

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 21, 1978.

EVENING SESSION

RESOLUTION NO. 8 CONTINUED

MR. CAMERON:— Mr. Speaker, I was indicating earlier what was fundamentally wrong here does not lie so much in the detail of what happened in Pelly nine or ten months ago. The more important question is what did the government do in response to what was laid before it, in terms of the proper administration of justice in the province.

When further inquiry was clearly called for and none was taken, (and it was clearly called for — no question about that), both of the report of Carol Bryant and secondly, in the report from the Attorney General's office itself. Secondly if there were no charges laid, then in that respect there may be some answers for it, because some limitation period had expired, but there was a time when charges could have been laid, and they were not. The point to be made here, the point I have made before, is, you cannot have one standard of application of the law for politicians and political parties and another for the public at large.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON:— Let me ask you seriously, had we been dealing here, (the government had) with some allegations of offence under the Fuel Petroleum Products Act, or under the Education or Health Tax Act, or under any other statute of the province, and there had been suggestions of the variety that were made here about possible offences, you can be sure that they would have been followed up with a full examination and a full inquiry and if there was prima facie evidence at the commission of an offence, charges would have been laid. What happens in these circumstances when it is so evident even beyond a prima facie way that there were breaches of the Act, the investigation was not pursued despite a full suggestion in this House repeatedly while the Bryant report was being written, that there ought to be additional investigation. Despite her indication that she couldn't get at the facts, despite the memo from the Attorney General's Department itself indicating in three instances that additional investigation would be necessary, none was undertaken. The question here is, what cynicism do you breed in the public when you act that way in respect to the matter affecting the politicians in the government and the political parties, and in quite a different way when you are dealing with ordinary members of the public and their activities with respect to the law. The question is, why was the additional investigation not undertaken? Why were no charges laid before the time limits had expired?

What the Attorney General says the reason for that is 'the Act is too sloppy'. The law is at fault — not the administration of the law. But I say, whose work is the law? Who tailored this Act? Who brought it before the House and said 'here is a good piece of legislation that the province needs', and invited members of the government to vote for it and we did? Who drafted that legislation that is so sloppy? It is the same man you can see who made the decision that the law was too sloppy to apply, that put it before the House in the first place! So I say that he stands twice censured — twice censured. In the first place, for failing as it was his duty to put before the House legislation which was not so sloppy. The moment a breach occurred you couldn't prosecute. That is one error. Secondly, not investigating further when the facts were so clearly demanding of additional investigation. What I say in all of this is, this cannot be permitted to happen. It

March 21, 1978

can't be permitted to happen because what happens in the process is it fosters contempt in society for the administration of the law itself. No man is about to respect the law or to assume its impartial application if he sees the lawmakers and the leaders when they are drawn within the confines of the law treating themselves to quite a different standard than what they would be treated to.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, the whole episode is unfortunate. It is not right, we know it is not right, every member here knows it is not right. It is purely and simply wrong. Some time or another, those responsible for the wrong, Mr. Speaker, will answer for it in some way or another.

There is one other aspect of this I want to discuss before closing my remarks, and it is this. To whom is assigned the responsibility of the Chief Electoral Officer under the law? It is the Premier. Under the law of Saskatchewan, the Chief Electoral Officer is clearly responsible to the Premier of this province. That is the law! It is he who must communicate on behalf of the Chief Electoral Officer, if you look at the law, to the Executive Council. No one else can do it. Her only avenue to the Cabinet in Saskatchewan is through the Premier. That is what the law says. Secondly, she answers to the Legislative Assembly through the Premier. That's what the law says. Thirdly, the law vests in the Premier, the responsibility for the proper functioning of the office of the Chief Electoral Officer. Those are the three responsibilities that the office of the Premier has under the law. One is to communicate to the Executive Council on behalf of the Chief Electoral Officer, secondly to answer to the Legislative Assembly for the office and the functioning of the Chief Electoral office, and thirdly, to oversee it and see to it that it is conducting its function within the purview of the law, and properly.

The additional question that arises is how has the Premier in these circumstances, met his responsibility under the law? Was it the Premier who answered the questions in the Assembly throughout this whole thing or was it the Attorney General? The answer of course as we all know it was the Attorney General. Was it the Premier who oversaw the investigation of the Chief Electoral Officer when she was making her inquiry? Was it the Premier? No it wasn't. He turned his responsibility to the Attorney General and I ask the Attorney General to show me where in law, the Premier has the power to turn aside the responsibility that is vested in him for the Chief Electoral Office.

