

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Katzman:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to introduce two groups today in the House. The first group is in the west gallery. They're from Hepburn School. They are here visiting the gallery with their teachers, and I will be meeting with them after question period to discuss what happened in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also introducing a second group, and I will tell you there's three of them sitting in the Speaker's gallery behind me, in the first row. They are here representing the Students Freedom Caravan for Soviet Jews. They are here, as I said, with a group of 50 touring across Canada, taking a petition to the Expo '86 to ask for the freedom of the Jewish people who are in the U.S.S.R. who would like their freedom to come to Canada or other parts of the free world.

I speak for them here, Mr. Speaker, and introduce them because, as one who has had some involvement, my oldest brother came out of the U.S.S.R. in 1930 when he was ten and a half years old; four years ago we were able to get one of my cousins and his wife and their three children out of the U.S.S.R. We still have 13 members of our family left there, and therefore I feel for their cause.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you would all help me welcome them here, and have a safe journey. Thank you.

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

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I join with the member for Rosthern in greeting the members of the Students Freedom Caravan for Soviet Jews, and I know that all members will share the profound regret we all feel, that Jews and other people are not able to leave the Soviet Union when they would so wish to do to seek a new life in other lands. And we very much hope that those circumstances will change, and we wish the Students' Freedom Caravan, and those who are working with them, every success in their endeavours.

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

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of people situated in your gallery, sir, who represent the membership of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation.

They are members of the executive. Seated in the gallery is Lorne Scott, president; Ed Begin, executive director; and members of the executive — the president's counsel, Jim Emke, Jim Kroshus, Gord Demoskoff, and some others who may be joining us later, I will introduce at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say I've been a member of that organization for a number of years. They represent the conscience of wildlife in this province, and I ask all

members to give them a cordial welcome. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague from Turtleford in welcoming the leadership and the executive of the Sask. Wildlife Federation to the Assembly.

All members will know the great work that they have done in working for wildlife habitat in the province, a job that is ongoing, and at times dealing with governments takes longer than we would like to, whatever government is in power. And I would just like to encourage them to keep up the good work because it's very much appreciated, both by farmers and by people who go out on hunting expeditions. And we welcome you here today.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Trade Complaint Against Canadian Lumber Exports

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Forest Products, who was surprisingly uninformed yesterday about a major threat to the hundreds of jobs in Saskatchewan's forest industry.

Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the American lumber industry's attempt to have a 20 per cent duty slapped on all Canadian lumber products entering the United States market which, in effect, would cut off Canadian lumber sales to the United States.

Can the minister today tell us how much Saskatchewan lumber is sold in the United States each year, and what percentage of our total production is sold into the United States? And further, can he tell us what specific action your government will take to intervene in this case in order to protect Saskatchewan jobs.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question as it relates to the amount of Saskatchewan lumber which goes to the United States market, it is about — it's approximately 50 per cent — 50 per cent of Saskatchewan lumber goes into that American market. There's no question that the question that the member raises is an important one. Each time, each time one of these countervailing suits is raised in the United States, mainly by members of the . . . politicians really, and spurred on by politicians from the north—western states of the United States, each time one of these threats comes forward, certainly all of the producing provinces, the lumber—producing provinces of Canada, become alarmed, as does the Government of Canada.

I would say to the hon. member that the Government of Canada and all of the producing provinces are working in collaboration with each other. My colleague, the Minister of Forestry Service, is more involved in this than I am, although my interest is certainly there, as you have stated, because of the responsibility for Sask Forest Products. But

I would say that this government, the present federal government, is the first one to have a minister responsible for forestry, in the Hon. Mr. Merrithew. That minister is co—ordinating efforts of all of the producing provinces. There is no question that the matter is a serious one when it's raised, but we believe very surely that this will not come about, and that our exports into the United States market will be preserved.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, this is the first step, although it comes a little late when you consider that the American industry has been publicly talking about filing such a suit for many months. One would have thought that Ottawa and the provinces would have discussed strategy prior to today. But my specific question is this. Considering the fact that hundreds of Saskatchewan jobs hang in the balance, will Saskatchewan appear as an intervener at the public hearings on this countervailing duty case?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, there will be representatives through the Canadian forest service and all of the provinces who are producers of lumber products involved in this case and representing the interests of Canada and the interests of Canada's lumber industry.

This is not the first time this has taken place; it has taken place before. As the member says, there have been many months that this has been threatened. There is no question that it has everything to do with the fact that the free trade negotiations are now just getting under way between our two countries. Obviously they are trying to flag that issue. There's no question that issue will be flagged in there. I believe that it will come out on the side of Canada, as do many others who are involved in the forest industry in Canada.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes. My question is to the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Forest Products also, and it deals . . . Mr. Minister, the petition for a 27 per cent duty on Canadian lumber sold in the United States was filed by a group called the U.S. Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports. The Weyerhaeuser corporation is a member of that coalition through its membership in both the National Forest Products Association and the Western Wood Products Association.

In other words, Mr. Minister, the company which is about to buy a major share in Saskatchewan forest industry from your government is at the same time trying to prevent Saskatchewan from selling lumber into the United States. And so I ask the minister: can the minister explain how Weyerhaeuser's position is in the best interest of Saskatchewan forest industry, and how it will indeed protect Saskatchewan jobs?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the members are now going back to the position of being against Weyerhaeuser coming to Saskatchewan. The member has clearly said that. The member has clearly indicated the NDP's position as it relates to Weyerhaeuser being a corporate citizen of this province, involved in a lumber industry of this province, and the exports which must go into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Weyerhaeuser, with their interests in the

United States are a part of that, although I don't take the member's word for it necessarily, but they are a part of the lumber industry in the north—western states of the United States; there's no question about that.

But as I said yesterday, and I'll repeat here again today, the most important thing that Weyerhaeuser brought to the negotiations and then to the subsequent deal here in Saskatchewan, as it relates to paper and pulp and production here in Saskatchewan, is the marketing network which they have in the United States market, which even the members opposite will admit is a very important market to our products.

### Free Trade Negotiations

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question, in the absence of the Premier and the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Economic Development, to the Acting House Leader, and it deals with the issue of free trade, and it deals with the government's unwillingness or inability to answer some pretty basic questions yesterday in the Assembly about the free trade negotiations with the United States. The negotiations began this morning in Ottawa between Simon Reisman, the Canadian negotiator, and the U.S. negotiator, Peter Murphy.

My straightforward question is this: does Saskatchewan have a representative at the bargaining table during these negotiations, and if so, who is the representative?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the negotiations are going on between the nation of Canada, the nation of the United States, and those negotiations will continue on that basis. Saskatchewan's representative in the consultative process which led up to the negotiations getting on, and which will carry on as the negotiations continue, will be Mr. Wakabayashi, whom the Premier appointed to that position some weeks ago.

We have confidence in Mr. Wakabayashi's ability in that area, and I would say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as I did yesterday, some of the specifics, and I took notice on behalf of the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, who will be in the House tomorrow, and who will have the answers to his questions tomorrow.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the minister to say that Mr. Wakabayashi will not be in the bargaining room today in Ottawa, or do I understand him to say that Mr. Wakabayashi will be at the table and in the room at Ottawa today?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to repeat his question. There's a bit of noise in the House; I'd ask him for the question. I noticed while the Leader of the Opposition was on his feet the member from Quill Lakes was making reference to Mr. Wakabayashi being under the table and not at the table, and I'll come to Mr. Wakabayashi's defence as a public servant . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to repeat the question. It was a fairly simple one, and it was this. Do I understand the minister to say that Mr. Wakabayashi will be at the table and in the bargaining room, or will he not be at the table and in the bargaining room?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I said very clearly that the negotiations, as I understand it, are under way between Canada and the United States. Canada's representative is Simon Reisman. The United States has their own representative at the table. And there are not 10 provinces involved in the negotiations, although all of the provinces are involved in that consultative process leading up to, and throughout the negotiations, after the various meeting with the other country. So there are not 10 provinces and 50 states negotiating. The United States of America and Canada are negotiating.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a new question to the Acting House Leader. Mr. Minister, last year Ottawa and the provinces agreed and announced that there would be "full provincial participation in any free trade negotiations" — full provincial participation.

Now, Mr. Minister, they did not talk about consultation, discussion, talks, as part of a consultative process, but full provincial participation. To me, and to most Saskatchewan people, I would think that would mean a place at the table. Are you saying that that's not happening? Are you saying that our role is restricted to consulting in advance, and we will not participate in any negotiations?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, the very acts that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to, the talks, discussions, consultations, are all part of a participation by the provinces in the lead-up to the negotiations, obviously. It should be obvious to anyone when bilateral negotiations go on between two nations on this continent, those negotiations will be between those two nations. We believe that's the right way to go, and we believe that's the way it is going.

There is and there will continue to be . . . Our understanding is that there will continue to be, and that there is consultation, discussion, talks, on an ongoing basis between all of the 10 provinces of Canada and the federal government of Canada, and the United States has its own process for that through their own political process. And that's the way it should be — the United States of America negotiating with Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, these negotiations could have a very severe impact on the Saskatchewan economy and Saskatchewan people, and Saskatchewan people understandably want to know as precisely as possible how their interests are being protected at the bargaining table.

