

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on Tuesday next, pursuant to rule 16, I will move:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for failing to meet the needs of Saskatchewan's small business through its inability to effectively lobby the federal government for renewed regional development funding, its policy of favouring wealthy out-of-province interests at the expense of Saskatchewan's small business, and its failure to prevent the federal government from implementing a 9 per cent hidden sales tax which will cause more hardship to Saskatchewan small business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and to other members of the Assembly, a class of 40 kids from Gull Lake, Saskatchewan. Now the town of Gull Lake is a mile outside of my constituency, but a whole lot of these kids are from my seat and I want to welcome them here. Their teachers are Ruth Migneault and Cam Lock.

Quite some time ago, and it makes me feel a little older, I used to play hockey against a fellow by the name of Kevin and John Migneault, and they went on and played junior hockey with Saskatoon and the Swift Current Broncos at one time. There's also up there a Kerwan who used to play hockey with the Swift Current Broncos too. And I'm just pleased to welcome them, plus there's the Gibsons up there, I just want to welcome you all. And I want all the members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Court Appeal re Rafferty Project

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the minister in charge of the Souris Basin Development Authority. Mr. Minister, your appeal of the federal court's ruling on the Rafferty project, which everyone but you and the Premier knew was going nowhere, was thrown out by the federal appeals court yesterday. This attempt to repair your tattered political image at the taxpayer's expense has now provided a bill to the Saskatchewan taxpayer which they're going to have to pay.

So, Mr. Minister, given yesterday's decision by the federal

appeals court, will you today tell us how much your appeal is going to cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much the appeal will have cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I suppose I could undertake to find out what the cost of it was.

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, it will cost nowhere near the \$2 million a month that the stoppage of construction is costing us, and it bothers me, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite take great delight in the fact that the project is stopped. All fair minded people, certainly everybody that knows and lives near the Souris River, Mr. Speaker, is quite anxious that this review be proceeded with and that the project get back on track soon, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, we do not take any delight at all at this government's haste and incompetence which has caused this problem to arise.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am surprised that you would not have that information, being the minister who made the decision to have the appeal, who's been asked these questions yesterday, and you come to the House today and you're unable to answer the questions. But you continue. Mr. Minister, to talk about the \$2 million a month expense which has resulted from your strategy — nobody else's — of pushing this project so far so that when the criticism began and the problems . . . and your illegal actions began to get caught up with you, that somehow it would not be able to be stopped.

Mr. Minister, can you explain to this House where you are spending this \$2 million a month that you continue to talk about, which you alone have caused to happen?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I have to chuckle a little bit. He said, I expect that you should have that information as to the cost of the appeal. Mr. Speaker, the lawyer was in Ottawa yesterday. I don't think he's even sent in his bill yet. How could we possibly know? Mr. Speaker, I mean, it's absolutely ludicrous that they should . . . would even suggest that I would have that information by today.

Mr. Speaker, secondly . . . secondly, Mr. Speaker, those members continue to make the allegation that the province of Saskatchewan was acting in some illegal fashion relative to Rafferty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the facts are as follows: at no time, at no time was Saskatchewan acting in any way but under a valid licence issued by the federal government, Mr. Speaker — issued by the federal government. The court then decided, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government acted beyond its jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, therefore there was an order issued to shut down

the project. At no time has there been any suggestion ever that Saskatchewan has acted illegally, except by members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan are sick to death of them making that allegation, number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, anybody that knows anything about the project knows that it will stand the environmental scrutiny of the process that's going on today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — New question to the minister. Mr. Minister, twice now in a court of law you have been unable to prove your contention that the Rafferty project was developed in full compliance of the environmental laws of Canada — twice now in court, Mr. Minister. The main reason that you've been able to do so is that the project has not been developed in compliance with those laws. You knew that, Mr. Minister, right from day one, and you went ahead anyway.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, instead of continuing your efforts to circumvent the laws, will you today join the Premier of Manitoba and many others who are acting responsibly in a call for the federal Department of the Environment to conduct full public hearings into this project, instead of carrying on the political sham that you've been carrying on for the last month?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, some place here, right here, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the licence, a copy of the licence that was issued by Canada to Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It was under the conditions of that licence that the Rafferty project proceeded, Mr. Speaker. At all times Saskatchewan was in compliance with the law of Canada, operating under a valid licence.

Members opposite say that twice Saskatchewan was found to be in breach of Canadian law. That simply is not true; the court has never said that, Mr. Speaker. What the court did say is that the federal government acted beyond its jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government did not adhere to their own guide-lines. At no time did they ever say, or did the court ever say, that Saskatchewan was in breach of anything relative to the Rafferty project, Mr. Speaker.

Now how can they say, Mr. Speaker, how can they say, Mr. Speaker, that they favour the project, even with all of the processes gone through and the environmental scrutiny, how can they say that they favour it when their own member, the critic for the Souris Basin Development Authority has said that if it is built he will blow it up when they become government.

The only comfort I take in that statement, Mr. Speaker, is nobody believes they will ever become government again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Amendments to The Park Act

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Parks, Recreation, and Culture, and it concerns changes to The Parks Act tabled in this House recently, Bill No. 34, Mr. Minister.

This new Act will remove from legislation the restriction on leasing shore lines within a 10-metre strip on any lake, stream, river or body of water within our parks. You say you intend to cover that by policy rather than legislation. But if you don't intend to make any changes to the existing practice, why not leave it in the legislation as it is? Do you have some plan to start leasing private beaches in this province, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, the opposition will have every opportunity to get into debate on this Bill when we do Committee of the Whole, and I suggest he holds his questions till then.

The Speaker: — I'd like to bring to the hon. member's attention that his question is in anticipation of a Bill that's on the order paper, that is presently on the order paper, and he'll have to be careful on the way he directs his question.

Mr. Thompson: — New question, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker. And I want to remind the member that this is question period. New question, Mr. Minister.

In Saskatchewan our summers are very short and our beaches are not infinite. In fact those with good public access are limited, and we need as many of those beaches as we can possibly get. Could you tell this House, what would be the purpose of removing this restriction in Bill 34; since when did Saskatchewan need or support private beaches? Or is this something your wealthy friends are telling you that they want?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, if I have any wealthy friends, I'm not sure of their names and addresses. I don't move in those kinds of circles at all. In terms of beaches . . . and I don't drive the Cadillac that lies out in the MLA parking lot. It's one of those socialists who drives that, Mr. Speaker, one of these socialists.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Not only the Cadillac, but if we want to talk about wealthy friends, let's find out who owns the condos down in Florida . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order, order.

Mr. Thompson: — New question, Mr. Speaker. And I see the member of Finance, maybe he should answer the question. But I tell you, the member of Parks, Recreation and Culture takes all this light. Two questions, he hasn't answered one, and he's just making jokes in the House.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, by way of information, those buffer zones around our lakes and parks are very

important issues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — And I direct a new question to the Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture, and I expect an answer from him.

Your government has made a public commitment to the environment of this province. Surely you recognize that part of that commitment must be to ensuring that the natural gifts of the province are there to be enjoyed by everyone, not a select few.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, you haven't managed the economy so badly that we have to start closing our beaches to the public and turning them over to your wealthy friends just to make a quick buck.

My question to you, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Finance doesn't even understand what a buffer zone is, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — My question to you . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order, order.

Mr. Thompson: — Will the minister stand in this House today to confirm that the beaches of our public parks belong to the people of this province and should be never leased to private developers or private landowners for private beaches, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well that was kind of a wide-ranging question, Mr. Speaker. I'll give him several answers, and I'm sorry you'll have to bear with me, but he took a long time to get his rocks off on this one. So I demand a little equal time to respond to the question.

In 1986, Mr. Speaker, we introduced a new Parks Act in this province, a new Parks Act that reflected our commitment, the commitment of this Conservative government and this Premier to parks for Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, that Parks Act was recognized nationally and we won a national, and then an international, award for bringing that Parks Act forward, something those rhetoric-bound ideologues never did in all the years they were in office.

He's talking about quality of life. Who's done more for quality of life in terms of wildlife, fisheries, parks, resource lands than this government? Their idea of quality of life is to give new meaning to the phrase, Queen City.

Mr. Thompson: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what's wrong with the minister this morning. He hasn't heard one of the questions I've asked. He hasn't answered any of the questions because I believe he doesn't know.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will you stand up in this House and indicate whether this new legislation will open up the possibility of private beaches in our parks in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, I can give assurance to the member opposite, the media up here in the gallery, all the folks watching here today, and the people on television who've been subjected to this asinine level of questioning that the parks will continue to . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order! Order, order. I think the hon. member should be careful in the phrases he uses, and that's not one we want to use commonly in the House and I'd ask him to withdraw it.

An Hon. Member: — Say hello to your mother and dad.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The member says, say hello to my mother and father. I think he forgot that my mother died two years ago, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Would all members come to order. The member from the Turtlefords . . . Could I ask the member from Regina Elphinstone to please come to order so I can address the minister.

I'd ask the minister to withdraw the remark he has just made, and I'd ask him to do that again before he continues with his comments.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to withdraw the remark. It was just in terms of the questioning, I thought, would probably be brought up in Committee of the Whole, that's all, so I thought that's really more proper . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. I believe the hon. member knows that explanations aren't permitted, so I'm going to ask him once more to simply withdraw the remark without any equivocation and then carry on. Would he do that please?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to withdraw the remark. May I continue the answer to the question?

Mr. Speaker, I was giving a commitment that we will continue with the level of service we currently provide in the parks. We increased the number of parks to 31 provincial parks under this administration, 101 regional parks — far more than they ever had under their administration, and, Mr. Speaker, the commitment I'm giving to everybody today is we will continue unabated the level of service that continues to date; in fact, we will ameliorate the situation that exists currently.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Financial Details re Fertilizer Plant at Belle Plaine

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Trade and Investment. Minister, I have

here the 1988 annual report of the Crown investments corporation, and on page 10 it says, and I quote in part:

CIC . . . (industrial interest incorporated) investment portfolio at December 31, 1988 included 100 per cent voting interest in Prairie Malt Limited and 586643 Saskatchewan Ltd . . .

And here's the phrase I want you to keep in mind:

. . . a 75 per cent voting interest in Saferco Products Inc.

Mr. Minister, is this the same company which is the project co-ordinator for the Cargill fertilizer plant, and if it is, would you care to explain how CIC's 75 per cent interest as of December 31, 1988 bears any resemblance to what you and the Premier have been telling the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the annual report in my hand. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't make a habit of memorizing the numbers of numbered companies, but I will take notice of the question. I do know that there was . . .

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Trade and Investment. As we have seen so far, Minister, your government either does not have the details finalized on this deal, or you do and you're not telling the people of Saskatchewan what the details are. That being the case, will you today confirm or deny that one of the details of this deal that you have forgotten to mention is that you have guaranteed . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The question is relating to the one you previously asked.

Order, order. I'm sure that you know that once notice has been taken that . . . if you seek further information, that's certainly allowed, but further questions supplementary to new questions are out of order.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, a new question that is not related to this report, to the Minister of Trade and Investment. Mr. Minister, you have either confirmed the details of this report or you haven't. And if you have, you haven't told the people of Saskatchewan. That being the case, will you today confirm or deny that one of the details of this deal that you have forgotten to mention is that you have guaranteed Cargill a guaranteed rate of return on their equity investment in this plant, and will you tell us today what that rate of return amounts to.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I won't confirm that. What has been said in the past and what is the fact is that the deal, Mr. Speaker, is designed in such a way as that it will not in any way, shape, or form have any level . . . zero level of government subsidy, as it must be, Mr. Speaker, as it must be, because the volume of the plant will not be consumed in its entirety in Saskatchewan. And this product that will be shipped to the export market, Mr.

Speaker, must not attract countervail. So, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the deal will not in any way, shape, or form contain any level of government subsidy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. Deputy Premier, can you confirm or deny this morning, in this legislature, whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan, the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan, has guaranteed a rate of return to Cargill on the fertilizer plant deal through Saferco at Belle Plaine? Can you confirm or deny that? Yes or no?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. Deputy Premier, we've got a very serious problem here in Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan know that you have been anything but straight with them when it comes to the terms of this deal. In fact, the people of Saskatchewan wonder why you continue to insist that this is a 50-50 deal, and why the Premier insists it's a 50-50 deal, when there's so much evidence to the contrary.