When it was clear that an additional inquiry should be had, who took that responsibility on — the Premier or the Attorney General? Again we saw the Premier in the House turn that question to the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, at every turn at absolutely every turn, in every way from the earliest time in this whole matter, the Premier has failed to meet his responsibility under the law. He has consistently throughout this piece, turned it to the Attorney General and I ask the Attorney General to show the House where the Premier gets that kind of power when the law vests in him, the responsibility of the kind I have spoken of.

Of course the politics in that is clear to everyone. It is clear to everybody. When you get a by-election that is tainted as this one is, of course there is a political decision made not to involve the Premier in it. That may be a wise political decision but I tell you it is not a decision that is defensible in the law as long as the law vests the responsibility in the Premier for the office.

Time and again we see the application of that same principle. Whenever there's a matter that is tacky, whenever there's a matter that's difficult, it is not the Premier who takes it on it's turned over to the Attorney General. It happens time and time again. In

other circumstances that may be defensible. I say in this one it is not because it flies in the face of the law of the province and it is the Premier who should be answering for this. The question is, where is he? Where has he been in the course of this debate? He is the minister responsible for the Bryant Report; he is the minister responsible for the proper functioning of that office. He hasn't even been in on this debate. He has purposely and deliberately every step of the way, avoided his responsibility in this connection.

The resolution says that members of the Assembly ought to find contemptuous the acts of the Attorney General and the Premier and the government in not following through and investigating this matter. Mr. Speaker, I support that. Secondly, in the course of the remarks of my colleague, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, he indicated that we want either a judicial inquiry in respect of the thing or a reference to the Elections and Privileges Committee and in addition to that, we want this act referred to an all-party committee so that it can be cleaned up and so that there aren't these major loopholes left in it. Those are sensible suggestions and what we say and conclude in is that we, from this side of the House, see in this incident, shoddy behavior on behalf of the government, administration of justice which is less than proper, a Premier who has shirked his responsibility because the matter is messy, and a clear indication that the government has not functioned in its office (particularly the Attorney General) in these circumstances as it ought to have done. For that it deserves our condemnation.

HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— It is a pleasure to watch the member for Indian Head-Wolseley there write a fast speech as he rose to his feet. I'm sure he would have done as good with the second speech as he did with the first one. Mr. Speaker, I just want to spend a very few minutes talking about what's gone on here this afternoon and this evening in the debate that we've seen. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the activities of the two Liberal members across the way, they're the activists that reek of cynicism; that's where the pure politics is. Now, if you want to look at the political position of the government seeing as the members opposite want to talk about it in purely political terms. Though, had we said, yes, at the Attorney General's recommendation he overruled his department, proceeded with an investigation there would have been cries from the Conservatives, there's the NDP picking on us poor Tories again. Ah, the Liberals, you can't prosecute them. Six months is up, it's just us poor Tories you're chasing. You've got your RCMP fellows out there. I can hear the member for Nipawin saying to the press, the Attorney General is purely politically motivated in this investigation which he's put upon us. There are no grounds for it, it's pure simple politics. That would have been a charge against the government. That would have been a charge, I'm sure, as piously stated, by the member for Nipawin as it was by the member for Regina South. I listened with real interest to the member for Regina South because, I don't know, there may be one or two members sitting in the Liberal caucus who believe that someone can be in Otto Lang's office as an Executive Assistant and behave political and as high and mighty as the member for Regina South sounded. But I'll tell you there's not a soul on this side of the House who'll ever believe that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY:— You know, I was surprised that the member for Regina South was the one who spoke of incestuous relationships. I would have thought they would have left that to the member for Regina Wascana. Though, Mr. Speaker, what we saw this afternoon led off by none other than the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who talked about how we should have fair elections and he talked about gerrymander. Now how he

March 21, 1978

got that mixed up with The Elections Expenses Act, I don't know, but I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have every confidence and I am fully confident that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley knows a great deal more about gerrymandering than he does about The Elections Expenses Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY:— Mr. Speaker, those are the members of the Liberal Party opposite and I remember when they were the government of this province and they had that great unbiased electoral officer, Jack Harrington. Well, you know, Jack's trying to make a come back. He's with the Tories now and I wouldn't be surprised that in the highly unlikely event that the Conservatives ever get elected in this province he might show up again as electoral officer under a Conservative government. I don't think there was anyone who's ever served in that or a similar job who was more political than Jack Harrington. Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I don't condone that. I don't think there's any evidence of the three people who filled the office of electoral officer in this province since 1971 that they've done anything but act in a fair and impartial manner. Certainly, the members opposite can't complain about gerrymandering.

