

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 20, 1978.

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT VOTE 9.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse):— Mr. Speaker, prior to our adjournment for dinner we were dealing with land use.

Land use and how we deal with one of our greatest resources is a very important and vital question. I think it is one we all have to be looking at and looking at very, very seriously. I would also like to state that I hope we don't go off half-cocked in regard to land use. I hope that we don't rush into a solution for it. The reason why I say this is we are extremely fortunate in the province of Saskatchewan in that the land use question isn't as big an issue, or as big a question, in Saskatchewan as it could be in other areas surrounding metropolitan Toronto, for example, and Montreal, some of the larger cities and some of the states in the US. I hope, because of this fortunate position we are in that we will take our time in formulating a good sound land use policy that is going to supersede any other land use policies that are now in effect in other parts of Canada and throughout North America. And that, in effect, we will come out with a land use policy that is going to be beneficial for future generations not only our generation now.

I would ask the Minister in charge to be cautious in his approach to this question and allow much dialogue and discussion to take place throughout the province of Saskatchewan before a final land use policy is implemented.

I have a couple of concerns which I would like to express in regard to the present Land Use Committee and some of its hearings that are being held throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

My first concern is that I would have liked to have seen a bit more representation on that committee by rural people, people from especially the southern part of the province where we do have vast areas of land and the use of that particular land is going to differ somewhat drastically from other segments of the province of Saskatchewan.

Secondly, my second criticism, if you want to take it as a criticism, is of the present land use hearings which have been held throughout the province. There hasn't been an ample opportunity provided for all people to participate fully in those debates that take place during that day. One day, in my mind, is not sufficient to cover all of the concerns expressed not only in the questionnaire, but also some of the fact sheets that are presented in each and every one of these hearings.

I criticize, mainly, the aspect in regard to farm size. I have had a number of my constituents, not only farmers but RM councillors, who have attended various hearings throughout the southwest part of the province and they have, in turn, expressed their concern to me that an opportunity was not available for them to debate and discuss farm size at these particular hearings. Farm size, Mr. Chairman, is going to be a very, very vital question in regard to land use policy. I am sorry, or dismayed, that not enough opportunity is given to our RM councillors and farmers in the southwest to adequately express their views and their thoughts in regard to farm size. We may have to be looking at another approach, another format, in regard to allowing this discussion. I know that in most of the areas in the southwest part of the province, the feeling that was expressed to

me, by those individuals who did attend was that another hearing would be held in those areas to allow them to discuss and talk about farm size and the effect it is going to have on a meaningful land use policy for the people of Saskatchewan.

I am just wondering if, in effect, the Minister could hopefully answer some of the concerns which I have expressed to him during the last five minutes and whether he, too, in effect, has received some type of correspondence or a feeling from the people or the members on the committee to him and to the chairman of the Land Use Committee, as to the concerns of the people in regard to not enough time available for discussion of as important an issue as farm size. I might point out before I sit down, this question has been asked by some councillors and some farmers at these hearings as to why more time is not available to the farm size question. The answer that was given by some of the individuals that were there was that it was an extremely hot issue. It was an issue that they did not wish to discuss at this time. If that is the case, that the members of the commission and the government feel that it is a hot issue and they don't want to discuss it at this time, fine and dandy, but I hope that you make the opportunity available for the similar amount of hearings to be held throughout the province of Saskatchewan, to discuss that basic question of land farm size.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concerns raised by the hon. member for Morse and I couldn't agree with him more that a project of this magnitude does call for caution and I hope he regards me as one who doesn't rush off on a tangent where angels fear to tread. We do realize that it is going to take some time and we are pursuing what we think is a cautious and careful approach.

We are trying to involve as many people and organizations as possible. On your first point, there should be more representation from rural people. May I say that when this project started we did sponsor two workshops to obtain the views of some 19 organizations in the province — 19 organizations that do have a broad base and are representative of most, if not all, groups within the province. These 19 organizations held two workshops and the guidelines which are now being discussed in the community workshops (if I might call them that) have come forth from the two previous meetings of the 19 organizations. We did encourage the 19 organizations to promote the dialogue on land use, groups like the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, SUMA and the National Farmers' Union, and so on. Both SARM and the NFU held their own set of meetings. We certainly realize that any land use policy to be effective must be endorsed for the most part by local governments because that's where the action will happen. Therefore, there are a large number of rural people who are represented in this project in many ways through their organizations such as, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers' Union, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, which has many fine members, and the like. So we think we have provided the means whereby rural people can express their views on land use through their various organizations.

Secondly, your concern that there is not ample opportunity in one day — this project has been going on now for well over two years. Therefore, any citizen has had a chance through a number of organizations, be it SARM or SUMA or the Wildlife Federation or the NFU or the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture — and who in Saskatchewan isn't at least indirectly a member of one of those organizations — Northern Municipal Council included, to provide his/her input. We do not expect to obtain all the ideas in one day but one day operation at 30 places in Saskatchewan is at least the opportunity for the citizen to speak if he hasn't already got in his two bits worth through one of the other organizations. With respect to discussion on the subject of farm size, we do

realize that this is a tough problem to wrestle with. There are people in society who feel that there should be some limitations put on farm size. The question is, what is the appropriate criterion if any are to be approved? While the subject of farm size may not always be debated in the so called plenary session of the community meetings, nevertheless there is an opportunity to discuss this subject in one of the discussion groups at the community forums. It is not an easy subject; however, one of the purposes of this whole exercise is to try to ascertain if there is a widespread public feeling that some policy that would limit farm size should be implemented, and if so, what the elements of that policy ought to be.

We can argue that there is never enough time and that is a valid concern for anyone to raise. We are now in the process of holding the community meetings which permit more citizen input, if I might state it that way, than has been available up to this point. We are not, at this time, in a position to determine what other follow-up action, if any, may be required. Perhaps after the results of the community workshops are in and compiled, the Land Use Policy Committee, which is sort of the non-government input into this project, may have a recommendation to make to the government as to further follow-up activity. I think, however, it would be unwise and premature to state at this time what further follow-up work is required until we've had a chance to assess the ideas that come forth from the community workshops and until the Land Use Policy Committee, which consists of representatives from eight organizations can offer a suggestion to the government as to what follow-up action, if any, is necessary, and if so, what it should be. I think it would be unfair really, to the Land Use Policy Committee, the group that is giving the non-government input, to suggest at this time which further follow-up action is necessary.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Mr. Chairman, I'd like to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:— I recognize the member for Morse for this question, then I'll be to you.

MR. WIEBE:— Mr. Chairman, just to finish up on my questioning and I'll be happy to allow Mr. Lane to take over from there. Let me say that I'm pleased to a point with part of the explanation which was given to me by the minister in charge. And yet, it is my understanding that about one-third of the workshops are completed. As each succeeding workshop comes along, the participation by the general public increases. It is my understanding that at a number of the first workshops that were held, there was just a handful of people there. One was as low, I understand, as 15. Some of the later ones were up 200 people attending, so people are concerned and now realize that this process is taking place. It is unfortunate that the first one-third of those hearings that did take place, took place in the western and southwestern part of the province of Saskatchewan. In my mind adequate representation was not available at those hearings by the general public — by the general public I mean the grass roots of this province. You go to the SARM convention which was held in Regina last week and many of the delegates that were there were not even aware of this process of workshops that was taking place throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I rather was astounded myself, when I found out that the president of the SARM, who is a member of this committee, only attended one of those workshop hearings that were held throughout the province of Saskatchewan up until this point in time. So one asks, what contribution is the SARM through its membership on that committee, providing to the land use question? I don't think that we should rely on a lot of our farm organizations to contribute all the input into this land use question. Their feeling on behalf of their membership is important, and I believe it's very important, but we must not forget the

grass-root input into these hearings. I am saying that not enough adequate opportunity has been provided for our grass roots to participate in these decisions. It's for this reason that I imagine that when the minister evaluates the success of these 30 odd workshops that are going to be held throughout the province, he's going to go by the results of the questionnaire that's handed out at each and every one of these. I hope sincerely that he doesn't go by this. I hope that he doesn't go by this questionnaire because really ample opportunity is not provided for those workshops during that day to discuss each and every aspect that's in these questionnaires and air it and discuss it fully. This is why I would hope that the minister will not close the door on future participation of the grass roots of this province, in dictating to this province the eventual land use policy that it will come up with.

Again, let me just reiterate that I hope that more opportunity will be made available to the grass roots in the province to participate. It's my hope that we could be looking at more than one day seminars. It's pretty difficult, for example, for someone in the southwest part of the province to attend a seminar that's going to be held up in Yorkton. You might be able to get one representative to go up, but how many of the grass roots from the Shaunavon area for example, or from the Swift Current area who may have missed the land use conference that was held in their area, and I understand the one at Shaunavon was not that well attended, partly because of not enough advertising was made available to the people in the area. And at that point in the time I think many of them didn't view the entire question as a major concern. There is a lot of concern being expressed by these people now because it's in the news, because they can read about in the paper and what's happening at other land use conferences in other parts of the province. And as I said earlier the first conferences that were held were very poorly attended. People are now realizing that they can contribute and we're getting upwards to 200 people attending many of these workshops now. I would hope that you're not shutting the door on future workshops, that you're not shutting the door on the possibilities of coming back into the southwest part of the province, coming back into the western part of the province and obtaining not only the views of our farm organizations which are very important, but much more so obtain the views of the grass roots people of the province.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the input of the hon. member concerning the attendance. First, I thought we were running a fairly extensive and adequate campaign of advertising to advise the public of the meetings. Secondly, we do rely on the organizations that have participated in this project to notify their members and encourage them to attend the community workshop. Perhaps, the early meetings were held in the harsher part of the winter when it wasn't as easy for the public at large to attend them. I am prepared to ask the committee to take account of the poor attendance in southern Saskatchewan and perhaps consider another meeting or two to ensure that no one is overlooked. We thought we had fair coverage of the meetings with meetings scheduled for Swift Current, Leader, Maple Creek, Shaunavon, Assiniboia just to list a few centres in south west Saskatchewan. I can give you a similar list for the south east. With respect to whether the responses to the questionnaire are the only thoughts recorded, that is certainly not the case. Any one who attends the workshop is free to submit his comments on any subject. I know that at one of the workshops I attended, most of the delegates there took considerable pains to see that their views were committed to paper, so that the committee and the people charged with assembling these ideas had the benefit of their thinking. I want to assure the hon. member that we are not simply running on the results of the questionnaires. The in-put and suggestions are offered in a variety of ways and we are using a number of methods to collect peoples' viewpoints — aside from the questionnaire.