If this is not the sweetheart deal that people in this province have come to believe it is, will you today table all documents showing that the provincial government's full financial commitment . . . what it is; and the studies you have done, the economic feasibility studies, the break-even point analysis that you have done, to show that this project will fly? Will you table those documents this morning?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, that's the same question that was asked yesterday, and I'll give the same answer, Mr. Speaker. When we did the Weyerhaeuser project we tabled all relevant documentation in this House, and I don't think members opposite even took the time to open the book, Mr. Speaker.

I'm told yesterday the WESTBRIDGE documentation was tabled, and I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to take the time to look at that one either, except, Mr. Speaker . . . Well, and if they did open it I'm not sure they'd understand what they're looking at, in any event.

And, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to this Saferco deal, at the appropriate time all documentation will be tabled. Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely inappropriate, absolutely inappropriate for reasons of commercial confidentiality, etc., to table them prior to the project's being matured enough to not be damaged by unfair competition because of prior knowledge and information and all of those other arguments that members opposite used to give when they were sitting on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Deputy Premier. Why is it inappropriate to not table the documents now, but at the same time appropriate to make an announcement of a deal? Why is that inappropriate in one case and appropriate in another?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, how can you go to the engineering firms and the contractors of the world and say, will you please bid on this project? And they say, what project? Are you afraid to announce this project, Mr. Speaker? No, you have to have a real project before you can go out and get . . . put it to tender and get bids on the project. I mean, my God, even members opposite should be able to understand that.

I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why these people are against the Saferco project. They want to tie their wagon, Mr. Speaker, to a 400-tonne-a-day plant, a plant of the size, Mr. Speaker, that has shut down in every other part of the world. And why have they shut down, Mr. Speaker? Because they could not compete with the large-scale plants with economies of scale and efficiencies, Mr. Speaker.

It is estimated that this Saferco plant will produce urea at 35 to \$40 a tonne less than these other plants, Mr. Speaker. And he says, what about Cargill in Pincher Creek? Cargill in Pincher Creek? Well, he asked the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Deputy Premier. We either have a deal or we don't have a deal. Now you just said a minute ago, we have a deal, because you want all the engineers and project people to bid on the deal.

I want to know for the time being what that deal is financially. That's what the member from Regina is asking. And is part of the deal a guaranteed rate of return on the \$60 million that Cargill is putting up — yes or no?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, these members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have been told, not once, not twice, probably a dozen, maybe even a hundred times . . .

An Hon. Member: — He's had a dozen different stories . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The minister has been interrupted on different occasions, and I'm sure you can appreciate it is difficult to answer if you're going to be interrupted. Then he begins to answer that, and of course we have some conflict in the House. So let's just allow him to continue with his answer.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — They've been told a dozen times, Mr. Speaker, at least, that Saferco is a joint venture between CMB (Crown Management Board of Saskatchewan) and Cargill grain, Mr. Speaker, Cargill Canada Ltd.

The proposed plant by Saferco is 1,500 tonnes a day of urea, Mr. Speaker. Now 1,500 tonnes a day, Mr. Speaker, from a plant of this size, 35 to \$40 a tonne cheaper to produce urea, let me tell you what this translates into, Mr. Speaker. Do you know that in North Dakota you can buy Canadian-produced fertilizer, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce some students.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the member from Moose Jaw South, I would like to introduce to the Assembly some students who arrived during the process of question period. They are seated in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to introduce them to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly.

They are 26 grade 5 and 6 students from St. Margaret School in Moose Jaw. Members here may or may not know that St. Margaret is the French immersion school in the Moose Jaw Roman Catholic Separate School Division. They, following question period, Mr. Speaker, will be taking a tour of the building and then I will be meeting with them at 11 o'clock for pictures and a visit and refreshments after that.

I would like, as well, Mr. Speaker, to introduce their teacher who is accompanying them, Lynn Gaudet, and four chaperons: Margaret Pillay, who is also a member of the school board, Sheila Elsom, Kathleen Pugerude and Pat Aldred.

I would ask all members to welcome this group, who, I assume, will be taking their tour in French this morning; I hope that will be the case, and I would ask all members to welcome them to the Assembly and *bienvenue*.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 60 — An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Northern Municipalities Act.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks, Recreation and Culture Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39

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

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The officials with me this morning, to my immediate right is Doug Cressman, the deputy minister of the Department Parks, Recreation and Culture; behind Mr. Cressman is Dick Bailey, assistant deputy minister; and directly behind me is Alan Appleby, assistant deputy minister from the resources division.

Item 1

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, this morning in question period we were witness to an outburst on your part where you rather showed your arrogance to the members in this legislature, and you were asked to apologize. Not only did you show arrogance to the members, but you showed your arrogance for the entire democratic process by the language that you used, Mr. Minister. The Speaker made you apologize, Mr. Minister.

And there's one other apology that I think you owe the people of Saskatchewan. And I recall back . . . and I'm going to ask you whether you've already apologized, or whether you're prepared to do so today. And that's on behalf of the entire government as well, where you were asked to represent your particular group, the Government of Saskatchewan, at a meeting in Swift Current not too long ago; where you walked out on that meeting of 350 people in some arrogant manner or other; where you walked out because you didn't like the seating plan that they had set up; where you walked out in a huff because you felt that you were better than somebody else; where you walked out, leaving 350 people who had graciously invited you — an arm's length organization had graciously invited you to be guest, to bring greetings. You could have represented the government in a fashion that could have been respectful, that could have been diplomatic — instead you chose to walk out. You chose to walk out. That behaviour was displayed and confirmed once again today in the legislature.

You know, there are all kinds of things that could have happened and things that you could have done. I want to set the scenario, Mr. Chairman, first of all, before I ask the Minister whether he's going to apologize. At this meeting . . . and I might say that the Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils did a tremendous job. They had set up a meeting in the town of Swift Current, which was celebrating its 75th anniversary, a very good choice for this meeting. They were celebrating their 20th anniversary, and so they had sent invitations, as is a Saskatchewan tradition, to people from all over the province, and they had sent invitations to members of the government, and they sent invitations to members of the opposition, as is proper, as is the Saskatchewan way — as is the Saskatchewan way.

The program of three-day length was extremely well organized because it was organized to a large part by the Swift Current Allied Arts Council, one of the organizations for which the minister is responsible for, the allied arts council. They were celebrating their 20th

anniversary. There were three celebrations in one. What does the minister do? He puts on a display like he did today in the legislature and he walks out.

Mr. Minister, my question is: have you apologized to date? And if you haven't, will you apologize and tell us right now that you will apologize to that organization?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member can put any interpretation he wants on anything he chooses. Let me read a letter dated June 15, 1989. I received it on June 20 in my office, and I'll quote the bottom paragraph.

We want you to know you're admired by our group as a hard working, supportive Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture, and we'd very much like to reinforce the healthy relationship between your department and OSAC (Organization of Saskatchewan Arts Councils).

And asked me if I'd be interested in having a meeting, and the meeting is set for Wednesday of next week for lunch. It's signed, Catherine Hanson-LaBelle, President, Barbara Flaten, executive director. And I don't think I have to make any apologies, Mr. Chairman. There was something urgent; that's the bottom line on it. The hon. member was told that; he chooses not to accept that. That's his business. The point is I have an excellent working relationship with the executive of OSAC, and I intend to keep it that way.

In terms of question period, the hon. member brings up question period, and he knows full well that in question period the opposition do their best to embarrass ministers, and ministers have to respond in as best a fashion as they can. And I used one word in question period that I was asked to apologize for, and I did so. In the heat of a moment we throw words back and forwards all the time. One member from his desk made some comment about my family, as a matter of fact, knowing full well that I went through a painful experience watching my mother die two years ago. And yet he threw a question to me about say hello to your mother.

You know, these are the kinds of things that probably we don't serve our democratic process very well, Mr. Chairman, when we throw these kinds of remarks and epithets to each other, and frankly I don't particularly enjoy it. But in the heat of debate I'm quite prepared to retaliate, as are members opposite; they're never slow to retaliate if someone throws gibes at them. In fact we'd probably be disappointed if they were because it's just part of the process, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, first of all I would like you to table a letter from which have read just now.

Mr. Minister, you say that you were prepared to retaliate, you are prepared to dishonour the government, you are prepared to retaliate in this same way and abuse your visitors, because the two are very similar situations. You were angered in the House here, you had a fit of temper, and you blew your top. You did the same thing in Swift

Current. You had a fit of temper and you blew your top.

And what happened is, as a result of that, you've threatened every cultural organization in Saskatchewan, threatened every one of them in terms of whether or not they should be inviting you or any elected members, people to whom they ordinarily would trust and rely upon to understand their aspirations and their goals, you have threatened them. You have threatened them because they're all afraid to say anything to the high and mighty minister, the minister who puts himself in the public eye as somebody who's king. That's completely unacceptable, Mr. Minister, completely unacceptable.

Will you table that letter, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I've ever been perceived as threatening at all. And certainly in question period this morning I didn't have any fit of temper or tantrum. If I had lost my temper, he would certainly have known about it, and I don't do it very often.

And in terms of threatening groups, I don't think anybody's threatened. I've just been going through my nice-letter file — you know, we all keep those. I know members of the opposition don't get too many of them. But I've got a nice-letter file with all kinds of groups in here saying: thank you for the work you're doing; we appreciate your support; we appreciate your financial commitment.

I tell you what, if the hon. member really feels that these groups have threatened, and if he really feels that somehow I'm acting in a high and mighty fashion with those particular groups — and we can give you the whole list of the members of the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations — you contact them and you find out what their concept or their perception is of the way I deal with them.

And I see the Leader of the Opposition is coaching you on this one. If he wants to get into it, fine. I have nothing to apologize for, nor will I be making an apology.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I'm very disappointed to hear that, but I asked you whether you would table that letter, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — If we're going to be into a tabling situation, as happened in the past, I'll be asking anything that's quoted on that side to be tabled also.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Chairman, I believe the rules of the House require that any document from which you choose to read or refer to should be tabled. The minister is displaying his arrogance once again. He's talking about retaliating or implying an retaliation. I want that letter tabled in this House right now.

(1045)

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to temper, this dude takes a back place to nobody.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister once again: will you table the letter at this moment, please.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Page.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, on this issue I may be tempted to have believed you and your explanation and the explanation that you're trying to fan out across the province. I was predisposed to believe you as a matter of fact, until I heard a few comments and I made a few inquiries, and until I heard you this morning, and also when I heard about . . . when it was brought to my attention and I was reminded of an event of this type that happened previously at Persephone Theatre a year or two previous to this, a very similar event where the then critic was at Persephone and was invited to a reception at which you were to make a presentation to Persephone, at which you or your officials, under instruction, made sure that that invitation was rejected, that that invitation was withdrawn — withdrawn — so that you, the minister . . . the now minister, would have that reception all to yourself.

You made him feel — and this is where the threat comes in; this is where the retaliation comes in once again — that if they didn't abide by the way you thought it should be, that the implication clearly was there that that grant money was threatened — it was threatened.

And that's what's happening now with all of the arts organizations. They're in a position where they're threatened if ever they invite an opposition member to some kind of a function, a function which is organized by the organization, even though it's supposed to be at arm's length, but the minister leaves them with a threat. That's why an apology is necessary, Mr. Minister. That's exactly why an apology is necessary.

And that's why it's necessary that you indicate to this House quite clearly that any function that is being sponsored by any arm's length organization — in fact, I think it should be any organization that's even sponsored by the government but run . . . or at which volunteers are present — that it's quite clear that it is only right that they have the freedom to invite and set up a seating plan for a government member, for an opposition member, for any guests they choose. That's why an apology is necessary, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to reflect back on visiting Persephone Theatre in the summer of . . . I think two years ago in summer.