And I ask you again, sir: who will speak for Saskatchewan at the bargaining table? Is it Mr. Reisman and, if so, what protection do we have to prevent him from downplaying, perhaps even sacrificing, Saskatchewan interests in the course of these negotiations?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — The Leader of the Opposition says these talks could have detrimental effects on Saskatchewan. I say these talks could have very beneficial effects for Saskatchewan and all of western Canada.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — The Leader of the Opposition suggests that Mr. Reisman should not speak for any part of Canada from which he does not come. That same kind of logic would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition should never speak for anybody from Meadow Lake, an area that he does not come from. That doesn't make any . . .

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

### Saskatchewan Health Laundry Study

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — A question to the Minister of Health, and it deals with a recently prepared report for your department called the Saskatchewan Health Laundry study. Now you'll be aware of that issue; you were asked the question last Friday. You took notice of it.

I would like to re—ask the question: who prepared this study for your department; what was the total cost of the study; was the contract for this study awarded by public tender and, if not, who made the final choice that that particular consultant would be hired?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to you in the House again, as indicated to the Leader of the Opposition a few days ago, that we noticed that the laundry service in this province for the hospitals was rather in a hodgepodge situation with the laundry coming from Meadow Lake through North Battleford, where there is a laundry, to Saskatoon; the laundry from the hospital in North Battleford going over to Prince Albert, where there was a laundry in North Battleford; and various other rather strange patterns of delivery. I felt that perhaps we could save some money by rationalizing and improving some laundry facilities, like we're doing in Yorkton, to perhaps use the health care dollars more efficiently. So I asked my deputy minister to carry out a study of these, and they had the people in SHSP (Saskatchewan hospital services plan), the director of SHSP look for firms.

There were three firms that were considered. One was Northwest Consulting Associates, the other was Resources Management Consultants, and the third one was Associated Business Consultants. All of them have local offices here. Some of them, the head offices are out of Saskatchewan. Interviews were held with all three firms. The lowest bid was Northwest Consulting Associates, but in view of the directors of SHSP in consultation with the deputy, they did not think they could carry out the best job. The highest bid was Resources Management Consultants, and the second lowest was Associated Business Consultants, and the award was given to Associated Business Consultants.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, I'm impressed that you

did something about the dirty laundry when you took over. The question was whether this consulting process was tendered or not. Was there a public tendering process? You indicated that you consulted with several firms, but was there a tendering process where all consulting firms in the province were given an opportunity to bid on this project?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Well as I pointed out, there was rather a strange pattern of laundry services, and we thought we could correct this and improve it, and I think we will be able to. We asked for invitation of bids from local people and local firms that could do it, and there was invitation of submissions. And as I say, there were three groups that submitted, and they were all interviewed. The second highest one was chosen. The lowest one was not chosen because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The second highest one was chosen. If he would listen, or if he prefers to laugh, it is up to him . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if there's three, the second one is either the second highest or the second lowest — depends which way you're counting it. But let me indicate to you that after interviews by the people in SHSP (Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan), the Associated Business Consultants were the ones hired.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Would you know whether the company that got the contract was the company owned by the former executive assistant of Dick Collver, one Ron Ryan? Is that the company? And also, what was the amount of the contract? I think you neglected to tell us what the total amount paid for that study was.

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Certainly, as I told the Leader of the Opposition the other day, it is the company owned by Mr. Ryan. The bids by the various companies were as follows: Northwest Consulting — and this was not a firm bid — this was an estimate of 24 to \$27,000; Associated Business Consultants, \$32,000; and Resources Management Consultants, \$50,000. So the \$32,000 firm was chosen.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, can you confirm whether or not Ron Ryan was also a ministerial assistant to the minister of Finance in 1983? Is that the same individual who was an executive assistant to the minister of Finance at that time, the minister who dealt with Pioneer Trust and all those issues? Can you tell me whether or not this is the same individual, and what was the reason for his dismissal as an executive assistant with the Minister of Finance at that time?

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Certainly, when the bid was provided, Mr. Ryan was running Associated Business Consultants. As far as whether he served for the minister of Finance, when he did, how he was dismissed, you'd have to ask that of the minister that was in charge at that time. I don't know.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Acting Minister of Finance could indicate whether or not this Ron Ryan is the same individual who was dismissed by the previous minister of Finance, the

member from Kindersley.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I will check with the former minister of Finance as to the circumstances. It's obviously irrelevant to the question. I took notice, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — When you talk about an old Liberal, I think that's a perfect example of it there, trying to pull a fast one.

But I want to ask the Minister of Finance again . . . I don't think it's his prerogative to decide whether the questions are relevant or not, but I want to ask him again: the Ron Ryan who was given this contract — and I say again there was no open tendering process that took place — can you tell me whether or not this individual was an executive assistant to the minister of Finance in 1983, and can you tell me the circumstances surrounding his dismissal at that time?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, as I indicated to the hon. member, I would ask the former minister of Finance. I was appointed Minister of Finance in 1985, which is the year previous to this one. I was not in in 1983, which was three years prior to this one. And I indicated that I would pass that on to the former minister of Finance who held office at that time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I will explain it again. I was appointed Minister of Finance in 1985, which is not this year; it was last year. It was not 1983; it was 1985 — 1983 some three years ago — former minister was in office at that time. I believe Mr. Ryan worked for him. And I indicated that I would pass on to him the question of what the circumstances were and get back to the hon. members in the House, Mr. Speaker.

I think I can try and explain this in as simple a manner as possible in hopes that the opposition can understand.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Final supplementary to the minister. I'm not sure why he's jumping up and down like that, Mr. Speaker, but I want to ask him a question and, while he's at it, whether or not he can inform the Assembly the salary of the individual who worked for your department. And while you're taking notice of the question, I don't think it's proper for you to pass it on to someone who is not the minister. Part of your duty is to bring the answer back.

Will you tell us what his salary was, his term of employment. And as a minister of the Crown at the time that the OC was passed, I think that if you really searched your mind you could probably remember the date he was hired by cabinet and the date he was dismissed by cabinet. But if you can't remember, would you bring that back as well.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I certainly . . . My memory is not bad. It's not that good, Mr. Speaker, that I can remember . . . I mean, if I have any highlights, it's the day I realized how incompetent the opposition was, which was the first day of the House after 1982.

Having said that, certainly I'll get the information. Just so that the public understands the waste of time that the

NDP opposition — the information was public in the OCs, and they could check the orders in council. I believe that they made a production at the time, so the information was public. But we'll go back and get the public information and give it to the opposition. It's obviously a very difficult chore for the opposition, so we'll get the public information that's on record and give it back to them.

Mr. Speaker, I took notice . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Order, please. Members cannot take notice and then in answer to another question just flow on into the next question.

#### Non—Payment of Municipal Taxes by Pioneer Trust

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Thank you. The member from Shaunavon asked three questions with regard to a situation where individuals affected by Pioneer Trust's liquidation did not have their property taxes paid. The first question was whether we have lobbied the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation. No, we did not; we dealt with the liquidator of Pioneer. The reason is the interpretation as to whether it is in fact a deposit or not, but we did lobby with the liquidator.

Secondly, has it been investigated by law enforcement authorities? The liquidator advised us no, that there was no reason for an investigation by the law enforcement authorities. Thirdly, any laws broken in taking the money and not passing it on to the municipal authorities? the answer is again as the liquidator advised us: there's no reason for any such investigation.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Supplement to the minister. I wonder whether you consider it fair in Saskatchewan that a trust company would allow the process where individual families who paid their taxes, to keep that money, so that these families now have to go through the process of paying their taxes again, which a number of people have indicated is the case. Is that part of this government's policy to allow that to happen?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well I frankly was shocked by that particular question, Mr. Speaker, because when this government dealt with an unfairness of people not being paid by Pioneer, we were severely criticized by the New Democratic Party for bailing out people like the Ursuline sisters, the Oblate fathers, the city of Regina, some trade unions, SaskSport, individuals throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, that were affected by the liquidation of Pioneer.

And this is a rather historic occasion today. For the first time the New Democratic Party has stood up and said that the government should, in fact, bail out the people who were affected by Pioneer. And it's very surprising that today, for the first time, we get the request that help should be given.

With regard to the particular individuals, the situation arose because the Columbia Trust Company — some time prior, we're advised by the liquidators — bought a number of mortgages. And that's a very common practice, as perhaps the Leader of the Opposition knows.

The question is whether those tax moneys are considered an asset of Pioneer Trust. The liquidator believes that they are an asset of Pioneer Trust and would be paid out in the normal disposition — not the total amount, obviously, but whatever sum is determined by the liquidator, what is to be paid on the assets. So there will be some payment; there will be some payment by the liquidator who now has ruled that these are an asset of Pioneer Trust. Should there be any payment, yes. I would be fully supportive of payments to these individuals. I believe that it is fair that there be some payment. I am, as I say, shocked today that the NDP . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### SECOND READINGS

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

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my brief remarks, I shall be moving second reading of Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Wildlife Act.

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

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill will provide for more severe penalties for night hunting, trafficking in wildlife, and poaching — the three most serious wildlife management problems today. Mr. Speaker, judging by the comments and the catcalls from the opposition, from the seat of their pants, they are opposed to this Bill. I look forward with interest to hearing what the member for Shaunavon has to say in response in questions in committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, night hunting, the act of blinding a big game animal with lights before shooting it with a high—powered rifle, is a practice . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. I'm going to ask both sides of the House to come to order. It's very difficult to hear in the Chamber.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'll repeat that last paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, night hunting, the act of blinding a big game animal with lights before shooting it with a high—powered rifle, is a practice that is both dangerous and abhorrent. An increase in the maximum fine for this offence will send a clear message tonight hunters and will be applauded by conservationists and rural residents of our province.