Mr. Chairman, there is a gentleman who wants to see me. Could I be excused for a minute?

MR. CHAIRMAN:— Yes. If you would just wait. The minister has a gentleman who wants to see him.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— We had some indication from the minister just prior to five o'clock that the land use implementation program of the government opposite, that study program, was going to be (and I think I am quoting them properly), 'one of the greatest exercises in participatory democracy that this province has ever seen'. That's what he says. Unfortunately, his actions completely refute the words that he gave this Assembly this afternoon. Rather than it be an exercise in participatory democracy, what it is, is an attempt of the government opposite to implement its land control policies throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I am going to give some evidence to that effect. First of all, after the program started, one group has the courage to stand up and fight the government. The Qu'Appelle Valley Human Rights organization, participating in the democratic process, pouring themselves into a non-profit society, well, espoused by the members opposite, using the practice in democracy of freedom of speech and exercising their point of view — and what happens? The minister gets up in this very House in the Budget Debate and proceeds to accuse them of misrepresenting the facts. They drew the minister's ire and are very much opposed to the operations of that particular organization because they dared speak out and use their democratic rights against the minister opposite in his land use policy.

He proceeded to criticize in this House an organization that happens to disagree with the government opposite. I say to the members of this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that anybody else who opposes the land use policy of this government is going to be subject to the same intense criticism that that first organization had. I am going to suggest, as well, that like the Bayda Inquiry and other supposed public interest studies by the government opposite, the decision has already been made. That land use study with its politically pointed questions, I suggest is enforcing a philosophy or endorsing a philosophy as opposed to having an honest and sincere desire to come out with a fair and equitable land use policy.

I say to the members opposite that the Flying Creek Special Planning Commission, which is one of the first special planning areas, has already set the rules on what the land use policy of the province of Saskatchewan is going to be because I have a pamphlet put out by the Flying Creek Special Planning Commission. In that pamphlet it says that the duties of the Special Planning Commission are, first of all, to control land use in the best interest of the residents and to set up a procedure which, if it works here, may be used in principle all over the province; we are a test group. That's what the Flying Creek Special Planning area is. Let's look at what that special planning area does. If a farmer wants to put an addition to his house, he has to get a permit. If a farmer wants to renovate his barn, he has to get a permit. If a farmer wants to make any changes in his land, he has to get a permit. That is the test group. That's what it's going to be like for the rest of the province according to the pamphlet put out by the Flying Creek Special Planning Area. I say to you, that you couple that with the type of question that's being asked in the questionnaire, that in fact, the government's mind is already made up on this and it's just going to be a question of how rapidly or how slowly the government intends to implement its land use policy.

I notice, too, when we start talking about land use policy, and zoning and the use of

land, that one of the areas of philosophy set out in the land use workshop, and I am going to refer to fact sheet 2, which says one of the purposes of the land use policy is to provide a suitable system of land tenure. Now, what's that got to do with the land use policy?

AN HON. MEMBER:— Everything.

MR. LANE:— Everything. Sure it's got a lot to do with the land use policy if your intent a land use policy is control by the government of Saskatchewan. Then it has an awful lot to do with the land use policy. You know, this is just a variation and a further extension of your land grab policy and is a far cry from a land use policy for the province of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER:— What's he? The new Minister of Agriculture?

MR. LANE:— I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this particular program is going far beyond what the government is letting the public perceive it to be. In fact, that this is another area of the government attempting to control the lands of Saskatchewan and again, I use these pointed philosophical questions, as an indication.

I could go into many other areas, and I'm sure the minister has read the regulations in the Flying Creek Special Planning Area and the absolute controls that that can give. But I'm going to make a couple of suggestions. The hon. member for Morse raised a good point, that went, this program, the public hearings, was first started, that the attendance was poor. (I think the hon. member should get back out, there's time for another three or four holes before it gets dark and then he doesn't interrupt this House . . .) And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a couple of suggestions to the hon. member. First of all, I think that what you should do is commit to the public tonight, that once you have devised and set out a final form of the land use policy and the regulations to be applied thereunder, that you then go back and hold public hearings. Because there is a far cry from what you say you're going to do at the outset in broad terms and the final regulations of how you're going to implement that original purpose. You know as well as I do that the public does not get concerned until they see the particular regulation that affects their farm or their property and then there is, obviously, and I think the Qu'Appelle Valley Human Rights Association has provided that, then there is great concern on those affected by the legislation. I warned the government opposite that if they implement their land use policy under the philosophical direction that they have stated that they are going to do, that in fact, public concern is going to grow and is going to grow rapidly in this province. I think it would be incumbent upon you to commit tonight to a second round of hearings once you have finalized your regulations for the land use policy and how it's going to affect the individuals, the individual property owners of this province of ours. I'm going to ask the minister some specific questions. First, you've indicated in your remarks earlier tonight that the Land Use Committee is the non-government input into the operation, I want to know, first of all, details of the government input and those officials who are responsible. Secondly, I would like to know the names of those who did the research for the Land Use Committee in detail and their salaries and their experience.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised closer to eight or nine questions than two. I'd like to make a few brief remarks on some of the matters raised by the hon. member. First of all, I think the hon. member either fails to appreciate or blindly refuses to recognize that this government is sincere when it establishes a process for the public of this province to have input into policies that will affect them in the years

ahead. That, perhaps, is well beyond the realm of his comprehension. Perhaps, when he alludes that the decision is made on the subject that Chief Justice Bayda is now examining, I say to him that is totally false and, furthermore, I think it is unfair to Chief Justice Bayda, Dr. McCallum and Mrs. Groom and their staff, who held 70 or 80 meetings in this province to compile the views of the public and for whose report we are anxiously awaiting.

In the case of the Conservative government in Ontario, we know how they consult the public. With the case of the decision that was made to build the Darlington Nuclear Station, the Conservative government in Ontario decided that there would be no public hearings. We are prepared to consult the public.

With respect to the matters he raises about zoning, he quotes from a pamphlet as if somehow the zoning regulations of the Flying Creek Special Planning Commission were government policy. That is totally and absolutely rubbish. Those are the building regulations or the zoning regulations that the Special Planning Commission has in place just as the city of Regina has zoning regulations. If you go and buy a lot in the city of Regina, you have to apply for a permit to get a house. The zoning regulations will tell you how far you can build a house from the end of the lot, from the front of the lot, from the side of the lot. Is that regarded in any way as a threat on individual liberty and freedom? That is accepted in urban areas in this province. When governments are undertaking to spend \$30 million or \$35 million over a period of 10 years, there is no point in spending public funds on that kind of development if there isn't going to be some zoning regulations that will only allow development to occur in a rational manner.

Those regulations have not been written and handed to the Special Planning Commission to impose on any developers within the area. They have been developed and they are endorsed by the Special Planning Commission.

We, in this government, have confidence in local governments to develop building regulations which they consider appropriate for their region and we are not going to use the strong arm or the strong hand of the provincial government to force any such regulations upon them.

With respect to the question that he raised on the suitable system of land tenure, he is brandishing that about as if somehow it were the policy of the government, carved in stone and was actually in place. The recommendation that a suitable system of land tenure be part of an overall land use policy was a recommendation that came from the second workshop on land use and it was put there by 19 organizations in this province. That is where it came from and it is out there now as a discussion piece of the public. They can agree with it or they can shoot it down or they can endorse it or they can amend it. They can do what they like with it. There is no government policy carved in stone on that one. I say to him that I think the 19 organizations who wrote that idea understand some of the dilemmas with respect to land use that exist in this province and await a solution.

Coming down to the two specific questions which he raised; what is the government input into this project? The government input into this project is by way of the Interagency Coordinating Committee, which is a committee chaired by my deputy, Mr. Mitchell, which has the permanent heads of approximately 12 government departments and Crown corporations such as Agriculture and Highways and Municipal Affairs and the Power Corporation, basically those departments of the government and those Crown corporations that have a major interest in land use.

That's the internal committee of the government that provides the government input and does some of the analysis on the suggestions that come forth.

