

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon Mr. Hardy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the Legislative Assembly, 17 students from Mistatim. They're accompanied here today by their teacher Annette Legare, and their principal Garth Hibbert. They also have their chaperons along with them. They have Gordon and Joanne Kirkland and they have Martin and Eunice Biro.

Mr. Speaker, these students come from the north-eastern part of our province where we believe it's the prettiest it could be. It's the forest land of Saskatchewan and certainly one of the party here today works in the bush up there in our northern communities, and all our northern communities are involved in the forest industry one way or another and in farming.

So I'd like to extend to them a welcome. I hope they find the morning informative and that they enjoy it very much and that they have a safe trip home. I'll be meeting with them at 11 o'clock for pictures and back in my room at 204 at 11:15 for refreshments. I ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them to Regina.

**Hon Members:** Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Saskatchewan Health Laundry Study

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health, and it deals with a report prepared for his department called the Saskatchewan Health laundry report, or perhaps Saskatchewan Health laundry study. Can the minister tell the House and the Saskatchewan taxpayers who prepared this report for his department, about how much the study cost the taxpayers, and how the government contract for the work was awarded?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — I can indicate to you that it was, I think, it's associated . . . the consulting firm for Ron Ryan. I'm not sure of the name. I would have to . . . I wouldn't want to mislead you as to the cost. I would take notice of that and bring that figure to you. I do not have the figure at my fingertips. And also I think your question was how the contract was awarded. I would be pleased to provide that information to you too.

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Is the minister able to confirm that the study was prepared by Associated Business Consultants, the company owned by the former employee of the PC Party and also the former executive assistant to the president of SGI, Ron Ryan. Did I understand you to confirm that in your answer to the first question?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — Most certainly, Mr. Chairman, when I became Minister of Health, I noticed that there were certain patterns in laundry delivery that I did think that

maybe we could correct. For example, the laundry from one of the hospitals in North Battleford is not done in the laundry in North Battleford but goes to Prince Albert. That was the wisdom of the other government. The laundry from Meadow Lake passes through North Battleford to be done in Saskatoon. So there's been some very, very strange patterns established in how laundry services were done.

As an effective way of looking at more efficient use of health care dollars, I felt that it would be wise that we take a look and a study at how we can improve laundry services and also save money in providing them. So I asked my department to get a consultant to do this. In answer to your question, sir, yes, as I said at the beginning of my answer, the firm was the one owned by Mr. Ryan.

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did you feel that Mr. Ryan's service at SGI, which as the Premier told us yesterday was terminated, apparently for a breach of trust, particularly qualified him to undertake this work on behalf of your department, I suggest to you, on the basis of a contract of employment which was not tendered?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — I instructed my deputy minister to do a study, to get a study done on the laundry services because, and I will repeat it again, what I saw when I took over was rather a hodgepodge and looked to me to be a mess.

There's been pressure from an area in North Battleford which has a laundry, with maybe a few dollars could be updated, could serve that area much better. I think it's only wise that we have someone take a look at it and make some recommendations as to how it can be better provided.

And the underlying factor, of course, is to save taxpayers' dollars in the operation of the health care system. So therefore I have instructed my deputy to have a consultant do it. I think he looked at various other ones. I've told the member opposite that I will report back to him as to what way the contract was awarded, as to the amount of money that was paid for the study, but certainly that was the company that was selected.

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Was it Mr. Ryan's experience as an assistant to Mr. Collver and the Conservative Party, or was it Mr. Ryan's experience at improperly obtaining files from the SGI and showing them to people who had no right to see them? Was it each of those areas of experience which caused you to employ him, to study laundry services in North Battleford, Meadow Lake, Saskatoon, and elsewhere?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — I will tell you why I'm studying laundry services in Meadow Lake, North Battleford, P.A., and other parts of the province, because what I inherited from you and your operation was a sheer, utter mess of patronage to certain areas, certain trucking firms, things of this nature. That was it. You tell me. You . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Order.

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't finished my answer because I'd like the members opposite to justify why they think it's in the best interests of efficient delivery in Saskatchewan to take the Meadow Lake laundry to Saskatoon when you go right by one in North Battleford, to take the North Battleford Hospital to P.A. — to take the North Battleford's laundry to P.A. when there's one in North Battleford, And there are other services, Yorkton, other areas. That's what we have to look at. I asked my deputies to get a consultant to do this. He went through the selection process, and the firm of Mr. Ryan was selected.

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicates that he hadn't finished his answer. So far as I'm concerned he hadn't started his answer.

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

**Hon Mr. Blakeney:** — The question was relatively simple. What were Mr. Ryan's qualifications to undertake the study? Let's concede, for the purposes of this question, that a study was appropriate. What were Mr. Ryan's qualifications, and were the qualifications his particular knowledge of patronage, which you referred to in your last answer?

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, it's evident in this House any time you give an answer that happens to indicate some of the skulduggery, some of the poor service that was there when we took over, immediately . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. This Assembly cannot operate with this much noise, and I'm going to ask the members to come to order.

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — . . . immediately the members opposite, to try and cover their mismanagement, start shouting from their seats, making rude remarks, hollering and yelling in this forum. I don't appreciate that and neither do the people of Saskatchewan.

I indicated to the member opposite that I saw great needs that could be improved within the service of laundry in the hospitals of this province. I asked my deputy minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you can make light of it; you may think it may be better. The member from Quill Lakes again bellows from his seat saying he prefers that the laundry from Meadow Lake go through to Saskatoon. In fact, he probably would prefer it to come to Regina, because that was their policy to centralize everything here.

Let me tell you that I believe that money can be saved — money can be saved in the laundry services by taking a look at this. That money, Mr. Speaker can be used to being in other services in health care in this province. And I think that's what we should be doing.

They continue to banter from their seats because I don't think they support that kind of action, but I certainly do. I asked for a consultant to look at this. I asked my deputy to see if he could find someone that would come up with this type of evaluation. He selected Mr. Ron Ryan, and that is the study that's in.

## Positions Occupied by Relative of Member

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as minister in charge of the Public Service Commission, I would like to respond on behalf of the minister in charge of SGI who took notice of a question a couple of days ago concerning positions, Mr. Speaker, that were occupied by relatives of the member from Quill Lakes. The question was asked by the member from Regina North West, and I would like to provide this information to the Assembly today.

The information is as follows, Mr. Speaker. The sister-in-law of the present NDP member from Quill Lakes, the wife of one Morley Koskie, was employed in the Attorney General's department . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. Order. Order!

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the first relative employed by the NDP member from Quill Lakes was Deanna Koskie. The second relative employed by the NDP member from Quill Lakes . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, I guess, do not want to hear the information. But I will give it to the public anyway because this is very significant information. Mr. Speaker, I did not know this information until I became a member of the Assembly, and I think everybody in Saskatchewan deserves to know how many relatives . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Everybody in Saskatchewan deserves to know how many relatives of ours . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I would ask the minister to get on with the answer to the question.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — I will be pleased, Mr. Speaker, to get on with the answer. The third relative of the NDP member from Quill Lakes who was employed in the former government was one Morley Koskie, who happened to hold the position of vice-president of SGI. I suspect that he is the brother of the present NDP member from Quill Lakes.

So Mr. Speaker, we had Deanna Koskie, we had Linda Koskie, we had Morley Koskie, and the fourth relative employed by the former NDP government, the brother of M. Koskie, former NDP cabinet minister, related, of course, the member from Quill Lakes, the present NDP member, was Ted Koskie. Now Mr. Ted Koskie was appointed executive assistant to the minister of Consumer Affairs.

So what we have, Mr. Minister, to recap for the members of the Assembly and for all of the public: we had Deanna Koskie, Linda Koskie . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please, If the members would give the opportunity for the question to be completed, it would

take not nearly as long.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I'm going to caution the members that I've asked for order quite a number of times this morning and I'm not going to continue to do it.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was recapping and the members opposite had been making so much noise that I'm sure they could not hear my answer. So I will recap for them one more time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I would ask the minister to come to an end of the question.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addition to these four relatives of the present NDP member from Quill Lakes, I understand that there many have been a fifth relative that was employed in SaskTel corporation. We haven't been able to determine that completely. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, five relatives, at least four, possibly another one, employed by the present NDP member from Quill Lakes when he was in the NDP cabinet.

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

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'd like to ask the minister a supplement. We're any of them ever charged or convicted for incompetence, or removing files, or corruption, or have any of them fired who were with cause?

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, I had considerable difficulty hearing the question from the NDP member from Quill Lakes whose relatives were employed so substantially . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I'd like to ask a supplement to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister, in view of all of the dismissals because of cause relative to Ron Ryan episode that has continued during your reign as government, I want to ask you whether any members of the Koskie family that you mention, any of them were fired for cause or for corruption or for pilfering files or incompetence, as is happening in the employees of your government vis-a-vis Grady, vis-a-vis Cutts, all of these people that you've hired.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the real question that should have been asked, Mr. Speaker, is were there any Koskie relatives that were not hired?

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Mr. Koskie:** — The question is, since the minister has indicated the number of Koskies that were hired, I want to ask him whether any of them were dismissed for cause or corruption or for mishandling the affairs of government, pilfering files, or excess travel, or any of the current concerns that we have with the management of government at the present time.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, I can speak for my relatives, and I can certainly say that none of my relatives are employed by the present government. I'm sure the member opposite knows his relatives better than anybody else, and that's likely one of the reasons why so many of his relatives were employed by the former NDP administration — four, five, perhaps six of them.

Talk about nepotism, Mr. Speaker. It was rife under the former NDP administration. Certainly that is something not to speak of proudly. And how the member opposite can stand up and somehow defend the fact that four or five or six of his relatives were employed by government, certainly that is something which I don't think the public would support. And I think it's important that they hear the information, and I have just given it to them, Mr. Speaker.

### Saskatchewan Pension Plan

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, two months ago in the throne speech which opened this session of the legislature, which has now been sitting for some considerable days, your government promised the quick introduction of legislation to create a voluntary Saskatchewan pension plan.

Can the minister inform the Saskatchewan people whether the detailed legislation has been drafted and, if it has, when will it be introduced in this Assembly so that many groups in Saskatchewan, many families in Saskatchewan, and others interested in how the plan will operate, can study the legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The legislation is presently being drafted. I'm not sure whether it's into the final draft yet or not. We certainly expect it this session. I know the hon. Member is getting the same questions we are — that people support the Saskatchewan pension plan, the concept behind it, particularly the home-makers of Saskatchewan who believe it lone overdue, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the public of Saskatchewan will continue to look with interest at this rather innovative proposal by the Government of Saskatchewan. And the legislation, as I say, is presently being drafted and will be introduced at the appropriate time in this session.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary. Mr. Minister, clearly this is not a simple issue. This is a very complicated issue, and the details of the legislation are very crucial as to just how effective or how fair such a plan is going to be. Press releases are not going to be enough, Mr. Minister, but the legislation is what citizens of this province must see, so that they have sufficient time to consider it.

Why was your government not capable of preparing this legislation before you introduced it in the throne speech, and therefore delaying it until the latter stages of the session so that the public will not have an opportunity to study it?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The hon. member talks about time, and I'm actually somewhat surprised and shocked at that

question. He had 11 years in the cabinet to try and come up with pensions, an adequate and fair pension, for the home-makers of this province. The NDP turned their back on them like they turned their back on the farmers and those owning homes when the interest rates were 20 and 22 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the program will be well received by the people of Saskatchewan. They will have their opportunity to review it. I continue to remind the public that the NDP turned their backs on those pensions, refused to have them, and have already indicated – have already indicated – that they will oppose the Saskatchewan pension plan, have indicated their alternative of the guaranteed annual income, modified welfare for seniors, which is the NDP proposal. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it'll be another opportunity for the NDP to oppose a common-sense, good proposal for the people of Saskatchewan like they've done with the paper-mill, Gainers, upgraders, etc.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. And I wish the minister would address the question. I will give him an opportunity to do that. Mr. Minister, you will know that there have already been a number of questions that have been raised about the fairness of your proposed pension scheme, at least as you have outlined it to this point, and I think that that is even more reason why many groups and individuals are anxious to see the detailed legislation well in advance of the final passage. There have been suggestions made by people who have some authority on this that substantial subsidies to those well-off households will be provided under your scheme, and there will be many, many people who cannot afford, in this pension plan proposal of yours, to be in it, who will be left out. And that's why it is important to have this legislation early, Mr. Minister.