And I believe if that hon. member will consult with my former critic, the member from Moose Jaw South, on this particular issue, we met each other in the foyer going in and he actually said to me: Colin, I'm sorry, I had no idea you were here on official business. I've been asked to come up to a performance, and this is the one I've chosen.

And I said to him: "Lorne, no problem," and I believe we actually had coffee together and we visited. And if he did not attend the reception afterwards, then I have no idea why not. It would have been by his choice, because the exchange we had was extremely pleasant, extremely cordial, and I think the member from Moose Jaw South would confirm that.

In terms of attending functions, some weeks ago there was a function organized by the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations to which members on this side of the House were invited and members on that side of the House were invited, and I recall seeing a number of those members there. I was there. I visited with several — I won't start naming names — but I visited with several members on that side of the House.

I'd like to point out also that I was at a function, probably two winters ago, and it was a Sask Sport function — they were honouring past presidents — and a former minister of the department as it was then — of culture and youth — was present at that function, and he had not been acknowledged. So when it was my turn to speak, when I spoke, I acknowledged the presence of that minister and indeed asked him to be . . . I asked him to stand and be acknowledged and be welcomed by the crowd, which he was. And that former minister is seated on the other side of the House today, sitting beside the Leader of the Opposition. And I think he would confirm that as well.

I have attended functions similar to that with members of the opposition, and I've acknowledged their presence and I've always introduced them. And if this one incident is really going to make an issue for the hon. member, then I'm sorry he's taking a particular perception out of it that I don't think is prevalent at all across all the organizations in the province, be they sport or recreation or culture.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, if you'd asked me on that particular evening to bring remarks on your behalf, I would have been more than pleased to do so, that particular day. I would have been more than pleased to do so, to follow your instructions or even read from a statement that you would have made. I would have been more than pleased to do so.

If . . . Or I could have seen . . . I could have seen you ask for the mike before you left. If you could have gotten up and said, well I . . . and made a couple of remarks, they would have given you their mike within a minute. They would have given you a mike within two minutes, and you could have gone to it. But you couldn't control yourself on it.

But the reason I'm doing this, Mr. Minister, and I'm asking you these questions, because I want to clarify the future role and I want to make sure that it's understood what the role of a critic here or any member of the opposition representing the critic when he comes to a function, a public function, with you — all right? — when he comes to a public function with you.

Will you give me your guarantee that at any function that there's to be no questioning of any organization as to how they set up a seating plan or whether a member of the opposition or a government back-bencher can sit, you know, within shouting distance of the minister? Do you feel that the people of Saskatchewan who are running these cultural organizations have the authority and have the moral authority to make their own decisions with respect to these type of invitations?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Absolutely.

Mr. Kowalsky: — We can turn then, Mr. Minister, to a

more substantial issue with respect directly to the department, the department that we are dealing with here. I want to ask you first of all about the Sask Sport organization. In the case of Sask Sport, there is a thing within this Sask Sport that is known as a . . . or money emanating from this Sask Sport that is known as the minister's discretionary fund.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Correct.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Could you indicate to us here how this fund is set up — is it a 10 per cent of everything that's taken? And could you give me an idea of how large it is?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly. I'll have one of the officials, Mr. Chairman, actually take a look through the documentation in terms of the numbers that the hon. member is requesting. And the way it's set up is like this: lottery tickets account for about a hundred and . . . this year it should go about \$110 million worth of sales — it would be in that neighbourhood. Once expenses are deducted, which amount to about one-third in total . . . I'm sorry, expenses plus prizes would go about two-thirds in total, then whatever is left in the pot is divided this way: 50 per cent goes to finance amateur sport in the province, 40 per cent goes to finance cultural organizations in the province, and 10 per cent for recreation.

Now that 50 per cent is directed to Sask Sport. Sask Sport is an umbrella group for 75 sport-governing bodies. They make the decisions themselves, as an organization, how much each sport-governing body will receive. Similarly, the 40 per cent goes to the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations and they decide, of their 25 member bodies, how much goes to each of them. The other 10 per cent goes to Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association.

A \$75,000 licence fee is charged by the Government of Saskatchewan which goes to the Consolidated Fund under the purview of the Minister of Finance. Then there is what is called the minister's directed funding. And the minister's directed funding is based on whatever amount is left over after the trust, which is Sask Sport, together with representatives from SCCO (Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations), SPRA (Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association), department officials get together, decide the actual amount that goes into that trust — it's divided 50-40-10. Then there are obligations that come out of the directed funding.

We can look up a list. I believe you have a copy of the annual report. Do you have the current one or do you need some being made available?

An Hon. Member: — I don't have it here.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — We'll send you a copy of Sask Sport's annual, and it's all listed out.

We have some fairly statutory obligations, Mr. Chairman. For example, the Canada Games is going to be held this summer in Saskatoon. We're funding our share of that out of the directed funding, which is, this year would be \$2.5 million. We fund museums, we fund the arts board, we funded western development museums and a whole host

of minor activities that come in the form of requests, either from communities or organizations who are looking for special assistance over and above whatever is in budget. And these are reviewed with officials and with people who are in the umbrella organizations who oversee the activities of those groups, and we decide on their relative merits.

It would be wonderful if everybody received allowances. This year, for example, the arts board received an extra \$1 million from this particular fund. It would be great if we could do that with all of the groups with whom we deal.

Mr. Kowalsky: — The way I understand it, Mr. Minister, is that the Sask Sport organization collects a sum of money, and I believe it's in the vicinity . . . in the last couple of years has been capped around \$15 million. Then the minister gets about 10 per cent plus something over capping. Would you . . .

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Twelve per cent.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Twelve per cent? Now you get this money from Sask Sport, that 12 per cent, would that . . . and then, I guess, is there an amount that you get after a cap as well?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — There's 12 per cent on the first hundred million of sales. That's of profit on the first hundred million of sales. It's not a full amount of money there; I think you understand that. And after that it's 50 per cent of the profits on the sales over a hundred million.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Would the amount that you have at your discretion be in the vicinity of three and a half million dollars?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Sorry?

Mr. Kowalsky: — Would the amount that you have from that fund in total, discretionary money, be in the vicinity of three and a half million dollars?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — With the payments that are, I would say, obligatory payments, things that we have either statutory requirements to fulfil or so on, for example, I said the Saskatchewan Arts Board — they actually receive two and a half million dollars from this fund, but one million was over and above the one and a half we'd originally budgeted. So the total discretionary amount, you'd be in the ballpark figure. I haven't added it all up, but you'd be in that kind of figure.

The amounts vary according to the kind of profit that is going to be made by the lottery. So obviously the more tickets that are sold, the more profit that's made, the more money that would be available. I can tell you, the trust this year has grown to \$19 million. So over the last few years it's increased significantly.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Now this money is collected . . . first of all, it's your department that authorized Sask Trust. The money's collected by Sask Trust. Part of the money, approximately three and a half million we've established here, it goes back into a minister's discretionary fund.

I want to ask about the accountability of this fund because I am uncertain, Mr. Minister, exactly how this fund is accounted for. Does that money, this discretionary money, appear anywhere in the budget estimates for '89-90? Does it appear anywhere in here?

(1100)

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't appear in there. It comes under the auspices of Sask Sport and it's all detailed within their report. Oh, I should say, at the beginning of the year when we're discussing lottery funding, we discuss how much potentially could be required. We negotiate a figure like, how many million come off lotteries to go into this directed funding.

We do discuss some of the items that we have to fund. For example, the Saskatchewan First program, a very successful program for the training of athletes and coaches — I don't want to digress too far, but as a result of that program in the last four years we actually finished fourth at the winter games, the last Canada Winter Games, which is the highest-ever placing we've had. And we're extending that program again for another four years, and the goal of course is to finish as high as we can at the Canada Games this summer, after which it's going to be extended another four years. For example, that's a two and a half million dollar program right there.

We have cultural facility grants that we put out to organizations, and these are done in conjunction with the trust and with the organizations themselves, and they amounted to \$2.75 million in this year.

So it would vary according to the amount of sales. The numbers that we have to put out for the museum grant program, for instance, is established at the beginning of the year — \$500,000. The amount of discretionary will vary with the amount of the sales and after we've paid out all of these things that the groups have been accustomed to receiving.

Mr. Kowalsky: — To whom is the minister responsible for spending the discretionary money? I understand that any spending that's in here, you're responsible to this Assembly, to the Government of Saskatchewan. Is the minister responsible for the spending of the discretionary money to the arm's length organization, Sask Sport?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No, I'm not responsible to them but they're all discussed with them. And not just Sask Sport — Sask Sport Inc. I think the hon. member is aware of the distinction.

Mr. Kowalsky: — So in effect then, what happens here is the minister has a fund of three and a half million which really you have pretty full rein on, contingent on good relations with affiliated organizations and your staff, and contingent upon, I suppose, moral suasion from other parts. But really you have full control of that without really having to account to anybody else, any authority.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I'm accounting to you now, so I have to account. I account to Sask Sport for any payments that are done — and I just did the addition. It wasn't three and a half, it was about 2 million that is left in the directed

fund once we meet all of our commitments.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I wonder how long this has been in place. Has it been in place for about two years that you've had this discretionary fund?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Since the inception.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Since the inception. Have you found any awkwardness with this at all? I know it's rather convenient to have a fund of money, but I'm talking to you in terms of accountability, how this is to be done, because I'm wondering whether it's something that should be pursued in this forum or whether there's another appropriate place for it.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, we could pursue that, because obviously it would be nice to have sufficient funds to satisfy all of the groups who come looking for assistance. And I may point out to the hon. member — and obviously I'm not going to name names — but one of your colleagues on your side of the House has approached me for funding for a particular arts project that, if I've got money left, I'm certainly going to give it serious consideration.

But I'll give you the process on that. When your colleague approached me, I sent a letter to my department. I put it in writing and said, I've been approached to fund a particular artistic project. At first blush it looks fine to me. Now I don't purport to be an expert on those matters, so the officials then review it and send back a recommendation to me in writing that, yes, this is worthy of support, this is something we can pursue. From there, what I like to do is go to the parent body — let's say it was a choral society, it has something to do with one of the choirs — we'd check with the choral society and say, would you have a problem with this particular individual or group receiving assistance.

And that's basically the way it's been working. It's been working quite well. The awkwardness to which you refer obviously comes in because eventually you've got to say no to somebody. It's like, you know, when you're raising your kids it's always nice to be able to say yes, but every once in a while you have to be able to say no. And that would be where the awkwardness comes in, because it's not a terribly large sum of money when it comes down to what is left for directed funding.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Have you ever considered putting into place an arm's length body that would be . . . I suppose a parallel to it would be somebody that would administer a scholarship fund, for example, where that group is mandated with the objectives of disbursing the money; where it would be done in that fashion rather than be done through the authority of the minister, but it would be disbursed by a group chosen to represent various sectors of our province.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — We have two responses to the hon. member on this, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we tend to be responding to problems that don't fit into established programs, or they don't qualify, or the budget runs out on an established program and no place else to turn; that would be one.

And a second is, the groups with whom I'm dealing, certainly the umbrellas and their membership groups like the current system. I think if you establish the type of body or board that you're outlining, I think there'd be far greater problems. I think there'd be tremendous lobbying going on with a body like that.

The groups with whom I deal seem satisfied, and certainly have indicated to me they like the current system.

Mr. Kowalsky: — There are a few groups in the province, professional groups like Globe Theatre and the symphonies, Persephone (Theatre), the film festival, who I believe receive funding through this method. But what's happened, we find that if you look at their records that these people are operating sort of a semi-professional organization but they are chronically underfunded; that is, they are never quite able to keep up their funding processes up to their expenditures, I think, largely because of the low population in Saskatchewan, I suppose, would be the primary reason.

But the kind of situation that they find themselves into is they get good artists, professional artists, professional directors who would just love to be able to spend more time on creative aspects, but they find themselves, either on an annual or semi-annual basis, with depleted funds and they have to go directly to the minister and put in and spend a lot of time lobbying, and they have to spend time advertising, and public campaigns looking for funds.