With respect to who did the research work for the Land Use Committee, the research staff for this Land Use Committee comes from a great number of government departments. They come from the research staff in Agriculture and Municipal Affairs because we did ask a number of government departments to make their input. I don't know how the Deputy Minister and the Minister of Agriculture organized that in the Department of Agriculture, for instance. They had someone do it and we don't have the names of all the staff nor their salaries because the job was given to the respective departments to do.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— I think the minister has gone a long way to proving my point. First of all, he has indicated that it is no big deal in the cities to have to go and get approval for any changes in your house and that is true. I am not at all surprised that there is that government office that is going to tell each and every farmer of this province that he is going to be faced with exactly the same problems, zoning requirements, any time he wants to add an addition to his barn or add an addition to his house. That is something which the government opposite may accept but I think they are going to have a great deal of difficulty selling that to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

We notice, as well too, that here we started the land use hearings just recently and I say to the government opposite that it is, in fact, predetermined. Because all of the research was done by 12 government departments and Crown corporations; then they went to all the officials in the government, to various staff and various officials. That is a massive undertaking that was done before we got into the public hearings and I venture to guess, before those so-called 19 organizations ever sat down to their first meeting. I think, as well, that the government's efforts were very — the government's direction was very strongly oriented to a major government control policy, as opposed to a land use policy, well before we got into any question of public hearings. I am going to ask you specifically to name me the 12 departments first of all involved. I would be surprised if you didn't have in each case a designated official from each department who is responsible for liaison. I would like to know the names of those officials. I would suggest, too, I would be surprised if you didn't have a designated research official or someone designated in each one of the departments for research for input into the Land Use Policy and I would like to have those names.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I really take exception to the suggestion that the government handed the 19 organizations such as SARM, SUMA, SFA and the Northern Municipal Council and the Wildlife Federation, an outline for a proposed land use document and that these organizations in fear and trembling knuckled under and said, we'll accept it. That is sheer and utter rubbish, if I may say so and still be within parliamentary language, Mr. Chairman.

At the first workshop the government of Saskatchewan provided to these 19 organizations a report that contained information on existing land use legislation, existing land use programs. The ideas that came forth after that point came not from the government but they came from the two representatives of the 19 organizations. Those people in those 19 organizations have a clear grip about what the real world is like. They are out there in the real world. They see problems that still need to be tackled with respect to such things as forest management. They see problems such as arise when there are improper or inadequate or an absence of zoning by-laws. They see and know of a great host of problems and they are willing and have been prepared and they have

gone out at their own expense, like the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and like the National Farmers' Union and they have held on their own dozens and dozens of regional workshops around this province. If you think this government can shove ideas down the throats of organizations like that, maybe a Tory government can but this government has no intentions of doing that. These organizations are willing to work with this government to see that they can work as partners to develop a sensible and logical land use policy. Maybe not in one year or five years but certainly in the long haul and they are prepared to work with us and they have worked with us, co-operated fully in that project.

With respect to who are the members of the Interagency Co-ordinating Committee, the departments are and these are the permanent heads in each case: Agriculture, Health, DNS, Highways, Industry and Commerce, Environment, Tourism and Renewable Resources, Sask Power Corporation, Executive Council, Occupational Health, Urban Affairs and Rural Affairs.

Now with respect to the research input, I expect that the deputy minister asked one or more persons in each department to do the research work on this. I expect in many cases there would be more than one person. We don't have the names here at our finger tips but the assignment was made I expect in all cases by the deputy minister or the general manager of the department concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Who is the deputy minister?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Mitchell.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):— I have a question to the minister. I have here a list of studies and reports commissioned by the Department of Environment since the 1st of November, 1975, some particularly probing reports; two reports commissioned, 'Birds of the Qu'Appelle', another one, 'Mammals of the Qu'Appelle'. I have particularly one here of I am sure great concern to the government entitled, 'Water, Where does it come from and Where does it Go?' I hope you found out, it comes from up there and it goes down there. You commissioned those studies and that one, for example, was \$2,798. You commissioned a study for the popular version of the Churchill River Study Report which leads one to believe that there was an unpopular version. I would like to know, firstly, if the minister will for the members here table the reports that he has commissioned by his department in this committee so that we may peruse the content therein.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, the reports about the birds and the water were information material prepared for schools and we'd be quite glad to provide that to the hon. member.

The popular version of the Qu'Appelle Study, that was a public summary and we'll provide him with a copy if there's still one available. I am not certain that we have extra copies of all these still on hand. We don't have the list here with us. Do you really want copies of them all? I ask you that because. . . .All right, we'll provide the hon. member with the copies of the reports that are still available. If there are some of them out of print, then I don't expect you would expect us to crank up the printing press to get the story about the birds and the water. We'll do the best we can on it.

March 20, 1978

MR. MCMILLAN:— I would like to say as well would you give me the assurance that you'll include in those the reports that have not been completed to date and the list that I have includes four of those, Edit and Rewrite of the and Bank Data Report, Saskatchewan Land Bank's Teaching Kit and two ground water reports for Regina and Yorkton. I'd appreciate it if you'd try and get those tabled as well, but I would like to ask you a further question, have you commissioned any studies or reports to be done by your department that will fall due, say, the 1st of January this year through the expected fiscal year? And what particular field are probing with your reports, etc.? I only have one final question here.

MR. BYERS:— For what period are you really asking?

MR. McMILLAN:— January 1, 1978 through to the end of this particular fiscal year.

MR. BYERS:— To March 31, 1978, the reports that are commissioned are not in yet. We can provide you with the reports that are outstanding for that period. At this time we can't provide you with reports that may have been commissioned in this period and aren't completed at this time, they may not be completed until after March 31. But we'll do the best we can on this for you.

MR. McMILLAN:— One final question. I would like to know if you have in the past, or if you are planning on either doing any particular research by your own department or commissioning anyone else to do research with respect to environmental impact surrounding the development of uranium resources in Saskatchewan?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, in a general sense, no. However, the hon. member should realize that any proposed project on uranium would require a complete environmental impact assessment report that goes beyond just the environment, it has to deal with the local impact as well as just the effect on the environment.

MR. McMILLAN:— Have you in conjunction with the Department of Mineral Resources encouraged them to undertake any of the overall studies so that you might have available to you the environmental information. Now, obviously Mineral Resources has been negotiating to some degree, anyway, with other concerns about the development of uranium projects in northern Saskatchewan. That has to be a concern to you people, particularly because the Bayda inquiry has not been finalized yet or at least the report hasn't been made available to the public. I would like to know if you have requested the Department of Mineral Resources to pursue an environmental impact study for any of the potential developments that they have in northern Saskatchewan; not that I expect you to be able to table them at this date, but I want to know if you have commissioned them.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, we are not requesting DMR to undertake such a study to obtain specific environmental information. There is a certain amount of information that is being gathered on an ongoing basis particularly in the north, the effect of developments on stream flows and that sort of thing.

MR. McMILLAN:— Well, I was given to understand as were other members of this House in the press gallery, that your Budget had allocated \$40 million for the development of uranium in, I assume, northern Saskatchewan; now whether that includes a refinery at Warman I don't know. We have to ask under those circumstances, while our Minister of Finance back pedalled quite rapidly on it or said yes, it was \$40 million for uranium development, the Minister of Mineral Resources said well maybe

not. Your government has allocated \$40 million this year to the development of uranium and to date you have no commission, no study or had the reports of no study available. All the evidence you could present to us, absolutely no work has been done in a final way to tell you whether or not it is even safe for you to proceed with that \$40 million worth of development. Now we can assume if you are putting in \$40 million worth of development, there is another 40 being matched by outside interests, \$80 million worth of uranium development in Saskatchewan with no conclusive reports from anyone. Now we are obviously expecting the Bayda report to come down. We have been given absolutely no indication from the members of your government that you are even going to pay it any heed and I want to know on what basis the Department of the Environment can allow the Cabinet to proceed with the \$40 million allocation to uranium development when the environmental interests haven't even been protected.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member is still understanding, trying to get a grip on the whole environmental impact assessment process. That is, if a developer whoever it be, SMDC or whoever comes forth with a specific proposal for a development, then the policy of the government is through the environment department to require that developer to undertake an environmental impact assessment that indicates how a whole range of things will be dealt with in the proposal.

I beg your pardon.

MR. McMILLAN:— Did you ask in respect for the \$40 million worth of development.

MR. BYERS:— If any development proposals come forth resulting from any expenditures in this Budget, Environment will certainly ask the proponent whoever it be, to undertake an environmental impact assessment just as the Cluff Lake people were asked to do an environmental impact assessment and it's as simple as that.

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland):— Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the hon. minister some questions regarding the Saskatoon area.

As you know, Mr. Minister, the city of Saskatoon has been looking at some long term plans in terms of the riverbank area of the city and the park that has yet to be developed and beautified and so on, and in particular someone to study the riverbank area and more particularly a Saskatoon riverbank authority. What I would like to ask you is, what discussions have taken place to date between you and officials in your department with the city of Saskatoon with regard to the River Bank Authority in Saskatoon?

MR. BYERS:— The Department of Environment has not been involved directly in discussions with the city of Saskatoon concerning this proposal. The Department of Urban Affairs has been the front department that has held discussions with the city of Saskatoon. The Department of Municipal Affairs has consulted Environment about certain matters with respect to flows and water and that kind of thing but the Department that is conducting the discussions with the city of Saskatoon is the Department of Urban Affairs.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Will you just give us some detail on the sorts of information that have been required of your department in terms of the Saskatoon River Bank Authority?