When we look at the system we have of choosing and drawing the electoral boundaries I believe it's the fairest there is in Canada. You know, I want to say to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley in some days when I look at those boundaries I envy, from the political point of view, the opportunity he had prior to 1971 to move a pole here and a pole there and jiggle a line there and turn things around. That's great from a political point of view but I don't think it's particularly good from the point of view of the electoral process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of other things talked about by the members opposite. I suppose it always gets to be a question of the pot calling the kettle black. But I listened with interest to some of the things that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley was talking about. You know he said that the purpose of the act that we introduced in 1971 that the thrust of it was to throttle financially the Liberal Party. I don't know, I don't think there's much evidence to point to that. I look at the last general election 1975, the Liberal candidates, the 61 Liberal candidates were entitled to spend \$628,343. They spent \$513,048.01. They did not expend \$115,294.99 that they could have spent. Now, that's fair enough. Perhaps the constituencies didn't have the money. Perhaps, they judged that what they needed was something other than spending money. But there's no evidence, I suggest, no evidence to support the statement by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley that the party, the Liberal Party, was throttled somehow financially in the 1975 election. If you take that, add it on to what they unexpended at the provincial level. About \$120,000, they under-expended as to what they could have in the 1975 election. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't only peculiar to the Liberal Party, it was true of the Conservative Party, it was true of the New Democratic Party. I didn't take the time to add up either the Conservative or the NDP figures but they're there and you can run down them and you can take a look at the various constituencies. Take a look at Rosetown-Elrose and every candidate there could spend \$10,000. The Liberals spent \$8,700; the NDP spent \$8,900; the Tories spent \$5,200 . . . and they won. If there's a moral there, I don't know.

AN HON. MEMBER:— No morals in the Conservative Party.

MR. COWLEY:— No, I didn't say the moral was in the Conservative Party but you could look at Shellbrook, represented by the hon. minister of northern Saskatchewan. There

you find that he spent \$7,900; the Conservatives, \$4,700; the Liberals, \$3,300. The Liberals lost that seat but I think that one could hardly argue on the basis that they only spent a third of what they could and that they were somehow constricted by the act in a financial way. Obviously, limits have to take into account changes that take place, inflation, etc. But I don't think there's any foundation for the argument that was made by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley with respect to the Election Act, that it was designed and indeed did act to constrict the Liberal Party or indeed any other party in this Legislature or outside of it in a financial way.

I noticed one other comment made (I don't recall now if it was the member for Indian Head-Wolseley or whether it was the member for Regina South) with respect to Bill Knight, who's a former member of parliament and now our Provincial Secretary. He called him a former government employee. To the best of my knowledge, unless he worked somewhere for a summer for them, he's never worked for the provincial government, either the NDP provincial government or the Liberal provincial government that preceded.

Mr. Speaker, I listened also with interest to the talk by the members over there of the federal act and how it was different and how it was much better. I want to say that I've had a chance to look at the Federal Election Act, as I've been doing some work with respect to the two federal ridings that cover my provincial seat. And that act is, I think, an attempt on the part of the federal government to control or to limit election expenditures by all political parties, to provide some reimbursement out of the public treasury, to allocate in a more or less fair manner opportunities to media, etc. I want to tell the members opposite that that act has got a lot of problems, too, I think that will be found out in this next election which will be the first one that they've operated in Canada under this particular election act with limitations. I wouldn't be surprised that they'll run into difficulties their first go around. I must say, I think we were fortunate..we did pretty well in 1975 but there weren't a lot of problems with the Election Act in 1975, which was our first shot at it with a general election.

Obviously the Sutherland and Prince Albert by-elections and the by-election in Pelly were the first, in a relatively short period of time, shots that the parties had to experiment or to try out to work with The Election Act in a real down-on-the-ground situation in a natural by-election. Certainly there were some difficulties with it but I want to point out to the members that these have been experienced in other provinces. I think if members looked at some of the new election acts that have been brought in in other provinces, they would find that they have encountered many similar problems, not identical but similar and that, in most cases, they came to the same conclusion on the first go-around with The Election Act. They haven't sort of ridden out on their white knights attempting to prosecute whomever they might be able to find right around the corner. Indeed they've taken the approach that sure there are problems; we need to look at them, look at the act again, tighten it up and go to work on it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could take a great deal more time here but I want to just sum up on this thing in this way. I think that what the public needs to realize is that the attack by the members of the Liberal Party is purely political and I think had the government operated in the opposite way, had an investigation been ordered, we'd have been having the same debate today with a couple of different actors and probably a different resolution.

MR. CAMERON:— And a few more facts.