And then finally what happens, well, the minister comes through with some funds and everybody's happy again for a little while, for another year or two or three, and then the thing depletes and they get themselves into the same type of situation. And their creative abilities from creating art they have to turn, and I suppose in some sense — I don't mean this in a negative sense — but they have to turn their creative art abilities into creative abilities of how to lobby for finances from the department.

Now we've got some of these organizations which have got rather a permanent and high profile role in the province. And I'm wondering if you had considered using that fund, or a portion of that fund, or some other fund, in a fashion where they wouldn't have to be facing this cycle every three or four years.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's precisely what we're doing. Two things happened recently. I'll give you one that happened about three weeks, four weeks ago. Arnold Edinborough who's, as you know, a past member of Canada Council and various other achievements to his credit, requested a meeting with me and asked me to set up people from the business community of Saskatchewan, which we organized and had a luncheon meeting. And there were all kinds of people from various large companies in the province, Saskatchewan people.

And their aim was to try and encourage these businesses to get actively involved, not just in fund raising, but direct funding to various arts groups. That is up and running. We think that it's going to meet with some degree of success. So that's one of the things that we're spearheading. The

other one, we have an arts review strategy, or an arts strategy review in process currently. It's supported by the Arts Board, the arts alliance, and SCCO.

In fact they're going to be members on this particular task force. And we will be holding hearings, public hearings around the province, and the idea is to come up with a strategy to address a very real problem the hon. member just raised, which is the ongoing funding. I won't bore you with the details here. I've got lots of letters from different groups saying, you know, thank you very much for the one-time infusion and so on, and it bails the arts out for a year or two years at a time.

Their problem is the ongoing funding and one of the difficulties I have, Mr. Chairman . . . lets take the ballet, for instance. We had a professional ballet company in this province for a year or two years and, okay, they weren't the best company in the country — we know that — but it was professional ballet of a relatively good standard, and the dancers came from as far away as Montreal and Vancouver. And the problem we have is if the public isn't sustaining the company through admissions at the theatre, then if we want to have that ballet company, we have to come up with funding someplace, and they received funds from this particular source, Mr. Chairman.

But the problem we have is if the company folds, then the dancers are gone and it takes two to three years, even with the money in place, to get those companies back into the province. Frankly, they look sideways and they say: well we tried Saskatchewan; we were there for two years and it folded. The level of support wasn't there so they take off, and then other dancers and companies are looking at the province and saying, well we're not sure we want to relocate there because who knows, it's month-to-month stuff. They can never been sure even if they've got a one year contract. And that's the very kind of thing that we're trying to address with this review in conjunction with our partners, the arts alliance, the SCCO, those kinds of groups.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Well the difficulty here then is that there is no established sort of long-term strategy for these groups, and my understanding from your comments are, that that's what you're trying to do is establish a strategy of a sort so that they would have more . . . so that they would have a steadier flow of income, or at least they would know what they can expect and not have to rely on as a much money on a fluctuating basis.

One of the organizations that I think is very much in this area that is in the same difficulty is the film society, the people right here in Regina who are attempting to do some filming and to establish a film industry right here.

Now I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, have you got any kind of a plan for the film industry here working in Regina? And I'm referring to the people who have, I believe, received — I think you would have to confirm the figure, but is it 400,000? — to put into place or to film, I believe, a series of seven half-hour films.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, we have been supporting the film industry in trying to get it established. We're interested in the film industry, we're interested in the

recording industry, and the publishing industry. And we're going at them in that particular order.

And right now what we've done is we've got \$700,000 a year for three years committed to the film development fund — 150,000 for office and establishing a position within there. And we put 200,000 into the project, the one you just mentioned — the six half-hour films with the National Film Board.

So in total I guess that gives us just over a million dollars — that's one million and fifty committed to film development within the province. So we're taking that one very seriously. And again, I won't bother you with it, but I got a letter from Veronica Gamracy, the president, just thanking us for it and saying we're off to the right start. We hope that we can attract other people into Saskatchewan to help promote the film industry so that it does become viable, sustainable, and long term.

It's the long term — and you identified this yourself — it's the long term that you have to worry about. Actually starting a project very often isn't very hard. It's like building a new facility — building a new gymnasium or a rec centre or something. Getting the thing up is one thing, but then the ongoing operation is the difficulty, and that's been the difficulty with the arts groups.

And when we went to the Arts Board, who are the umbrella, as you are aware, for arts groups in the province, and the Arts Alliance who are the umbrella for the professional arts groups and said, look, we've got to start talking a long-term strategy, they were very supportive, very interested, and asked us as a department to head it up, but obviously with their input.

(1115)

Mr. Kowalsky: — They're asking them to come up with six half-hour films. And what you've done here is they've got a working budget of perhaps a million dollars at the most.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Per year.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Now my understanding is that they don't have that long to come up with this film.

What I want to know is, what is your objective here in terms of what are you trying to do with the film industry here? Are you trying to give them some practice? Are you putting this money down as seed money for practice? If so, they should really quite understand that. Or are you actually expecting that this kind of money is going to generate or put Saskatchewan into the film industry? It's quite well accepted it takes about a million dollars per film to set up, and there's no way that they're going to be able to come up and compete with producers that are getting . . . or that are able to sell to the CBC or to the NBC or any one of the TV networks, CTV or ABC. There's no way that they can with that kind of funding. In other words, they're sort of being programmed for failure if that's the expectation.

What I want to find out is: what is your plan for the film industry here in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The sum of money is actually 400,000 a year because the National Film Board matches the money we're putting in. We put in 200,000; they're putting in 200,000. One film that's already gone into production is **The Great Electrical Revolution**, which will be broadcast this fall

An Hon. Member: — Good one.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — It is a good one. The program is very much driven by the National Film Board themselves, and we've got a lot of respect for that particular organization.

We view the program that we're involved in with these films and the films that we made here as a training and development program. And we get good co-operation from University of Regina who have got, as you may be aware, a film component over there, training film component within their . . . I think it's communications over there. And they're doing a really bang-up job. So they're producing the people, and those people traditionally have gone to Vancouver, Montreal, Toronto to get jobs.

We're saying, if we can get this film developed — and we have got it off the ground — and if we can attract groups in here, and we use the people who are home-grown, then we can have a sustainable, ongoing film industry. And that's our goal. That's precisely what we're trying to do. And I really believe it's achievable. This is one I've been really enthusiastic about, because you can see light at the end of this tunnel. This can really fly, and it can take off.

And we've got several advantages here in Saskatchewan. Production costs are much lower in Saskatchewan than they are in Vancouver, as an example. We can provide trained personnel right here in Regina, and they don't have to haul people from all over North American with all those concomitant extra costs that they accrue. They can come in; they can hire the crew locally; production costs are lower, and they know they'd get the support of this film development office.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I think I would agree with you on pretty well everything you said. There's just one little problem here, and the glitch is that they're going to run out of funding before they're able to produce everything.

Have you got . . . are you giving them any understanding or have you acceded to their request to provide funding that would actually be able to accomplish what they're set out to accomplish? Because I believe that they're . . . they've just about got this one film in place but they're far over budget, and that's simply because it was an unrealistic . . . we're working some unrealistic assumptions, in the first place, about just how much cheaper it is to produce in Regina than it is someplace else.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I'll take the last part of your comment first. It is much cheaper. I've been assured by film industry personnel with whom I've met, and I visited the site of *The Great Electrical Revolution*. We've had a lot of discussions, before we get into this, when we held a

news conference to announce it, we'd had an awful lot of discussions and I was assured that we do produce far cheaper here than many other places. So I believe, I really believe that to be the case.

When we talk about the budget and how much money's going into it and the 400,000 I mentioned, it also has support from Telefilm. This 400,000 is a training component. There is other money and there are other groups involved in this, so I believe it will be sustainable, and the six films that we talked about certainly will be able to be done within the budget that's been structured for them.

The Saskatchewan Motion Picture Industry Association who are spearheading within this province are pretty confident that they can deliver right here in Saskatchewan. I'll take their word for it.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Well, I take it that it's your objective is to see those six films produced here in Saskatchewan. And I take it also, from what you said, that it may take . . . if it takes a few more dollars, that organization will come back to you, but you're quite open to looking at it at the time. It looks to me like you don't have the money available at this stage or haven't expanded the money at this stage.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — We're committed for a period of time, as I indicated. You know, we're in it for three years, and this is the pre-production funding that's gone ahead. The goal is to end up after the films are done with a trained core of personnel right here in Saskatchewan, so that people who want to produce and make a film, when they're looking around, we can compete and we can say, yes, come to Regina, come to Saskatchewan. We have the people here on the ground who are trained, with experience, and we can handle it right here.

Mr. Kowalsky: — There are other ways of helping the film industry, of course, besides just a direct subsidy. And one of the ways of helping the film industry is to assist them in, or at least make it possible for the people in the film industry here in the province to bid on advertising contracts.

As you well know, the Government of Saskatchewan has one of the largest expenditures in the province with respect to advertising and making up of ads. And I refer you to a letter that you received on May 16, 1989, from Veronica Gamracy of SMPIA (Saskatchewan Motion Picture Industry Association) and representing SMPIA. She refers to the government's practice of not having open tenders for all of government advertising.

Now I'm asking you, Minister, whether you were able to, in your dealings with caucus, or whether you're willing to, in your dealings with caucus, to steer government advertising in the direction of open tendering so that people in SMPIA can have a fair and equitable chance at government advertising?

As Veronica Gamracy indicates, SMPIA, the Saskatchewan Motion Picture Industry (Association), now asks that your government initiate a fair and equitable tendering policy for government advertising

and communications, something that your government has not been known to do. She indicates in the letter several advantages to doing it this way, and several advantages which I think are not difficult for you to buy.

I think the difficulty is: can you convince your government, or can you give any kind of commitment that your government will go to a fair and equitable tendering process?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — As the hon. member would be aware, as has happened with your administration and all administrations across the country, the administration has an agency of record who then source the component parts they need in terms of tendering. We've been asked to review the tendering policy and that review is currently under way. They're looking at practices in other provinces and what they're doing. As the hon. member knows, government-wide tendering is certainly not under my purview, but we can submit to colleagues a brief, outlining what is happening in other provinces, in particular with an industry that is very fledgling.

We've taken some of the risk out. That's why the industry is establishing. We took some of the risk out and private investors are putting money in now that they see that the film office is there, the fund is there. We've made a commitment for the six films, so obviously anything we can do that is going to promote this, or improve this situation, then we've got to take a real serious look at it.

So I take the comments in the spirit in which they're offered. Yes, we'd certainly be looking at that.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The chairman is asking for leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Muller: — I'd like to introduce to the members of the legislature 16 students from the Wahpeton School just north of Prince Albert. Their teacher is Pam Metz; chaperons Alvina Buffalo, Stella Head and Clayton Waditaka.

I hope they enjoy the proceedings of the Committee of Finance this morning. I will be meeting with them at 11:45 for pictures and drinks, and I would ask all members to welcome them here and wish them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks, Recreation and Culture Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask just a couple of brief questions of the minister — maybe one if he gives me a full explanation. I admit that I

don't understand the situation as well as I should, and maybe the minister can shed some light on it.

It concerns the funding to Tae Kwon Do associations in the province of Saskatchewan, and I believe the funding comes, if not from your department, from Sask Sport. And there seems to be a controversy, Mr. Minister, between the world Tae Kwon Do association and the international Tae Kwon Do association. And if you trace them back far enough, as I understand it, there's some international politics involved to the extent that one association originates in North Korea, one association originates in South Korea.

And it's my understanding that the funding right now, most, if not all of it, goes to the world Tae Kwon Do association, but the largest number of members in Saskatchewan actually come from the international Tae Kwon Do association, or at least are affiliated with it. And I know that in our own situation, in the constituency I represent in The Battlefords, there is a Tae Kwon Do association there, and we do have some competitors that go outside the province, in fact outside of the country to compete. And I understand they've had trouble getting, or to this point have not got, funding from Sask Sport to go to international and national competitions.