So I ask you: prior to your decision to proceed with a voluntary pension plan for home-makers, did you study the history of such plans in other places, like in Europe, where governments have found that only upper income people are able to take advantage of such plans while the neediest home-makers are left out?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well I can't see how the member can have it both ways. On the one hand, he's criticizing the plan that has not yet been . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Oh yes, you've been criticizing it. The NDP have been criticizing the Saskatchewan pension plan, doing it here again today, anticipating a plan that I've indicated the drafting is being done and that the public will have ample opportunity, Mr. Speaker. You can rest assured that the plan will be well received by the people of Saskatchewan.

Secondly, it's about time that the home-makers in this province have had a pension plan. We will continue to show the leadership in protecting the security of home-makers and those owning homes in the province, Mr. Speaker. I just remain absolutely amazed that every time a new idea, a new proposal, new industry, new business, new opportunities have come forward, the

NDP have opposed them every step of the way, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister obviously has now indicated that the reason that they have delayed the introduction of the legislation – because they're afraid of a critical analysis of the proposed scheme, Mr. Minister.

Can the minister tell us how a needy family, which can't afford the monthly payments into a voluntary pension plan, would benefit under your scheme?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — The details will be announced, but we brought this . . . He said that we were not anticipating or afraid of criticism. Let me make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker. When we announced the Saskatchewan pension plan and the program for home-makers' pensions, we were anticipating criticism, Mr. Speaker. We were anticipating criticism from the New Democratic Party, its members and its candidates. We believe that that criticism will come, Mr. Speaker, because they have opposed every single good idea, every new business, every new project that this government has implemented over the last four years.

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

#### Young Offenders' Centre in Saskatoon

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, it deals with concerns that have been raised, and I raise this question again for your consideration as you weren't here the other day and the acting minister of Justice wasn't able to answer it. It deals with the concerns raised by the residents of a residential neighbourhood in Saskatoon who have learned almost by accident that your government plans to open a young offender's centre in the middle of the residential area.

Can the minister tell the Assembly that the people and the people of Saskatoon Nutana – why your government refused to consult with the residents in the area prior to the decision to open the centre?

**Hon. Mr. Dutchak:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member and the people of Saskatchewan know full well that this government is noted for consulting before we make moves on anything. Mr. Speaker, I want to also inform you that we're dealing with a relatively new piece of federal legislation here, and there are certain transitions that are taking place across Saskatchewan. It's interesting to note that the NDP members had great concern over crowding problems a week or two ago in our jails, and now when there is an attempt to revamp the system and to bring in new ideas, they suddenly don't like that either.

In specific reference to the question, I wish to now refer it to the Minister of Social Services who is directly responsible for this area.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order, please. The minister referred it across to the Minister of Social

Services who is responsible for the area.

**Hon. Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, the matter of the location of young offender's facilities is, of course, something that is naturally of concern to myself as Minister of Social Services responsible for the implementation of young offenders' programming. I know that it's a matter of concern to people in the province.

We want to ensure that facilities are appropriately placed to alleviate whatever community concerns there might be as best as possible, but at the same time, to ensure that we are providing appropriate residential facilities for young people who are not a threat to the safety or the well-being of the community, and many of these young people that are sentenced under The Young Offenders' Act, of course, do live in urban areas.

It's appropriate ... (inaudible interjections) ... Well, the members opposite don't seem to be listening whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why they even ask the question unless they're interested in hearing the answer.

I indicated to the member opposite that we are in a consultation process with the individuals in that particular area. The matter of where young offenders' open-custody facilities should be located is a difficult decision. We want to do what is best for the community. At the same time we want to do what is best for the young people who are involved, because we all do have a concern about both of those matters.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No. 41 – An act respecting Stock Savings Plan Tax Credits

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill, respecting Stock Savings Plan Tax Credits.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### Bill No. 42 – An act to amend The Income Tax Act (No. 2)

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Income Tax Act (No. 2).

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### Bill No. 43 – An Act to amend The Wildlife Act

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Wildlife Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## SECOND READINGS

### Bill No. 24 – An Act respecting the Licensing and Inspection of Amusement Rides

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I'm going to be relatively brief in my comments on second reading. I'll be less brief in committee of the whole, Mr. Minister. We have no particular quarrel with the goal of this legislation. Indeed we had – the former government – had made some tentative and unsuccessful efforts to develop some legislation to deal with this problem.

Amusement park rides operate in a variety of milieux in Saskatchewan, everything from the exhibition in Regina to some very small and very unsophisticated operators operating in smaller communities in Saskatchewan. These rides are inherently dangerous, put a child at the end of a light chain and swing them around, and you obviously have a potential for injury and danger.

So we don't quarrel with the legislation. It's overdue.

I have some serious questions, Mr. Minister, about your ability to enforce this legislation. I note with alarm, I think that the same branch of your department which failed to prevent the death of Polly Redhot, and I won't put it any stronger than that, is also looking after this. The staff complement wasn't adequate during that regrettable incident a year ago and hasn't improved much. You're adding on to a branch which was already overworked – demonstratively so, with tragic consequences; you're adding on quite a hefty responsibility from the 1st of June to the 1st of September.

This, if it's done properly, will be a very considerable responsibility. So I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, how you're going to enforce it? I don't want to be misunderstood. It isn't just small operators who run a potential risk. I note there was a girl killed in Vancouver in what must be one of the larger amusement parks in Canada at the moment, at the Expo '86. So patently the very large operators in Regina and Saskatoon, the very small operators operating in towns and villages, all require supervision. It's an inherently dangerous situation.

We support, Mr. Minister, and we'll be voting in second reading for the Bill. But I really want the minister to address himself as to how he's going to enforce it as you simply don't have the manpower you need to do the job, unless there's something I've overlooked, and if I have, I'll be delighted to be informed of that fact.

I don't take any particular joy in the understaffing of the safety inspection branch of your department; no one would.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, our caucus will be voting in favour of this on second reading. The minister may have an opportunity to address himself to some of these things in closing debate, or you may want to do it in committee of the whole, but we do want you to address yourself to your staff complement in the safety and inspection branch.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm certain that the opposition agrees that this legislation is necessary. It's unfortunate that we recently had an example of a little girl being killed at Expo, which drives home the need for this legislation. Unfortunately the opposition wishes to have a guarantee that if we pass legislation, no one will be injured in Saskatchewan. And I can't make that kind of guarantee, nor can I guarantee that there won't be other accidents in Saskatchewan.

But we have to start somewhere and we are starting today to pass safety legislation on amusement rides and to make inspections, and certainly while we can't guarantee no one will be injured, we can guarantee that there will be a greater effort made than there ever has been in the past. And we do not guarantee that there will be no injuries. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we make no guarantee and, if there is an injury, I certainly hope that the opposition will not be joyful in the misery of the people of Saskatchewan when there is an accident, as they have dwelled on it in other instances.

We consider this a positive step, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan deserve this kind of protection. We will do everything possible to enforce the legislation. We will be reasonable about the enforcement, but the number one priority will be the safety of children and adults who ride on these rides. Therefore I'm pleased to move second reading.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 31 – An Act respecting the Provision of Home Care Services**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not have a great deal to say on Bill 31, which basically sets out a Bill that will set in legislation what has already been in existence for some time, as I understand it.

And as you know, Mr. Speaker, the home care program, which is an excellent health care program, was brought in by the previous New Democratic government under the leadership of the then premier, Allan Blakeney, and the minister in charge of Social Services – that's when this area was under the auspices of Social Services and now has been moved over to Health. But my colleague and friend from Quill Lakes was the minister of Social Services at that time, and I think did an excellent job of setting up, now without some difficulty – but any new social program will have an introduction period, but I think now has proven to be one of the best health care programs in Canada.

And I just say that the legislation which we are now dealing with today does little to improve the home care program; in fact there are many in the province who believe that home care is in many ways starved for money. And I hear from time to time from home care boards who are saying that they would very much like to expand the four basic roles of home care to include physiotherapy and a meaningful transportation component. Because, as you will know, Mr. Speaker, in the rural areas particularly, members of families who are elderly and needing home care, one of the big

components is transportation and physiotherapy. And not only haven't we moved quickly into physiotherapy, but we haven't even taken the opportunity to set up a division, at our university, of occupational therapists.

And I think that's something that our government will look at quickly after the election which we believe will be called on May 24th at the nominating convention of the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. And I think there's a great deal of anticipation, not only that Bills like this will actually have some substance to them in terms of bringing physiotherapy and transportation in a meaningful way, but right after the election, which we believe and people are hoping will be called on the 24th of May, that we will have proper staffing of our hospitals, where many of the seniors are, in terms of getting health care and are not getting the proper nursing care because we have a nursing shortage at the present time, is clearly outlined by the nurses in the province.

I say as well that there will be some questions that I want to ask if we get to the committee on this Bill before the election is called on May 24th at the nominating convention of the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. If we get to committee, I want to raise a number of issues, and some of them are the reference to volunteers in the minister's remarks. And I won't do it now, but there are some questions about the role of volunteers – if we'll be moving away from paid staff in the home care program to more volunteers, or whether he's suggesting volunteers will play a lesser role in the program. And I'm not here being critical, but there are some answers that I would like to see.

I would say as well that the other areas that should be looked at in the area of complementing the home care program are programs again that were brought in by the New Democratic government, such as hospitalization insurance. We worry a great deal, with the very high deficit that these birds have run up, that they will be forced to – if they were to possibly win an election after May 24th when the election is called – that with that high deficit, if they are not able to manage the economy of the province, that they may look at having hospitalization premiums the way the last right-wing government of Mr. Thatcher, when they couldn't manage the economy . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I would ask the member to stay on the subject of the Bill. He's wandering into elections and many areas that have nothing to do with the Bill.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — A big part of the democratic system, the fact that we are here, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the fact that we were elected, and it's hard to deal . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I've just given my ruling. The member is not allowed to debate my ruling, but rather to follow it, and I would ask you to get on with the subject at hand.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Your ruling is definitely correct, and I know the members opposite are very, very sensitive at the present time. And I will want to talk about other little programs, not small to the people who they affect, but that complement the home care program – things like

medicare, which come under the umbrella of the Department of Health and are a big part of the home care program which were brought in by previous NDP and CCF governments. And we would hope that as we work through this Bill that there are some questions that I want to ask as the relationship between hospitalization and medicare and the home care program.

But I want to say that in having people remain in their own homes, whether they are elderly or whether they are younger people who have medical problems that are debilitating, that possibly mean that they need the help of the home care programs, there were other programs brought in by the New Democratic government like the SAIL (Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living) program, the drug plan, the hearing aid plan.

And I just say to you, Mr. Minister, that it is difficult to work under such restricting rules in this Assembly when we have to stick so closely to the Bill, but I think maybe we will be allowed in committee to ask some of the questions that will directly relate to things like the programs brought in by the New Democratic government. Mr. Speaker, you will remember some of them, when you were in opposition, like the SAIL program and others that greatly helped senior citizens. And we would hope that the home care program will not deteriorate further under your government because that's what people are basically telling us.

And I remember being in, I believe it was in Rosetown, for the opening of that home care operation, and the great excitement and expectation that there was at that time, and speeches made by individuals there that complimented the government of the day for bringing in the home care program.

And today what we are seeing is the culmination of a great work done by a New Democratic government. And I give you credit for bringing in the Bill, but I would also suggest that we would look at extending the home care program to include transportation and physiotherapy. And I know that all members of the Assembly will be supporting this Bill. It's not a matter that there's anything in it, but it gives more legitimacy to the home care program that was introduced by the New Democratic government in the late 1970s.