March 21, 1978

MR. COWLEY:— Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South says a few more facts. There might be a few more facts; there might not be a few more facts. There might be an investigation and then no prosecution because there was no basis for it but I'm sure that we would have had the members of the Conservative Party standing up and saying that we were picking on them, that it was a politically motivated decision on the part of the Attorney General and that we did it because we knew our "friends", the Liberals over there, were immune to prosecution.

As I say, the government had no easy political way out. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley was obviously one of the first ones to spot that. As soon as the Attorney General made the decision that he did on the recommendation of his department, he jumped on it. I'm not surprised. That's good politics. If there's one thing the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is pretty good at, it's politics. That's why he's been in the Assembly a little longer than I have. He may even be here after I'm gone but that's what it is. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley had a group in the gallery today — perhaps it was the member for Kelsey-Tisdale, that he was more at home with than you and me — I don't know. But I think when one looks at this, when one looks at the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who partook in the great gerrymander prior to 1971 and now gets on his high horse and, you know here's the Attorney General acting in a way that is not fitting with his department. I think it's purely solely a political attack on the part of the opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate, I don't intend to support the motion.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, I'm angry. I'm angry not at the comments of the member for Biggar, but I feel disappointed and angered at the silence of all members of this House and I am not sure if you can conclude or suggest that silence is an admission of guilt. When the member for Biggar reads over the comments that he made in this Assembly tomorrow about this very serious matter and the way he very jokingly tried to pass this issue off as something non-important and as something of little consequence to members of the House and to the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to stop for one minute and also turn to the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, the accusations made against the NDP, the Liberals and Conservatives were not made by politicians and that's the part that the member for Biggar forgot to say. The accusations were made by an employee of the NDP government; the person that they appointed to have the responsibility to carry out the Elections Act in the province of Saskatchewan. That's who the accusations were made by. They were not made by the Liberal Party. Some very serious accusations have been made against the Conservative Party, not only in this report, not only in this report, but by investigations of members of the press, investigations, or comments and information received by members of the opposition as well as by members of the government, as well as by Mrs. Bryant. And the Conservative Party has chosen to remain silent. It is rather interesting that the NDP today at 2:30 wanted this brought at the very top of the order paper. They want this resolution to go away, to go away as quickly as possible, get it out of the books, get it off the order paper, take one little shot in the press. Conservatives are even more anxious.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. I think that there is one thing I have always learned in politics and that is that when you get attacked or accused of anything, you stand up and defend yourself and you do it with a considerable amount of vigor if you have some justification for the defence that you make. And to hear the silence of the

Attorney General who took the brunt of the insinuations of the Chief Electoral Officer to sit silently by when he never sits silently by, when he is always up on his feet for a issue for any minister or any member, is another thing that I think the members of the House should be cognizant of — that that silence is rather a strange one for the Attorney General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD:— It is rather strange particularly, too, when he has that responsibility for the administration of justice. It is also rather strange that the Premier is not in the Assembly tonight, nor was he here this afternoon, but he was here in question period. He is the man also (as the member for Regina South has indicated) that has the responsibility. When you talk about politics, I don't know if it is politics. This particular article in the Leader Post didn't suggest that it was politicians playing politics. It suggested . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— (inaudible)

MR. MacDONALD:— Well go and read it, Mr. Attorney General. "The Pelly by-election Controversy Makes Politicians Look Bad" and it starts off with rather a negative comment about the Attorney General. "Attorney General Roy Romanow is the Last of a Dying Breed". A quick-change artist. It goes on to comment about whether or not you are going to have . . .

MR. ROMANOW:— Who wrote the article?

MR. MacDONALD:— The article was written by a person by the name of Ed Owen. Good old Ed Owen.

It is rather interesting for the Attorney General now to point a finger at a member of the press for expressing a sentiment in an editorial.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there are a couple of issues here that go far beyond what the member for Biggar has said. There is no use me repeating the argument but I am going to say them briefly.

1. The issue here is the frustration of justice and the failure of the Attorney General and the government of Saskatchewan to pursue what are serious accusations by the Chief Electoral Officer in relation to a bill.

2. The fact that they refused even to investigate very serious allegations even after she purported evidence and admissions of guilt by political parties. The refusal to investigate. It would appear without question that there is a major cover-up and anybody that would watch this debate in the House and the response of the NDP member for Biggar knows full well that there is a cover-up and how serious it is no one will ever know.

Mr. Speaker, we might say that this was rather interesting, the figures that he used. He used the figures of the last election in relation to individual candidates. Not to the political party. We are talking about the political party here, as well as the candidates.

MR. ROMANOW:— Oh no we're not.