Mr. Speaker, illegal trafficking in wildlife is rapidly becoming one of the most serious wildlife management problems of the day. In the past five years, there has been a marked increase in the demand for North American wildlife for commercial purposes. As a result of this, the monetary value of some wildlife has sky—rocketed, making trafficking in wildlife an extremely profitable business. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, substantial penalties are needed as a deterrent against this activity.

Mr. Speaker, since much poaching is carried out to supply wildlife traffickers, stiffer penalties for poaching will also work to reduce the illegal trafficking in wildlife in our province. Recently, Mr. Speaker, an Edmonton man received one of the toughest sentences ever given in Saskatchewan for a violation of The Wildlife Act when he was convicted of unlawful hunting. Yet the sea of circumstances of the crime prompted Judge Wilf Meagher to comment during sentencing, and I quote: "I can say I only regret the maximum is only \$1,000. That is something the legislature has to address."

Mr. Speaker, this government is addressing the problem at the request of the people of Saskatchewan. My department has received over 3,000 letters and calls from private citizens and interest groups asking for harsher penalties for wildlife offences. At the annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation in Lloydminster, a motion was passed unanimously in favour of harsher penalties for wildlife offences.

This legislation will do exactly that, Mr. Speaker. This Bill once again illustrates this government's commitment to managing and conserving Saskatchewan's wildlife resource for present and future generations. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud now to move second reading of Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Wildlife Act.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our staff is still going through this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and for those reasons I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Education Act

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have the opportunity to introduce to my immediate right, Mr. Peter Dyck from the Department of Education, and right behind him is Mr. Don Bennett from the assessment authority. And we look forward to any questions that the member from Regina North East may have.

#### Clause 1

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, just a few questions on this. As I indicated in my remarks in second reading, most of the amendments that are provided here we do not disagree with, but I would just seek some clarification of a few items here in committee.

Madam Minister, I know that in subsection 7(2) of the Act — which is being repealed and then put into The Department of Education Act — that it was a provision which allowed the department to produce and lease, etc., and do other things with audio—visual material. Can you tell me whether you have had any difficulty with having the department do all these things with the existing provision as it now exists in The Education Act?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, Mr. Chairman. We have had no

particular problem with it, and it would just better be in where it's being transferred to.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I thought that would be the case, but I was just curious as to whether there were any particular reasons for this amendment. It is nothing more than simply a housecleaning — moving a provision from one Act to another.

Do you intend, or does your department intend, or does the government intend, to broaden the scope of the activities in this area, of the production and the leasing and the selling and the distribution of audio—visual material? Is there any plan in your department to broaden the activities, other than what the department has already been doing?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the plan.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I have some concerns about the kinds of material that's there, but I'll pursue that when we get to the next Bill. Madam Minister, if it's okay with the Chair, I will cover all of these under subvote 1, and then we can proceed with them. Is that okay, Mr. Chairman?

One of the things that I had some concern about in second reading was the matter in section 146 which provides for access to pupil records. As I indicated in my remarks, there is a very major change in principle here. I'm curious to know if the department recognizes, and I suspect it does, the significance of the principle behind the new provision. What the new provisions will do is allow access to student's records by parents or guardians, regardless of the student's age. There is no limitation.

As the legislation is now, anyone who is 18 years of age or older is an adult, can sign contracts, can do anything else that a n adult can legally do — get married without permission — and therefore school records that may be requested by someone, when a person is an adult, are not made accessible unless there is consent.

Can you explain, Madam Minister, why it is thought this very major provision, or this very major change, is thought to be necessary?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated in the second reading speech, within the school Act school boards now have responsibility to provide education for those that are over 18 and up to 21. And this was a recognition that for those that are from 18 to 21 that they do, in fact, have a right to have access while that student is within the school system.

I had also indicated at second reading speech time, Mr. Chairman, that it had been suggested, when we were doing some minor changes in 1985, that this particular clause be looked at and reconsideration be given to the change. So that is why it is before this House.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I think I recall your comments, Madam Minister, about the suggestion. I guess all kinds of suggestions are made, and I'm not arguing with the provision. I have some concerns about it because I'm not

sure that any of us can fully understand what the implications might be here.

Can you tell me, besides the suggestion that someone made — and since I was not here, I don't know whether it was made by members on the government side of the House or members of the opposition — can you indicate why it is thought by the department or, I should say, by the government, that this provision is necessary? I don't think simply saying that somebody suggested it is good enough. The implications are just too broad.

(1445)

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go back a few years for the benefit of the member from Regina North East. Prior to the 1985 amendment, what existed was that parents could not request access to school records pertaining to a pupil directly. They could only accompany the pupil who had requested the access. The 1985 amendment made provision for access to be granted to parents — to be granted to parents — where the pupil was dependent on the parent or guardian and was 18 years or less.

Now during the consideration of the amendment by the Non-Controversial Bills Committee, it was suggested that the department monitor — and this is dating from last year's amendment — monitor the reference to age in this section. And while I did not attend that particular committee meeting, I would suspect several reasons for the monitoring of — one being that children between the ages — or young adults — between the ages of 18 and 21 do have access to the school system. The school system has a responsibility to supply that education if they so wish, and that, in fact, those students can be totally dependent on their parents, and that the parents, in fact, be allowed to have access for those that are between the ages of 18 and 21, if they so require.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I think the amendment was a good amendment back in '85. Obviously it was, I think, necessary at that time. I'm curious, Madam Minister, the result of your department's monitoring of this age provision — what did the department's monitoring, what kind of information did it provide which would have brought about the need for this amendment?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess the term "monitoring" would perhaps better be said to be one of consultation. We did have some consultation with the Department of Justice and with the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, who felt, in fact, that this particular amendment would be very acceptable and should have been done.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, thank you for that correction, Madam Minister. There's a very distinct difference between the department monitoring, to see whether they have problems, and consultation. And I certainly think that consultation is desirable. I was going to ask you the next question — and you've answered it — that the Saskatchewan school trustees is in agreement with this change, and I suspect the Department of Justice has also recommended it.

I guess, Madam Minister, the problem with the provision that you have in the Bill is that I don't think anyone will be able to know how one defines "dependent." Can you indicate how, in the view of the department, the term "dependent" will be defined? Because it can be either very broad or it can be very narrow. I suppose one of the ways that you can define what this Bill does, it's now going to be: he who pays the pupil calls the tune. I would hope that that's not the way that this amendment is going to be applied.

Can you tell me, Madam Minister, whether the government has considered what the definition of "dependent" will be? And if so, is it somewhere in the Bill that is not before us, but in the bigger Bill, so that there is not some confusion, or indeed in some cases — and even if there is one, it's too many — some wrongdoing?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, no, the word "dependent" is not defined in the Bill. I would suggest to the member from Regina North East that it is not, in fact, difficult to define what is dependent. I think most people in this Assembly understand what is meant by a dependent child, a dependent student, and a dependent young adult. I mean, most people in the province understand that.

And of course the normal meaning is one of relying on the parent or the guardian for support or help. And of course that support is one of financial support — lodging, board and room, clothing, the necessities of the day, and financial support in order to maintain their living, that is not in any way very difficult to understand. We all know what "dependent children" means.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, it's not the question of what we know, Madam Minister; it's a question of how the law may interpret it. We're not dealing here with what we think, necessarily, or what our assumptions are. We're dealing here with the law, the law as it will be argued by lawyers, and as it will be interpreted by the courts. So I simply ask you the question in all seriousness, Madam Minister, because I think it's a question that ought to be asked. And I would have hoped that the government would have considered the possible implications of this.

In other words, what you have said in your definition — and I want to say at the outset that I'm rather concerned that there is not a definition of "dependent" in the Bill, because it leaves it wide open. But according to your definition, if a young man or a young woman 21 years of age goes to live with an uncle, or an aunt, or a brother, for the purposes of going to a high school — and that's in this day and age not uncommon — and because they pay the board and room in that place, and because in that sense they are dependant on this home and the people who own that home, they will be able to have access to this information.

Now I say that with the underlying assumption that this student will not have an independent income, because they will be relying on the lodging that is provided by these individuals they live with. are you saying, Madam Minister, that they will then have access to this 21-year-old's school files without that student's permission?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that we can all think of various examples that we could be concerned and perhaps should be concerned with down the road. However, for the purposes of children and students going to the school system, kindergarten to grade 12, it is usually your parent or your guardian that, in fact, supports you while you are in those school years. I also might add that for many of those students between 18 and 21 you will find some that are handicapped, and they, in fact, could be living with an uncle or an aunt while buying services with a particular school system. This Bill is meant that parents or guardian that are supporting the child while the child is in the school system, if there is a problem, do in fact have some rights and access to that school record.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — As I indicated at the beginning of my questions, I'm not saying that I am disagreeing with the provision. I just think this committee needs to know all of the considerations that went into it.

I have one final question, Madam Minister, and that is this: have there, in the experience of the department, been problems which have been brought to the department's attention, or concerns, and if so, are they large in number or few? With the fact that this amendment is not in the present legislation, has there been a problem that has brought about the need to have it before us today?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, we have not had a great deal of complaints. In fact, there have been no complaints during the last year, if that is what the member is looking for. I would also suggest that, you know, one tries to look ahead and put legislation in place that recognizes some of the changes that are taking place in society instead of waiting for several complaints to come in, or perhaps a crisis, or until you are challenged with one.