(1045)

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the member opposite when he stood up. I thought he was giving an election call. He was continuing to talk about nothing about home care other than try to bring out pure partisan politics. I listened to him for five minutes.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the reason this Bill is in this House is that the NDP never ever got around to providing a basis for home care. It was just a clause under The (Saskatchewan) Hospital Standards Act. They never thought home care was important enough to bring in a Bill and put it on its own right.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, since taking over in health care some four years ago, we've travelled this province. More recently we've talked to over 2,500 people who

said that home care is a priority and home care should be beefed up. We listened to those people. In last year's budget we changed the formula so, where there were areas where there were more elderly people in that home care district, they got a bigger grant; and that was very well received. And in this year, in our consultation and discussion with people . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Again, Mr. Speaker, as soon as you start touching a nerve in the opposition, they start barking from their seats. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg continuously hollers from his seat every time you start to score a point against the NDP . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Let me indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people out there said, thank you for doing that, but we have a predominance of elderly people, so let's look at the funding again. So this year in this budget you will see that, for those who have people over 75 years of age, they get an extra \$30 in their operating budgets. Those are the things that people want to see happen.

And I hear the member opposite talk about volunteers. I know that they are against volunteers, but as I travel this province, I know there's an awful lot of people out there, people who feel that they can do something to help the senior citizens and the young disabled of this province. They don't want to go into full-time work; they don't want part-time work; but they want to use their expertise and their ability to help out.

And from where I come from in Saskatchewan, that's what Saskatchewan is all about. I see nothing wrong with allowing people who want to help out in some way, shape or form: in driving people down to shop, and maybe helping people go to the doctor; things of this nature, providing transportation in small towns. If they so want to do that, if church groups want to do that, and service clubs want to do that, they should be allowed to do that. They may think that everybody should be on a contract and be paid, and they would like every worker to be unionized — and I know their standpoint — but I can tell you, in talking to people out there there's an awful lot of people in Saskatchewan that say we support what you're doing in the care for the elderly; we support the fact that you're building 1,600 nursing beds; we support that you're enriching home care; and we want to help out, and we'll help out as volunteers. And this Act is going to allow them to do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm proud to bring this Act, this Act that has been needed for a number of years in Saskatchewan because the legislative authority was never really there. The Provincial Auditor is questioning how grants can be made without an Act, so the Act is coming here. The federal government was willing to probably cut back on payments without an Act. That was the way the NDP had home care in place. I can tell you that the Devine government has improved home care immensely over the last four years. We're going to do more.

The member opposite talked about therapy. If he had listened to the Speech from the Throne and listened to my estimates, he'd know that the number of therapists in rural Saskatchewan are being doubled this year.

So certainly services to the young, disabled and the elderly, mainly the people served by home care, are forging ahead. And I can tell you that the home care program that has been developed by the Devine government is the best home care program in Canada, and I'm proud of that. And that's why this Act is here, and I'm proud to move second reading of this Act.

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

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — I ask leave of the Assembly to introduce some guests. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce some guests to our Assembly, and I do this on behalf of my colleague the member for Humboldt.

Our distinguished guests today, Mr. Speaker, are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are from our good neighbours to the South, the United States of America. They are six in number. And I just want to, on behalf of the Assembly, wish them a very pleasant visit to our legislature. I trust that in the short time that you're here you will have an opportunity to gain some knowledge of our legislature, of our parliamentary system.

I am going to be taking the opportunity to meet with them, Mr. Speaker, for a while, for 15 or 20 minutes in about 20 minutes from now, and try to assist them in understanding our parliamentary system as it contrasts the United States system of government.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to just make note that they are accompanied today by a teacher from Humboldt, Mrs. Candace Adams. And so I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here to the legislature today.

**Hon Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** M. le Président, c'est mon plaisir de vous présenter pour ma collègue le ministre d'Energie, le membre pour Weyburn, des étudiants de la belle province, Québec.

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

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** Merci. J'espère que vous allez enjouir de votre visite ici à la Saskatchewan, et que vous allez trouver la session à la législature très intéressante. Les professeurs qui sont avec les élèves sont Richard Wanner, de Weyburn, et Messieurs Arsène Savoie, Alain Gauthier, et Walter Sonier de Jonquière, Québec. Bienvenue!

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### Bill No. 34 – An Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the Assembly our associate deputy minister, Mr. Merv Clark, directly on my right. And as well with us here today is Paul Hunt from the department, a traffic safety engineer.

Clause 1

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, I have a number of questions that I want clarified in this Bill, although we don't necessarily object to you allowing signs along highways. But there are some questions in this Bill, and I think what I'll do, if the chairman will be lenient and give us enough time when we go clause by clause, I will ask most of my questions as we go through the Bill clause by clause.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

#### Clause 3

**Mr. Lusney:** — Clause 3, Mr. Minister, it says here that you will be allowing a larger group of private signs to be exempt. Now what do you mean by that? What kind of signs will be exempted that will not require a permit apparently, or whatever the section is supposed to mean. Could you just explain what that means?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Quite simply, what we will be doing is expanding that, and they will primarily be the advertising type of signs that will be advertising the small businesses in our various communities. So they will be small-business signs, direct advertising signs, if you like.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Those will be allowed along the highways then without a permit being required? Any business that wants to set up a sign will be able to put it up without having to apply for a permit?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — No, they will have to have a permit.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, you're saying then that they will require a permit for any sign that they put up. What's that clause with the exemption in there supposed to mean then? Why do you feel that this will allow a larger group of private signs to be exempted? Just what is that clause supposed to mean?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — They would be limited in number and primarily would consist of — I guess a good example would be a construction sign. If there is some ongoing construction in an area, and people would like to be directed to the construction or be knowledgeable about where the construction is taking place, that would be a prime example.

**Mr. Lusney:** — That will not, however, apply to any other form of sign then. It would be basically an informational sign regarding construction or some other thing that may come up at a given time and will not be a sign that will be up there for a lengthy period of time.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Yes, they're normally a very temporary type of signs.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, it also states in here that you will be exempting a certain size of sign; anything over 3 by 3, 3 square metres, will be exempt. Does this mean that anyone having a sign that'd be larger than that would not require a permit, or are you saying that anyone with a larger sign than that will not be able to put up a sign at all?



**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Yes. Signs that are the standard 4 by 8 sheet of plywood size or smaller will not require a permit. Any signs larger than that, yes, they will be able to be erected. But signs larger than 4 by 8 — I prefer to use the imperial measure, if you like — signs larger than 4 by 8 will require a permit.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Did I understand you to say that a sign by 4 by 8 will not require a permit, but anything larger than a 4 by 8 will require a permit?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — That is correct, sir.

**Mr. Lusney:** — So then you're saying, Mr. Minister, that if anybody wants to put up a 4 by 8 sign, he can just set it up along the highway for whatever purpose he wants, and he wouldn't require a permit for it.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — I'm sorry, I did not make myself perfectly clear. I was speaking about on-premise signs. If we are speaking about signs that are off the premises, then all signs regardless of size will require permits. I want to make that perfectly clear.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Okay, Mr. Minister. Any signs, then, that will be on the direct premise of that business will not require a permit — if it's a 4 by 8 sign, or smaller than 3 square metres, will not require a permit — if I understood you correctly. That's what you are saying. But if they want to set up . . . if that same business wanted to set up a 4 by 8 sign a quarter-mile down the road or so, they would require a permit for that.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Yes, sir that's absolutely correct.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, it states here also in 3(3) that you will be designating, you could designate, a person or an employee or anyone else to provide or allow or issue these permits. Do you have someone in mind, or what kind of structure are you going to create to provide permits for whoever applies for them?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Yes, that's a very good question, and we certainly have given these considerable thought. And the intent of it is to pass on this right, if you like, or the authority to issue the permits to local governments. We're speaking about municipal officials or urban municipal officials or R.M. officials, or someone designated by those elected people.

(1100)

**Mr. Lusney:** — Is there going to be some form of guide-lines given to them by which they could sort of assess whether the sign will be allowed to not allowed, or are they just going to be appointed and told, well, you make the decision whether you want that sign out there or not, and we aren't going to tell you what the guide-lines should be?

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Yes, that will be covered in depth by regulations. And I can assure you that there will be standards that will have to be adhered to, and those will be covered once again by regulation.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

## Clause 6

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — On clause 6, I would just like to . . . well firstly, introduce to you someone from the Department of Tourism and Small Business. The director of tourism development, John Spicer, is with us. And I at this time would like to pay a great deal of tribute to the small-business people in the department.

The impetus for this whole legislation came when our Minister of Tourism and Small Business went to a number of meetings around the province and consulted first hand with a large number of business people all over the province. His officials were with him. And this was brought to light, that a major concern of many small-business people would like less restrictions on business signing.

At the conclusion of these meetings it was brought to my attention, and our department officials, together with the officials from the Department of Tourism and Small Business, worked very, very closely in some other follow-up meetings. And I just wanted to pay my personal thanks to both the officials in my department who worked very, very hard on this, and the officials in the Department of Tourism and Small Business who did go out to the public and consulted with a large number of people.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think it's very, very important that we as a government respond quickly to the needs and the wishes of the public of Saskatchewan. And in this particular instance I do want to really say that we really worked quickly to address the solution. And I'm certainly very, very happy that the opposition is co-operating in their rather abnormal fashion.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, after listening to some of those comments, I would only hope that the people that'll be involved would look closely at the countryside and the scenery that we have in this province and not litter the highways with signs totally, so that the people driving down those highways can enjoy some of the scenery that we have.

Also, Mr. Minister . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You've got to watch for potholes.

**Mr. Lusney:** — I think it would be nice if you would also fix up some of those highways so that when the people are trying to read those signs they wouldn't wind up wrecking their vehicles while they're driving down the highways. So I think you have to maybe do both.

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

**Mr. Lusney:** — When you put up the signs, get some of those highways fixed up at the same time.

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Well I, at this time, certainly wouldn't want to direct my comments specifically to the roads, but as it respects the aesthetics of the countryside, I really do appreciate your genuine concern for that.

And I can give you, and I can give the public of Saskatchewan, our assurance that the regulations will cover these signs, so that aesthetics are not jeopardized and so that we do not end up with any billboard jungle. That certainly will not be the case. We will be very, very cautious that we go a slow road on this and make very, very certain that we have still a very aesthetically pleasing landscape.

Clause 6 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 34 – An Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks and Renewable Resources Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 39

#### Item 1 (continued)

**Mr. Petersen:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I have a few questions with regards to your estimates in general, if I may. I want to start out, first of all, with a couple of concerns to my farmers with regards to duck depredation and water-fowl depredation of our crops. Can you outline to me the system that will be in place this year for farmers to collect compensation for duck depredation or water . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. Order! I'm afraid I'm going to have to insist on a little less noise in here. The minister certainly won't be able to hear the question, and I would ask that you come to order.

**Mr. Petersen:** — I'll repeat that question, Mr. Minister. The opposition was making a bit too much noise. With regards to duck depredation of our cereal crops, Mr. Minister, could you explain to me the system that will be in place this year?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the concern the member just raised and I don't think it matters which political party he represents, because this particular issue is certainly non-partisan and it certainly cuts across all political boundaries and it is also extremely important. So I'd just like to respond to the member and outline our water-fowl crop damage prevention program.

A five-year, water-fowl crop damage prevention agreement covering the period 1983-87 was signed by Saskatchewan and Canada on March 30, 1984. The agreement was implemented by Saskatchewan Parks and Renewable Resources and covers prevention activities

only. I think that's important to note. Environment Canada and Saskatchewan each contribute up to a maximum of \$350,000, for \$700,000 annually.

Compensation to farmers suffering water-fowl crop damage is available through a separate program administered by Agriculture Canada and Saskatchewan Crop Insurance. A five-year water-fowl compensation agreement signed on March 21, 1984, provides compensation to a maximum of \$70 per acre to \$13,000 per farmer. Claims are filed through the local Saskatchewan Crop Insurance offices.