MR. MacDONALD:— Oh yes we are. We have a limitation of, what is it, 180,000, or is it 200,000? Well the Attorney General has started off at 125 and the financial bisectomy of the opposition in the province of Saskatchewan, you know, Mr. Speaker, that started off a few years ago and was changed after a great deal. The member for Biggar says, ‘oh yes, but there’s no problems’; all acts have problems. Do you realize that this is the third set of amendments that will be brought in to the election expenses portion of this act in three or four years? The third set of amendments and I suggest if you don’t do a proper job and appoint an independent committee or a three party committee. There’ll be amendments every time there’s a by-election and every time there’s a general election in Saskatchewan until you get a decent and an honest act.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t have any more to say. I’m disappointed in the government, I think their silence is an admission of guilt. I think that anyone who has watched this particular debate this afternoon will recognize that that is a fact. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much, and I’m going to ask every member of the Assembly to support this motion, including the backbenchers of the government who some of them, I suspect, have a semblance of honesty and justice in their make-up. It is unfortunate that the member for Biggar refused to comment on whether or not the government would give consideration to a three party committee to review any amendments to the Election Expenses Act in order to have a decent election expenses act instead of a political document created and generated by the NDP. That once again, is another admission of guilt. I think that’s very disappointing.

Mr. Speaker, once again I urge all members of the Assembly to support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 9

Malone
Wiebe
MacDonald

Penner
Cameron
Anderson

Stodalka
McMillan
Clifford

NAYS — 25

Blakeney
Thibault
Bowerman
Romanow
Messer
Byers
Kowalchuk
Robbins
Banda

Whelan
Kwasnica
Dyck
McNeill
MacAuley
Feschuk
Rolfes
Cowley

Tchorzewski
Shillington
Vickar
Skoberg
Nelson (Yktn)
Allen
Johnson
Thompson

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — ADULT MOVIES RESTRICTED UNDER THE AGE OF 18.

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview) moved, seconded by Mr. Cameron (Regina South):

That this Assembly urges the provincial government to amend Section 17 of The Theatres and Cinematographs Act so that no person may attend a restricted adult movie under the age of 18 years unless accompanied by an adult.

He said: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of remarks that I would like to make with regard to the motion that is before the House. At the present time the act allows anyone who is 16 years of age or older to attend a movie that is labelled 'restricted adult' unaccompanied by a parent. We have had, and I'm sure other members of the Assembly have had, people who have voiced concern about that. I think the very fact that a restricted adult movie is called a 'restricted adult movie' indicates that it is not the kind of movie that is intended for children. I think most will be aware that when the age is set at 16 there are many youngsters who are 15 and 14 and 13 who are able to attend movies of this sort that really ought not to be attending them. My guess is from the reaction when I gave notice of motion last week, that members of the House, generally support the idea. I'm not going to take any more time of the House right now except to encourage all members, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):— Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just address a few words on the subject. I have had some opportunity to look at it, having received a number of letters from Yorkton, in fact within the last week or so and just shortly before I received notice of the motion.

I can say categorically, Mr. Speaker, that it was never this government's intention to liberalize the laws with respect to pornography. I listened to the member's argument opposite that that has in fact, happened. I can say if it did, it happened not through any intention but through a drafting error. I have had an opportunity to review some of the sections and there are two or three sections in the act which appear to be in direct conflict with each other. I would read section 8 for you. It used to read that children under the age of 14 years shall, if not accompanied by a parent or responsible person, not be permitted to attend any exhibition or cinematography, moving picture machine. That was deleted and section 3 was added to the new act which said, no licensed person shall permit any person under the age of 16 years to attend a film classified as restricted adult; 18 years if classified as Special X.

Now as I say, these sections appear to be in conflict. I am going to ask leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate on this and I want an opportunity to further study this legislation. I'm getting some stage calls here.

The advice that I am getting from all of those who are around . . . The advice that I am getting, Mr. Speaker, is to the effect that this government never intended to liberalize the laws with regard to pornography. We passed an act which we thought would assist the theatre owners. We thought it would assist them in controlling young people's attendance. Apparently that was the view of the opposition because they all voted for the bill, so we assumed that that was their intention as well.

It is being urged upon me and perhaps it makes sense, Mr. Speaker, that since the motion reflects government opinion that we are not going to liberalize the laws with respect to pornography and since that appears to be the unanimous view of the House, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it would be just as well to let the motion pass. We will in all

March 21, 1978

likelihood, be introducing legislation to clean up the act if necessary. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Assembly to vote in favor of the motion.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — ENVIRONMENT — VOTE 9 (continued)

ITEM 1

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— I asked the Chairman last night if his officials would be able to supply me with the cost of the monitoring and follow-up of, for example, the children at the school in Uranium City that were associated with that radon problem.

