget for a forest fire year. And so the money is advanced as it's required during the season.

Item 7 agreed.

Items 8 to 25 inclusive agreed.

Vote 39 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Capital Expenditure – Vote 40

Items 1 to 6 inclusive agreed.

Vote 40 agreed.

HERITAGE FUND

BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCE DIVISION)

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Provincial Development Expenditure – Vote 40

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 40 agreed.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW (SUPPLEMENTARY)

TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 39

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 39 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.