We feel that both programs are highly effective and have been well received by the farming community, with positive implications for habitat retention programs.

**Mr. Petersen:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In regards to water-fowl in general, and the fact that obviously tourism is a big industry in Saskatchewan, we have a number of heritage marshes, and I have two of the very first in my constituency – Ponass Lake and Foam Lake. Could you outline to me the operation of the heritage marshes and how they affect the surrounding municipalities?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll give the member a little bit of background, and then I'll perhaps describe some of the marshes in place. The purpose of the Saskatchewan heritage marsh programs is to preserve and improve major wetlands for wildlife in the province. It also ensures that crop damage control for landowners in the vicinity of a specific marsh through provision of bait stations, lure crops, scare cannons, and compensation measures.

The November 1981 heritage marsh agreement with Ducks Unlimited Canada, Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, and the Saskatchewan Natural History Society include five marshes. I can arrange to have physical descriptions of the areas and all of the projects and the costs and benefits sent over to the member for his edification, if that's agreeable, and I can also arrange to have it sent to members of the opposition.

**Mr. Petersen:** — Mr. Minister, one final question with regard to wildlife and problems with farmers, and that regards elk. And a number of my farmers are very close to the provincial forest and have suffered some problems with elk this past year coming out and getting into their bales and into their feed supplies. Could you outline to me what steps you plan to take to maybe prevent this or to help the farmers out?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now this is problem not only in this particular member's area, Mr. Chairman. We are also having problems in the south-west part of the province, the Cypress hills area, because of the large elk contingent down there.

Basically what the department attempts to do is to prevent damage from happening. If we're contacted, we'll have officers go out and meet with the individual farmers and take a look at fences and crops and anything we can do that would try and prevent the animals from getting into the farmers' fields.

(1115)

Once damage has taken place, the maximum compensation available is \$2,500. Personally I feel that that type of a program would be better operated under the auspices of crop insurance.

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. A question I have: could you give me an update on your current negotiations with the federal government regarding what is the standing on the grasslands park? Last year's estimates, the bottom line was that some exploration needed to be completed to determine the gas and oil and coal reserves in the park area, and they were going to argue about that. And that sounded like the only hold-up to go ahead with the park. Can you give me an update, what's happened during the past year, and if they grasslands park is on hold, or if it's dead, or what's really happened since your government has taken over this one?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — An excellent question, Mr. Chairman, and it's been rather a ticklish problem for my department. As the hon. member would recall from last year, and ongoing discussions, we are very anxious to conclude an agreement with the federal government for the operation of grasslands national park, and we would like it up and running. And the problems to which the hon. member alluded have, in fact, been ameliorated in the last 12 months.

Unfortunately, we stumbled across one other problem, and at that time I didn't even know it existed, and that is jurisdiction of river bed land. The federal government, let's say Canada, wants control, to effectively manage the park, of the river bed land. But Saskatchewan, the provincial government, would like to have control to effectively manage water supplies in drought-prone areas. It has boiled down to a legal argument right now, and we're very hopeful that there's room for compromise here because both levels of government want that park. And I think as long as we're all going to be reasonable and deal with each other as reasonable men and women, there should be room for compromise, and we should be able to bring about the desired outcome, which is a new grasslands national park.

**Mr. Engel:** — What is a new time frame. We're years behind the time frame that was in place when I can remember the original signing with Jean Chretien and John Kowalchuk. We had a good understanding between the federal and the provincial governments. And the studies proceeded. They'd rented office space, they've put people in place, and all of a sudden I drive around and I see nothing happened, and all that's there is some frustrated farmers.

How long do you really think you can keep this issue alive before you can resolve something? On behalf of the constituents that are in my portion of the park, on the east wing of it, I would like to say either get on with it or announce that it's dead, it's not going to happen any more — one or the other.

I think taking back to 1967 is long enough. You know, this is '87. Twenty years have gone by that I've been promoting and fighting and pushing, and honestly, Mr.

Minister, along with the ranchers down there, we're getting tired of the delays and the reasons and the excuses you can find to hold it up and to not proceed with it. So could you give me a little bit of an indication of when do you expect you'll be able to resolve this?

There's no excuse, because this is the first time since the grasslands park has been an issue that there have been governments the same in Saskatchewan and in Canada. And surely, if your Premier is saying, keep up the good work, Brian — surely there's no excuse for not getting it resolved now to the issue that's out there. Give us a time frame and a time line and what you think is going to take place to resolve the issue one way or the other.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, there may be a federal and provincial government of the same political stripe. It isn't the politicians who are holding us up. If it were up to the politicians, I suggest that this matter would have been resolved many years ago whether it had been an NDP provincial government, a Liberal provincial government, or a Conservative provincial government. It's not the politicians who are holding it up.

I don't like to point fingers, but there has been some constitutional argument; there is only one issue, and I wasn't even aware it was an issue at this time last year, remaining to be resolved. I am still awaiting a reply of my letter to my federal counterpart of March 17. To date I haven't had a reply from him, at which time we suggested maybe we should be looking at a compromise to get this river bed situation settled once and for all. We are as anxious as the federal people are to get this park up and running. But I can assure the hon. member that it's certainly not a partisan political issue.

**Mr. Engel:** — Can you tell me who — the people that are on the ground negotiating with the feds now — can you give me the names of the people that are involved in the process at this time?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Hon. member, there's more than one agency of government involved. Justice had been involved, because of constitutional discussion, and the water Crown corporation. I can tell you who's handling negotiations on behalf of my department — under the auspices of the deputy, John Law, and the director of parks, Alan Appleby. But from the other departments there are two or three lawyers involved. I can undertake to find names and send you a letter on the whole situation. You can have it by Monday or Tuesday.

**Mr. Engel:** — If you would give me a letter so that I can show a farmer that comes along and says, what's happening, I can say, well here are the issues, these are the points we have resolved, this is what's still left open for discussion and at this time . . . Or give us a time frame as to when you think those things might be happening. When do you expect the meetings will be taking place between the various officials and so on.

Let's try and put a little package together because it looks like in the very near future there'll be all kinds of politicians running around the country, and I don't want this to be political issue. I think the park is one that has never cropped up as a political issue as far as the South is

concerned. We've had amiable meetings. But the only thing that's happened in the last four years is there's been little excuses been brought up and, oh, this is now a major road-block, and then that was a major road-block, and then somebody else had a major road-block. Surely, surely you can say to the people that we believe in a park, or we don't believe in a park, and let's do it. If you want to just keep holding up a flag until, you know, it's some great thing we're going to develop a park some day, it just has been very, very frustrating for the people concerned.

I can show you, if you want to come down with me, Mr. Minister, I'll show you a quonset in a package, laying on the ground of a farmer, that is 20 years old today – 20 years this spring since he ordered a quonset and was going to build a quonset on his farm. The thing is in a box. The package is there, and it's laying in the weeds because the guy has given up and said, why should I build a quonset here and develop my farm if they're going to make a park and take my land away from me. And these guys are frustrated. They've given up on governments over 20 years to try and bring things together, and surely, now that we've got Conservatives in Ottawa and Regina, your officials can get together and put a package with some instructions there. If the instructions are there from both officials, you put it together or kill it. Do one or the other, but don't drag it on for ever.

I'm sure you know here I stand on this issue. I would love to see a beautiful wilderness park down there, a grasslands park. I think the ideas that I've heard, when I think back at some of the federal officials and federal people that have been involved, and Ron Malis putting years and years of effort on behalf of the federal government, worked hard at it. All of a sudden it died; we got a change of government. Since that time I don't see a federal person on the horizon that's waving a flag and being aggressive about trying to get this thing solved. I just see little road-blocks coming up in the way.

So if you can put a little time letter together saying: this is what we've done, here is where the negotiations are at, here are the people that are meeting, and these are the possible dates of meetings, and this one we expect the thing to be resolved, I'd appreciate it. And do it in light of the fact that I might show that to a rancher or two. This is basically what I need.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I've got no problem with what you're suggesting, hon. member. I think it's important to note that there is already 50 square miles being purchased in the area for the park. Some of the road-blocks to which you've referred are not really small ones. They've been around for quite a number of years – oil and gas exploration, mineral rights, that type of thing, and one by one they've all been resolved. And it boils down now to ownership of river bed where the province says a river bed belongs to the province, and the federal government saying, we would like the control of the river bed for management of the park.

However, I think, and I think you would agree, because you've already intimated, maybe not in so many words, surely there is room for compromise. I believe there is. On March 17th I wrote to the federal minister suggesting compromises and indicating a willingness to meet and

saying, please come to Saskatchewan; we'll discuss it; we'll sign up right on the spot and it will be done.

And if you do have constituents, and I'm sincere about this, who do have problems or questions, if you'd direct the inquiries to my office, we'll make sure we can draft a response either from my signature or from yours to explain the situation.

And if I may digress, Mr. Chairman, I sent some information over to the hon. member for Athabasca, the information which I promised him last night. I trust it's satisfactory.

**Mr. Engel:** — One more quick question on that. Is the acting park superintendent still in place down in that area and working out of that office, or have they phased that out?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As far as we know, yes, that's continuing.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a question about the campsites which the House has heard a lot of discussion about. Some two weeks ago, Mr. Minister, my colleague, the member from Athabasca, asked you for a list of . . . or the names or the list of the campsites which you have, through your budget, decided to close down. Do you have that list, and can you provide it for us?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I do not have a complete list of the entire plan because some of it is still under review and nothing is carved in stone right now.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, I guess if you don't have the list you can't give it to us, although the question was asked two weeks ago. I'd like to ask you, sir: is one of the campsites that your department operates, one called the Piwei campgrounds, which is located six miles south of Somme; it's off Highway No. 23 – is that one of the campsites that your department operates?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — That's a campsite we've been operating, yes. We've been doing the maintenance on it.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Have you done any maintenance on it this year, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I beg your pardon?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Has any maintenance been performed on this campground this year?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I should make the hon. member aware, it's not a campground; it's a picnic site, and there hasn't been maintenance performed that I'm aware of. There was a plan to remove . . . I think there was one outdoor toilet. Let me just check this for one minute for you. I'm going to look up and see exactly what was in the campground.

In response to the hon. member, the facilities that exist at this picnic ground: five tables, six barbecues, four garbage cans, one outdoor toilet, and a wood bin-cum-picnic shelter.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, that's what exists at the campground, you say, at the present time?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As far as I'm aware, the plans were made to remove those particular facilities. I'm considering putting some of them back in, and there's a local group apparently would like to administer it.

(1130)

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, let me get this correct. You are considering putting those facilities back in. What was the rationale, what were the reasons that you decided to . . . Well let me ask you another question first.

Is this one of the campsites that you determined — campground, picnic ground; I'll call it a campground; you can call it a picnic site, and we'll both know what we're talking about — but is this one of the sites which you determined to be one of those that was to be closed down this year?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There are no camp spots at Piwei. It's a picnic ground; so it's not a campsite. However, it had been identified, I am advised, by department officials as one that was underutilized and facilities could be removed and maintenance discontinued.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Do you have information . . . I think you answered this, Mr. Minister, but I want to make it crystal clear. Did you indicate which facilities have already been removed, if any? I'm not sure whether I got that clear.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The picnic tables, barbecues, and the items to which I'd referred had been taken out, but we're currently negotiating with the town to put them back in.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Why, Mr. Minister, would you not have negotiated with the town before you moved these facilities out? Surely you are now going to spend an unnecessary amount of money if, indeed, this transpires. Why would you have arbitrarily — and I only assume that's how you did it — gone into the campground, moved out the picnic tables, the barbecue stands, or whatever, Mr. Minister, without negotiating with somebody in the local community first? It seems like a backward way to operate, and it's certainly not a good management of taxpayers' money.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — This particular picnic site is situated approximately 20 miles from the town, the town to which you'd referred. It is not a particularly good road; it was being underutilized. And we decided, yes, we could go ahead and take their facilities out and move them some place else where it's more heavily utilized. Subsequent to that there was some contact from the town. They said they would be interested in taking over management, and we'd like to oblige them.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Is that the usual procedure of your government, and in this case your department, that if you decide to move out a campground or picnic site or whatever you have closed, that you go in and move it out

and then wait for the community to protest or express concern, and then you negotiate? Is that the normal procedure that you use, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — It's not. And this is one department, I can safely say, has conducted a tremendous amount of consultation with local groups, whether it be through open house, through white papers, through meeting with individual groups.