I will go back to the fact that this matter was put before the Non-Controversial Bills Committee in 1985, which the opposition are members of, and at that time was asked that we do in fact consider this, because the issue was not one of age, so much as the defendant's issue, while the child is in school.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. That's all I wanted to ask on that particular section, and I don't argue with the need to look ahead. I might argue — and I'm not suggesting that's the case with this legislation, but it may be very well the case in other legislation which we have before this House — I argue with the government bringing forward legislation simply to fill . . . to make it appear as if there's something happening when the legislation is not necessary. In this case there may be an argument, depending on one's point of view, for having this amendment.

I have one last question, and depending on your answer I may not have any further questions on it. But dealing with section 279, it is mentioned that there will be staged introduction of — I'm having trouble finding it — an assessment. Can you define for us what you mean by staged introduction?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, the staged introduction of reassessment is really very simple. When a property . . . The member from the Leader of the Opposition laughs. He obviously finds assessment and reassessment a little more difficult to understand than I.

However, when a property is reassessed, there may be decreases as well as increases in the assessment. The increases result in increases taxes on that property, as the member from Regina North East well knows. If the increase due to reassessment was very significant, there was provision during the reassessment cycle for the increase to be phased in.

And let me use the city of Saskatoon as an example. They made a deliberate decision to phase it in over a three-year period so that the impact was not difficult for the citizens that lived there. We have some municipalities who were reassessed in the last year of reassessment, the 10-year cycle, and they could not stage or phase in as the city of Saskatoon did, and this proposed amendment allows them to do that.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. I think that's a good provision. I might argue with you about whether reassessment and the increase in taxes is a simple matter, and I think maybe most property owners would argue with anybody who would suggest that.

Madam Minister, those are all the questions that I have. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing us to go under clause 1, because I think we can now proceed, unless others have some questions.

(1500)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

## **Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1983**

### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I indicated when we were considering the Act to amend The Education Act, that I had some questions on this Bill, dealing with the actual practical application of this provision.

Madam Minister, I think one of the concerns that many teachers have, in fact I think most teachers have, is the limited supply of audio-visual materials that's available, not only the limited supply but in some cases the quality; the fact that many of the materials that are available are extremely outdated and in fact many of them are not produced in Canada.

I guess I speak to some extent from personal experience as a class-room teacher. And I really say that in all sincerity and I don't say it in a critical sense, because I would suggest that the problem has existed for some time, although there was, I think, some very positive attempt and some positive results in changing that around when



we had an agency called Saskmedia corporation, which not only purchased materials that were produced elsewhere, but also commissioned the production of materials. And I really believe, Madam Minister, that the production of materials relevant to Saskatchewan schools is a very important matter.

Let me go back to the question of the limited supply. There are some units in some subject areas that really in order for them to be effectively taught, have to be taught at certain seasons of the year. And I'm talking about science, although you could apply it in social studies, depending on what happens to be happening around the world at that particular time.

One should not in the class—room follow the textbook from page 1 to page 201. If a certain part of the social studies course has some relevance to what's happening internationally or nationally at that particular time, most teachers would say, this is the unit I'm going to work at now because I can motivate my students; the students can look at some real things that are happening around them. But then they face the problem that there are so many other teachers who may want to do that at that time that they cannot get access to some of the audio—visual aids that are available. And I think if this provision . . . And I know it's simply a matter of moving the provision from one piece of paper of a Bill to another one, but if in the doing of this it in some way results in more production and a provision of greater numbers of supplies, I would be the first to congratulate you and the department.

I know that in the — was it in the budget speech or the throne speech? — there was an announcement of an agency which will now produce, I believe, audio—visual materials. If you wish to comment, or if you can, I would like you to indicate whether that will get into the business of producing educational materials. If you're unable to do that, then I will ask the minister who might be in charge of that particular agency.

Can I ask, Madam Minister: is it the intention of you, your government or the department, to do more work in the production of Saskatchewan material, audio—visual material, that can be used in the schools of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, with that question and the preamble to it, we are into a whole host of other issues, including curriculum and a few other things. The amendment before us — and let's deal specifically with that — is simply to move the Act from The Education Act to The Department of Education Act, which better describes what the department does and what it's responsible for.

In terms of the member's comments on materials, whether it's audio—visual or perhaps written textbooks, I'm pleased to hear him say, first of all, a recognition that it's been a long time coming in getting some mechanism in order to produce better — particularly Canadian—made; perhaps Saskatchewan — material. The member will be pleased to know that we have been making some special efforts in that particular area within the Department of Education itself. I look forward to the new program, whoever the minister may be responsible

in terms of the educational television network that will be forthcoming. I think it will be something that the education system will be able to use for many, many years, and it can do nothing but improve, even as a first step, improve the access that teachers have to various materials.

In the conversations that I have with many teachers, I'm well aware of their concern over access to films, videos, including written textbooks. I know many of them utilize the public library system, the regional library systems, those from rural Saskatchewan, and when they have depleted that resource, they perhaps then turn to the department including the branch that we are now talking about in terms of this particular amendment. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further comments on it.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Your comment, Madam Minister, about the long—time coming is an interesting one, because in fact there was a mechanism, and I think a very effective one, in place prior to 1982 to provide material. It was called Saskmedia. In the euphoria of your government after your election and in the attempt to recreate the world, I think unfortunately it was decided that Saskmedia ought to be abolished, and it was, although not totally in that it became a part of the Department of Education, became simply a distribution centre of materials from which teachers and the public could order. I really regret that Saskmedia was not allowed to carry out its work because I think over the last four to five years it could have made a very substantial contribution to the production of important and relevant materials which may have been more available.

If I may go to some specifics, and then we can proceed on this very quickly because it is consequential to what we've already talked about. I noticed that in subsection 8, it's repealed and there's another section substituted, but whereas it used to be called . . . the department is responsible; it now says the minister is responsible. And I'm not arguing, but is there some legal need for that or is there some other reason why that is a change in word?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's very simple. The minister is in fact responsible for the Department of Education, and that's why it states that.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — It stated the Department of Education before, so once again it's simply housekeeping, I assume, and means nothing.

I notice in (b) under 8, it is indicated that "materials that will be used for educational purposes not related to elementary or secondary education." Can you give an indication of what kinds of materials you might be talking about here?

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, if I could, for the students from Swan River, before they leave I would like to welcome them to Saskatchewan, Regina, and to the legislature. They're a group of junior high students from Swan River, Manitoba. I believe there's 50 students, grades 7, 8 and 9, with their teacher, Garry Anderson, who are here in Saskatchewan today. I'm sure all

members will want to wish them a safe stay in the province and an enjoyable one, and a safe return to their province of Manitoba.

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

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 23—An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1983

#### Clause 1 (continued)

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member's question, what this does is allow the acquisition of such things as films, audio—visual materials, that are not done in the department. They perhaps would be done by . . . You referred to Saskmedia; I could refer to a new network, perhaps the British Columbia educational network, that type of thing, to make available to school systems if they so wished.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I'm not sure that you got the question right. It says that:

the production, acquisition, sale, lease, distribution, exhibition and handling of educational programs and materials, including educational programs and materials that will be used for educational purposes not related to elementary or secondary education.

Does the department provide this material for purposes other than that of elementary and secondary education? That's all I wanted to know.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Saskmedia previously had materials that were not related to the programming in elementary and secondary education. And what this does is allow, through education, the acquisition of those materials to be handled by us. Before, that was not allowable.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1515)

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would in fact like to thank the two officials that are with me today, and the member from Regina North East.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well let me also indicate my appreciation to the officials for providing us with the answers, and I look forward to having them here when we get into the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Education.

### Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act

**Mr. Chairman:** — Would the minister please introduce his officials.

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce Ken McNabb, who is the assistant deputy minister of Tourism and Small Business; and on my right, Tony Koschinsky, who is our legal adviser.

#### Clause 1

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't have any large number of questions. I would like to ask some questions, and I can probably do them in clause 1 and save the time of the committee.

Some of the questions relate to the explanatory notes, so if they are at hand it would assist. With respect to the way that the explanatory notes are set up — and I don't know whether this is appropriate to direct this to you — but under the heading "section of the Bill," I would like to think that there was under that heading the appropriate section in the Bill and not the Act, if I may put it that way. I t just would make it easier to follow — and I don't know whether I make myself clear. But section of the Bill 2 — it's not section 2 of the Bill, but it's section 3 of the Bill, which happens to deal with section 2 of the Act. But that's a question of form.

I'll move on to section 4 of the Bill, which is section 5 of the Act. And here is a change, and there are a couple of changes. One clearly makes the Bill . . . the Bill will make the Act applicable to communities between 5,000 and 20,000, if I may put it that way. It will cover the Yorktons and the Swift Currents, but still leave excluding the four major cities.

Is there any significance to the changes in wording? The Act as it now stands talks about a corporation primarily engaged in business, and the new one talks about investing in businesses primarily outside a city. Is there any significance between investing in a business and investing in a corporation which is engaged in a business? Was there any significance in that change of wording?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all I understand what you're saying about the numbering, and I will take that under consideration. And I think you might be right that that might make it easier to follow in the future.