MR. BYERS:— You will appreciate that with respect to water matters we do give advice to a great number of agencies and departments when called upon to do so. The kind of

information that Environment has provided to Urban Affairs, I hope it has been passed on to the city of Saskatoon, is information related to the river regime, the river flows and how the sand bars behave. Environment has advised Urban Affairs, for example, that there should be no in-fill of the river undertaken without proper studies done and that kind of thing, information relating to the regime of the river.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— I understand, Mr. Minister, that in terms of the Wascana Authority, there is funding out of this government to the tune of 75 per cent, if I am not mistaken, 75 per cent of the total cost of the Wascana Authority. Now, if that information is within your knowledge would you please confirm that or tell me what the funding is from this government?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I think the department of the government that is dealing directly with the city of Saskatoon is the Department of Urban Affairs and I think the hon. member should make inquiries there as to any possible funding arrangement. That is a function of the Department of Urban Affairs in the government.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, just this one question. In other words you are telling me that in terms of an actual commitment for funding that that will be handled entirely through the Department of Municipal Affairs and that you have not nor will you have, through your department, any say with respect to the amount of funding that takes place in regard to the Saskatoon River Bank Authority?

MR. BYERS:— That is correct, Mr. Chairman. This department was not set up to run the government of Saskatchewan; we have a relatively small budget and we don't run a lot of programs. We do provide support to other departments but we are not intended to replace the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Municipal Affairs or other government departments.

MR. McMILLAN:— Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the minister. A problem that has been apparent in Saskatchewan and has bothered farmers for a long time — I refer the minister to section 8, subsection (1) of The Water Rights Act, which states that subject to subsection II, no person shall divert or use any surface water, and no person shall construct or cause to be constructed, any dam or other works, for the impounding of surface water unless authorized by or under this act for the regulations.

As the minister well knows, we had a problem for the last three or four years in Saskatchewan, (not so bad last year) where there has been a considerable amount of drainage being done by farmers. I brought this problem up with the Minister of Agriculture before and he said in one breath, "Well, I don't know how to deal with it", and in the next breath, he says, "it isn't my headache anyway". Now The Water Rights Act says, in the section that I just quoted you, is: "No person shall divert or use any surface water.." I would like to ask you a very simple question. Is it, or is it not illegal for people in Saskatchewan to divert surface water without authorization from your department? Is it illegal or is it not?

MR. BYERS:— Well, to give as short an answer as possible, Mr. Chairman: If an individual, or a local government, or a group such as the C & B Association, obtains authority from the Department of the Environment for such drainage, and have the works properly licensed, then they are protected from civil action. On the other hand, if they do not have their works licensed, they can be open to civil action. That's my legal interpretation.

MR. McMILLAN:— Well, one would assume that when it says, unless you have authorization, then you are in breach of the act. That is what it says here — right, unless you have authorization. We can only follow from that then, that any one who does not have authorization to divert surface water, is in breach of the act — which I believe is a summary conviction, criminal offence. You may correct me if I am wrong there. Is that not a fact?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I am told that we do have an opinion from the Attorney General's department that states, we do not have the authority to stop such diversions.

MR. McMILLAN:— Under the circumstances then, this act was obviously passed with the intention of preventing any one from diverting surface water without authorization from the department of the Environment. What you just said to me is that your act is inadequate. You cannot do that. It has been the legal opinion of the Director of Criminal Justice, probably in the Attorney General's department. Do you not feel then it should be incumbent upon the Department of the Environment to protect these land owners and down stream people who are being abused by people up stream, by amending the act so that it is workable? All right, I know that you would love to get up and tell me sure, you are in the process of doing that and you have been for two years. Your act here is undoubtedly at a fault because of wording or a legal technicality, because the spirit is there. It was brought in to prevent the unauthorized drainage of surface water, and it does not do that. Are you prepared in this Session to make the necessary amendments to this act so that it is workable?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, to explain the situation in farmers' language. The present act provides that if some one constructs an obstruction in an actual water course, then the Minister of the Environment has the authority to order the removal of that obstruction. On the other hand, if a person as a party or parties, alters a natural water course without permission and it is altered in such a way that it can't be not licensed. In that situation the Minister of Environment does not have authority to order the offender to fill in the natural water course that has been so altered. Now, that is the law, adequate or inadequate as it may be in some people's minds. However, this whole subject of water management is a very large subject. I would be quite willing to discuss it for as long as the hon. member wants to discuss it. However, that is the present law with all its inadequacies. There has been a good deal of work done to assess the adequacy of the current law to see if a different system could be developed. At this point in time the government has not made a decision on an alternate course of action.

MR. McMILLAN:— Well, I'm sure the minister is well aware that the problem with this act is not whether or not you have the authority after an offence is committed to order that an obstruction be removed or a ditch be filled in. The fact of the matter is that you have legislation here, which I assume you endorse because you didn't strike it from the books when you came into power, that states that no person shall divert or use surface water without authorization from your department. Now you know very well why that act was brought in and why that particular section of The Water Rights Act was brought in. It was to make it an offence for anyone to divert water without authorization. Now your act doesn't do that. I'm not talking about whether you have the authority to authorize someone or to force people to remove obstructions. The greatest offence here is not after the act has been committed, but in fact, when that water is initially ditched. You admit that you don't have the authority under your own act to enforce that. My question to you is, are you prepared to make a very simple change in The Water Rights Act which would make it an offence for anyone to divert water without

authorization from your department? That's a very simple request.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal in some quarters to the effect that the provincial government should not interfere in people's lives by telling them what to do, that the individual is the best judge of his own actions. It is true that now the provincial government doesn't have the authority to require everyone digging a ditch, whether it is a boy dragging a stick across the road allowance in the early spring time, or a farmer moving water from one depression on his farm to another depression with the help of machinery. The simple change which the hon. member proposes would require that anyone anywhere in the province get a permit or licence from the provincial government before he made the slightest impression in the ground to move water from point A to point B and I don't think that is the way to tackle the problem. Perhaps, the Liberal caucus wants that kind of control over farmers. I will admit there are many deficiencies in the present system, but I personally do not believe that every single farmer who wants to dig a single ditch should have to come to the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Agriculture and get a license to do it. I think that is simply the wrong way to go, given there are inadequacies in the present law. I think it would be most improper to put that kind of restriction by a government on the farmers of this province to say that before they can dig the smallest ditch they have to go to the government and get a permit. I'll have none of that.

MR. McMILLAN:— Maybe you should have some of that because you have between 500 and 600 complaints on your books from farmers in Saskatchewan now because people have dug drainage ditches and altered the course of water from one slough to the next and dumped water on their property. Now that becomes your concern then. You say you have none of it. That has been the problem in this province for the past four years. You found out your act was no good and rather than deal with the problem you just ignored it. You don't have a system in Saskatchewan for dealing with that. Talk to Sam Stands. He is the man that has the 500 complaints on his desk. People phone him and ask, can't you do something about this? My neighbor has drained 400 acres of water onto my property. He says, no, the minister won't give us the authorization because they won't make the act workable. You say you will have none of that! You have a responsibility as a government to protect the interest of individuals in Saskatchewan.

The farmers in Saskatchewan have been badly abused over the past three or four years, particularly by other farmers draining water from one slough to the next and subsequently ending up in their property. You have had that complaint not just by 500 farmers but by 500 at a time who have said, please do something about this. It is illegal for me to act in an irresponsible way with respect to your personal property and the use of my automobile and the use of anything else. I can't drive across your lawn or I am subject to prosecution. That is not new theory. Your job as a government is to protect the interest of the people in Saskatchewan. There is no problem. You are not preventing farmers from draining water from one slough to the next if you give them the authorization to do so. You have a Firearm Safety Course that you want to bring in to try and train people how to act responsibly when they use that with respect to other people; the use of a blade on a four-wheel drive tractor. People have a responsibility to act in a responsible manner. Your government has the authority to see that they do so by making it mandatory that they get authorization. What do you do instead? You say, I am sorry we can't deal with the problem.

The previous Liberal government brought in an act that tried to deal with that problem. Your government left it on the books. You found out it was unworkable and now you sit on your hands and say, no, we don't want to interfere. You know very well and the

Minister of Agriculture knows very well because he is getting complaints. You say, well some kid is going to drag a stick across the road allowance. You know very well that if you bring in an act here which makes it a restriction for people to drain water without the authorization of the Department of the Environment, that the ultimate judgment of whether or not there has been an infraction will be made by the courts not by the Department of the Environment. That is where all these legal matters end up, with your acts. The determination and interpretation is done in the courtroom not by you. If a judge or a jury or a magistrate decides that a kid dragging a stick across a road allowance has in an unlawful way altered the water flow and subsequently harmed someone down stream, then so be it, that is an infraction of the act. But until you get the courage to bring that act in, the injustice is going to continue going on in Saskatchewan as long as we have surface water collecting in sloughs.

The SARM has asked you for four or five years to come to grips with the problem, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and thousands upon thousands of individual farmers and you refused to do anything. I say one simple amendment to your act would prevent this sort of thing from happening to a very great degree in the future.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the present water law is far from adequate and there could be many changes made in it. We have been working very closely with the farm organizations over nearly the past two years, certainly the past 20 months, to try and come to grips with a different system.

The farm organizations, SARM and CND, SUMA, the SFA and the Wildlife Federation and so on, have offered suggestions for a different system of approvals. They have not, however, advanced the suggestion advanced by the hon. member, with all deference. They have not proposed that before anyone undertakes to trench or ditch that they get the approval of the Minister of the Environment. That has not been a suggestion they have come forth with.