And if you want to run down the program areas for which this department is responsible, take any of the areas you like — take wildlife. I have met frequently with the wildlife federation; officials have met with them. We meet with their executive on a regular basis, which no minister had done before. I attend the president's council. I met with the northern outfitters' association and all of the groups, all of the client groups with whom we normally deal. In the case of SARM, I think there was probably an oversight — unfortunate, but we're quite prepared to make amends if that's what the community wants.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Minister, that is a very shock oversight, if indeed it was an oversight. I can only conclude, Mr. Minister, that this is a practice that's been happening in other places. And I asked you twice what facilities you have removed because I am somewhat familiar with this area. I happened to have grown up in this area, not too far away; in fact, I am familiar with this campsite.

**An Hon. Member:** — Picnic ground.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — You call it a picnic ground. It's not the point here. The point here is that you arbitrarily closed down a campsite, or a picnic ground, among the many others which you have closed down, while you're trying to promote tourism, and did not even as much as talk to the local people. You come in the dark of night or whatever, with equipment, and you move out facilities without the community even being talked to. That is what's wrong, Mr. Minister.

What I find particularly peculiar about your answers here today is that you simply say you've removed tables, barbecue pits or stands, and toilets. That's what you said. Well, Mr. Minister . . . And I'm sure you can ask the member from Kelsey-Tisdale, who I'm sure has heard about this, because the community affected has been extremely concerned and upset. And I know that there has been a letter written to the local newspaper — I think in this case it's the *Hudson Bay Post-Review* — which I want to read to you.

And then I want you to, after I finish reading the letter, explain why you have only mentioned tables, barbecue stands, and toilets, when in fact that is not the facts, Mr. Minister. And I would like you to correct yourself and explain why, in this House, you would not give the full explanation of what's happened here.

You have said that the picnic ground in this case was underutilized. I submit to you those are not the facts either because the local people have indicated, and they should know better than you do, sir, that indeed those picnic

grounds were well utilized and were very popular.

And here is the letter, and I will read it without interruption so that you can get the full thrust of it. It's titled, "To the editor," and I received a copy of it today, with a phone call several days ago expressing some concern. And the reason that the phone call came to me is because the local member, the member from Kelsey-Tisdale, would not provide the time of day to these people so that they could express their concerns.

The Piwei campgrounds (and note, Mr. Minister – I'll start again – they say "campgrounds")

The Piwei campgrounds, six miles south of Somme in the forest, off highway 23, consisting of a kitchen, tables, 2 barbecues, and outdoor bathroom, and a beautiful campground, believe it or not this last week this property has been destroyed by the provincial government. They brought in a backhoe and a crew of five men, spent two days (two days) to mutilate all of this property. They hauled the wood, after smashing things to pieces, a quarter of a mile, piled it up and burned it. The cement was pushed into a huge heap, fairly close by. This building was painted just two years ago and repairs needed were done. This building was built in the mid-fifties, being a unique part of our community and just a very beautiful, peaceful, and restful spot with a stream flowing close by. This campsite was a well-used campsite. It has recently been used by riding clubs, tail riders, by individual groups, schools, tobogganers, and 3-wheeler riders, members of the Saskatchewan Natural History Society, of which some very outstanding work has been done by the people in our community, and many, many families in our own area, tourists across Canada and to the United States.

Our own family hosted a couple from Ontario who had with them people from England. We spent time at this campsite and hiked through the trails, when returning to England they wrote us saying this was the greatest highlight of their trip, which they had covered from east to west coast.

Our parks are very over-crowded, and little campsites like this give people a chance to enjoy nature and get away from the hustle and the bustle of over-crowded places.

I have been told the reason for destroying this campsite was the expense of trimming the grass which was not a big area, and the grass had terrific competition from the trees surrounding this little area, and no more than two cuttings in the summer would be necessary.

After taking millions of dollars of wealth from this rich forest, would it be too much to expect to leave this little campsite for the people of this province?

There are organizations in this area who would have seen to it that the grass would be cut rather than this campsite being destroyed.

We have been told by good authority that there are lots more of these campsites in our province to be destroyed by the provincial government.

Why not cut the grass in these campsites and utilize our young people who cannot get jobs? No person in our community was notified of this vandalous destruction.

By destroying campsites such as this, the government is destroying the essence of our culture in tune with nature.

Mr. Minister, can you explain . . . It's signed by a citizen of Carragana. I'll see that you get a copy of the letter; it was in the newspaper. Mr. Minister, can you explain how you would respond . . . why you would respond in my questioning and attempt to mislead this House and say only that tables, barbecue pits, and toilets were moved away, without telling the full story of the destruction that has happened at this campsite?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Quite a few points came up there from the hon. member and by needs be, Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a lengthy reply. First of all, I want the name read into the record of whoever wrote the letter. And if you don't have the guts to put the name in the record, then strike it from the record.

The second one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you've got a question to ask, get up on your hind legs and ask it. The second one: phone call to you, sir, strikes me as a partisan issue. A letter to an editor with not contact with my department or contact with my office is blatantly political, and I would suggest to you, sir, it's not beneath you to have inspired that letter to the editor and bring up the phone call yourself. There's no question in my mind that's how it came about.

It's absolutely scurrilous for you to say that that constituent from Kelsey-Tisdale could not contact the minister, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale, because he wouldn't give him the time of day, and I note, in your usual cowardly fashion, you wait until the member is not in the House to bring it up. I notice that's the way you've always operated. So it's no surprise that you would choose this particular forum and this particular occasion to raise that.

It is not a campsite; it is a picnic site. And half of what you read into the record is garbage, when you talk about tourism. You were the member who stood in this House – and check *Hansard* if you don't believe it – and said we were closing 75 parks and related facilities. Not one park, but you said 75 parks. You were deliberately misleading the House and trying to make a partisan issue. You have not succeeded by raising this issue in public and trying to do a little mud-raking and getting down in the grubby dirt where you belong – but I don't, so I refuse to get down to your level.

Now, you said this community is extremely upset; the whole community's upset. I haven't had one letter from that community – not one – if they're extremely upset.

You say that we're closing parks all over the province. No we're not; not one. What has been decided is 75 camping spots, comprising 10 campsites which are underutilized, would not be maintained. At the same time, the savings generated from that are being put into other areas that are utilized – heavily utilized – so we can expand our facilities.

And just recently, apart from the announcement of five new provincial parks, which is what the public want, we have also put in campgrounds in other parts of the province and upgraded existing facilities. And I may say the five parks that we are adding are the kind of facilities people want. You say this department isn't co-operating, which of course is a slur on the officials, nothing less, when you say that. Again that is your wont.

I remember 1971 with blood-letting that took place when you and that bunch of cutthroats took over there. I remember the blood-letting that took place. It's conveniently been forgotten about somewhere with the passage of time. Cast your mind back; you remember. You were part of it. In fact, I remember talking to you. You don't remember the conversation when I was a head coach of the Legion track camp out at Humboldt. You don't even remember the conversation. When I asked you a question and you took a note, I never did get a reply from you. And that's the way you ran office when you were in government. And you say we don't co-operate. Well let me just read into the record, and I'll put the name of the man who signed the letter, because I'm not afraid, unlike you:

Northern Lights Lodge, Box 832, Flin Flon, Manitoba.

Dear Mr. Maxwell: On behalf of Northern Lights Lodge and its staff, I'd like to take this opportunity to invite you, Ross MacLennan, and Ross Duncan to the official opening of the first fully accessible wheelchair camp in northern Saskatchewan.

We, Northern Lights Lodge and the Saskatchewan Abilities Council, would be thrilled if you would officially open a campground for the disabled at the south-east arm of Deschambault Lake. To you, sir, my personal thanks for your input. It is my hope to spend some time with you . . . (etc., etc.)

And you say we don't co-operate. It says:

In closing, I would like to thank you and your department for what I can only call super co-operation. Yours truly, Ted Ohlsen.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, really. This is an interesting day in the House. The minister waves his arms and goes into a tirade when he knows that the policies of his government are causing a lot of concern in the public.

Mr. Minister, you did not answer the question after your speech. The northern house lodge letter had nothing to do with this particular campsite, which is similar to many others which you are closing. And I noted with particular interest that today you talk about 75 camping spots. The other day in this House when we questioned you were

talking about 75 parking stalls.

(1145)

**An Hon. Member:** — No I wasn't.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, you were, sir. Yes, you were.

Why do you keep changing your story? Earlier today in my questioning your story was that at this Piwei campground you moved tables, moved barbecue stands, and closed a toilet facility. There is evidence now to show that you did not tell the whole story, that in fact you went in there and you totally razed the campground.

Mr. Minister, the buck stops there with you. The buck stops with the minister of the department who establishes the policy and stands responsible for the activities of his department, as the cabinet table stands responsible for the activities of the government as a whole. The buck stops with you, sir. And if at least something goes wrong, Mr. Minister, at least have the decency to stand up in this House and give the full answers.

You tried to mislead the House by not giving the full answer. I ask you again the question, Mr. Minister, which you did not answer and instead went into your speech.

The question is: how do you explain your not giving the full answer to my previous question when we have evidence here which shows that you actually destroyed this campground, leaving nothing there for the local community to be able to take over and run any more? You not only took out the toilets, you not only took out the barbecue stands, you not only took out the parking tables; a backhoe was moved in there, destroyed and tore up all the concrete, piled it up in a pile, defaced the whole area which has been here since the early 1950s. And now you decide you're going to destroy this.

Mr. Minister, how do you justify your explanation with what, in fact, are the real facts?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The real facts – you said toilets, plural; there's one. Who can believe you anyway?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, I think we see the height of irresponsibility here, Mr. Speaker.

You are saying that the opinions of the people who live in Somme and Carragana, and Porcupine Plain and all the communities, Weekes, all communities who have utilized this facility, local people, people who have come from a far away as Europe, people who have come from the United States and still come from the . . . Well the minister shakes his head.

This is the minister who, in conjunction with the Minister of Small Business and Tourism, spends \$3 million of advertising to promote tourism. Well your department maybe doesn't – we'll get to that – but your government spends \$3 million in advertising to promote tourism so that your favourite advertising agency can make themselves an awful lot of money. On the one hand you do that, and then on the other hand you have facilities that have become widely known and appreciated by people

who come, and you close them down.

And all you can stand up here in the House, is not give the full information. I will ask you one more time, Mr. Minister; why did you not give us the full answer when the question was first asked? Were you deliberately misleading the House? Were you deliberately misleading the House, Mr. Minister, or were you not well enough informed?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Don't you ever give me any lectures about misleading the House when you stood there and said we were closing 75 parks. Your credibility is totalling non-existent. I did not bulldoze anything at Piwei picnic grounds. I personally didn't go in there with a cat and a bulldozer. As a matter of fact, I didn't even know that action had been taken until some time after it had happened.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, I'm glad to know that you're in charge, Mr. Minister. This kind of activity only happens because the people who do the work for your department follow policies and moods and temperaments established by your government. That's the only reason it's done. Do not now, Mr. Minister, try to take it out on the local staff who did what they were instructed to do. They acted in the true form of the way your government operates.

Mr. Minister, let me just again highlight – let me highlight how you have attempted to twist and turn to try to hide what's been happening with this whole issue. You said the other day, and it's on the record, that your department closed 75 parking stalls. You said today you closed 75 camping spots,

In your letter of May 1st, 1986 to the mayor of the northern hamlet of Dore Lake, you said, 75 campsites in small, underutilized areas will be closed, at a total of almost 9,000 campsites in the provincial system.