The answer to the second question is no, there's no significance to that. It's meaningless, I guess.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I'm turning over my explanatory notes, and the next one refers to section 7 of the Bill which doesn't refer to anything that's before us. I'll put it this way: is there any change proposed in section 7 of the Act?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, Leader of the Opposition, there's no change in that section of the existing Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I refer now to section 5 of the Bill, section 9(2)(b) of the Act, and I note that there is added prescribed agricultural and livestock production activities to the list of businesses that may be primarily engaged in, if I may put it that way. Are there any other changes of significance in the new 9(2)(b) from the old 9(2)(b)?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — I think the only other change of significance is one we've already discussed, 9(2)(b)(vi) which of course we've talked about, which gives you the right to apply the venture capital to any business in a population less than 20,000. I think, other than that, that's the only significant . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm looking at the explanatory notes again. I'm just looking at the last paragraph there which says:

The new provisions provide for the minister to exercise discretion in favour of specific projects which have a significant impact on economic activity and employment.

That is a general comment, but there is no specific provision in the Bill which refers to ministerial discretion, except the 5,000 to 20,000 one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

With respect to section 6 of the Bill, section 10(2) of the Act, would the minister indicate what the significance of that is?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — I think, Mr. Chairman, that what we're trying to do here is clarify exactly what the venture capital corporation can do. The word "in," as the note indicates, is redundant. So they felt they maybe had more powers than they actually did, and they had to comply with the other elements, so that has been removed to simplify the . . . make it clear, I suppose, what exactly is meant.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Minister, turning to . . . I will give you notice in advance. I'm going to ask a question about section 7 of the Bill and section 9 of the Bill. Section 7 of the Bill seems to deal with, I suppose you'd call it inside trading, or internal dealing, or non—arm's length transactions, and the original Bill, the original Act, seems to say that no venture capital corporation shall invest in a business if the proceeds of the investment are used to finance the purchase of goods or services through a shareholder of the corporation — I'm summarizing. And you now say, unless it's in the ordinary course of business.

Do you see any problems with that where venture capital corporations might be organized to take over a significant portion of the operation of one of the shareholder organizers?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Chairman, I think there are two elements to the question. The reason for this inclusion is primarily in smaller centres where the local hardware store owner might want to buy into the venture capital and still continue to sell nails to the project, something simple like that.

The other question was in terms of a take—over — I think there are two elements again; some attempt to take over would obviously not be in the normal course of business. And secondly, section 12 of the regulations prohibits anything of that type. And so if that is a sincere concern, we can certainly monitor it. But we think it's taken care of

in the rest of the legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think that the history of sales to the public — and I know this is a specialized public — but sales to the public are one of the main areas of abuse, as undoubtedly there's been people organizing public companies in order to take over businesses they already owned. It's classic if you're in the securities regulating area, and it would be a surprise if it weren't tried in the venture capital area, but I note that you are taking steps to see that it doesn't become an area of abuse.

(1530)

One last question, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister. Could you offer an explanation on section 9 of the Bill with respect to reduction of capital. Perhaps I could say: is it anything that is other than purely technical and purely legal?

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Chairman, I think it is purely technical and purely legal. The explanatory notes may go through it. I think the basic concept in layman's language — when we're talking about technical and legal, I certainly am talking in layman's language — the concept is that if an investment is made, an initial investment of \$100,000, that that amount must be in the fund over the five—year period. If there . . . You would be allowed to withdraw some of it if the retained earnings on the other side maintain that level, but the \$100,000 investment must stay in the fund during the five—year period. And the reason for the wording is to make that eminently clear.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister and his officials.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Education Act

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

#### Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1983

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

#### Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act

**Hon. Mr. Schoenhals:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill

be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Maxwell that Bill No. 40 — An Act respecting the Establishment, Maintenance and Use of Park Land and Park Land Reserve be now read a second time.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've checked this Bill out, and I want to say at this time that we will not be opposing the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and if there are any questions we will do that in committee.

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

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

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

#### Item 1 (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a few questions to the minister with respect to forestry. I would like to ask the minister, firstly: what dispositions of forest reserve or timber are currently outstanding for a considerable period of time?

I'm not asking for any short-term leases, but you will have given perhaps some leases to MacMillan Bloedel, some to PAPCO, some to Simpson. Could you give us an indication of what major dispositions of timber land are now outstanding?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I assume you're referring to ongoing forest management licence agreements and the negotiations taking place with the companies. Am I correct?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, I think . . . I would ask for your response along that line, and then I will follow up if it doesn't appear to be what I'm looking for.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There are five, I imagine what you would call major, four major, one minor. And then there are others that would be small operators.

There's MacMillan Bloedel lease; Simpson Timber; L & M Wood Products from Glaslyn, which would be the minor one; Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation; and then Weyerhaeuser, which we would term major, plus the small operators.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to Saskatchewan Forest Products, what type of disposition exists from the department to Saskatchewan Forest Products?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — What we have with Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation is a volume harvest agreement. Are you looking for a precise size of agreement and the exact amount of wood which would be allocated to them?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — No, Mr. Minister, I'm looking for any indication of whether or not the volume harvesting agreement is restricted to certain geographic areas, and whether it has a time limit in years.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The agreement is currently still under negotiation. It would be for 20 years. And the precise geographic location has yet to be determined.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you tell me under what security of wood supply, timber supply, Saskatchewan Forest Products mill at, say, Carrot River now operates?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — They are now working under the existing volume harvest agreement.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in general terms, what does the existing volume harvesting agreement provide with respect of the rights of Saskatchewan Forest Products to harvest timber to be processed at Carrot River?

(1545)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, it is 20,000 cubic metres per year.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, can you advise me whether that is assured to Saskatchewan Forest Products for a given number of years and, if so, for how many?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm assuming you're saying that they have this 20,000 cubic metres per year, and is there an allowance specifically to Carrot River? The forest management licence agreement which is currently being negotiated will be with Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. The allocation within their lease to their individual mills will be under their jurisdiction.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Perhaps I will ask what the situation now is as opposed to what is being renegotiated. What is the situation prior to any changes which may result from the current negotiations?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The current situation, hon. member, is that Saskatchewan Forest Products has access to all of the sawed timber outside all other FMLA (forestry management licensing agreement) areas.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The Sask Forest Products has access to them outside areas which you have identified, and I'll ask you to identify again for me the FMLA area, if I understood it correctly, and I'll ask you to identify that further.

And do they have it on any assurance of long-term allocation other than their association with the

government? Is there an agreement in writing between the government and the corporation specifying access for a period of time or term of years?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, hon. member, we're looking for some information back here. I'm assuming that what you're getting at is that you want to take a look at the area of interest, as we call it, that Sask Forest Products currently has, and what it is liable to have at the conclusion of the round of negotiations for their next FMLA (forest management licensing agreement).

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, the first part of it is right, anyway. I'm asking what access Sask Forest Products now have, and you tell me that it is access to the forest, generally, not now covered by forest management licence agreements in the name of Simpson Timber or the other existing ones, the four you have identified: L & M; Simpson; PAPCO; and Mac—Blo, or MacMillan Bloedel. I'm asking what the existing arrangement is which gives Sask Forest access to the forest to require timber, and I use Carrot River as an example.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We do have access to the Big River supply area and a piece on the eastern part of the province around Carrot River.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you mentioned Big River. With respect to the mill at Big River, or Bodmin, I will call it, is it accurate that that mill has had access to a supply of timber in the Doré Lake—Smoothstone area, and perhaps elsewhere in that general area, for the Bodmin mill and for the Big River mill preceded it for many years?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Correct.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, is it accurate to say that the timber which has been available to the Bodmin mill for a considerable period of time has now been disposed of, or is in the course of being disposed of, by means of an agreement with Weyerhaeuser?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — In the Big River supply area, a part to the eastern side would be going to Weyerhaeuser in Prince Albert. That's the part that contains the large stands of hardwood which are not processed in the Bodmin mill.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you advising me that the wood which has . . . the areas where softwood has been obtained for the Bodmin mill — and here I'm speaking purely from recollection — in what I call the Doré Lake—Smoothstone area, and which certainly in the past has been a fruitful source of softwood, are you telling me that that is or is not part of the disposition to Weyerhaeuser?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, east of Doré Lake it is. It is also part of the deal with Weyerhaeuser; Bodmin will become part of Weyerhaeuser.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — So you're telling me, Mr. Minister, that the area which provided the timber, the softwood timber, for Bodmin is partly in the Weyerhaeuser deal and partly not in the Weyerhaeuser deal; the portion east of

Doré Lake is part of the Weyerhaeuser disposition, and other portions are not? Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Essentially that's correct.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, since the Bodmin mill is going to Weyerhaeuser, judging from press release — and we have no other information, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister — and since the portion of the forest which has been the area where Bodmin has got its timber, since the portion that is going to Weyerhaeuser is, as you say, made up to a significant extent of hardwood, and since hardwood is not processed at Bodmin, am I correct in assuming that a good deal of the softwood, which in recent years has gone to Bodmin, will not go to Weyerhaeuser and therefore will not be available for the Bodmin mill?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — There will be no shortage of softwood for the mill at Bodmin. What we are going to see is intensive forest management whereby the hardwood in that area will be going to Prince Albert for us in the paper mill project and pulp. The softwood will be going to Bodmin. In fact, Bodmin could increase in its capacity of softwood because they will not be competing with PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) and they will not be competing with the Meadow Lake area.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I hear what you say, but are you asking us to believe that all the softwood in the area will go to Bodmin, and that which is pulpwood will not go to Prince Albert?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm really not asking you to believe anything. Because, judging by the line of your questioning, I know exactly where you would like to take it; whereby you can once again scare the workers at Bodmin, scare the workers at Carrot River, scare the workers at PAPCO, scare the workers at Meadow Lake, and say this government is giving away the resources — gloom and doom; we're going to shut down all the mills. That is patently false. We have made allowance for an increase in the softwood both to Meadow Lake and to Bodmin, and their future should be assured.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Minister, I wonder if I can get some answers rather than some speeches, and they were . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, will you let me know when I have the floor?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Member of Elphinstone, you have the floor right now.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to the minister was: are you saying to me that all the softwood in the area that is tributary to Bodmin will go to Bodmin, and that under intensive forest management none of the softwood which is of pulp size will go to Prince Albert? Is that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The soft timber will go to Bodmin and pulp size would be going to Prince Albert.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That is not what you told me before. We can read it, and you told

me the softwood would be going to Bodmin and the hardwood would be going to Prince Albert. So that what you're saying the, so far as the softwood is concerned, is that the disposition will be the same as in the past — saw timber going to Bodmin and the pulp going to Prince Albert?