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of the Environment):— Mr. Chairman, there is a study being undertaken by a Dr. Band from the Montreal Institute of Cancer. He is doing survey work, among other things the early detection of lung cancer. This survey work, I understand is being done at Uranium City and is being done, the tests are being conducted, the survey work is being done on the school children. He is also attempting to determine the role that radiation exposure has towards cancer. The cost of this survey work in 1977-78 will be \$81,700 and the costs will be shared as follows: the Atomic Energy Control Board \$33,000, Saskatchewan \$48,600 and the Saskatchewan portion is paid from the appropriation of the Departments of Health and Labor. For 1978-80 the estimated cost of this study by Dr. Band will be \$94,000 with the costs being shared as follows: the Atomic Energy Control Board \$39,000, Saskatchewan \$55,000 and the funds for the Saskatchewan share in the Budget for this fiscal year 1978-79 are in the department budget of the Department of Labor.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— That's the only study being done, is it?

MR. BYERS:— In addition, the monitoring of radon levels at Uranium City is continuing. The cost of that has not been separated out because it's all part of the total clean-up program.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Now, was there a radon problem anywhere other than Uranium City?

MR. BYERS:— Tests have been taken on radon gas levels at a number of northern communities. I have seen the table of the locations where the radon gas levels were high. At Camsell Portage it runs in my mind there were two or three buildings where the radon levels you would say are high. At Fond-du-Lac, I think there was one and there was one other northern community where surprisingly enough the radon levels were exceedingly high at the RCMP barracks. I forget which northern community it was but roughly about three what one could term as high radon gas levels were detected.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Would you supply the names of those communities to us?

MR. BYERS:— Yes, in due course we can give you the names of the communities and the number of buildings where the levels were high. One was an RCMP barracks and the other was a rectory and in another community was two or three houses.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— O.K. Now what was the source of the radon gas emissions, have you determined that in all cases?

MR. BYERS:— I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, that the source of the radon gas has been precisely identified in these centres.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Are there any studies being done to determine the source?

MR. BYERS:— In the course of monitoring, this monitoring program has been underway for two or three years now, the first round of tests were taken and they found elevated or high readings in certain buildings in Uranium City, in Camsell Portage and Fond-du-Lac and so on and what is really happening now is that further testing is underway to confirm whether the initial readings which were high are accurate. Keep in mind the Atomic Energy Control Board, I believe it is, has obtained much more sophisticated equipment for monitoring than they had when the radon gas problem broke out. So that it's a matter of first identifying the areas and the buildings where the high readings were. Now with better equipment they're going back to check their initial readings and that's really the state of the test.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— When are they expected to have that new review done?

MR. BYERS:— We are not certain at this time how long this testing program will go on. My officials will be meeting with the Atomic Energy Control Board officials and the other federal regulatory agencies within the next couple of weeks to come to more specific terms with respect to the monitoring program, and the length of testing, and that sort of thing. This is not all finalized right at this time.

MR. LANE:— In the course of the review in the testing, have your officials or the Atomic Energy Control Board discovered or found other areas of high radio-activity from sources other than say radon gas?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, the other kind of radiation would be the gamma rays, and I am advised that in the testing to date, there has been no indication of gamma rays present that would be harmful to buildings or to human settlements.

MR. LANE:— O.K. Has your review been done in any areas outside the settled areas in Saskatchewan?

MR. BYERS:— May I report to the House and to the hon. member that the policy of the federal agencies is now that where a new site is proposed or could be proposed, then there is a requirement that testing be done in advance of any work.

MR. LANE:— How long has that policy been in effect and what areas of Saskatchewan have been covered under that policy?

MR. BYERS:— This policy has been in effect for about one year. I understand that any proposed permanent structures, for instance at Cluff Lake, have been examined and tested in advance.

MR. LANE:— Well, have you got the results of that examination?

MR. BYERS:— I am not sure off-hand if we do have them. We can find out if we have them. More than likely those results would be contained in the companies' environmental impact assessment report.

MR. LANE:— O.K. Now, did the government give this information to the Bayda Inquiry

March 21, 1978

on the problems at Uranium City the radon gas radioactivity, other areas that have been covered?

MR. BYERS:— This question was certainly discussed in general terms with the members of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry. Off-hand, we do not know whether the Bayda Inquiry requested this information or not. Certainly if they had, it would have been available and provided to them. We do not have a list of all the information they asked for, nor what was provided. The terms of reference were very broad. It was certainly within their power to get this information if they wanted it.