Dealing with this one issue you have given it three different definitions. You call it once camping spots today. Another time you called it parking stalls. In your letter of May 1, 1986, you talk about 75 campsites. Now, Mr. Minister, which is it?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — If you care to look back through *Hansard* you'll find it was my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, who said parking stalls. I have always said it's 75 camping spots or camping sites – not campgrounds, not parks – campsites, meaning an individual little plot where you can put your tent, a campsite or a camp spot, which I think is fairly synonymous in all but the minds, except the tiny minds, of you and your colleagues.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not going to pursue this much longer because I think it's clear . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Saskatoon has something to say about this. She might want to . . .

Mr. Minister, can you explain how you can talk about and promote tourism, on the one hand, and close down some of these facilities which tourists in Saskatchewan will use? And don't give me the tirade about, oh, the kind of accommodations that tourists are looking for has

changed because, Mr. Minister, you know as well as I do that there are many kinds of tourists. There are those who like to come and stay in the motel with the water-slide and that kind of recreation. There are those who like to go to the outdoors and do some camping and move from one campground to another; take their family for a walk, do a little roughing, see what this province is all about. There are those kind too. Why have you not considered them an important priority in your tourism plans?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well you just led into what could be a half-hour speech. We have provided for those people. We're providing for a wide range of experiences and activities. In some areas there were five and six small campgrounds, all within 20, 30 kilometres of each other, not all being utilized. Those were the ones we looked at for closure or for discontinuing the maintenance on them.

At the same time, we are accelerating some of the other type of camping facilities that we want to make available, whether they be for recreational vehicles or, indeed, with the wilderness park, for the type of experience people want there. And we do have other campgrounds, remote campgrounds, that are being utilized.

To suggest that tourists are coming from Europe specifically to find one small campground, I find just a tad difficult to believe. And if they are, and they want that information, either myself or my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, would be more than delighted to provide it and explain to people exactly where to find those particular campgrounds and parks.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, after destroying and razing this campground, you say that you now, because the local community, finding this out after the fact, has expressed an interest in the park, can you tell this committee, Mr. Minister, how much it's going to cost the government to rebuild this park so that the community can then be able to manage it?

Just a . . . I used the word "park." I wouldn't want the minister to get confused with "campground."

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, it's a matter, if we so choose, of putting back in the picnic tables, the toilet in the site – which is approximately two days of activity for employees of the department – in the picnic site.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Did you tell me . . . did you answer the question, how much will it cost?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — It will be done by employees who are on staff in any event – because of the wet season, probably by fire-fighting crews who are on stand-by, who are not otherwise employed fighting fires.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Are you saying, Mr. Minister, some of this equipment that was destroyed, some of the wooden facilities that were destroyed, are not going to have to be replaced?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Would the hon. member please inform me which wooden facilities were destroyed? I'm not aware of destruction of facilities.



**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, clearly, as the letter indicates, this picnic site might have been a good place for you to have your youth convention. The vandalism . . . The letter indicates this vandalic destruction of this park.

In the letter, Mr. Minister, in this letter it indicates very clearly that wood . . . Well I'll wait till the minister's ready to listen. Mr. Minister, in the letter it indicates that wood and other facilities were pushed down – and I'm not quoting it word for word – and then taken somewhere, put on a pile, and burnt. Are you suggesting that some of the stuff that was burnt is not going to have to be replaced? Mr. Minister, can I have your attention? Are you suggesting that some of the stuff which was burnt is not going to have to be replaced?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — You're quoting from a letter which I haven't seen, and you haven't given the name of the author. For all I know, your research staff wrote the letter.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Minister, the letter was printed in the Hudson Bay *Post-Review*. I'm sure that you have been given a copy of it by the member from Kelsey-Tisdale because I suspect he probably has had some concern about it. I will indeed have a copy of this letter made right promptly and make sure that you get a copy of it, as I indicated earlier that I would.

The gentleman who writes the letter on behalf of many other people not only has sent me the letter; he has also had it printed in a local newspaper – so certainly he is not trying to hide anything. But he does indicate here that wood . . . I mean, these campgrounds have wood that your department puts up, Mr. Minister. That was taken and burnt . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But let us assume it was. Let us assume it was, okay? If it was, how much does your department estimate it will be costing to replace this? — never mind the staff time who would normally be doing something else.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Look in your *Hansard* for May 12, 1986, page 1226.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, a couple of comments. At least in that lengthy discourse the member has obviously ended his efforts to try to convince people that 75 parking stalls are 75 parks.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals, Minister of Tourism and Small Business – not I. So don't try and mislead people to say that I was using the phrase. I wasn't. Someone else was using that phrase.

The hon. member gets down in the muck again and he refers to a youth convention, a young Tory convention that took place in Regina at which point a sink was destroyed in a hotel. And then he says, well perhaps this park, or campsite, or picnic ground, is the kind of place we should be taking these young Conservatives because that's where they fit in. It's not been pointed out yet, but the investigation is still taking place about what happened in that hotel, and the evidence points out to some interlopers having arrived. And knowing the current state of desperation of the NDP party, I wouldn't be surprised where those interlopers arrived from or

where they were motivated.

However, maybe this would be a more fitting type of activity out there, if you want to get into this type of debate. And I'm looking at *The Commonwealth*, not a rag I would normally care to be associated with. But there was an article that interested me, talking about the NDP youth gearing up for the election. And what did they say? What resolution did they pass? They passed a resolution calling for the legalization of prostitution through the formation of worker-owned co-ops. Perhaps you are wanting a lease on this site to have your worker-owned co-op for prostitution.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would like to ask the minister what his department has contributed towards the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association in this estimate before us. As well, while we are on that subject, I would also like to ask you whether or not you have provided any encouragement, any incentives, towards the wild rice industry.

(1200)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — To deal with the question relating to trappers first, Hon. member, the financial contribution this year is \$70,000, which is the same contribution as last year towards trapping education and development.

And the wild rice – we'll just check those figures for you.

**Mr. Yew:** — The trapping industry this past year, Mr. Minister, has been very poor. The industry itself is very volatile. The income, the production of fur, and the income to the individual people that rely on this industry, has been very, very drastically poor.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that your government can provide funding to millionaires such as Peter Pocklington – you provide a lot of incentives and tax and royalty holidays to people like Peter Pocklington and also to major oil companies – I wonder what type of incentive, or compensation, if at all you have considered compensation, what type of support you have given that industry.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As relates to trapping, trapper training programs and course material have been upgraded. Three new trapper training instructors have successfully completed the trapper training instructor course at Lac La Biche, and during the winter of 1985-86, 20 trapping schools were run with 393 students in attendance.

**Mr. Yew:** — In terms of the trappers' association itself, Mr. Minister, in terms of the Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, and also individually, in terms of the trapping blocks, the fur blocks, could you provide me with the figures, financial assistance that you may have provided to these areas?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The figure is 45,000 – fur blocks. We also contributed 500 to the association for the annual meeting, plus we sent representatives to assist with it. And for fur bearer and trapper education, the figure was \$80,000.

**Mr. Yew:** — Do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that that is not consistent at all with the former administration. I personally can recall funding that was provided to the trappers' association with an annual funding assistance of \$121,000. Why has that been eliminated, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The hon. member referred to a figure in 1981 when the trappers' association received \$120,000. And, yes, that grant had been reduced considerably, but the STA (Saskatchewan Trappers' Association) cannot be considered to represent all the trappers of Saskatchewan, since less than 1,000 of the province's 20,000 trappers are members of that organization.

We have decided that we'd like to see the money spent and spread among all the trappers rather than funding one organization, which represents just a small percentage of the total number of trappers, and that's why we've put it into trapper education, development incentive, and to fur-bearer programs, which comes to \$150,000, plus our support for the forest institute of Canada, to the tune of \$15,000 a year to promote humane trapping.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, I think there's a fundamental difference here of the type of trapper we're talking about. You know, the people I'm referring to are people of native ancestry. Trapping, hunting, fishing, has been their traditional way of life. And they . . . for many of them they have no education; they have no skills or qualifications to enter into the professional job market. This is their sole livelihood.

And, Mr. Minister, you know, I take it that your government has no commitment at all to urge the people in the northern administration district. They rely on this industry as an important industry and an important source of income to supplement some of the other seasonal work that they manage to get, you know, in other areas like commercial fishing, etc.

I look, Mr. Minister, at the overall economy of our government, our province, and what the Devine government made from our northern resources. And, Mr. Minister, for the record, northern people are asking, you know, however, whether there is an adequate return to northern people from those resources, and whether there is adequate participation and consultation in the development of those resources.

I look for an example, Mr. Minister, figures released by your government for the year 1983. The value of uranium produced for that period was \$120 million. The value of forest products produced was 171 million. And the value of receipts from tourists, etc., from other parts of Canada and so on, receipts came up to \$212 million. And much of that, Mr. Minister, was due to the tourist appeal of northern Saskatchewan.

Again, Mr. Minister, your government collected significant revenues as well from . . . looking at your '84-85 estimates, Mr. Minister, you collected \$17 million in uranium revenues for that particular year. And then we can go on to other areas such as licences and permits for forestry, fishing, and trapping, and so forth, you collected

\$11 million.

But, Mr. Minister, the people of the North are asking, where are the jobs? Where are the economic opportunities for northern people? You know, just how much are you putting back into the North? The top half of our province which is populated by 44 communities, people who rely on traditional pursuits, have got nothing back from your government.

On one hand, you can spend millions and millions and millions of dollars to provide incentives, tax breaks, royalty breaks, compensation, to oil companies, to the Peter Pocklington of Alberta, to the Manalta Coal of Alberta, the Husky Oil of Alberta — 390 million was it?

And then you also, just the other day when we were under estimates for Environment, I noted that your government is prepared to spend \$23 million to pay from the Saskatchewan treasury to oil companies such as PanCanadian, Canadian Roxy Petroleum, for 32 oil wells that would be affected by rising water.

Mr. Minister, you know, you've got a mixed-up priority back there. You are not looking at the social and economic conditions of people back in the northern half of this province. Those people are in dire straits. They need help, and they need help today. They don't need help over a five-year program. Your government continuously reiterates hollow promises of major facilities or programs that they want to initiate. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, your mandate is out. It's run out. It ran out a month and a half ago.

With all sincerity, Mr. Minister, I ask you: what can you do? Have you got any commitment to help alleviate the high social and economic disparities in the northern administration district where we have high unemployment — as high as 99 per cent in many of the remote communities? There is nothing but welfare dependency rates that are going up. You know, unacceptable welfare dependency rates.

Now that is something you and your government and your colleagues can snicker at it, probably, but that is a serious issue. Those people need help. You just don't provide help to the rich. That's not the way it should be. But your government has a policy of capitalism. And I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, capitalism does not work in northern Saskatchewan. I've said it before and I'll say it again. This big policy that you've come up with, this fancy policy of yours, this open for big business, just doesn't jibe with the people up North. Sure we're not against development, Mr. Minister, but we haven't got the capital to help ourselves.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: have you made any attempts at all to look into the industries in question and to seriously provide some revenue, some working capital, significant working capital — working capital that will start building a sound economic base for the native communities in the northern administration district, a sound economic base?

Well I'll stop at that for now, Mr. Minister, and maybe get a reaction. If you have any commitment, I'd sure love to

hear it. I'm sure the people in the North would love to have some information if you do have any concerns about the North.

(1215)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well certainly, Mr. Chairman, we do have concerns about the North. Northern programs in 1986-87, we have committed \$22,402,860 from my department alone in programs in the North. So it's definite there's a commitment.

Your other far ranging questions would perhaps be more accurately directed to my colleague, the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

**Mr. Yew:** — What was the figures, Mr. Minister? I missed out.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — \$22,402,860.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, in which areas specifically are those funds directed to?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — That is put into all the services our department would be provided, including grants, trapping, fur, etc.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, could I have the information in detail in writing?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — That would take a fair piece of intricate bookkeeping, but yes, I'll direct officials to put some details together, and whenever it's ready, I'll make sure it's forwarded to you.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, I want to go on. As I mentioned earlier, the fur industry, the production, the income to the individuals involved here in the top half of the province, the industry is very poor. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if your department has given any consideration towards restocking some species of wild game in the northern administration district.