They have proposed that one method may be the establishment of a commission based on natural water sheds. That certainly has a lot of merit. That idea certainly has a lot of merit, I think. There are, however, many, many questions to be sorted out before, I think, any government would want to endorse that approach. I think we have held very fruitful discussions with groups over the past nearly two years and to gain a better appreciation of this problem and I think there are a great many people who support the idea of introducing a different regime than presently exists for water management. There are none that I have heard of who have advanced the suggestion put forth by the hon. member for Kindersley. I ask him to be patient for yet another while, I don't know whether the government will have legislation at this session or not. All I can say, to give you the standard pat answer, is that government policy on this will be announced in due course if there is any change. We have done a lot of work on it and I don't think there is really any unanimous feeling as to what a more desirable regime ought to be.

MR. McMILLAN:— Well, one final summation, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you must be well aware that every organization in Saskatchewan that was affected by drainage of water was in favor of an act being brought in in 1965 which would make it illegal for anyone to drain water. I am well aware of the complexities of bringing in a constructive drainage program for arable lands in Saskatchewan. I am well aware of that. I have waited for two years, two and one-half years, since I came into this Legislature to hear one positive statement out of your government about the entire question and there's been nothing. Absolutely nothing. I have had a world of patience. I have suggested to you that as an interim measure to protect people from further abuse by illegal drainage

that you put some teeth in the act that is already on the books, has already been accepted by the Liberal government that brought it in and by every farm organization in Saskatchewan that was a party to it at that time, that has already been accepted by your government because you left it on the books when you assumed power in 1971 and by every farm organization that's been involved in this province since that time because they haven't asked you to remove it. Many have asked you why it isn't workable. Now all I am saying to you is, until such time as you come up with what you feel is a workable program for drainage, can you not make it illegal for people to drain or alter a ditch or a slough trench or anything to protect downstream people from the unnatural flow of water. I am telling you it's a simple thing to do.

You are well aware that your department was supposed to be doing it since 1965. I don't know where the problem came up, I don't what the Attorney General's Department says about section 8, which while it states here, "No person shall divert water without authority from your department," that that's unworkable. I don't know the legal problems there but I'll tell you it's not difficult to change them until such time as you bring in a better policy. I'm asking you for one last time will you not consider doing that to protect these farmers in the interim?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the subject has been under very serious study for at least the last two years and at this point I am not prepared to say whether legislation will be forthcoming in this session or not to cope with the matter.

MR. KATZMAN:— Getting back to the Saskatoon River Bank area. The dam that was built near the Queen Elizabeth power plant, it's a stone-filled dam, I believe, are you consulted on that and how it will change the water flow of the area? I believe it was done by the Water Supply Board.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the effects of this dam were analyzed by the Department of the Environment before it was constructed. I'm told that the Department of the Environment hired an expert in river regimes from the University of Alberta and apparently got his endorsement or at least his recommendation supporting it.

MR. KATZMAN:— Is there a study available on that?

MR. BYERS:— I believe there is some form of written report available.

MR. KATZMAN:— Would that written report also cover the intakes at the Queen Elizabeth and the Water Supply Board's intake?

MR. BYERS:— I understand that the purpose of the weir was to train or direct the water so that it would be available at both intakes from the plant.

MR. KATZMAN:— Now, the other part of the question is, did it not cause problem downstream for the city of Saskatoon's water intake? Therefore, they had to go out into the river further of that particular dam.

MR. BYERS:— I'm not aware of that offhand. I'm not aware of the adequacy of the 930 water intakes in the province of Saskatchewan. If you want a reply on that, if you'll drop me a line I'll get you the information.

MR. KATZMAN:— Going back to the proposed Saskatoon River Bank, there is a plan

that exists, that I think I saw in about 1962, that was drawn up showing the way that the river would be in-filled, for example, the old CNR and all that rubble is dumped in there with a certain idea in mind. That whole in-fill project, has that been approved by you people? And has the new fill in, for example, by Labatt's Breweries on the east side of the river been approved by your people because it's changing the flow of the water?

MR. BYERS:— The old ones were not approved by the Department of the Environment and I'm not sure about the new ones.

MR. KATZMAN:— You're saying all the in-fill then on the west side pretty well, between the Idylwyld, well almost the 19th Street steel bridge and the Avenue H corner would not have been approved, and you're not sure about the east side of the river, the Labatt's area, then? It started about a year ago.

MR. BYERS:— That's my understanding.

MR. KATZMAN:— Are you doing anything to see if they're going to be allowed to continue with the east bank fill-in, which is supposed to start at Labatt's and continue around underneath the Idylwyld Freeway and following the Saskatchewan Crescent area as it will be on the west side of the river.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member doesn't think that I know the contour of every slough in Saskatchewan. We have asked the Department of Urban Affairs and the city of Saskatoon to be cautious in any works they're proposing and to approach Environment to get all the information that is on hand or can be made available with respect to any proposals for in-fill. I don't think I can tell the hon. member any more than that. We'll share all the information that we have with them gleefully, gladly and generously.

MR. KATZMAN:— One other question. Has there been any survey done on causeways crossing that river and how they will affect the flow? Is it your department that did it or is it DNS that has been working on it?

MR. BYERS:— Well, there was a preliminary examination a few years ago on a combined roadway and weir, that information was given to both the city of Saskatoon and the Department of Highways. But it's my understanding that the city is no longer seriously considering that proposal; they're looking at another site for a bridge or something.

MR. KATZMAN:— Can I have a copy of that particular study?

MR. BYERS:— Well, the study to which the hon. member refers to was done many, many years ago to the best of my knowledge. We would be more than pleased to give you a copy.

MR. KATZMAN:— The reason I've been asking along that line is that the city is again thinking it may work further downstream because of the Diefenbaker Dam and they can't find their copy. I've been trying to get their copy, so if you wouldn't mind. Thank you.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could answer a few questions about the Poplar River Project that was halted or asked to be halted by the IJC. What information was actually withheld from the IJC that brought about the call for

the halt?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, there has been absolutely no information withheld from the International Joint Commission on matters relating to the Poplar River Plant. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation engaged a consultant to prepare a report on water quality. That report was reviewed by Environment Saskatchewan and that report was sent to the International Joint Commission shortly after the report was printed and available.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— The minister is saying it was sent after the IJC asked for a halt if it was not sent. I believe it's what the minister is saying. What information is there yet to be related to the IJC that the Minister of SPC said would follow?

MR. BYERS:— I hope the hon. member will understand that there are a number of subcommittees of the IJC Water Quality Board. They meet from time to time with SPC officials. We don't have a list of the additional information that they may have asked SPC to provide but the main reports as requested of the SPC by the IJC has been provided. Now if there is supplementary information asked for by one of the subcommittees or a number of the subcommittees asked of SPC we certainly don't have a list of all such requests but in so far as we're concerned SPC is co-operating and providing the IJC subcommittees with responses to the questions that they are asking. It's an on going process.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us what authority or what approval has the province received from the Federal Department of Environment as far as to the first phase 300 megawatt unit, the second phase, the third phase, and the fourth phase at the Poplar River Power Project? Just what authority have they up to now?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Environment has an interim license from the Federal Minister of the Environment under the International Rivers Improvement Act. The interim license is valid for five years and the license is to construct the reservoir that is deemed to be adequate for units one and two.

MR. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):— Have you actually the authority to proceed or to install the second phase of the second generator?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to the hon. member that there is no license required from the federal environment minister for phase two. The federal government is satisfied that Saskatchewan has provided all the information that is needed to allow Saskatchewan to meet its international obligations. There has been no indication whatever from either the federal environment minister or the minister of External Affairs that Saskatchewan will either abrogate or contravene our international obligations with respect to water.

MR. NELSON:— Are you speaking of phase one or phase two? Now you have authority for phase one. Are you telling me you have authority to proceed without getting any further permission on phase two?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, the license, for the reservoir applies, as I have said, to phase one and two. We have made commitments to our federal government that we will abide by any findings by the International Joint Commission concerning water apportionment or concerning water quality. We will also abide by any subsequent

findings that are made by the International Joint Commission and are agreed to by the two governments. That's where it is.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Are you saying you have full permission or not? You didn't answer my question as far as phase two. I understand you have a reservoir there. It's good for phase one and phase two. You have a generator that's going to be a 300 megawatt unit for phase one. What about phase two? Are you saying you have permission or you haven't permission?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, we do make some of our own decisions and our own laws in our own province. We have established our own approval process by way of the Bergstrom Board, if I might call it that. It has been asked to recommend to the government and to SPC on what environmental and other measures will be needed for phase two at Coronach. Secondly the Bergstrom inquiry has also been asked as one of its terms of reference to examine Saskatchewan and Canada's international obligations and whether the proposals for phase two meet the international obligations. It then follows that if the government or SPC proceeds with phase two, that it will do so on the basis of the recommendations of the Bergstrom Board of Inquiry as well as the obligations that are placed on us by the International Joint Commission in their recommendations on water apportionment and water quality and whatever those recommendations are, that are agreed to by the two governments, Canada and the United States.

MR. R.E. NELSON:— The minister is giving the longest answer for a short answer, and the answer is that he hasn't authority from the federal government at the present time to proceed with phase two and he knows right well he hasn't and he better not be saying he has unless he gets a lot of communiqués away to the International Joint Commission or there will be a lot more than just halts at that project at this time and they have already spent \$171 million, and I hope he has a lot more information at his fingertips when he is talking to the International Joint Commission and to the federal government.

I would like to ask the minister at this time, how many tests were taken on different coal samples or was it all taken on one particular group of samples at Coronach with regard to the sulphur content of the coal?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I understand that there were at least four tests taken on the coal samples. There were two tests taken on the Poplar River coal. One of the test burns was done in Canada and one in the United States. There was one test done on the Estevan coal and there was one test done on the North Dakota coal for a total of four, not one.