So I'm wondering if the minister can tell me today what the situation is, and why, if you're affiliated with the wrong Tae Kwon Do association, you can't get funding to put on or attend competitions?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly this is a thorny issue for a couple of years, and I'll try and give you a very brief explanation on precisely what happened. Sask Sport fund their 75 sport governing bodies. Now they will only fund one sport-governing body, otherwise, let's say . . . take tennis for example. They fund tennis, a tennis body. The executive of that tennis association would decide how to spend their money. Now you might say, well we should have a women's tennis group, a men's tennis group, an under 21 tennis group, a youth group, and so on, and so on, and so on.

So what Sask Sport have said — and it's their policy, and as you know they're arm's length from government; we don't dictate this to them — they say, we're going to fund one sport governing body. Well, originally in Tae Kwon Do there was one sport governing body. Then one group split away and started doing — and this is the one you're referring to in your community — started doing far more community based things. And it was not really exclusive and it was community, it was right across the province, and they did an excellent job. And they said, now we want to be funded, and these guys, the other guys, shouldn't be funded; we've split up with them. Or, fund two bodies.

Well, Sask Sport said, no, we're only going to fund one body. And to cut a long story short, we did a lot of negotiations. My director of sport met with them many times. We tried to get both groups in the same room at the same time. They're a bad bunch; but if you get these groups together there could be fireworks. And I'd met with them separately and talked to them and said, can we facilitate a meeting between both your groups. I'm glad to

say, eventually we got them together. There is now one Tae Kwon Do federation. It's not world, it's not international, it's just Tae Kwon Do federation. So they will now qualify as a sport-governing body and the money will be . . . the allowance they would normally receive will resume from Sask Sport to the federation, and their executive will decide how to spend it.

So that problem has been resolved.

Mr. Anguish: — So, Mr. Minister, as you understand it, the world Tae Kwon Do association and the international Tae Kwon Do association are no longer large factions in the province; they've come to one Tae Kwon Do association in the province. The funding will go to that one Tae Kwon Do association, and therefore when there's competitors going to prestigious competitions various places in Canada and outside of the country, that they will be fairly dealt with in terms of being able to receive funding to attend these competitions?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — What they've resolved is this. There's going to be one federation, umbrella federation, which will receive the allowance from Sask Sport. Within that federation there will continue to be two groups because they actually . . . I don't want to get into all the technicalities, but they actually do practise a slightly different form of Tae Kwon Do, and this is one of the arguments they had.

I won't name you names, but one individual heading up one group said his is a much purer form, and he follows traditional things and is teaching far more than a contact sport; now he's teaching discipline and good health and a way of life. And he says these other guys aren't doing all that.

(1130)

So they've had a philosophical difference which I'm sure they're never going to resolve. But there will be one federation; they will receive the allowance. This is what they've agreed to, and they will agree mutually how it's going to be split to fund both their organizations.

Whether or not they choose to fund travel for their groups, that's entirely up to them. Some sport-governing bodies don't fund any travel. They'll fund a whole host of activities, but they say if you're going to travel . . . they might do in-province travel, but they say if you're going to go out of province, you have to do some fund raising. Other groups totally fund.

Mr. Anguish: — The only way you'll ever entirely resolve the conflict between the two major groups in Tae Kwon Do, I'm sure, is to get North and South Korea together, and that's beyond the mandate of this legislature or this government, I'm sure.

But the assurance can be had by local Tae Kwon Do associations, regardless of where they are in the province, that there should be some degree of fairness in terms of the funding of Sask Sport now, then because of the umbrella organization which represents the two factions in Tae Kwon Do. And if there's a decision to fund travel to international and national competitions, then it will be

dealt with in fairness; there won't be preference given to one group or the other group. Is that what I'm to understand, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — That's the situation.

Mr. Chairman: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Wolfe: — To request leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Wolfe: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce to you, and to all members of the Assembly, some 24 grade 4 students from Assiniboia Elementary School.

Accompanying them are teachers, Bev Coldwell, and a chaperon, Debbie Auchstaetter. I'm not sure of the other lady's name that's accompanying them, but I ask all members of the Assembly to welcome these guests here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks, Recreation and Culture Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all the new guests in the galleries also.

Mr. Minister, I want to start off on Bill 34 this morning, and I just want to indicate to you, Mr. Minister, that this morning you got quite upset when I asked the question. I was not aware of your family situation, and I say to you, I have the same problem, and I don't expect you to know what happened to my father, and you should not expect me to know what happened in your family. For that, I apologize.

And I want to start off by going into Bill 34, the new Act that, as you indicate, you are now going to use regulation to control buffer zones around our lakes and streams and rivers in our parks. And I just want to ask you this question very directly. What was the reason for eliminating the buffer zones and the fact that you are now going to administer buffer zones and activities within the buffer zones by regulation?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, to expedite an answer for you, could the hon. member direct me to the precise section of the Bill, please.

Mr. Thompson: — Okay, Bill 34, and the minister shall not grant — this is what was in the original Bill:

(3) The minister shall not grant a lease of the strip of park land 10 metres in width adjacent to the

bank of any lake, river, stream, or other body of water within any park land.

The explanatory notes accompanying Bill 34 explain it this way:

Subsection 15(3) is not required. Shore lines will be reserved by policy rather than legislation.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Several factors on this, and I'm sorry I took so long; I had to get some advice as to the precise changes here. Instead of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thought I was doing brilliantly at that point. The buffer zone that exists in front of cottages, and so on, there are people who've been building boat docks right up on front. They're actually there now illegally, and I guess if we wanted to go and enforce this under legislation, we'd be telling people that all of those docks would have to come out.

Similarly, anybody who operates — let's take your own case — a commercial fishing operation, and you would have your building set back, now you want to be able to have access to that front. Instead of in legislation saying it would be the buffer zone, it would be in a policy rather than legislation because we have a variety of situations around the province. And in terms of . . . I can answer unequivocally, I can answer unequivocally that no, the intent is not to have private beaches around lakes, and certainly not provincial parks. That's certainly not the intent.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, what it does open up is the fact that an individual has a private dock, which is what you are indicating. Now an individual cabin owner on a lake will have a private dock. And to me, if you have a private dock, then you have to have access from the dock down to the water. And if that runs through a public beach, then I say that you are creating a situation which may be far worse than you have right now. Because cabin owners who put docks or dock ramps or whatever they may want to use right now — that's fine.

But now if the dock is going to be a private dock and you as the minister under this legislation have the right to indicate to yourself or to myself that I can now legally build a private dock, and that dock could be in front of a beach, and individuals who are using that beach, young boys and girls and men and women who are swimming on that beach, I say will have to be very careful because here they'll have to stay completely away from that private dock.

Because if you use a beach, then you have to access water, and I think what you're opening up here is a can of worms where a minister can indicate that I as an individual can build a private dock, put my sign up, and any young boy and girl that wants to go swimming off that beach cannot go near my dock.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — That wasn't the intent and if . . . I think we should examine this one a little more closely when we go to committee because that's not the intent. And if it could be construed that way, we're going to have to reconsider, because that's certainly not the intent. The situation is that anybody putting a dock will still require a

permit to do it. So it's not just going to be willy-nilly docks all over the place. They're going to have to come and get a permit to put the dock in.

What it is covering off, I've just been advised, is Rowan's Ravine, Elbow Harbour, and the new marina that we're going to be starting this year. It's going to be a three-year project at Sask Landing park, Omache Bay. That's what it's supposed to cover off. There will be a marina, a commercial operation marina, in a bay and docking facilities available. So that's what this is supposed to cover off. It's not supposed to be covering off private beaches.

I think when we bring this back, I'm going to have the officials come back with some detailed explanations, and if needs be, if you want to get an amendment to do something on this, we'd certainly consider it in committee.

Mr. Thompson: — I think that's where the problem really comes in, and you've put your finger on it because in places like you indicated, there are marinas and that's where boats most certainly should be docked and tied up, at the marinas. And we should leave our public beaches alone. That is not the place to be putting a dock, because most beaches, it's shallow water.

If you're going to put docking facilities on a beach, then you're going to have to go a long ways out in the water and you're going to destroy a lot of that beach for the public that should be using it. And you gave a good example, and I think that's where the boats should be docked, at the marinas. If you want excess docking, then I suggest that you expand the marinas and the docking facilities where the boats can be looked after by caretakers.

I want to continue with that Bill, and I want to now move to clause 8, where you amend section 28, an Act to permit the minister to appoint any persons, or categories of persons, as enforcement officers in our parks. The existing Act, Mr. Minister, enforce enforcement officers to be appointed out of the department where they should have gained some experience before being promoted. This clause 8 in section 28 indicates to me that we've got another serious problem here, and I think that you as a minister should take a serious look at the ramifications of this clause.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, if I can just explain the change on this one. It's to accommodate the Grasslands National Park, because the Grasslands National Park will be federal. And right now we would have no jurisdiction in there, but we do have some control over water bodies within the Grasslands National Park. So the change is being made so that the people who can be appointed here for enforcement — it doesn't say it, but it's . . . well it says, flexibility to appoint persons other than employees of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Culture. Other than those it's going to be federal park employees who will be able to enforce our provincial rules within the grasslands park.

So it's not just to recruit anybody off the streets and say, we want you to do some enforcement. It's for Grasslands

National Park, and it's to appoint federal parks employees to handle enforcement matters within Grasslands National Park.

Mr. Thompson: — Well then I think, Mr. Minister, when you bring this Bill back for clause by clause, then you should reword it, because it's worded pretty clearly that the minister may appoint any persons or categories of persons as enforcement officers.

It does not indicate clearly that we're dealing with the Grasslands National Park here. When one looks at this, you would think that this could be carried out in any park or any jurisdiction that you may have, and that any group of individuals may be hired to carry out the enforcement laws.

If we're dealing with the Grasslands National Park, that most certainly is a big park, and we have federal park wardens who would be involved in there. And I know that federal park wardens and provincial game wardens, they work closely hand in hand, and they're trained for their jobs.

Here it indicates, if you just take a look at that, you could actually hire me to go in there and enforce laws. And I think maybe that your staff could change the wording of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — We don't have the Act with us, but in the Act, in the preamble, it gives definitions. So we think . . . and we'll know when we get to committee, and if needs be we'll effect that change. But we believe that there's a strict definition of enforcement officer — who can be an enforcement officer.

So in the terms of the change in this Bill, we would only be able to appoint someone as an enforcement officer who is qualified to be an enforcement officer. And it's covered off in definitions. When we get to committee, we'll have that definition in front of us, and I think we'll be able to satisfy your concern.

(1145)

The way you phrased it and the way it reads, you're right, it would look like I could appoint myself or you and we could be down there running around in a truck enforcing park laws, and that's obviously not the intent. So we'll check the definition of enforcement because we believe that's where it's covered off.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I now want to continue with the Grasslands National Park and ask you a few questions on that.

The Grasslands National Park, the agreement calls for approximately a hundred square . . . no, to assemble 350 square miles of natural mixed grass and prairies. Mr. Minister, could you tell me how much land, which will become part of the Grasslands National Park, is now in the hands of Parks Canada?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Fifty-four square miles are in the hands of the federal department now.

Mr. Thompson: — You indicate only 54 square miles are in the park, and are we working under the original plans that the Grasslands National Park will contain 350 square miles of park, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The agreement gives Parks Canada the right to acquire lands and they're in that process now. I believe they . . . the initial will be 130 square miles, but they already have 54 square miles.

Mr. Thompson: — What is taking place right now, Mr. Minister? Are you negotiating the completion of the land for that national park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Parks Canada is responsible for land acquisition and they're actively pursuing that now.

Mr. Thompson: — When that park is finally set up, Mr. Minister, will Parks Canada own the surface rights and the mineral rights to that park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Everything except the water courses which are exempted; they would remain under provincial control.

Mr. Thompson: — So the provincial control would be over the rights of the water in the Frenchman River and Morgan Creek and such bodies of water lying within the park. And, Mr. Minister, who will control this park? Will there be a body that will be set up to control the park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well the umbrella organization for the federal government is the Canadian parks service. That's their park branch which is part of the Department of Environment — Environment Canada. What they are in the process of doing — I believe they've already done it — is setting up a local committee from people from the R.M.s and the surrounding area who would be an advisory committee to Canadian parks service for the maintenance and operation of the park.