I noted with interest that we've had programs before like, for an example, the swift fox was classed as being extinct in this province, and there was a program that provided for the restocking of this fox in this province. I think this was a year or two ago.

In conversation with people up North, trappers themselves, I've had some concerns expressed to me that there is a possibility here that we could help the industry in terms of restocking species like lynx. Now there's a high-priced fur, but there was little or no lynx in the annual harvest for this past trapping season.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would consider restocking the trapping industry with game animals that are in demand and that can provide income for the trappers themselves.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm not sure of the feasibility of that particular suggestion. Was it only lynx you had in mind, or were there some other species? I'm hearing behind me from the biologists that there would be some difficulty

with lynx as a stocking program. So I am wondering if there are some other ideas you had in mind, perhaps other fur-bearing animals.

I know the hon. member is himself involved in trapping and he realizes that we don't dictate fur prices; they're dictated by the fashion houses of Europe. And when a particular species is in demand, the price goes up and when the demand drops off, the fur prices drop off. Right now we've got more beaver, in certainly northern Saskatchewan, than we had at the height of the fur trade; consequently the prices have dropped for that particular species.

But if there's a species you have in mind, hon. member, if it's something that we can discuss or we can look at, certainly we'd be happy to look at that situation.

**Mr. Yew:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it's my understanding that in this province, and possibly in other parts of the country, we've been successful in restocking some areas with the swift fox. I don't know if it's a success. But in other areas such as moose or elk, buffalo, there's been some success; and also the fish stocking program. There are some areas here that relate to the issue at hand.

I was referring to lynx, Mr. Minister. I could have maybe suggested other species of fur, such as . . . the discussions I've had dealt with fur like lynx, fisher, marten, possibly mink. And in some areas, Mr. Minister, the beaver population is relatively low as well. Maybe it's high in the southern areas, and maybe it's a pest to the farmers in the southern areas — I hear some vibes about it once in a while — but in some of the northern areas they have become pretty rare.

I don't know what your officials have in terms of the surveys that they have on game population. I really can't dispute or question that, but from my experience and from discussions I've had with the trappers, the fur in itself is relatively poor in the northern areas.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As the hon. member would be aware, an animal such as the lynx depends primarily for its food supply on the snowshoe hare. And the snowshoe hare has a 10-year cycle, so it goes high cycle, low cycle. Therefore, the population fluctuates according to food supply, and when the snowshoe hare is in low supply, consequently, concomitantly, we have a dip in the supply of lynx.

To introduce lynx, to try and promulgate the species, perhaps, in northern Saskatchewan, could be difficult if there is not an adequate natural food supply for the lynx.

If there are other animals . . . You mentioned big game. If you know of an area, for instance, that would be suitable for the introduction of elk, we'd be pleased to look at that area with you. That's the kind of thing we feel competent that we can do, both from a human management point of view and a biological point of view.

One or two other areas present difficult — maybe not impossible or insurmountable, but certainly difficult biological problems.

**Mr. Yew:** — I would certainly like to see if you have any plans, if you are going to consider any plans, Mr. Minister. As far as I can conclude, you haven't made any firm commitment at all. I'm very sorry to hear that when, on one hand, we can supply the rich with so much incentives and dollars out of our provincial treasury, I just can't accept the policy of your government; I simply can't.

I want to go on to the . . . The people of the North are desperate in terms of income and in terms of jobs. Their only other option now is to try to make do with what they have.

The other question I want to get into, Mr. Minister, is the wild rice industry I referred to earlier. Have you provided any funding to date to boost that industry?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — What we have done is we're working on a wild rice policy which would suit the people and the area, and we've taken out the royalty system and substituted it with a rental system of 10 cents per acre for the first four years. That's instead of royalties, which we think is a fairer break to the producer, and we've also lengthened the term of the lease to 10 years so there can be some stability within the industry.

**Mr. Yew:** — I understand, Mr. Minister, that there's a review of the policy for the industry, the wild rice industry. To this point in time I gather that you have some new regulations for leases — for getting leases and permits, etc. — and also in the policy of funding, Mr. Minister, and the provision for seeding. I wonder if I could ask you to provide me with a copy of your updated status of the industry — I mean a copy of your policy for the industry.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The regulations have been approved, have been printed, and I'll undertake to send a copy over to you as soon as I can find one.

**Mr. Yew:** — In terms of reforestation, Mr. Minister, I again was quite concerned when I talked with a number of trappers in the North who related to me that a lot of their . . . My colleague from Athabasca raised this point as well, you know, that a lot of our forest wildlife habitat is being cut bare. In some areas, Mr. Minister — and I'm not trying to exaggerate here — but in some areas as I drive I can notice a distinct difference between what the natural environment looked like some 10 years ago, in comparison to what it looks like today.

Some of these places are just like a barren desert, Mr. Minister. That is, to me, not a good practice. I distinctly remember my colleague talking about the clear cutting policy just yesterday evening. And, Mr. Minister, I wonder if that policy is under review, and if not, why not? And the other question is, Mr. Minister, in terms of forestation, reforestation or silviculture or whatever you want to phrase it, tree planting — I'll put it more in laymen's terms — just how much emphasis are you putting in that program?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — As indicated to your hon. colleague last night, over the course of this summer we will be putting out a white paper as a precursor to a new forest Act which will more accurately reflect not just

current policy, but current thinking and research in the area of forestry which would, of course, reflect silviculture, which is the care and management of the forest and reforestation.

There's no question that we have to have a commitment to reforestation. I'm not going to point fingers or lay blame on anybody, but there has been a lack of reforestation over a long number of years for a variety of reasons. And we're very anxious to play some catch-up and get into the business of reforestation. This year we will have 10 million seedlings grown in Saskatchewan for planting at our nurseries. The government program will exceed 7 million and be somewhere close to 8 million in planting this year.

(1230)

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Minister, in terms, of the contracts and the tenders for those tree-planting jobs, I would like to ask you . . . You know, I noted in 1983-84 your government provided contracts to two firms from B.C. for tree planting. It was noted by the people in La Ronge, and I'm referring specifically here to the Lac La Ronge Indian band, who have a lot of experience in that area, who were neglected and were not given the option to carry out the work.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, if you would take that into consideration and look at your own backyard first before you start providing for others out of the province.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I assure the hon. member that we haven't given a B.C. contract since I've been minister, and I think this is the second time around we've been doing tree planting contracting under my auspices. I don't directly get involved with that aspect of the department. That's under the control of the deputy minister and the executive director of forestry, and they recommend the contracts be awarded based on, of course, tender price and also capability of delivering and doing good work. And as you'd be aware yourself, there are some outfits that are pretty shoddy, and they don't meet our very exacting standards. Therefore they don't get contracts.

The B.C. company to which you referred — I believe it's Tawa — for the last two years haven't been able to compete with our own Saskatchewan tree planters, and they haven't had a contract.

**Mr. Yew:** — Yes, that's what I'm saying. Mr. Minister, there's a lot of people that were very upset about that decision, that at one time . . . And I have the documents to provide to you if you require, the documentation about the firms in question. As I was saying, the people were upset because of the fact that there was such high unemployment in those northern areas. They were neglected; they weren't given the contract at the time.

The other matter that really upset the people was the fact that they were available; they had the expertise and the experience to do the job. So I would caution the minister and advise you: let's look at the local areas, the people at the local level directly affected and try to provide some incentives and some opportunity for them next time around.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — One of the contracts given out this year — I've just been handed it — was to a native group. We are interested in pursuing native tree planting contractors. There has been some training and assistance provided in the past, and we're willing to pursue that.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, when we're talking about forestry, I have a couple of questions on it. And one is some of the problems that had appeared along settlements in the northern part of my constituency where there has been some clear cutting being done in areas where it was previously left alone and not being cut out by the large forestry corporations, but was left for some of the independent foresters so they can go in and cut some of the logs for lumber for themselves.

In the area north of Swan Plain, last year, that problem surfaced where a logging company was allowed to come in and just clear cut everything in there and leave nothing for the local people that were at one time somewhat dependent on getting some lumber out of there every year, going in there and being able to log some of that lumber or the trees out of there.

Mr. Minister, have you formulated some policy on how you're going to deal with some of the independent foresters, and will you be setting aside some areas for them where they can get logs for lumber for themselves or for selling a little bit of it, and not in an area that would be somewhere 10 or 20 miles in the forest but somewhere where it would be a little close to the area where they live so that they wouldn't have to have that far to travel, and let the large corporations go further into the forest?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, a good suggestion, and we have been acting on it through the new forest management licence agreements, the FMLAs, the acronym for short. We are making allowances for small operators. Again I could dwell at some length on the misfortunes of small operators in the last number of years, but it is certainly the intention of this government to allow them back into the bush and back into operations. And that is being reflected in the FMLAs that are being negotiated.

I may say to that end I've had numerous meetings with the Saskatchewan Council of Independent Forest Industries, very positive meetings, and they seem quite pleased . . . with the initiatives we've been taking to make sure their quotas increase.

When I became minister, they had less than one-half of 1 per cent of the total allowable cut. In one year that moved up to 6 per cent and now it's approximately 8 per cent, and there's much more room for movement on that again.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I totally agree that there should be some consideration given to the independent foresters.

The other question that I had, which you refused to answer or didn't answer at the time, was: are we going to be looking at areas that they can get close to the areas that

they may be operating from, rather than being sent into the forest and into areas where the large logging companies don't want to go or don't want to bother going into?

Let's not send them into swamp areas or into areas that are difficult to get to, but let's reserve some of the other areas closer to the settlements for them, and let the large logging companies go back into the bush because they've got the equipment to do that.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There will be bona fide quotas provided. It won't be garbage areas. They do salvage work, and they have done salvage work. There will be good areas set aside, and we have two reserves where we have set aside a sizable quota for the smaller operators.

**Mr. Lusney:** — And another area, Mr. Minister, deals with some of the . . . specifically one. You talked about campsites a while ago, and I'm not sure I got the kind of information out of the answers that you gave to my colleague as to what one would have wanted.

And I'll just . . . I'd like to get something clear on the campsites, Mr. Minister. You mentioned that you were talking about 75 campsites. And your interpretation of a campsite was — and I think it would be close, very close to what you said — you said that a campsite is an area, a site, where someone can put up a tent or park a vehicle and spend the night there. Is this what you say you are closing — those kind of individual campsites? Or are we talking about a larger area that could accommodate a number of such campsites?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — . . . speaking 75. Your definition was more or less accurate, or your paraphrasing what I'd said, and I have no quarrel with your description. The 75 are spread over 10 different facilities, so 10 into 75 gives you the rough average of the size of the campsites to which we are referring.

**Mr. Lusney:** — That was my question. What you are saying is that you have closed 10 different facilities amounting to the 75 campsites within those facilities. That was what I wanted to get clear.

Mr. Minister, the other thing is, I think it would be a shame if the department would do to all 10 as was mentioned in a letter from someone from the area. I don't have the letter, and I don't know what really happened there. But if that is happening at these campsites, I think that maybe it would be beneficial for you to take notice of that and go into those areas — if they all haven't been destroyed at this point — and go the local communities and ask them if they would like to take over these campsites and try to maintain them. Leave that equipment in there because it's not going to be that costly, and if you're going to destroy a lot of that anyway, then why would we want to do this? But allow these communities to take them over.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I assure the hon. member you got my attention today.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, one of the other things that I would like to ask you to do is to look at smaller areas, and again it's a specific one that I have in mind, and it's a boat

launch just south of Togo, a town in my constituency on the Assiniboine River, the Shellmouth reservoir area, or the Lake of the Prairies as it's called.