MR. R.E. NELSON:— The US have had many complaints of not being given particular samples of coal and that they asked for more samples in different places in the area. They say they have not been given them and I am wondering how many samples your decision not to use the scrubbers was based upon, as far as the smokestacks are concerned.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, all four tests that I referred to earlier were relevant to the decision not to use these scrubbers. The question of providing coal samples to Montana, we did make coal samples available to Montana. They asked for more, we didn't have any immediately. We intend to send them additional samples very shortly.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— It's been just under the two years since they requested it, I am

told. Would the minister tell us what the intentions as far as the sulphur removal equipment are for phases three and four of the power project?

MR. BYERS:— Would you repeat your question, please, about —

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— What is your intention as far as the technological equipment to be put on the smokestacks on phase three and phase four?

MR. BYERS:— Well, it is not possible to determine what kind of smokestacks will be on units three and four until there is a decision to build units three and four and there is no decision at this time to build units three and four.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is time that we asked the governments of both Canada and the United States to create an air quality treaty very similar to the 1909 Water Boundary Treaty which deals with water quality. Under such a treaty the governments of both countries could earnestly negotiate problems and questions such as we are presently finding at the Coronach site. Hopefully, we could discuss concerns and resolve them to the mutual satisfaction and benefit of the environment and the people of both countries. Certainly air quality is no less of importance to the well-being of our citizens than is water. It is my opinion that an air quality treaty between our two great nations is long overdue. I urge all the members to vote for the following motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:— The motion before the Assembly is moved by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg:

That this committee ask the government of Saskatchewan to immediately request the government of Canada to discuss with the government of the United States the arranging of an air quality treaty so that boundary problems on air quality could properly be discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:— I find the motion in order and debate continues on the motion.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):— Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks regarding some of the things that have been said by two members to my right.

First, I would like to touch on the Poplar River Project. I will speak to the motion, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN:— Order! I am afraid the member for Estevan is not dealing with the motion and we have to deal with this motion now. Confine your remarks to the motion, please.

MR. LARTER:— Since early in the century we have had a water pollution control under IJC between the two governments. I think this Poplar River Project has gone on too far and I am very concerned on this motion. I think it is a very legitimate motion. I was wondering if anyone has read the report of the member, Mr. Banda, for Redberry, on his trip, the same trip that I was on. I wonder if the Minister of the Environment has read his report on communication?

I believe that the slow down or the possible stop for the enlargement of the Poplar River Project is no one's fault but the Saskatchewan government and I am not sticking up for Montana. I say just exactly the way the member for Redberry reported, the lack of

communication by this government to the government of Montana brought about a situation that exists today. It didn't have to go this far. As a result of your delaying and not supplying the proper information and complete lack of communication between Cabinets, that you have now had the state of North Dakota enter into it with their Garrison project and they have thrown that in kind of as an added bonus to it, so now we have to negotiate on that, too. But this didn't have to happen.

They are not worried about the air qualities, the high qualities and the standards that the Saskatchewan and the federal government of Canada requires us to meet. They are not worried about the air qualities of the United States, the air qualities that they have to meet because our standards are higher than theirs. But what they are worried about is, as you carry this on up to 1,200 megawatts, that should they decide to go into some industry in that area of Montana in the future, and you should know this, they are worried that they will not be able to proceed with any projects of theirs in the future. Until you give them assurances of that, I don't know how you are going to convince them now, because you have already let it go too long that this is what they want on this air pollution. For this reason I can, very easily, support this.

The state of Michigan and the province of Ontario have such an agreement and it is monitored steadily. I brought this up in this House and I don't know whether you have looked at it or not. This is a very great concern of eastern Canada. We would think it wouldn't be quite as great of concern on the prairies, here, because we have wide open spaces and we haven't got the congestion in manufacturing. So it is a real concern and I could support that motion.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the hon. member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) has joined the clean air club. I advanced the proposal for an air quality treaty some months ago, some months ago, and have on several occasions and I am very pleased that he is in support of this idea. I think if an air quality treaty were entered into, the first thing that would have to be done would be to compare an inventory of every polluting power plant within a certain distance of the international borders so we could really come to grips with this question of air pollution between the two countries. On the subject which the hon. member for Estevan raises, may I say to him that when the decision was made to proceed with Coronach that both the United States and Canada agreed that the best way to resolve the matter of what standards of air pollution control equipment would be installed at Coronach, it was agreed that the issue would be worked out bilaterally and discussions were held between our technical people from Saskatchewan and Canada and Montana and the United States. Starting in March, 1975 and as a result of those discussions, it was agreed that electric precipitators would be adequate to remove the particular matter and the decision to install electric precipitators would meet all Canadian and United States standards concerning air pollution.

On the question of air, the problem has been sorted out between Montana and Saskatchewan, as agreed to by their respective national governments. We feel that the decision meets Canadian and American law and, therefore, no further action is required.

The suggestion for an air-quality treaty I think has merit and is certainly worthy of support and I see no reason why the members of the House shouldn't endorse this noble idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):— Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he has now, since unit 6 has come on stream at Boundary Dam, if it's living completely up to your expectations as far as the air pollution using the precipitators, if they are doing the job that they were intended to, in other words, up to something like 99.5 per cent removed?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the new unit at Estevan has only been in operation a very short time. We have monitored the air effects of existing units and we will continue to monitor the new one. We really don't have any hard data at this time but we think at the moment that the new unit is satisfactory.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Chairman, you know I live right on Boundary Dam about four months of every year and for the life of me I can't see the problem we got into on the Poplar River Project. I think it was hurriedly conceived. There is no doubt in my mind that we need the power by 1980. I don't think there is any doubts in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. I think they are behind the Power Corporation on this deal, but I think the whole program was conceived and put into operation very fast. I think this is what has caused concern to everybody.

I would like to know, have you used the experience of Boundary Dam? I personally — other than the residue on the ice the year that we had no run off from Boundary Dam, we had problems that year. The reports weren't all that bad. Have you used this to try to sell the people of Montana and even North Dakota — have you used this project and any information you have there in an extensive way? Have you brought them up to show them this unit, have them talk to people around there and in that way try to bridge this communication gap?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the pollution control provisions proposed for the Coronach one are certainly much higher in standard than exist on the old units at Estevan. We have made this information available on a number of occasions. The data is there for those who wish to compare it. I suppose we could have done more to disseminate the information. I think in all our communications we have endeavored to point out that pollution control equipment proposed for the Coronach one are much higher than the Estevan one and, therefore, should be satisfactory.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Chairman, this is exactly why I brought it up. I see absolutely no need for this confrontation having come about on the Coronach project. I think — it might have cost a little money to take the people that can make the decisions and tell them as it is — and I realize some of your key people have met with the key people in Montana regarding the Poplar River deal but I believe that if you had taken the Cabinet and had a couple of exchange visits, you could have solved that. Strictly that, yes sir, absolutely a communiqué. Maybe you people couldn't solve it but I think that anybody who talked any business sense could.

AN HON. MEMBER:— Now you've got a match!

MR. LARTER:— You people don't know how to do anything but confront; that is our main problem. Has your department looked into the scrubbers in some of the units that are in the Montana and North Dakota power plants? I understand they are not all that good. Have you had any reports on scrubbers?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, we certainly have looked into the scrubbers that are used in the United States and Montana. They are extremely expensive. There are all kinds of air pollution control experts in this world and I don't profess to be one of them. There is one school of thought that scrubbers are not necessary for units less than say 1,000 megawatts. That's one school of thought. They are very, very expensive to operate — both to install and to operate. We are not convinced that they are necessary.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Minister, I understand the same thing. Have you in any way tried to, with your people or with independent groups — I understand it's a method of using lime either before or after the burning. It can be done either before or after the burn from SPC officials. Have you, with an independent group or with your people, attempted to take tests off their power projects just to see how they stack up with Boundary Dam? I think it would make a good argument. As I understand it, they are not all that hot.

MR. BYERS:— Well, I think we should not overlook the fact that we are proposing to burn coal with a very low sulfur content; that the plants proposed, one and two are very, very small plants. Because of the sulphur content of the coal, because of the size of the plants and their locations, you simply cannot justify the additional expense for either installing or the operating costs, for lime scrubbers.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I think all that the government of Montana (and of course North Dakota is now in there), are doing, as I say, are trying to get a saw-off by using this Garrison Project with the federal government. All they want I think is assurances for the future and I don't think there is any doubt, by all of your reports, you are prepared to give them those assurances. I still say it is a communication gap and this was reported by myself and by your member for Redberry on that trip to Montana. This was their concern. They believed there was a communication gap between the two governments. I am not talking about what you are required to do, I am talking about when dealing with neighbors — you try to deal with them as neighbors and saw things off exactly as it should be with neighbors.

Going from there, I would like to also mention a few things the member for Kindersley was talking about. This is, and it is old hat to the minister, he has attended probably more meetings on the Souris Basin Study and has been in on more of those meetings, I certainly have to back up the member for Kindersley what he has quoted on the law on drainage. This Yellow Grass drainage and the drainage of the Creelman Flats have been going on for some time. All the answer that we have received is, if you want it stopped, you are going to have to sue your neighbor. I think that is one heck of a poor answer for a government to give. What kind of communities would have been created in this province if we had one neighbor suing another one, and they were forced to go to that level where we would have to sue in order to keep a neighbor from draining water.