Mr. Thompson: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could indicate to the committee if our Grasslands National Park will be developed in two blocks separate from one another — one block south-east of the town of Val Marie and the other block west of Killdeer. And what size will each of these blocks contain, if that is still the plan, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I've rounded it off into approximate numbers. The large park is — would be the first one you mentioned, south-east of Val Marie, be about 200 square miles, and the one west of Killdeer would be about 150 square miles. These are rounded off. That could vary a wee bit.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, could you give us any indication as to when there would be an official opening of the Grasslands National Park, and when do you expect it to be in operation and open to the public?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — They began work on a visitors' centre on the Easter weekend, and anticipated completion would be sometime in July. So the visitors' centre would be open.

When they have acquired about 130 square miles, they will then designate it as a park. The 54 square miles they have now isn't enough, in Parks Canada's view of the Canadian parks service. They want to get 130 square miles.

Once they acquire about that amount of land, then they have to take it, just as we do it here through the legislature, and it has to be passed in Ottawa. But I really don't expect any difficulty because it's kind of an all-party agreement. Everybody wants to see the park go.

So when they acquire the land, then they put the legislation through, and then it would be federally driven, when they want to come down and do a big splash or an opening. They may want to make some kind of splash over the opening of the visitors' centre.

Mr. Thompson: — Are you indicating the visitors' centre will be open in July of 1989 of this summer?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes. It's under construction now, so whenever it's complete, they're going to open it. Target date is July, middle of July, this summer.

Mr. Thompson: — Okay. Thank you, Mr. Minister. Then are you indicating that the portion of the park that is already designated is going to be open to the public and they will have access to a portion of the Grasslands National Park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Once the visitors' centre is open, they'll be able to take tours. There'll be a limited number of staff there and it will be open.

But I'm just being advised, there actually officially is no Grasslands National Park because there has to be a piece of legislation enacted that has to go through the House of Commons, and that hasn't gone through yet, but they anticipate no difficulty with it.

Mr. Thompson: — Was there any provincial funding in the tourist centre that's been constructed down there?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No, we have no money in it.

Mr. Thompson: — It seems kind of odd that you would . . . We haven't even got a Grasslands National Park yet?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No.

Mr. Thompson: — It has not gone through legislation, the land has not been negotiated for, and their final negotiation hasn't been set aside, yet here we have a tourist centre that's set up. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, I sincerely hope that you've been negotiating with your colleague, the Minister of Highways, because that is rough country down there, and in order to have access by the public there is going to have to be a lot of highways and roads put into that area.

And I would wonder, Mr. Minister, if you have any indication from the Minister of Highways as to just how much money will be spent on building highways and roads, or the provincial proportion. I realize that this will

be a federal-provincial cost-shared highways and road system.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Good point. We see tremendous growth potential for tourism in the south-west part of the province. Cypress Hills park is already there. And in fact this is blowing the whistle a little bit in advance, but we've been negotiating with the Government of Alberta to do the first joint interprovincial park anywhere in Canada, joining the Alberta side to the Saskatchewan side, and making a joint interprovincial park which we hope is going to come into being later this year.

With that park down there and with Grasslands going down there, with the unique flora and fauna that is in this area that's going to be protected for ever more, we think we're going to have a tremendous boom in tourism.

There's an awful lot of people who are interested in the palaeontology of the area, the archaeology, the wildlife, the naturalists, botanists — a whole number of people who have . . . I know from my mail from other parts of the country saying when is this going to come into being.

Well it will come in this summer in the sense that the visitor centre will be there, so there'll be an interpretive centre and there'll be some tours available. But the actual Grasslands National Park itself will have to be a piece of legislation that's passed once they've acquired the minimum amount of land, which I'm advised is 130 square miles, to put it into being.

In terms of the highways in the area, we want to leave it in the natural state, obviously. We don't want to be driving highways through the middle of the park. But the point which you're making, which is well taken, is getting people physically down there. And I just asked my colleague over here, the Minister of Highways, if he'd take a look at that with us for a long-range plan, and he's agreed.

Mr. Thompson: — Yes. Another question, Mr. Minister, do you have any indication as to when the land allotment will be finalized and that park will become a park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — We're assured by the officials from the Canadian parks service it will be just as soon as they can assemble the land. They're really keen to do this. You see, one of the reasons they're really keen, and I'm sure you're aware of this, is it's the only natural grassland area that's left anywhere in North America, and they're very keen to get it into their parks system because they already have examples of all different kinds of ecological systems across the country — whether it be forest or island or North. If you've got all those land types already in the system, this is the only one which is natural, indigenous to this country, that isn't already in the system. So they're very anxious to get it in and complete the parks system.

Mr. Thompson: — I agree with everything you've said there, Mr. Minister, but you didn't answer my question. The question I asked you was: do you have any idea, or your officials, as to when the Grasslands National Park will be finalized and it will be designated as a national park of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I can't speak on behalf of the federal counterpart, but I do know . . .

An Hon. Member: — It's our province.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, it's our province, but it's their money. But I do know that they have within their budget now enough money to buy the 130 square miles they need, because that was part of the negotiation. Obviously we want to get this thing up and running and get it finalized.

So it depends on how fast they're going to spend that money to acquire the land. The best guess would be within two years.

Mr. Thompson: — You indicate that the federal government has the money in place and can spend it. Now who are they negotiating with right now? Are they dealing with some farmers in that area and private landowners? And are you having any trouble with the negotiations to acquire the other portion of the land that's needed?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — They're dealing with ranchers right now in that area, and it's willing buyer, willing seller negotiations. That's the basis for it.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I do want to indicate that . . . I see you have indicated you did your negotiating with your cabinet colleague, the Minister of Highways, to go ahead and put a road and highway system into that park. I know full well when you talk about it being a fragile area, but as fragile as it may be, there are many fragile areas in the planet that we live on. And when you have a national park that's 130 square miles, most certainly it has to have access to it. You just cannot expect individuals to go into the service centres, there's got to be a road into there.

And to go on these trips into a massive grasslands park, it takes a lot of planning. And I would have hoped that . . . and I would think that you and the Minister of Highways and the federal colleague should sit down pretty quickly and get a plan in there as to how much money is going to be put into that highway and road system, and just how you're going to do it, because it's going to take a lot of work to engineer a system in there.

These are the type of expenditures that I would hope that would have been done long time ago. I thought the engineering work would have been done, but as you indicate, it hasn't. But I think you have to move fairly fast because you've already got the tourist centre set up, and we most certainly have to have access in there fairly quickly.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — In terms of access to the area, there is a highway to the area, which is a provincial responsibility, and it goes right to the visitors' centre. Within the park itself, access roads will be the responsibility of the federal government Department of the Environment. And as a matter of fact, there is a clause in the agreement we have with the federal government centring around tourism saying what are the needs in that part of the province. And we're negotiating with the

federal government for them to put the money in there that we need to promote tourism.

(1200)

Mr. Thompson: — Okay. We'll move away from the Grasslands National Park. I want to indicate my full support for that park, Mr. Minister. I have been pushing ever since I've been a member of this legislature for a park up in the Clearwater Valley — a national park.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — You got it.

Mr. Thompson: — I got it. I'm going to get you to stand up and put that on record.

But I think that this is something that we need more of in the province of Saskatchewan, is parks — parks that our citizens and citizens from other parts of Canada and other nations can come and enjoy. And it can be done properly. It can be developed the way that they should be developed for the benefit of all Canadian citizens.

I in particular would like to see a national park — and I'm not talking about the sand dunes; that's a protected area — but I would like to see a national park in the Clearwater Valley. I think that that's one of the most beautiful places that we have in Saskatchewan or any place in our nation. It's a place where a lot of development should take place, and if it did take place, it would be the benefit of not only the tourists and the rest of this province but for the community of La Loche.

There's a lot of timber in there, Mr. Minister, that the forest fires, every year we're losing little by little by little, and it's timber that should have been selectively cut and taken out of there, and it just hasn't happened.

You indicate that either negotiations have been under way for a national park in the Clearwater Valley or that you have some information that I don't have, so I would just turn it over to you and let you indicate what's taken place in the Clearwater Valley re a federal park.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get it on the record that this member was one of the people who was instrumental in bringing about the first wilderness park that Saskatchewan has in its park system of 31 provincial parks. And I want to pay tribute to the member — he has worked for it; he has pushed for it, and it did come into being because of this government, however, I will point out. But I do . . . the member asked me to put it on the record, and I have no difficulty whatsoever putting on the record that the member was in fact very instrumental in bringing this provincial wilderness park into being.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Now the member has asked about the possibility of having a national park in that area. Now here's where we'd have a problem. The member indicated that he's in favour, and so am I — I agree 100 per cent with you — of selective logging of overmature timber because we know that it is prone to fire and it is prone to disease. And the member lives in that area and

he knows what he's talking about. I agree 100 per cent with him.

However, if that were to become a national park, they don't permit any logging at all in a national park. And in a wilderness we allow selective logging. As you know, in Cypress and in other areas we had to take out that pine beetle down there, so we had to do selective logging there. But normally in a wilderness park there wouldn't be logging, or very limited logging.

But I agree that we can't stand by and let overmature timber rot and be fire-prone and then burn the whole park or a big chunk of it. We can't allow that to happen. I'd be prepared to discuss this with the member at any length whenever he chooses on some kind of a plan to look at the overmature timber in there.

But in terms of making it a national park, we have all the same protection provincially as a national park could afford, but in a national park there's absolutely no logging allowed, and I think that would not serve the purposes that you've been discussing earlier. But we thank you for your contribution.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. McLaren: — I'd like leave, Mr. Chairman, to introduce some students.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. McLaren: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's my privilege today to introduce to you, and to all members of the Assembly, some students from Yorkton. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery, and they are grades 3 and 4, 20 students, Angus Spice School in Yorkton. They are accompanied today by their teachers, Thom Koroluk and Joan Dobson; and I don't know if their bus driver is there or not, Barclay Westerhaug.

It's a real pleasure to have you come to the Assembly today. We hope you enjoy the proceedings, and we will meet with you in room 218 a little later on, and also to take pictures on the steps below the rotunda there.

And I hope you have a real good visit to Regina. I understand you're touring the building in a few minutes, and I would welcome you here again. I would ask all members to please recognize these students from Yorkton.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Parks, Recreation and Culture Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 39

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, when did they stop logging in national parks?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — As far as my officials are aware, it's always been prohibited, but we can't say that definitively.

Mr. Thompson: — That's for sure. I have logged myself when I was growing up in the Big River area and I have worked on many logging camps, and it was selectively cut. I say to you, Mr. Minister, that that is not an excuse for not creating a national park. That's one thing that Parks always looked after, the timber in there; it's selectively cut. And you could go check into the Moonlight and Kiyam Lake areas, and you'll find out that that timber was cut and it was big operations, but it was all selectively cut.

Leaving that aside, to create a national park in the Clearwater Valley would have nothing to do with selectively cutting timber. That would be an agreement between the federal park and the provincial minister in charge of forests. They determine if a stand of timber is mature and it has to be taken out. They negotiate and they take it out.

I've been involved in that myself, but I just maintain . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That was in the Prince Albert National Park, in the Kiyam Lake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Kiyam Lake is situated right within the park, and it was overseen by park wardens. They were the ones who came in there and made sure that everything was done properly and watched for all the violations.

And I still indicate to you, Mr. Minister, that I think it's time to get a national park up in north-western Saskatchewan. I think we have to push for that, and I would ask you, through your officials, to push for that. Meet with the communities up in that north-west side.

We now look like there may be a highway link between Fort McMurray and portage La Loche. I want to indicate that I'm disappointed in the way that that road is being put through. It's not even engineered; it's not being done by the Department of Highways. But I would urge you, Mr. Minister, to get in touch with the Minister of Highways and get him in there and get his engineers working with the Alberta group, and get that highway finalized as quick as possible.