MR. LANE:— Are you saying that you didn't volunteer the information to the Bayda Inquiry and are you saying that if you had a situation where there's radio-active radon gas emissions that, in fact, you wouldn't volunteer that information to the Bayda Inquiry and that they would have to ask for it?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, the question of the radon gas problem was discussed in general terms by our officials with the Bayda Inquiry and I also understand it was discussed with them by the Atomic Energy Control Board. The data is available if the Bayda Inquiry members want it. They have all the powers under The Public Inquiries Act and I think we can leave to Justice Bayda and his group whether they want this information — it's certainly there for them to get if they want it. And whether they've got it or not, I can't tell you offhand.

MR. LANE:— Well, I think that's a rather slipshod approach to a potentially very, very serious problem. According to your annual report in 1976, remedial action was proposed — this is on page 20 on the radiation clean-up in Uranium City. It refers in detail to the removal of some surface cover around elementary schools and various other items. You've now embarked upon a program to clean up the radiation around Uranium City, that's running at approximately in government costs of roughly \$350,000 a year over the next few years. You have a Dr. Band of the Montreal Cancer Institute studying over the next couple of years at a cost of approximately slightly under \$100,00 a year total cost to look at the question of the early detection of lung cancer. And yet with the Bayda Inquiry, you seem to be sitting on the information and if Judge Bayda happens to ask for anything to deal with radio-activity well, he's got the same powers as an inquiry and he can ask for the information. I say it's incumbent upon the government when it has that type of information to volunteer it to the Bayda Inquiry and not wait for the Bayda Inquiry to ask for it. You know the briefs that were presented to the Bayda Inquiry, some of them were, as you well know, very, very technical in nature. I find it difficult that the Bayda Inquiry would be expected to look for every type of problem that came along and here you are seemingly sitting on some pretty serious information of a potentially very serious problem and you're waiting for them to ask for the information. I say that these questions of the radio activity, the radon gas problems in Uranium City have been handled in a slipshod manner and I urge that the government give that information and any facts it has in any interim reports from Dr. Band to the Bayda Inquiry immediately.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is about two years late on this because it wasn't in the 1978 session; it wasn't in the 1977 session; it was in the 1976 session. And you have reports for 1977, which is a little while ago. It was during the course of the 1976 session that the radon gas problem emerged in this province. Our provincial government acted expeditiously, acted at once. We got our Department of Labour people and we got our Health people and we provided the best expertise that we could get from this government. We contacted the federal government and we got

the Uranium City instantly and the people of Uranium City understand and they appreciate that it was this provincial government, the New Democratic Party government that came to their aid. We had some initial problems in developing the interest of the federal government. I remember which caucus the hon. member was sitting in at that time and I don't remember him giving as much help to spur on the federal government at that time, but be that as it may, we did mobilize and we were able to interest the federal government and the federal regulatory bodies in the problem at Uranium City. We have, in the last two years, worked very, very closely with the people of Uranium City, with Eldorado, with the Atomic Energy Control Board and with all the federal agencies. We have made available our best brains, from virtually every department of the government. We have agreed to cost share in the monitoring. We've provided our equipment. We've provided our staff and we are now prepared to share in the cost of the clean-up and we have been doing that for well over two years. This problem was identified first in Uranium City, in 1976. I want to tell the hon. member that I was in Uranium City myself and I saw where they had excavated up to 14 to 16 feet of fill from under the high school. Unfortunately, just after that, the school burned down. I've visited the homes. I've seen the ventilating equipment. I've spent time in Uranium City with the Atomic Energy Control people. We put a full-time co-ordinator in there, Mr. Dodds, as a liaison man, to work with the local governments, the local people and all the government agencies.

The hon. member tries to make the point that somehow there are some queer numbers here that are hidden away in the back rooms or the shelves somewhere in the government and that we're hiding this from Judge Bayda. That is totally and absolutely false. This data has been available for well over two years. The first data was compiled in 1976. I said to the hon. member that even the Atomic Energy Control Board people realize that their system of measurements is not all that precise, that their equipment was, perhaps, not the most sophisticated it might be, that they have put better equipment and more trained people in there and they are now evaluating and testing the numbers that came out of the first survey. These numbers are all available. They've been available to the council, to the mining companies and to anyone who wants them. But for him to suggest somehow that this government's hiding information, keeping back information from a committee set up under The Public Inquiries Act is contemptible. I say that the information is there and Judge Bayda is quite competent of asking for that information which he wants and he has the assurance that he'll have the full co-operation of this government to provide it.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— I think perhaps the hon. member got a little too close to the radon gas and it perhaps affected his hearing a little because . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:— Order. I'll allow this as your final one and then we will ask another question in place of that.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— I asked you a series of questions tonight that perhaps you weren't listening too closely to. I was asking you about surveys, about monitoring the health of children that were in the schools and you indicated that there was a study done by Dr. Band not in 1976 for some reason you went back to. It's going on now. It's going on next year, according to your own words. I ask you about the matter of the Atomic Energy Control Board doing its studies now — not 1976, and I ask you why, when you have information like this, why — whether or not that was given to the Bayda Inquiry. What you said was that the Bayda Inquiry has the same powers as a public inquiry and they could get that information. Sure they could and I say to you that the duty does not lie