(1600)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes. Let me read it to you again. In your charming courtroom manner, were you leading up and leading up and leading up to the question which I anticipated right at the start? Why don't you just get up and ask the question? In fact, don't bother, I'll give you the answer now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What's this clown at the back yelling about?

I'll give you the answer now. The Bodmin mill is assured. The Meadow Lake mill is assured. We welcome Weyerhaeuser into the province. We anticipate a better forest management licence agreement with them than we've had in the past. And what's more, we welcome the small operators once again back into this province — the very people you squeezed out by conscious decision in 1972, who are only too happy now to see the opportunity to be back working the Saskatchewan forests.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we are obviously getting a maximum of rhetoric and a minimum of answers. And the questions, it seems to me, were designed to elicit facts, and all they have elicited is a great flow of rhetoric.

Now, Mr. Minister, have you concluded an arrangement? Have you signed anything with Weyerhaeuser?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The forest management licence agreement with Weyerhaeuser has not been signed yet.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'll ask the question again. Has your department signed anything with Weyerhaeuser? Is there any agreement signed between yourself, Her Majesty the Queen in the right of the province of Saskatchewan as represented by the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, and Weyerhaeuser Canada?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, we have not.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you negotiating with Weyerhaeuser on behalf of your department, or is your department, or anyone on behalf of it, negotiating with Weyerhaeuser?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Our department is negotiating with Weyerhaeuser to conclude a forest management licence agreement.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are you able to give any information on the terms of that forest management agreement as to its duration?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Twenty years, five years renewable, as are all of the others which we are currently negotiating.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you refer to others which you're currently negotiating. I'll ask you, with respect to the ones which are in existence, what is the arrangement with respect to — I will use Simpson and MacMillan Bloedel at this time — for what term were those forest management licence agreements?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — With Simpson, MacMillan Bloedel, Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporations, L & M Wood Products of Glaslyn: 20 years, five years renewable.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, just so we're clear: those are the terms of the existing arrangements with those organizations, and not the term of any new arrangements which you are negotiating. Is that accurate?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, sir. PAPCO had been 30. In a new negotiation, it would be for 20, as are the others.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not making myself clear. I'm not asking what will be, but I'm asking what is. You told me that nothing has been signed with Weyerhaeuser. I take it that nothing has been signed with Simpson and with MacMillan Bloedel and with L & M. If they have, you will advise me that new agreements have been signed, but if they have not, will you tell me what the length of the existing agreements is with respect to those recipients of forest management licenses?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No others have yet been signed, as you indicated. Existing, for PAPCO, was 30, and for each of the others I mentioned, 20 years.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when you speak of PAPCO for 30, this will have been for 30 years commencing in probably 1968 or when the agreement was signed? At least in the late '60s.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — PAPCO, I'm advised that date was 1965.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you give me any other indications of the terms of the proposed arrangement with Weyerhaeuser? You have indicated that you're negotiating; you've indicated that it's not signed; but you have indicated its term. What other terms of that agreement between yourself and Weyerhaeuser can you disclose to the House?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Without going into particular details, we are looking at higher stumpage fees. We are looking at increased level of reforestation at the expense of the company in return for a 20—year agreement, renewable every five years.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you able to indicate the level of stumpage fees which you're talking about?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Given the nature of some rather technical and intricate negotiations currently taking place nationally, I would be somewhat loath to put on the record the precise nature of those stumpage fees just now.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in the opinion of the minister, are the fees going to be high enough to convince Weyerhaeuser Canada to convince Weyerhaeuser U.S. not to push for tariffs on Canadian timber on the grounds that the stumpage fees are too low? We all know that Weyerhaeuser U.S. and its allies are now calling for tariffs, and calling for tariffs because they say Canadian lumber production is subsidized, and more particular, subsidized because of low stumpage fees.

Now do you think that the stumpage fees will be high enough to convince Weyerhaeuser Canada so that it can convince Weyerhaeuser U.S. not to claim that this is a subsidy? And if it isn't, will you assure the committee that you will charge sufficient stumpage fees so that Weyerhaeuser Canada will be able to convince Weyerhaeuser U.S. that there isn't a subsidy?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Sir, we have no evidence at this point that Weyerhaeuser U.S. is part of the lobby to which you referred. I am satisfied that the stumpage fees which are being negotiated are fair and equitable and without controversy within Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I don't know whether this is the appropriate time to get into a discussion with the minister on whether or not Weyerhaeuser U.S. is part of the groups which are pressing for the tariffs. But I'm going to ask the minister: are you not aware that tariffs are being pressed for? Are you not aware that these are being pressed for by lumber groups in the United States? And are you not aware that Weyerhaeuser U.S. is a member of at least one of the lobby groups pressing for the higher tariffs?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm well aware of the situation both nationally and internationally, and I understand the stumpage rates are comparable with those in other provinces, at least the ones which we are currently negotiating. I should point out to the hon. member that negotiations on a national and international level in terms of trade are being handled by my colleague, the minister in charge of Economic Development and Trade.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, dealing with Weyerhaeuser and with the stumpage which is being charged, and with the, I think, undoubted fact that groups in the United States are pressing for tariffs against Canadian lumber; and the undoubted fact that one of the grounds is that Canadian lumber is subsidized because of alleged low stumpage fees; and that the matter is being pressed by something called the coalition for fairer lumber imports; and that part of that coalition is Western Wood Products Association: is the minister aware whether Weyerhaeuser U.S., or one of its subsidiaries, is associated with that particular industrial group called Western Wood Products Association, whose address is Portland, Oregon?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I'm not aware of the specific group to which you've alluded, but we can certainly check it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, are you able to give us any other proposed arrangement with Weyerhaeuser?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Sir, we are negotiating for other agreements. I'm somewhat loath to divulge the precise contents of the agreement which we are trying to conclude with Weyerhaeuser, formerly the PAPCO company, in light of the negotiations with the other companies.

I will say this: they will be consistent and they will be fair. And the stumpage levels will certainly be considerably higher than the ones previously negotiated by the previous administration.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Just in case we're wondering about which previous administration, it was not the administration of which I was a part, but the administration of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher who negotiated those particular stumpage arrangements.

And they certainly were low, but times were different. And I'm not here now being necessarily critical of the inducements which were held out to get the pulp—mill in to Prince Albert. I am just saying that, just so that there would be no confusion as to the particular origin of those stumpage arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, can you give an indication of when you feel that negotiations with Weyerhaeuser will be complete and agreements will be available for public scrutiny?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — From the point of view of my officials and my department, sir, we are fairly close in concluding the forest management licence agreement. However, I'm, as you would understand, not empowered to speak on behalf of negotiation is regarding the details of the sale of the company.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would give us the estimated amount which you expect to spend on advertising in the 1986—87 year, and the amount that was actually spent in '85—86.

(1615)

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm having some difficulty pulling some numbers together because they're scattered all over the map here. I can tell you, 262,000, the figure I gave you last week, was for '85—86. And '86—87, we've got it spread—eagled among printing, advertising, newsletter, department newsletter, and various other things. I can undertake to have someone break that down, and we'll get that number to you.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, could you give me the amount of that advertising that was contracted through Dome Advertising?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I can give you the last figure we had for this past year; dome was \$198,578.25.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, have Tanka — I'm not sure how it's pronounced, T—a—n—k—a, Tanka Research or Tanka consulting ... What's the pronunciation? Tanka. Has Tanka Research had any contracts with your department, and if so, what amounts are they?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Nothing with Tanka.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, could we have details of contracts of service entered into by . . . consulting contracts in effect. Contracts of service may be too broad. Can we have details of consulting contracts entered into by your department? The minister of fits and snits, the Minister of the Environment — I'm trying to think of the name. The Minister of Environment gave that to us, and we assume that you're prepared to do that as well, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I have a rather lengthy list of all of our contracts for '85—'86. We have them ranging from a couple of hundred dollars up, because we do an awful lot of contracting out for parts and various things. I'd be pleased to have these photocopied and send them to you.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, I want to ask you whether or not there are any campgrounds still selling firewood to campers. Has that program been entirely discarded?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Well I'm very happy that the member has brought up the subject of firewood. And I'm looking at page 1376 of Hansard, last Friday, when the member decided to stand up and talk the clock out. And he ran off at the mouth, and he made a lot of accusations and allegations. The three—piece suit from Regina Centre stood up and made all kinds of allegations and accusations. One of them was firewood. No, we don't charge for firewood. No you've got it right in Hansard. You're saying, "Why are they paying for firewood?" Wrong. They're not paying for firewood.