I know the minister indicates that there's a shortage of money. I say that there's not a shortage of money. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan this year had a profit of \$106 million. And that's the type of programs that the potash corporation paid for over the years and should continue to pay for. And I would just urge you to direct some of that profits from the potash corporation into building highways and roads and parks and facilities for the tourists in Saskatchewan and other parts of our planet.

Mr. Minister, I now want to turn to the provincial parks. Do you have any plans or are there any plans for expansion of any of our provincial park system in the province, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, I can advise the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that the department has been, on an ongoing basis, conducting a major review of the parks

system. And in fact we're coming up with a long term. It's going to be a 20-year parks system plan. We may even be in a position to make that review public some time this fall — certainly we'd like to make it public — in which we are identifying potential candidates to be added to the current 31 provincial parks system.

It would be very premature to start talking about potential candidates right now and raising expectations around the province, but certainly there has been a major review. There is a long-term, 20-year plan, and there is room for expansion into the parks system.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, you say that that plan is almost completed and you're hoping that you will be able to announce a plan this fall. Could you indicate who is doing the study for the department, and how much did that study cost?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The original study was done by a firm from Saskatoon, called Hilderman Witty Crosby and Hanna, which is about a two-year project. The cost of the study, which I hasten to point out was not just looking at the parks system — they looked at tourism patterns, travel patterns, logistical problems, natural areas, ecological areas, and a whole host of things, and brought the study to the department and came in under budget of \$50,000 for the whole package, which goes obviously beyond my Department of Parks. It involved Highways, it involved Tourism, and to some extent Rural Development.

When the review and the study was completed and was placed in the hands of the department officials, they are in the process of turning it into a report which will be released hopefully later this year for public review and for public input before anything is done.

What we want to come up with is a game plan that says, here is where we're going to go over the next 20 years.

Mr. Thompson: — You speak of the original study. It would almost indicate that there's two studies going on, or you've got an original study that's not complete and yet your staff now have to compile all the information.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No, it's a technical study . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Thompson: — Okay. So that study will be released this fall then.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, as soon as we get it put into a format that it can be given to the public and used. It's got all kinds of technical data that I don't think they would particularly want to be reviewing.

Mr. Thompson: — So we won't expect any announcements on any new provincial parks or any additions to any provincial parks until you come up with that 20-year plan. Is that fair?

(1215)

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — If today I stand in the legislature and say that there won't be any more announcements or any new parks, I'm going to get called to order a month or

so from now. I don't want to get too premature with an announcement.

What I will say is, within the next month or so I'm going to make an announcement on something that will be of mutual interest, not just to you and I, but to everybody in this Assembly. But in terms of the 20-year plan and the potential candidates, that wouldn't come out till this fall.

Mr. Thompson: — I suspect what that announcement is going to be. It's been rumoured that there will be a provincial election, and I'm just assuming that that's what it's going to be.

I suspect that that's why all the sad faces we see on that side, is that your Premier has decided that before he sells off SaskPower, before they sell off the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan . . . and I say to you, Mr. Minister, you're the one that better stand up and put a stop to that sell-off or you won't be coming back and there won't be very many come back.

And one knows, one knows — sorry, Bill . . . the member from Rosthern knows full well what's going to happen if this government sells the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan off, a corporation that's made hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, that has provided provincial and regional parks in this province, has provided recreation that we have in this province. That was all contributed by the potash revenue that we got out of this province.

And I say to the member from Rosthern, it's about time . . . When you talk about \$106 million profit this year with the potash corporation, you can build a lot of provincial parks and you can build an lot of campsites and you can build roads into those parks. And I think this is important, this is important. And to the member from Yorkton who I know fully supports the revenue that came out of the potash corporation because he was in charge of it, and he knows that those revenues went to beautify this province; he knows full well where those profits went.

And the member for Weyburn, who continually chirps from his seat, knows full well that we have 5,000 years of potash underneath us. And let me tell you, we can get hundreds of millions of dollars every year to build parks and to build regional parks, and all the things that we are talking about here today.

The member from Weyburn knows that, and he knows full well that that potash is owned 100 per cent by the citizens of Saskatchewan. And that's where it should remain so that we can take the profits and continue to build on our parks that we have, improve them in this province — highways, roads, on all our systems. And I say that in all sincerity to the member from Weyburn, because I think deep down he really knows that.

Has there been any new golf courses or any golf courses within the provincial park or regional park system, Mr. Minister, that has been leased out or turned back, or has there been any negotiations to get rid of any of the golf courses that the provincial government owns right now?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Just by way of clarification, Mr.

Chairman, a question to the hon. member. Did you have any particular time frame in mind over the last two or three years or . . .

Mr. Thompson: — No, Mr. Minister. I just wondered if there was any . . . just in the last year, has there been any golf courses that have been turned back to the province, to the parks, or has there been any negotiations this year to lease any of them out to any private individuals?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, there was a proposal put out to lease The Battlefords park. The proposals have come in. Tenders have come in; tenders are already closed. They're being reviewed by officials now. No decision has been made. Duck Mountain was leased this year; Western Gulf is the name of the company. And there's been an unsolicited proposal for Pike Lake. In years gone by, there's been several proposals, but they never really got off the ground for one reason or another and nothing was done.

There is a proposal being received for someone who wants to go in . . . a proponent wants to go in and build a class golf course at Pike Lake. Of course, the course at Elbow which is just in the completion stages, which is being constructed — and we discussed that one in the New Careers Corporation estimates. I see we're back on Crowns. I think it's next week on New Careers so I can give you the rest of that story next week.

Mr. Thompson: — You indicate that there's negotiations for the Battleford golf course, Mr. Minister. Was that golf course not taken over by some individual or individual group and turned back in the last couple of years?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — There were negotiations for it in the original . . . when it was put out to tender the first time around originally, and there was a group that we were going to negotiate with who we thought would be proponents, but they just didn't get the thing put together. So it was re-tendered.

I'll tell you what happened there. The original group ended up bringing in new partners after the event, after the decision had already been made. So other proponents obviously weren't real excited about this and they said, hey, if group A are now going to get together with group B, after group A's been awarded this thing, how about groups C, D, and E, they should have a chance. And that's absolutely correct.

We didn't want to be in any legal problems with it, so we said whoa, if you're changing the rules after the event here, then it's all off. And we re-tendered the whole thing, and told them everybody can bid again if they want.

Mr. Thompson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would ask you to take another look at The Battlefords Provincial Park's golf course. That golf course is one of the nicest golf courses and the most well-kept golf courses in our province. It rates in the top golf courses in the province. It's operated by conservation officers out of your department and your staff, and they do a good job. And I've talked to many people around there and they're concerned about this changing hands. They like the way it's operated and they would like to see it remain that way.

Just to get off of that topic for one second, and I would ask your officials, or whatever official wants to take this concern, Mr. Minister. Individuals who live within The Battlefords Provincial Park — there's some home owners who stay in there on a year-round basis — they pay a permit to go in there. I believe it's \$5 that they pay on their vehicle. If they go to the community of Battleford or they go any place, they rent a vehicle or their vehicle's in the garage or if they rent a motor home or if somebody wants to even go in there and visit for an hour to those individuals, they have to continually pay.

It would seem to me, Mr. Minister, and I'd ask your officials to check this out, if there isn't a better way of working with those individuals who live there on a year-round basis. They have permanent homes and they get caught in this bind of having to pay a fee every time they go in there. And this is happening right now. And I would just ask if you'd have your officials check that out for me, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, actually when they pay their lease fee, their annual lease fee for the cottage lot, they are given a permit. So they don't have to pay . . . Well it would be one permit. But, you know, if they're lucky enough to own two or three cars, I don't think we should be giving them a permit for every car. But they do get a permit with their lease so they have access in and out.

You're right that if visitors are coming in, they'd pay the daily entry fee, or they can pay the \$20 fee which gets them into 31 provincial parks 365 days of the year which, you know, is really a good deal.

Mr. Thompson: — That's beside the point, Mr. Minister. The fact is you're dealing with one vehicle. And if somebody has two vehicles or three vehicles, so be it; they pay the licence plate on all those vehicles the same as you or I do. They pay for those vehicles, they pay their taxes, they pay the gas taxes, and everything that's involved there. It's just that if they live there and they have two or three vehicles, I think . . . And it's a minor detail. I just asked if you'd just check it out with the home owners that are living there.

Could you tell me who is the owners of Western Gulf at Duck Mountain?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The shareholders of the corporation are Al Patterson and Harry Brotchie.

By the way, when we were talking about logging in national parks, I had someone call Prince Albert because my understanding is that they don't allow logging, and they confirmed at the park office there that they don't allow logging in the national park. So perhaps that's been a change of policy since the days you were logging there. But they said they don't allow logging, so I just thought I'd clarify that. It's just a minor thing.

Mr. Thompson: — And the Duck Mountain golf course, is that in the process of being privatized or is it just that they've put in a proposal?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — . . . (inaudible) . . . they're leasing it.

Mr. Thompson: — They are leasing it right now? Okay then. And there's no other golf courses then that have been turned back to your department or that are in the process of being leased out?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Just the ones I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Thompson: — Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Minister. And as I indicated, I would ask you to reconsider tendering out and putting the golf course at North Battleford into the hands of the private entrepreneurs. You got well trained conservation officers; you got well trained staff; they know what they're doing and they're doing a tremendous job of providing the public with the type of recreation that so many people enjoy. And I would just ask you to reconsider and leave that as it is.

I know that you, I don't believe, yourself want to privatize everything, but a few of the members on the other side are bent on privatizing everything we have in the province and selling it. But it's just not working. There's been cases where golf courses have been turned back, and it just doesn't work. I think wait until you make that big announcement and call the election, and then we'll let the citizens of Saskatchewan decide whether we should continue on this privatization of golf courses and public campsites and provincial parks and potash mines and SaskPower and SaskEnergy.

And I think, you know, I know the member, the Finance minister, he's not going to be running again, but most certainly he has an interest in here and he'll be watching it closely because he was the minister . . . or the member on this side of the House who was so opposed to the type of development that we're talking about, which was created by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

I can remember him standing in this House for days and debating against hundreds of millions of dollars going into parks and recreation in this province. That's what he was debating. And now that we have seen the development that we have got through potash and the revenue from potash, now he's in the House here and he's trying . . . not a Liberal any more, he's not a Liberal any more, but he's trying to get all you back-benchers and the rest of you who think that you may run again and who may have some political careers left, he's trying to destroy you guys.

I think deep down he'd like to see you all go back to the Liberal Party, because I tell you, Mr. Minister, this Minister of Finance has never changed his stripe. He's still a Liberal. He never changed. He's still the same, and he's the one who fought the type of progress that we're talking about here today. And he will not be around when the next election is called, I can assure you that. And if he is, he will not be re-elected, and he knows that.

But I say, Mr. Minister, that provincial parks, federal parks, regional parks — it's a type of recreation that we need. It's short term in Saskatchewan. We have tough winters, and we know that the citizens don't have access to those facilities for that length of time. Our summers are very short and we want to make sure that we have the best facilities, and I know that your department staff does a good job, and I would just ask you to consider that before

you lease any more of our golf courses and privatize any more of our provincial and regional parks.

(1230)

I want to now turn to the public campsites, Mr. Minister. Has there been any public campsites, new public campsites created in the last year, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I guess we're talking within the last year or so since the last time we talked about these, yes. Blackstrap, the new camp ground there, new campsite. Douglas received an expansion; and Lac des Îles, a new camp ground there, up North, Meadow Lake area.

Mr. Thompson: — Could you tell me how much money you spent on the Lac des Îles campsite, Mr. Minister, and is that campsite going to remain as it is in the department?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I've got a little problem doing that particular one because it was done by New Careers and we don't have the New Careers budget with us. But as I say, we're going to New Careers again next week and I'll have that information for you, or quicker. It will just take a phone call to find that out anyway, so I'll undertake to get it to you by Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. Thompson: — Just to clarify this — it is a public campsite and it's owned by Parks, Recreation and Culture, your department?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes.

Mr. Thompson: — So my question was just straightforward, Mr. Minister. Have you got any plans to privatize that new one, or are you going to keep it in the system?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — It's owned by the department, yes, and we've got no plans to do anything other than just operate it the way it is currently.