(Interjection — inaudible)

Well under your laws, they said they can't. But you just will not do anything to back the laws up.

Mr. Minister, we have many people down in the bottom of the funnel, in the Estevan, Lampman, Oxbow area who have, in the case around Lampman, there are one or two farmers who have 400 acres to 500 acres under water that has come from up above. These people have been complaining for years and years. They have watched studies on that Souris Basin go on for years and years, study after study, and now we are just completing a three-year joint study by the provincial and federal governments and the

Manitoba government. How long is it going to be before the main parts of this study can be implemented? The minister made a statement to me that we won't necessarily wait until the finish of the Qu'Appelle Basin works and that the Souris Basin was the next watershed unit to come under study and under correction. I wonder if you could give us a report on that?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the Souris River Study, I think that a river basin study as has been under way on the Souris since 1975 is a sensible and logical approach to river basin planning, water management, land use and the like. I think that is a proper way to develop a management plan for a river basin. These studies are time consuming, they do require a lot of public input. I think the public in the Souris Basin have participated very well in the course of this study. The federal government and Manitoba have asked for an extension of the completion deadline to June 30 of this year and Saskatchewan is willing to accommodate their requests. At this time the remaining work to be done consists of drawing conclusions and framing recommendations based on the results of the Souris Study. These will be developed during the next few months by the study board, after which time the summary report will be finalized for presentation to the respective minister about June 30, 1978. I remind the hon. member that the report, for instance, of the Qu'Appelle basin study was a public document and for some months or several months before the federal government agreed to sign an implementation agreement with the provincial government. We do not know now what the recommendations of the Souris River Study Board will be. We will want to see those recommendations. The federal government will want to see them. I expect the Manitoba government will want to see them because they are involved in the study as well and we will want to see them. Only then can a decision be made as to whether a federal-provincial agreement along the lines of the Qu'Appelle agreement is signed to implement the works recommended. I cannot predict what the reaction of the federal government might be nor could I at this time, given the restraint program that's apparently evident rampant in Manitoba, predict what the response of that government might be to that kind of spending of public money. I simply would not want to predict what it might be. I hope that the Manitoba government and the federal government would be prepared to act expeditiously on an agreement provided the recommendations are sound.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Minister, I agree with you that you cannot implement this program until you see the entire report. I would like to ask you though, if the preliminary report shows one obvious project that has to be completed on the Souris River and I am thinking of the dredging of the funnel, the bottom of the fennel. The people living in that valley and the people along the valley that have watched the Souris all their lives, feel that this is one of the main causes and, of course, there's some disagreement by engineers from different departments on this. But I have seen it with you from the air the different blockages of trees and bridges and everything else along that river and if this becomes a very obvious recommendation by this committee, would the provincial government be prepared if Manitoba and the federal government, would you be prepared to move on that phase of the project as soon as possible, as soon as the go ahead is given?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I have seen the ravages of the Souris perhaps as many times as any members of this House. I grew up within eight miles of the Souris River and I have had long and many experiences with the Souris River basin and the people who live in it. Again, I don't want to predict what the study board will recommend with respect to channel conveyance improvement. In a 10 year program we were only

able to get approval last year for conveyance improvements in the Qu'Appelle and in the third year of the program a channel conveyance improvement program costing about \$5.25 million was finally approved. That's only the start. Then in some respect the problems begin when you get approval because in the Qu'Appelle we have run into no end of problems obtaining easements for land, rights of way and that kind of thing. It's certainly not easy to proceed with a conveyance program until easements and the like or consents are obtained. So that I don't want to prejudge the study board nor do I want to prejudge what action or when the three governments will respond. I would hope they would respond quickly and attempt to correct what may seem like obvious improvements that are needed, but we are dealing here in a league with three governments who have priorities for spending and it will depend on what the weather is like, whether we have wet years or dry years and a whole host of other factors. I think we are dealing in the realm of speculation to predict at this time what the ultimate solutions will be.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Chairman, I don't have to tell the minister the concerns of the people that have lost their hay crops and have seen their cattle herds reduced before the prices of cattle went down. The trailer courts have lost literally hundreds of thousands of dollars in the years of floods. You might ask, well, what are they doing living in the valley? This has been brought up but these people lived in the valley long before Boundary Dam was built and before the floods became a problem. They became a problem after Boundary Dam was built and this was proven the last flood we had two years ago.

Mr. Minister, I would also like to ask you, is it the intention of the Department of the Environment to do anything with the spill piles that have been there for years from the stripping of coal or is your program based at the present time just on the present coal that is being taken out?

MR. BYERS:— Well, the hon. member will be aware that one of our obligations at Coronach is to develop some guidelines that can be used for reclamation. The responsibility for approving the proposed guidelines has been given to Mr. Bergstrom and his board. We hope that from the Coronach experience we can develop regulations for reclamation that can be applied guidelines in the future. There is a problem with the old spill piles. In some cases the company may still be operating; in other cases the company may not be operating and we'll simply have to make a decision as to how much public money can be properly spent in altering the old spill piles. But essentially we're hoping that the Bergstrom Board can provide us with some guidelines that can be used for reclamation practices in the future.

MR. LARTER:— Mr. Minister, I do have to say that I think SPC can be commended for the job they're doing on the spill piles. It started a few years ago by Mr. Smart and is now being looked after by Owen Mickleborough. I think they're doing a commendable job. I think the fish and game boys are happy the wildlife is quite abundant in there and SPC is doing a good job of levelling out and replanting the spill piles.

Another question I have — of course this is built right into the price of a ton of coal now I would like to ask, possibly the Minister of SPC could maybe help me out on this, is it the intention on road rights of way (I don't think that this applies so much to SPC because they're in a new area there that's now closed off but there is a problem with farmers in that area that have land on both sides of spill piles, probably owned by the private companies where the road rights of way have been dug up now) could you possibly tell me have these road rights of way been bought up and are they the coal companies that

buy them for futurity? Can these roads be levelled off again, can there be some project to level those road rights of way out again?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I simply can't advise the hon. member if any roadways have been acquired or closed by the developers. There is a legal procedure for closing road allowances. We would have to know, I think the particular road allowance to which he refers. I am not in a position to give him any specific answers.

MR. LARTER:— If there is a problem between farms, is there a possibility that the government could look into reopening these roadways that are of no use anymore, the coal has been stripped out and all they have now is spill piles?

MR. BYERS:— I have no idea, it is not within our jurisdiction.

MR. LARTER:— One more question I would like to ask the Minister. Is your department, the Department of the Environment, are you responsible for any of the lack of drilling for oil, do you have any restrictions in the Estevan area, through that country, the Weyburn - Estevan oil fields? Do you have any restrictions right now that discourage companies from drilling for oil under the Department of the Environment?

MR. BYERS:— No, not under our department.

MR. LARTER:— Your tertiary recovery, there are no restrictions, you have not as far as you are concerned, you have not stopped anything there?

MR. BYERS:— If there are any restrictions, they would likely come under the oil and gas regulations and they are administered by the Department of Mineral Resources.

MR. R.E. NELSON:— Mr. Chairman, I was having a little difficulty hearing what your standards of reclamation are with the visiting of our newest member that crossed the floor; he makes quite a bit of noise when he is chattering and I had a little problem hearing just what standards. I believe you said there had not been a standard set as yet. Is that correct?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, there has been a task force if I may call it that, at work, since a decision to build Coronach one and that task force job is to develop guidelines for reclamation. The proposal of that task force will be considered by the Bergstrom Board and we therefore have asked the Bergstrom Board to recommend what the level or the guidelines for reclamation should be at Coronach and we hope the guidelines will be such that they could be applied at least to newly mined coal and spill piles at Estevan and other mines in the province.

MR. R.E. NELSON:— Mr. Chairman, I know the minister knows that much of the area at the Coronach coal fields is good productive farmland and I would certainly hope the plan is to bring this back into the same condition it was before or as good. I am sure he knows that Alberta, Montana and North Dakota have legislation that requires them to bring it back as good or better and certainly we believe Saskatchewan should and I would suggest, though it be expensive, that this price should be added on to power for the people of the whole province, so that one particular area wouldn't suffer over assisting to give power to the rest of the province.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Speaker, that problem has been under study now for well over three or four years. The Coronach Board of Inquiry recommended and the government accepted their recommendation that a minimum of \$1,600 per acre be spent on land

reclamation. The task force set up to develop guidelines has been asked to recommend guidelines for different levels of reclamation, levels meaning which land can be restored to agriculture, which can be set aside for wildlife, which can be used for recreation and so on. The work of the task force is, I believe, completed and the Bergstrom Board is in the process of evaluating their recommendations and will accordingly make a recommendation to the government respecting the various levels of reclamation that are feasible in the future.

That matter, I thought, was well in hand and fully understood.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— Well we certainly hope that the minister will consider bringing it back to a level as it was before the disruption began.

MR. LARTER:— I have a question of the minister. I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment if he couldn't convince the Premier and the Minister of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, if you couldn't have a complete exchange of Cabinet meetings with the State of Montana and the province of Saskatchewan and not wait for the IJC report to come down or what they are going to recommend or how long they are going to stop you, if you couldn't attempt to iron out these problems before this situation comes to a real confrontation?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the IJC was established as the mechanism to resolve trans-boundary problems between the two countries. The IJC was here long before the hon. member and I came to this House. It will likely be around long after we are gone and I think that in a federal system of government that it is the responsibility of states and provinces to co-operate to the fullest when difficult problems arise. However, in a federal system of government, which I believe in confederation, I think the appropriate way to deal with them is through External Affairs in our national government and the Secretary of State in the American federal system of government and I think it is somewhat inappropriate for us, as provincial legislators, to attempt to overhaul a system that is working fairly well and does deal with a great number of complex issues.