But let's take the rest of it. You stood there and you said, and I'm going to quote . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You're making my day.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — No, my friend, you're making my day. You see, the opposition have this mentality somehow, you know, they said to ministers, if you're nice to us and you let us make up anything we like and let us make all kinds of false accusations, if you let us away with it, we'll let you off estimates very quickly. Well I'm prepared to stand here in estimates till hell freezes over before you are going to get away with any false allegations.

So let's start with the first one. "Camp fees, the fees for camping, have doubled," he says. Not true. Camping fees increased by \$1 a night in 1983. In 1982, for an electrified site, it was \$6. From 1983 to the present, it's \$7; non—electrified was \$5; from 1983 to the present, \$6. So there you're caught with your first allegation. Now either you didn't do any research and you made a guess, or you tried to mislead everybody, and you tried to mislead the people unfortunate enough to watch this charade of yours on television.

Then you said the swimming pools are only open on weekends and that for twice the money. Not true again — not true again. The swimming pools are open more than weekends and certainly not for twice the money. In fact,

as soon as I find it, I'm going to read out to you the exact cost of that.

Then you talked about park fees, and you said that the park fees had been gong up as well. You said the parks are open for a shorter period of time since 1982. No, that's not true. In fact the parks are open year round. The summer park season is from Thursday preceding Victoria Day to Labour Day, inclusive, and that's been the case for many years.

Swimming pools. You said swimming pools are only open on weekends and they're open for twice the money. No, you're caught again making something up. The hours of operation — let's take Buffalo pound. The pool opens June 13th. June 13 — June 27, the hours: Friday, 12 noon — 8 p.m.; Saturday, Sunday, 10 a.m. — 8 p.m.; June 28 — August 17, 9 a.m. — 8 p.m. daily.

Cypress Hills: July 1 — August 22, Saturday, Sunday, 10 a.m. — 9 p.m.; June 21 — June 30, 10 a.m. — 9 p.m. daily; August 23 — September 1, 10 a.m. — 9 p.m. daily. Caught again, running off at the mouth, making up things.

Then where do we go to? You talked about McLean picnic site. You talked about the voluntary registration system. You said there are people taking registration, looking after the place, and it opens later. Not so. It opened earlier this year to accommodate Trans—Canada Highway traffic going to Expo. So you're caught again making something up.

Then you went on a little further — and we'll turn down to hunting; we'll turn to hunting. Well let's take a look at what you had to say about hunting and about game . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you go ahead and mock my accent. That's your privilege, to mock my accent. I don't mock yours, and I understand you have one.

But let's see what you went on to say here. You said about white—tail deer and about the hard winter, or the hard winter they had a year and a half ago . . . Then you said, "But neither, Mr. Minister, did you do anything about it." You said, "Mr. Minister, the problem — and I think they'll admit it in retrospect" . . . the wildlife association, you called them (it's federation) — you said the problem was too big for them; we didn't do anything about it. We put \$1.2 million into that program.

And through the combined effort of department personnel, which involved one—third of this department's total staff, and over two—thirds in volunteers — general public, farmers and wildlife interest groups — approximately 1,900 feeding sites were operated throughout the province. About 4,000 tonnes of deer pellets and hay were purchased to feed an estimated 45,000 deer and 1,000 elk. Supplemental feeding was restricted to approximately 196,000 square kilometres of critical deer range with intercept feeding carried out province—wide south of the forest fringe.

So you said that we did nothing as a department. Well, I've caught you; you're running off at the mouth making all kinds of comments that strictly and obviously were not true.



Look at the other things you talked about. You made some slurs about the management of wildlife in this department. Apart from the management of parks, which you said we didn't manage at all . . . And I could point out the number of electrified campsites that we've added just in the last year, which your administration chose not to do — a total of 632 newly electrified sites at eight locations in the last year; and you call that part mismanagement.

We've added several million dollars worth of capital activities within the parks. You call that mismanagement?

I'd like to get back to the kind of things you said about the management, again whereby you were casting slurs and aspersions on these good people sitting behind me whose responsibility it is to manage, conserve, and enhance the wildlife of this province.

Are you not aware that we have the only critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act in Canada? Are not you aware? And that was brought in since our administration.

Are not you aware that we are the first province to sign in and commit funding to the North American water—fowl plan, which has been an enormously successful and well—accepted program all across the country? We're the first province in. In fact the federal government, when we get the other provinces together to sign, want to come here and do it in Regina in recognition of the fact that we were first into this.

Well, hon. member, you have just acquired for yourself the unenviable position of getting the undying enmity of all kinds of sound and solid public servants across this province. You criticize them for the way they're managing and running and looking after the parks. You've criticized them for the way they're managing and looking after wildlife in this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I wouldn't ask you to resign. I wouldn't reduce myself to that kind of level and get into that kind of insult with you. I wouldn't do that at all.

But you did say that I don't visit the parks and that I should get out and take a look around the parks in Saskatchewan. Well, as a matter of fact, last summer I did precisely that. You said I should take my vacations in the parks. I want you to know I didn't take any vacation at all last year — none. But what I did do was, I took several days and I drove out to various parks in the province. I went out in just my runners and sweat—suit, just like a tourist; went through the park gate, introduced myself to staff, had a chat with them, wandered around the parks, took a look for myself, and met the public.

You said I should be out meeting the public. You see, you didn't bother to check your facts. I went out and had a chat with members of the public and said, what do you think of the parks? Nice day; good swimming pool; nice facilities here. Then afterwards, when we'd been chatting, if I felt it appropriate, I told them, I'm the minister in charge of the parks and I'm just interested to see what you folks think of the parks.

(1630)

Contrast that with my predecessor who used to be the

minister of this department under the NDP, Reggie Gross — Reggie the skier. What did Reggie do? What did Reggie do about looking around the parks of Saskatchewan? Well Reggie the skier, January 19 to 22, '82, went down to Denver for a few days — Denver. I've never had the opportunity myself, but I believe there's good skiing down there in Denver, Colorado, which certainly isn't in Saskatchewan. Reggie the skier.

What else did Reggie do for skiing here? I've got pages and pages of stuff that Reggie did. Oh here he went to Helena, Montana. Isn't that where Big Sky is? Isn't there an excellent ski resort down at Helena, Montana? Reggie went there in March of 1981.

What else did Reggie the skier do? Well Reggie went to Whistler, B.C., in January of 1981. Oh and do you know why he went? He went to inspect a resort complex. Do you know what he did after that? A week later, do you know what Reggie the skier did? Reggie went to Helena, Montana, again for another few days.

Oh here's another Reggie the skier. Reggie the skier, March 5 to 7, 1980, Reggie the skier went to Banff. Now am I wrong or is there a nice ski facility in Banff? I believe there is.

Oh here we go again, Vancouver in February of 1980. He's a boy who was the minister of Parks. He never saw a Saskatchewan park; he was too busy skiing around the world.

What else did he do? Well my goodness, my goodness, here's Reggie going to Calgary. Isn't that close to Banff where there's good skiing? And what did Reggie do there? Reggie went to discuss the use of a snow tiller at Blackstrap, but he did this in Calgary. Well that's Reggie the skier.

What about Reggie the tourist? Reggie the tourist, July 1981, here's Reggie the tourist in the Netherlands. He's at The Hague. And what else did he do in 1981? He went to Frankfurt and he went to Paris. Reggie the tourist was in Frankfurt. Reggie the tourist was in Paris. Oh I forgot to mention, that year Reggie the tourist also went to London, England, and Köln in Germany.

Here's another one. Reggie the tourist, he must have really liked Europe because — guess what — a year later he went back to Frankfurt, and he went back to Paris, and he also took in Amsterdam. Reggie the tourist.

How about Reggie the football fan? Reggie the football fan went to New Orleans and took in the Super Bowl in January 28th to February 5th. Oh guess what, though, guess what. In that same time frame, our football fan couldn't forget he was a skiing enthusiast. So just on the way back he dropped in to Aspen. Isn't Aspen where the skiing takes place? Isn't that a ski resort? So here we go: Reggie the tourist, Reggie the skier, Reggie the football fan.

And yet this member for Regina Centre tells me I've got to spend more time visiting Saskatchewan parks — something I've already done. Well I suggest to you, sir, that you take your mouth and have it looked at by a

proctologist.

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

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Minister, I think I'm going to do that again. I elicited more information with that running out the clock than we've got in two months. I presume, Mr. Minister, if I run the clock out again, we'll get some more information. That's the only information we've got in two months.

Mr. Minister, we do want to finish these estimates today if possible. I would like, Mr. Minister, to deal with the question of reservations. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it's possible to have any order in here. I can't hear myself talk.

Mr. Minister, I want to deal with the question of reservations at parks. I have been at parks frequently, seen a goodly portion of the park reserved, and then the people who make the reservations don't come. I really wonder, Mr. Minister, if it is a sound scheme to be taking reservations for \$6 campsites. I think the system is unenforceable. It means that a number of these sites are not used until after 8 o'clock. Sometimes they're then let out. I understand 8 o'clock is the time when they are then put up for general availability.