The community has written you a letter regarding that boat launch, and it's not an expensive project, but there are many people that come to that area that would like to launch their boats. But there was one at one time — it's been eroded a bit by the water — and either the community has to go and build a boat launch, or someone from the department would have to go in there and build a launch where the people can come in and unload their boats.

Mr. Minister, it's not a costly item. I think it would be worthwhile for the department to consider it and go in there and build that boat launch so that people that come into the area would be able to get to unload their boats and be able to load them easily once they're done their fishing.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** Well, hon. member, I don't recall the letter. I've asked one of my staff to search the files and see if we can find the specific letter. But yes, we'd be pleased to take a look at that for you. I'll have one of my staff take a look.

**Mr. Lusney:** — It's from the community of Togo, Mr. Minister. And if you could look into that, I'd appreciate it.

There's one other area that has been a bit of a problem and that area is the Porcupine forest reserve, Mr. Minister — that's the Woody Lake area and the Townsend Lake. There's a number of lakes in there. That's been a real problem and the biggest problems there are the roads leading to that area from the south. The roads are well built up from the north, from Hudson Bay, but when you go to the south area, and there aren't a lot of people using that road from the south, when they go into that area they have to hope that they get a nice weekend. Because if they go in and it starts to rain, the roads are in bad condition. What they need basically is gravel. People can't get out of that area. They have some difficulty getting out of there. So, Mr. Minister, I think everybody in that area and the people that have some cabins at the Woody Lake area would like to get that road fixed up; get some gravel on it so they could be able to drive in and out regardless of what the weather might be like.

I think the biggest problem there is the logging trucks that use that road, and it doesn't take long when you've got heavy trucks hauling on there to get rid of the gravel that may be put on. So, Mr. Minister, if you could get your department to look into it and to see if you can't spring a few dollars for that area and get some gravel on that road.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, I'm pleased to inform the hon. member that we have had an ongoing program of upgrading on that road each year. And unless memory fails me I did meet with a group from that area last year in my office. We discussed it and we're putting \$110,000 on the road this year.

**Mr. Lusney:** — What are you going to do specifically on that road with that \$110,000?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Graveling and upgrading.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Will that cover the whole road? One hundred and ten thousand doesn't seem like much, but if it's . . . Okay, go ahead. I see you have an answer, so I'll let you answer.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — What we do is we do a piece of it every year. We've found ourselves being responsible for a variety of roads around the province. Personally I'd like to give them to my colleague, the minister in charge of the Department of Highways, but we have traditionally maintained a certain number of roads. And on the budget we have, we've split among various roads. That particular road will be 110,000 this year, and gradually we're building them all, to the best of our capability.

**Mr. Lusney:** — With that \$110,000, just how much do you estimate you will be able to do on that road? It basically needs a graveling all the way through. Now how much will \$110,000 accomplish?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We anticipate rebuilding and graveling on four miles as well as the maintenance on the rest.

**Mr. Lusney:** — I suppose four miles is better than nothing, Mr. Minister. It's hardly going to do what the people require on that road, because four miles may get some of that road gravelled and will be able to get . . . they'll be able to drive on it. But I think the biggest problem is the rest of it that needs a graveling.

And I know you're not going to do that this year, but I hope that you would see if you have some reserve in that department, some money left over from somewhere that you can try and put a little more into there and try and spread a bit more gravel on it.

(1245)

One of your colleagues said they'll do that next year. Well I think by next year there might be an election. And if there is, I would tend to guess that we'll get most of that road fixed up from the South.

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

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, one of the other concerns that I have is the staffing at some of the major parks, and one is Madge Lake in my area. And I think we've been finding an increasing problem there regarding staffing, an insufficient amount of staff to do the work that has to be done.

And I know you're going to be talking about saving money and everything else, and I can understand why you would be wanting to save money. But when we look at the kind of waste that has been going on within this government, I think what we could do is cut back on some of that waste within government and put some of the money into parks and into roads where it would do more good for the general public, the taxpayers of the province, and maybe cut back on some of the advertising as we have heard in some of the departments when you're looking at not only a few hundred thousands, but when

you're looking at advertising going into the millions of dollars.

I think, Mr. Minister, if we could take some of that advertising, in fact if we could have taken one-third of the advertising of the Tourism budget — and most of it becomes political advertising when it's out there — if we could take one-third of that, we would be able to fix up that total road from the Woody Lake to the South.

So there is a lot of money there, Mr. Minister, that you could take out of the government, out of really excessive spending in some areas of government, and put it into some useful project that would provide a better service for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm not sure I can respond to that.

**Mr. Lusney:** — I beg your pardon, Mr. Minister. I didn't get your answer. What was that again?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm not sure of what kind of reply you were looking for on that particular aspect. The Tourism budget is under the auspices of the Minister of Tourism and Small Business.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Well, Mr. Minister. I think what I was referring to was that possibly you could take the initiative to cut back on some of your own advertising and ask some of your colleagues to cut back on some of the wasteful advertising that they have been doing. And when you run into millions of dollars in advertising, I think you would have to agree that some of that is maybe a waste, and there's no question that it's a waste when we have reviewed some of the advertising that has been done.

So, Mr. Minister, I'm just saying that you should maybe talk to your colleagues and instruct them to save some of that money from the advertising. Forget about the political benefits that you hope to gain out of all that advertising and see if you can put that money into benefits for the people of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Like some of those campsites that you closed down; some of the staff cuts that you have made within the parks that do create some hardships; some of the road systems within the parks that need to be fixed up that aren't there; many services within the park system, and other areas of this province, that could be improved if you would only use some of the money that this government has been spending — and not spending in a way that taxpayers would expect them to spend it but spending it in a way that taxpayers, I'm sure if they knew, would certainly disagree with.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I have examples of the type of advertising which my department does, and I'm going to send them over to the hon. member. And these are just three examples. We have brochures for every park in the province, be it historic site or provincial park, recreation areas. We have all kinds of information that goes out to commercial fishermen and sports fishermen. Just a variety of information, for which it costs our department \$262,000 a year. And this is the kind of advertising we are doing. Any other type of advertising to which the hon. member has referred, he would have to

bring up with other ministers.

This is the kind of stuff we do to promote our parks and to promote fishing and hunting within Saskatchewan. Personally I'm proud of it, and I'd like to send it over to the hon. member for his perusal.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I have seen some of the advertising and I don't disagree with the advertising that provides information for tourists and for people of this province that may live closer to the parks. I disagree, however, Mr. Minister, with advertising that would appear to be more political — and maybe I shouldn't accuse you of doing it; I don't know — but your government as a whole, the government as a whole certainly has been doing that. They have been spending millions of dollars on advertising that is a waste, a total and absolute waste. And, Mr. Minister, if advertising was cut back, the kind of political advertising that we have seen was cut back, then I think we would have done a lot more in providing park facilities, campgrounds. And it would take just a small amount. Those campgrounds that you shut down — the 10 of them, the campsites — 75 campsites, if you want to put a different interpretation on what a campsite is or a campground, those that you shut down, Mr. Minister . . . It would be a lot less . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As my colleague says, if we want to look at what it cost for one individual on a contract, for Ron Ryan, that would have been able to keep every one of these facilities open and would have been providing a worthwhile, very worthwhile spot for tourists and a place where they can stop and rest and have a little bit of a picnic as they are driving along the highways.

So, Mr. Minister, I am just saying that that is the kind of waste that we have seen in this government that should be directed elsewhere. And I would hope that you would make the move as the Minister of Parks, and tell your colleagues that we need this money to provide better service within our parks; we need that money to provide better roads within those parks. And certainly I could go into the highways that lead to the park, but I won't do that today.

But at least within the parks, Mr. Minister, if you could try to get some of your colleagues to release some of that advertising money that they have been wasting and some of the special contracts that they have been giving out and put some better roads and facilities for people — taxpayers and tourists of this province.

**An Hon. Member:** — Are you going to answer, or are you going to sit there like a stump?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The nonentity from Regina Centre is wanting to get into the exchange of insults here. I thought the hon. member from Pelly was merely making a closing statement to his questions and his remarks and I was going to give him the courtesy of having the last word.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, I want to begin by making a comment in general terms about the stewardship of this government with respect to renewable resources. It doesn't matter whether one's talking about parks or game or the northern Saskatchewan where . . . It

doesn't make sense to talk about parks in that sense — it's all a wilderness area. What this government has done to our renewable resources will take, I think, many years of a more responsible government to undo.

In virtually every area, Mr. Minister, you've cut back, you have utilized resources which in another sense take some considerable period of time to regenerate. You have utilized them. You have cut back on services. You have maximized taxes. And many of the public . . . I see the minister, the member from Swift Current, looking at me with a quizzical look. Many of the public are wondering where on earth is the money going.

Camp fees, the fees for camping, have doubled, and the parks are open for a shorter period of time. The swimming pools are only open on weekends, and that for twice the money. So many of the public are wondering where the money is going.

The money is going to the likes of Ron Rath and the other recipients of Tory patronage, and it exists in the same extend in your department as it does in others. People are paying more, they're getting a good deal less, and they're wondering, what on earth has gone on. What has happened?

What has happened over the last four years? Why are services more expensive? Why have the park fees gone up? Why are they open for a shorter period of time? Why are they paying for firewood? Why have you got this ridiculous reservation system that nobody can make work? What has happened? Part of this is basically the incompetence of this government. You can't even manage something as straightforward as parks without lousing it up.

For year after year after year, decade after decade, the park system ran itself. We have a park system that this province was justifiably proud of it. It was like our financial situation. We thought that nobody could louse it up. the Premier said on a broader scale that you could afford to mismanage Saskatchewan and still come out ahead. Well the last four years proved him wrong. I think there were a number of people who thought you could afford to mismanage this province's parks — they were so strong and it wouldn't matter — and the last four years have proved you wrong. They've also proved you wrong with respect to renewable resources, with respect of game.

Mr. Minister, there are increasing volume of complaints from the public. Here a park opens — at least it is what you describe as a voluntary registration system in the sense that there are people there taking registration and looking after the place — it opens a little later. You've got a swimming pool — the Buffalo Pound, for instance, the place where we always go — they open for a shorter period of time. You've got other parks in other areas that are being cut back. You're chiselling and hacking and chiselling and hacking, all the while increasing costs.

And you claim it is the hard times. You claim it's external events that have made your life so miserable. Well I say, Mr. Chairman, and members opposite, it is hard times but they've to some extend been induced by an incompetent

administration that cannot run something as straightforward as a set of parks — the finest in North American, if not in the world — which the former administration built, which you people are in the process of lousing up. There are fewer services; the parks are not as well maintained . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What garbage!

**Mr. Shillington:** — It is not garbage. If you people would get out of the Air Canada airplanes and you'd stop going to Swift Current and having the taxpayer pay your vacations; if you'd spend some of your vacation time in Saskatchewan in Saskatchewan's provincial parks; and if you weren't so high and mighty; if you were in contact with the public who use those parks; you'd know that all is not well. But you're not. At taxpayers' expense you vacation in Switzerland and in Saudi Arabia and in San Francisco, anywhere but in Saskatchewan.

I say what the minister out to do is spend some of his vacation time in Saskatchewan, spend some of your time at these parks, and you'll know that there are some real problems, Mr. Minister.

There are problems, as well, in the area of hunting, Mr. Minister.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sit down, Ned.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Once again, you've . . . Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I'm going to be interrupted by members opposite or not.

There are problems, in addition, with respect to hunting. You've done the same thing. The hunting licences have increased. And I intend to suggest later on that the game, big game, has not been adequately managed. In fairness to the government, Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the government, you people didn't bring upon the white-tailed deer the hard winter which they had a year and a half ago.

But neither, Mr. Minister, did you do anything about it. The wildlife association, the Saskatchewan wildlife association made a valiant attempt to keep the white-tailed deer alive during that hard winter. Mr. Minister, the problem, I think they will admit in retrospect, the problem was a bit too big for them.

What's the member on his feet? I'm on my feet.

**Hon Mr. Taylor:** — Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:01 p.m.