And I appreciate what you said about the conservation officers, by the way, because an awful lot of people take runs at those men and women, and I think they do one really fine job for the people of this province.

Mr. Thompson: — Well I fully agree with you with that, Mr. Minister. It's a tough job to have and sometimes policies are hard to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, that's right. And I fully agree with that.

Were there any public campsites turned back to the department in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — There were two, Mr. Chairman — Little Fishing and Peck Lake in the Bronson area.

Mr. Thompson: — They have been turned back to the department?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. Thompson: — And the rest, the other ones . . . I'll just give you an example of Besnard Lake, they're still under

lease to Red's Camps?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Thompson: — Little Amyot Lake, the same applies there?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, that's still being leased. I don't have the name of a person. I'll find it for you if you want to know . . . I think you know who has got that one.

Mr. Thompson: — You can ask the Minister of Education. He indicates it's a good place. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that Little Amyot Lake and that campsite and that road that was put in there was put in with Heritage Fund that came out of profits from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. That's where they came from. And you say it's a nice place, and I fully agree with you. And that's what we've got to continue to do, and you've got to stand up and start fighting for these things.

Time is running short, Mr. Minister, here today, so what I want to do, I want to ask you a question about a resource boat that your department had in Uranium City. I shouldn't really be calling it a boat because it's a large vessel. It had two large inboard-outboard motors. They were jet motors. It was a very expensive boat. Could you indicate where that boat is at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, that boat was turned over to property management corporation, to sales and salvage division, and they have subsequently disposed of it. We don't know who's got it. So either we can find out from the responsible minister and get that to you, or you could ask him in his estimates, whichever you prefer. We'll find it for you, if you like. We'll contact them.

Mr. Thompson: — Well, Mr. Minister, that was a boat that belonged to your department, and if that was turned over to property management for sale, then by all means you should have access to the information as to who it was sold to, and how much that you received from that boat, because . . . and I won't call it a boat any more. I shouldn't call it . . . it's a vessel, or it's a yacht. That vessel has been used by a private individual for the last two, three summers. I would suggest that your department not only knows where it's gone, but I think that you would have to know how much money you received for it, because surely the individual would not be using that vessel under lease, he'd have to have ownership of it.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The vessel, as I said, as is consistent with government policy, anything that is not currently being used by departments reverts to the property management corporation. They sold it by public tender, so the funds that came from the result of the sale went to property management corporation, not to us. And I don't know who won the tender, but I can undertake to find out for you if you want to know who got the tender.

Mr. Thompson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would ask you, and if you would agree, to pass that information on to me in writing. Number one, who purchased that vessel from Uranium City? That's the twin-engined jet boat that was used by your department on Lake Athabasca. It was made for a big lake. It's just a huge vessel — if it was tendered

out, and the amount of money that your department or your government — I'll phrase it that way — received for that vessel, and who was the individual that purchased that vessel? Would you provide me with that information, Mr. Minister, in writing, or when you bring your estimates back for completion?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, we'll undertake to find that information and make sure the hon. member has it just as soon as possible.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, earlier in the day I was asking you to table a document that you had quoted from, a letter from the executive director of OSAC, and you . . . what you did is you tabled one paragraph, and I want to ask you a question: what is it that you're trying to hide? Why didn't you table the entire document? You just tabled the one paragraph, the one paragraph that is rather flattering to you but doesn't address the question that I was asking about at the time.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I tabled what was quoted, and that was what I brought with me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's rather doubtful that you would only bring a part of the letter, and if you did only bring a part of the letter, it should have the whole thing available with you right here. It should only be a matter of about 20 seconds away from here. I would ask: would you please table the entire letter.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I tabled what I quoted, and he's got it and he's got the signatures. And that's what I bring, and I do that often. And I've got all kinds of little files, some with bits and pieces, some with letters, and some with hand-scratched notes.

Mr. Kowalsky: — It makes me wonder what the minister is trying to hide. I think it's important now that I do get the entire letter. If there was something that he wasn't . . . What is the reason for you not wanting to table it, Mr. Minister? It only makes sense that if you didn't have anything to hide that you would come up with the entire document as you're supposed to; bring the entire document; ask one of your officials to go get it. Give me a commitment that it'll be here in a couple of minutes, and the thing is taken care of.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I tabled what I quoted.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Minister, you know the rules of the House. You know that when you quote any article, that an article can be quoted out of context. An article can be quoted and a phrase can be quoted out of entire article that could be misrepresented . . . could misrepresent the entire tone of the entire article.

There's a good reason for this precedent, and not only in a legislature but also in courts of law, that the entire document be tabled. And in this case what you've given me is one paragraph from the letter.

It's a letter that you've received from Catherine Hanson-LaBelle and Barbara Flaten. I've got the

signatures. I would like to see the whole thing from top to bottom. Why don't you comply with the existing procedures in the House?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I tabled what I quoted, what I had lying on my desk in front of me. And I suggest to the hon. member that he contact the officials at OSAC and find out if he is actually representing them here today, if he representing their views by pursuing this line of questioning, or if in fact they may even be embarrassed by the fact, Mr. Chairman, that he's pursuing this particular issue, because my understanding from them is they don't want to get into any political wrangling or football with the New Democratic Party in this legislature. And I think they'd be a little upset that it came up on the floor of the legislature, something that was personal to me, and nothing to the hon. member.

Mr. Kowalsky: — On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — State your point of order.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if you would rule on this, Mr. Chairman. It's clear that the minister has refused to quote a document. I refer to *Beauchesne's* on page 115, item 327, which reads:

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

It goes on to indicate the reason for it, Mr. Chairman:

This restraint is similar to the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevent counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in.

Furthermore, in 327(1) . . . from 327(1) to 327(7) it reads:

When a letter, even though it may have been written originally as a private letter, becomes part of a record of a department, it becomes a public document, and if quoted by a Minister in debate, must be tabled on request.

Mr. Chairman, it wasn't I who initiated the letter into this debate, it was the minister that initiated the use of the letter into this debate.

I would ask that you make that ruling, Mr. Chairman.

(1245)

Mr. Chairman: — The point of order is well taken. The minister should produce the total document.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I'd be delighted to comply. I don't have it.

An Hon. Member: — Well, go get it.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I can't go get it because it's not in my office. As a matter of fact, I tore off the piece I wanted to quote from, discarded the rest, and . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to speak to this point of order, please.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The Chair has already ruled. There is no further point of order.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — May I call a point of order on it?

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The Chair has already ruled on it. The document the Chair received appeared to be a copy. The original document could be recopied.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it appears to me that the Government House Leader is challenging the Chair, and I wonder if that's what he's doing, because there is a process whereby he can challenge the Chair's decision. Is that what he's doing?

Mr. Chairman: — There is no challenge to the Chair. Order, order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Chairman: — State your point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder what the process is now. You've given instructions to the minister to release the letter and he's refused, and I'm wondering what your decision is now to censor the minister in terms of his lack of approving of your decision.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The Chair cannot censure the minister. I asked the minister to produce the original or a copy thereof.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, that was the original letter. I don't have a copy. If you look at it, I'm sure you'll . . . I think that was the original. Take a look at it. I'm not sure if it's a copy or an original. I thought it was the original.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The signature on the letter appears to be a copied signature, so therefore I can't say that it's the original. Order. The Chair has asked the minister to bring the document to the House. If the House isn't satisfied with that, we can report it to the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — That's what I was trying to speak to a moment ago. I thought that was the original. It turns out it's not the original that I was handed. I will find the original, and you've instructed me to get the original and bring it in here. Sure, no problem. That would satisfy the hon. member, I guess, if that's what he's asking, right?

Mr. Kowalsky: — What I want is the original letter, Mr. Chairman, and you've already ruled, and I would like to have it now. It's quite clear that if a minister comes in and

makes quotations from a letter that he ought to know, he knows the rules of the House, he should have the whole thing with him.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The minister has said that he will produce the letter as soon as he can, as soon as possible. The Chair accepts that.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I would ask the minister if he could produce it later this day.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Sure.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Now I want to take the few remaining minutes to ask the minister here some questions about the portion of his estimates that relates to forestry and reforestation. I notice here, Mr. Minister, that the amounts of money granted to forestry under your department has increased quite substantially.

Could you indicate, Mr. Minister, whether this money is intended to replace the ERDA (Economic and Regional Development Agreement) agreements that have been in place from the federal government, and whether or not the ERDA agreements are still being negotiated and still in place, or about to be in place.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — No, Mr. Chairman, that money has got nothing to do with the forest agreement at all. And yes, we are trying to renegotiate a new one, the one that we just had expired in March.

Mr. Kowalsky: — This is a rather large increase in funding under item 8 for forestry, from 3.1 to 6.8. I guess that's in millions of dollars. Could you explain, Mr. Minister, what the purpose of this funding is, and where is it going to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Basically, Mr. Chairman, this is part of our commitment to plant 50 million seedlings, which was announced a year or so ago, and in order to honour the commitment we need increased funding, and that's what it is. I think that's what the hon. member was asking — reforestation, primarily.

Mr. Kowalsky: — I'll pursue this perhaps maybe next week. My colleague from Rosemont has a couple of questions.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, just before we had the little kerfuffle about the letter, I was going to congratulate you on some of your activities as minister. Now I'm not so sure. I guess you'll have the weekend to reflect on what you said here in the House and what we will say, and what was recorded in the record, Mr. Minister.

However, Mr. Minister, I was going to congratulate you on your activities around the Athabasca Sand Dunes and the creation . . . it's my understanding that there's going to be creation of a provincial park in the sand dunes. Is that understanding correct? Are you going to create a

wilderness park to preserve the Athabasca Sand Dunes?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, no it would not be a wilderness park in the Athabasca area. Yes, I have been pursuing declaring a parkland reserve, and an announcement on the precise terms should be made in July some time with the intent of what we want to do with the area.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I can appreciate the . . . without giving away the confidentiality, if any is involved, I wonder if you could just take one or two minutes to outline why it was you made the decision to preserve, or to declare that portion of this province a parkland. And also, would the same reasoning apply to the area of the Great Sand Hills in south-western Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, and I really don't need a briefing note to handle this one, but I'll touch on a couple of points. As we well know, this is a natural ecosystem unique to, not just Saskatchewan, to this continent, the highest sand hills we have, the highest sand dunes; unique fauna, flora in the area, obviously.

Because of its fragile nature, we think that it's well worth preserving. Now I've been accused in the past of being anti-development by some organizations in this province. I'm not anti-development, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not pro-development at any cost.

And I think that by putting a parkland reserve there, we will ensure that any development which may potentially arise in the future or may be suggested in the future, will be subject to a thorough scrutiny, and certain types of activities would not be allowed to proceed.

And the second part of your question about the Great Sand Hills, yes, we're actively pursuing that and looking at it. It's not the whole sand hill area that is in question, as the hon. member knows. It's the core and one or two other parts. Yes, we're pursuing it.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, I raised the question of the sand hills precisely because of the debate that's arising now throughout the province, particularly among the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, for example, is one of the organizations; the potential for oil development that certain oil companies are pursuing, Lone Pine, etc., in that core area of the Great Sand Hills.

Do you have the power or do you have the ability to prohibit any further development by the oil companies, to declare at least a temporary moratorium on that development, through your legislative authority? And can you and will you move at all possible speed to in fact ensure that that very, very fragile ecosystem which has much in common, I may say, with the Athabasca Sand Dune area, given the fragility of the cover, that you will move with all possible haste to ensure that no further development takes place which would endanger and put in jeopardy any kind of future park?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — The responsibilities to which the hon. member refers actually fall under the jurisdiction of Department of Environment. They can declare an environmentally sensitive area or an environmental

protected area. They would have to do that. It's actually Crown land and it's under the purview of the Department of Agriculture; it's not under our control right now.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, have you made representations to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of the Environment regarding the possibility of developing that area as a park? And have they indicated to you that in fact that they are going to prohibit future oil exploration and development in that area?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Yes, but not as a park. But there have been discussions and to declare it an ecological reserve, and that conversation has taken place with the Minister of the Environment.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.