But I really wonder, Mr. Minister, and I think many campers do, whether or not the reservation system really serves a useful purpose. It seems to me that it is abused every bit as much as it is used.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — ... (inaudible) ... abuse. However, I can tell you, in 1985 evaluations, 6,408 reservations were made; 34 reservations were guaranteed and did not show and did not cancel. That's 34 out of 6,408.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, Mr. Minister, those figures are simply not accurate. I have seen ... (inaudible interjection) ... Oh I don't know whether it's intentional or otherwise, but the figures aren't accurate.

Mr. Minister, I have been at camps. I have been at campgrounds where there were 34 in a single evening that weren't used in a single park site. There are large numbers of these things that sit empty, and they're not mobile homes. They are people who don't come, who don't pay, and those campsites are not used.

Mr. Minister, those figures are simply not accurate. I don't know where you got them from. And I don't particularly want to know, because I assume you can concoct some source that sounds credible. But, Mr. Minister, your figures aren't accurate. There are large numbers of those campsites that sit empty. It annoys me and it annoys other campers who don't have those sites, who often are shuffled off to much poorer sites while the better campsites, which are available for reservation, sit empty.

So I say, Mr. Minister, your figures are simply not accurate and I don't know where you got them from.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Not all of the sites that are vacant are because of reserve—a—site and somebody not showing up. The ones that are reserved have an "R" on them.

You're questioning my figures. I'd remind the members of the committee here, you're the gentleman who stood there and said: we doubled the fees; we doubled the swimming; we're charging for firewood; we did nothing for white-tailed deer this year. And I'll put my credibility, and the figures given to me by my officials, against you any day of the week.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, I had a few more questions I wanted to ask, but I'll allow my colleague to do it before I ...

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Chairman, with leave, I would like to introduce a few guests.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my pleasure, Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, to introduce to the members here the members of the Student Executive Council of the Technical Institutes in Saskatchewan. We have with us here Tracey Vigar, president of Kelsey Institute association; Todd Benko; Vickie Haughn, social director; and Daryl Fraess, president of the Wascana student council.

I would ask members to join with me in extending a welcome to the student executive council members. This is a newly organized council. It's in its formative stage, Mr. Chairman. And certainly we want to extend best wishes for success in the new organization that the students have launched.

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

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — With leave, I would like to, on behalf of the Minister of Advanced Education and the government, extend our best wishes to these four young people. Creating and building, when it comes to a new organization, is a particular challenge, and we wish you great success with it and a very special success with your years in the technical training institutes. Welcome.

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

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

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

#### Item 1 (continued)

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have three short questions, Mr. Minister, and then we can move on with the estimates. The questions that I have, you may not be able to provide me with the answers here today. If you haven't got that information, if you would agree to provide that in writing to me, Mr. Minister, the information that you don't have, then we will proceed.

The first one I wanted to ask, Mr. Minister, is regarding the big game surveys that you carried out last year. Could you give me the number of contracts that were given out to airlines for aircraft to carry out that survey, and the names

of the aircraft firms that carried out the survey.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I can certainly find that information for you and have it sent across to you as soon as possible. If I can't get it today, you'll definitely have it by tomorrow.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Okay then, Mr. Minister. You agree to provide me with that information regarding the game surveys.

The next question I want to ask is the hiring policies of your department regarding stand—by crews and react crews. It has come to my attention that individuals have had their names down on the list for up to as high as four years and now have been told by your conservation officers — specifically in Buffalo Narrows, and you can check this one out — that they wouldn't be taking any local people, but would be hiring union personnel for react and stand—by crews, and the next hiring position would be coming out of Calgary.

If you don't have that information, Mr. Minister, you could also provide me with that.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I know you're aware of the recall system that does exist within the department. Those folks who had been employed previously are on recall for the next year. I was just checking with the officials. We're not aware of any out—of—province people coming in or any contractual arrangement, verbal, written, or otherwise, that's been made with people from Calgary. However, I can undertake to verify that and I'll give you that in writing.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Yes. That's fine, then. You will provide me with the information to the hiring policy regarding react crews and the stand—by crews in northern Saskatchewan.

I want to now turn to the final item that I have here, and it's regarding a fishing project that I believe your department was involved in — I know your department was involved in it to a certain extent — on Lake Athabasca this winter. I know the individual, Steve Oneski, who was in charge of that program was down here and was quite concerned about some policies that were taking place.

And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could indicate what the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, just how they were involved in that project?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — The gentleman by the name of Steve Oneski — and I'm not certain of the spelling, but I'll find that out and get it to you — did get some federal government funding and he did some project work in Lake Athabasca. He produced 750 pounds of fish, a mixture of whitefish and lake trout — and I don't know the breakdown and the poundage there — which he subsequently sold in Fort McMurray. I'm advised, and

we're not entirely certain, but I am advised that he's currently looking around the countryside for more money.

(1645)

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, could you indicate how much money was put into that project?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We had no money in that as a provincial department; it was federal money. I've asked my director of fisheries to ascertain the amount of money he did receive federally, and when I find that out I'll certainly be happy to provide it to you.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Your officials could indicate if it's approximately \$100,000 that was spent on that project?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I believe it's in that range some place, hon. member. I think it's less than that. The figure 90,000 is being bandied around. I'd rather check it and try and find a definitive answer than just guess, but I'm hearing the figure, about 90,000.

**Mr. Thompson:** — I just want to close off by making a short remark, that when you take a project that has got \$100,000 to spend and they produce 750 pounds of fish, now that is absolutely unbelievable. If our commercial fisheries and fish operators in this province worked under these conditions, well, you could imagine what you'd be paying a pound for that fish. And if this individual is looking for more money, then I question how in the world you could give any individual more money when you've already given them close to \$100,000 to produce 750 pounds of fish.

I know that that money came from the Conservative government in Ottawa, and I know that it was approved by one John Gormley, the member of parliament for the Battlefords—Meadow Lake, but I want to say that it was a provincial resource and a provincial lake that was being utilized.

I just say that when we take a look at the massive debt that we have in this country and in this province, and we see that they will give \$100,000 to an individual without any questions asked and allow them to go on all winter and spend that money and produce 750 pounds of fish, most good commercial fishermen produce that in one day. My gosh, this is really what I call a waste of money, and I don't even know if that 750 pounds of fish was sold to the corporation, or if it was sold in Fort McMurray, or where it went. But if other commercial fishermen could get \$100,000 and go out and produce 750 pounds of fish, they could have that work all done in one day and collect their \$100,000. But I just ask you, Mr. Minister, to have your officials check into that project. And I think this is the type of projects that we don't need.

There was a number of good commercial fishermen fishing on Lake Athabasca last winter. Fond—du—Lac fishermen are good fishermen. And I think that that training program — if the trainees could have been put out on the fish—line with a commercial outfit that was fishing there from Fond—du—Lac or Uranium City or Camsell Portage or the Buffalo Narrows—Beauval area,

any of them fishermen could have taken them on and showed them how to fish. But to allow this type of a fishery to go on our lakes, I think is bad business.

With that, Mr. Chairman, we can proceed now to go through item by item.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — I would like to respond, Mr. Chairman, to what the hon. member has just said. First of all, we had no money in this project at all. Secondly, my department was not consulted. This was a unilateral decision made by CEIC (Canada Employment and Immigration Commission), who were responsible for the funding of the program. Officials in my department did complain about the program, and the complaints have fallen on deaf ears.

And just for the information of the hon. member, I don't particularly care what political stripe the government in Ottawa is, but when they do something, or officials do something, that I don't like, I'm not afraid to stand up and tell them so. And if you check with what happened at the wildlife colloquium in Ottawa a week ago, you'll realize I was not slow to be critical of some of the stuff that had been done there.

**An Hon. Member:** — What is CEIC?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission, under the auspices of Flora MacDonald, I believe.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

#### Item 16

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Minister, I see that you have a cut in the Meadow Lake region, and you also have a cut of five staff. Could you indicate where the five staff reduction is and the reason for the cut in the Meadow Lake region?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — You'll find them in subvote 05, and as I recall there was a question about that in the first day of the estimates. That was a transfer of positions, and they show up in subvote 05.

Item 16 agreed to.

Items 17 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

#### Item 24

**Mr. Thompson:** — Under 24, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could indicate . . . There's a cut here also of a million dollars. If you could indicate where that cut is?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — We do expect some more revenue because of increased tourists travelling to Expo. So with anticipated increased revenue, the level of subsidy will be down. And there's a reduction due to more effective and efficient operations as well.

Item 24 agreed to.

Items 25 and 26 agreed to.

Vote 39 agreed to.

#### **Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks and Renewable Resources Capital Expenditure — Nil Vote**

Agreed.

#### **Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Employment Development Agency — Parks and Renewable Resources Employment Development Fund — Vote 65**

**Mr. Thompson:** — could you indicate where the \$2 million grants go to for the heavy—haul roads?

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Mr. Chairman, I believe you're reading out a whole page of items, and the only applicable item to my department is indeed number 13. The others are not applicable to this department.

Item 13 agreed to.

#### **Supplementary Estimates Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks and Renewable Resources — Vote 39**

Vote 39 agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Maxwell:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, indeed I would. I'd like to extend a warm thank you to all of my officials who have done an excellent job, not only in preparing for the estimates, but in the administration of the department during this past year. It's been a pleasure to work with them. I'd also like to thank the members of the opposition for the spirited questioning, particularly my critic the member for Athabasca.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the opposition, Mr. Minister, I would like to thank you and your staff for the co—operation in doing your estimates.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.