I hope one does not get the impression that the International Joint Commission's only job is to deal with Coronach problems, because that is certainly far from the case, far from being true; they deal with a wide range of problems between the two countries and I think are competent and do a good job.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):— Mr. Chairman, when the Department of the Environment asks somebody to make some construction changes or something because of an environment problem, who pays for that?

MR. BYERS:— The proponent, the offender.

MR. KATZMAN:— Then why would Mr. Roy Lloyd, Chief Planning Officer of the government of Saskatchewan state that any money spent by the company on construction of environment or safety would be deducted from the government of Saskatchewan's royalties that they are supposed to be paying? When then does the government suggest that they will deduct it off royalties for Cluff Lake for all environmental construction problems? I understand the royalty structure provides that any capital expenditure on a project is deductible as a write off on the royalty calculation. If you want to get into a discussion on the royalty structure, I don't know whether this is the appropriate department to do that with or not.

MR. KATZMAN:— The thinking here is that an environment requirement to a uranium company — Mr. Roy Lloyd suggests that they can deduct it from their costs, their payments of royalty — yet any other area where you go and ask them to do environmental corrections, for example, a farmer who for years has had a lagoon system and the overflow may come down the river, has to pay for the improvements to meet environment standards. Yet here on June 2, 1977 in the summary before the Bayda Commission, Mr. Roy Lloyd is saying that the government will absorb those costs indirectly through royalty deductions. Are there any other areas in which the government absorbs when you people recommend that changes are required?

MR. BYERS:— We are for example, in this Budget, providing financial assistance to such things as the relocation of extensive livestock operations along the Qu'Appelle that are to be adversely affecting water quality. There are some areas where the government does offer financial assistance.

MR. KATZMAN:— Well going with that same line of thought, let's go into the second part. The Environment Department, I assume, monitors the tailings and the pits or anything else that will be left behind when a uranium site closes down. Who is going to pay for that? Is the environment department going to be responsible or who?

MR. BYERS:— The responsibility for the matter you referred to is not entirely clear. Uranium mining does come under federal jurisdiction. May I report to the hon. member that a number of submissions to the Bayda Commission proposed that where a uranium mine is abandoned that the company should be responsible (financially responsible) for the clean-up to perpetuity. Now perhaps Judge Bayda will have a recommendation on that. We will have to await his report.

MR. KATZMAN:— Then why, when on the same hearings and on the same day again, would it be indicated that Amok would only be responsible for monitoring while they operate and they suggest that the government of Saskatchewan would be responsible from then on?

MR. BYERS:— One of the purposes of the Bayda Inquiry is to obtain some recommendations in the area to which you are referring. I don't know whether he will or not, but we are hoping that he will.

MR. KATZMAN:— Well, it is interesting that it is the government's chief planner, Mr. Roy Lloyd, that keeps indicating these things through the Bayda Commission.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, what document is the hon. member quoting from? Is it the submission of Research Planning Branch to the Bayda Commission?

MR. KATZMAN:— Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, Phase two and three, of the formal hearings, summary number three, June 22, 1977.

This is the summary of the document that was about that thick, that Mr. Lloyd presented on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan.

All through this summary and, of course, in this full document the indication is that the government of Saskatchewan will receive some benefits. Therefore, it is taking the long-term risk. I am wondering if the Environment people, where you will budget for it; what expense you expect it to be, and how many years you figure you are going to have

to monitor it? I refer only to the Cluff Lake, no other spot yet.

MR. BYERS:— Well, if there is a recommendation from the Bayda Commission that the provincial government assume responsibility for ongoing monitoring and clean-up, whatever, we will have to consider that recommendation if and when it comes to the government.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— There is a very good series of questions here. If the province is going to be saddled with the uranium industry and then when it is finished with the province and walks away we are going to have to pay for the clean-up and the problems with radio activity after the mining phase is over with, then this becomes a pretty high risk venture for the people of Saskatchewan. I don't think it is good enough for the government to say that that is a matter for negotiation or some discussion. I think there is more than one member concerned about that, in this Assembly. Who is paying for the radio activity clean-up in Uranium City referred to on page 20 of your annual report and how much is that costing?

MR. BYERS:— On the broader question of clean-up, we have asked Mr. Bayda for recommendations as to how this should be handled.

With respect to the clean-up in Uranium City, Eldorado is assuming the full financial responsibility for the clean-up of its own property. Where the monitoring of radon gas has been completed and the problem areas identified, there is a work program outlined and the province, in the case of Uranium City, is cost-sharing with the Atomic Energy Control Board on a 50-50 basis for the work that is agreed to. I believe that the amount for this year is in the order of \$325,000. That is the provincial share alone.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— It is my understanding that the costs were about \$700,000, not counting Eldorado's own property. Did you enter into any discussions with Eldorado with a view to Eldorado paying the cost for such clean-up as the removal of the contaminated material in and around the high school and the removal of some surface cover around the elementary schools?

MR. BYERS:— Yes, there were certainly discussions held with Eldorado. I draw the hon. member's attention that the source of the radon gas believed to be caused by the fill at the high school could not be blamed on Eldorado and that the fill came from other places. Therefore, the province agreed to co-operate with the policy of the federal agency to share the cost of the clean-up at the school on a 50-50 basis.

MR. LANE:— I suppose it is being simplistic but are you suggesting that the fill that was used at the school came from another source? Is the ground that radioactive or if the surface cover is disrupted, is it that radioactive that it causes the problems that it did in Uranium City?

MR. BYERS:— This is what is believed to be the source of the radon gas — the fill that was used. I personally visited the high school at Uranium City and it was necessary to excavate about 12 to 15 feet of fill from under the school.

MR. LANE:— So Eldorado is only going to pay the cost of the clean-up on its own property and not anywhere else. Are you doing any follow-up of the physical health of the individuals who could have been affected in Uranium City and if so, what follow-up and monitoring are you doing?

MR. BYERS:— With regard to the health of the workers, there is a jointly funded health study that will span three or four years under way. This study of the health of the workers and the effects and so on of workers is now in its second year, so there is follow-up work related to the health workers, ongoing. Well it's in the health of everyone not just the workers.

MR. LANE:— First of all can you indicate to me where in the Estimates is the \$300,000 plus? Secondly, how many years do you expect that payment to be made, and thirdly, what follow-up is being done of the children who attended the school, or is there any follow-up being done that came in contact with the contaminated material?

MR. BYERS:— Where is the money in the budget? It's under item 5, Water Pollution Control, under Other Expenses — the amount requested is \$481,760. How long? We are in the process of negotiating the terms of the period for which the clean-up will take place with the federal agency and that is not finalized as of today.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Well, surely you've got some time frame that you're looking at?

MR. BYERS:— Well, there's a rough estimate of five years, up to 1981 as an estimate of the time it will take to undertake the clean-up. We haven't formalized the agreement at this time with the federal government.

MR. LANE:— Well, I asked you a second question about what procedures you are using to monitor the health of the children that came into contact with the contaminated material?

MR. BYERS:— The medical survey that will go on for three or four years and is now in its second year, takes in everyone, the children and students included at Uranium City.

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— O.K. Now where are the costs for the medical survey?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the province has paid its share, whatever that is, I expect it's 50 per cent. Hereafter we expect the costs will be borne by either the Department of Labour or the Department of Health. I don't think that's worked out yet.

MR. LANE:— Surely, you must be able to indicate to me where that cost will show up in somebody's estimates. I want to know the cost, what I am trying to find out, the cost related to the radon contamination problem in Uranium City. I'm trying to find out — obviously the ramifications. . . we're looking at provincial costs at being roughly \$1.5 million, closer to \$2 million I suppose over five years, which is a 50-50 share, so we're now looking at \$4 million. We don't have those figures right here but we would be pleased to provide them to you and the department that will be administering it in the coming year.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— O.K. and could you also give me what you project how long that is to go on because I am assuming it is not a one-year monitoring that we are doing?

MR. BYERS:— Well we'll do our best to give you the information that is known at this time.

MR. KATZMAN:— Going back on the same day's statement, I also notice that you've

done an environment impact assessment on a road for the area and could we have a copy of that? Could you explain why the road is being built right now under another guise called

MR. BYERS:— Road to where?

MR. KATZMAN:— The road that will be required to take transportation and equipment up to the Cluff Lake site. You did a study in October, . . . sorry, you did information campaigns in October, 1976. It is based on an impact assessment of the road construction in the area.

MR. BYERS:— Well, first the environmental impact assessment on the road to Cluff Lake, that's been a public document for months and we would be glad to provide the hon. member with a copy of that report.

Why? That was an election commitment, New Deal '75 or '70 what to build a road to the south shore of Lake Athabasca.

MR. KATZMAN:— Why, going further into the Cluff Lake studies (and I am now moving to January 24, 1977 if you want to check it later) does it indicate that there will be no problems with radiation gas leaks into buildings and, therefore, there should be no concern? This is once again by your people's saying that they are not concerned about radiation leaks in the North at the Cluff Lake site. Could you explain why they would make a statement like that?

MR. BYERS:— Well, I think if you read that document with more care you'll find that it says that we said there should be no problems with radon gas at Cluff Lake because of the development is not situated where radon gas is known to exist or believed to exist.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.