March 21, 1978

upon Bayda in such a situation when you have the information. I specifically said, in any interim studies or interim reports of Dr. Band, that you have a duty to give this, gratuitously, to the Bayda Inquiry. I think that the minister cannot deny that there is, and I say cautiously, a potential problem that's a matter that's being researched by an expert that the government is paying at least part of the cost and surely you have a duty to make sure that that is given voluntarily to Bayda and not to sit back and wait and hope that Bayda can decide to ask you for it or hope that Bayda does not decide to ask you for it.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the surveys for the public and for the children, there was a public health survey undertaken prior to 1976. I believe it was a general survey; it was undertaken I believe by some people from the University of Alberta and some from Colorado. There have been no end of surveys undertaken of the children and the workers at Uranium City. I think one of the best tests of whether or not the people affected, the ill, that there have been adequate tests and surveys taken, would be the people in Uranium City themselves; and in the course of the two or more public meetings that I have attended with them when this and other matters were discussed, I got the general impression that the people of that community in particular were satisfied that adequate surveys and adequate precautions were being taken by the appropriate government officials.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):— Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a few questions about the Churchill River Development and the Churchill River Study that is I understand ongoing. I may be under the wrong impression, Mr. Minister, correct me please if I am wrong, but my understanding is that SPC and of course your department becomes involved through the environmental protection provisions of your jurisdiction. Has the choice of building a dam either on the Churchill River or in the alternative at or near Nipawin and that the choice now facing the government is at which location they are going to locate this power plant? I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would confirm whether that statement is correct?

MR. BYERS:— Well, I will attempt to give the hon. member as short an answer as possible.

We know that SPC will need additional generating capacity, that at present there are three possible locations for the next unit: one of them is the Churchill; one is Coronach; the other is Nipawin. All three locations are currently being examined by boards of inquiries set up by this government. The one board of inquiry is to report the middle of June and the Churchill Board of Inquiry is to report the end of June and the government will then have the recommendations of both boards of inquiry and be able to make a decision.

MR. MALONE:— I am correct then in my assessment, except that I didn't mention Poplar, that there are three options open — expanding the Poplar River Project, building on the Churchill River or building in Nipawin to meet immediate future needs; I am not suggesting for the next 200 years but for the immediate future. Is that correct?

MR. BYERS:— Those are three options open to the government, to the Power Corporation and all three options are currently being considered by two boards of inquiry.

MR. MALONE:— Now is there any persuasive reason that the government has to favor one option over another due to economy or due to easier service being provided or

easier construction technique? Does this enter into it at all?

MR. BYERS:— Well, I think the economics of any particular proposed site could be .. that information could best be provided to you by the SPC.

MR. MALONE:— A further question then, restricting it to your department, do you have any particular preference? Are you just waiting for the inquiries to come in with the reports and then make your recommendation? Are you in a position now where you prefer one over the other?

MR. BYERS:— No, I am waiting for the advice of the people on the boards of inquiry who have been asked to make their recommendations.

MR. MALONE:— I haven't attended any of the inquiry meetings and all I really know about them is what I read in the press and the few letters that I receive from interested parties. I think one thing that has become abundantly clear over the past few months is that there is a concerted appropriate opposition by interest parties to the Churchill River Development as I can't think of one organization that is based in the North that has agreed with this particular development. The FSI has opposed it; the Metis Association has opposed it; resident in the Prince Albert area and in that northern area have all opposed it; environmentalists from all across the country have opposed it; canoeists write me every day and they oppose it. I suspect the only people who are in favor of it are probably the construction industry and maybe one or two others. I think the construction industry could probably care less which development went on.

Now you take the Poplar River situation — here we have a government that's probably the only provincial government in history that could get itself into an international crisis by its actions in that area. But again we have problems there with the expansion of Poplar River. The Americans have expressed their concerns to Ottawa, to perhaps your department directly. Whether those concerns are justified or not, they are concerns and the people in that area immediately to the South, in Montana, are very upset about the possible expansion of that project.

There is one particular project that hasn't been opposed, that indeed has been welcomed according to the press reports that I read and that's the location of the power plant or the dam at Nipawin. I have all sorts of press clippings that I am sure the minister is familiar with, where town councillors from Nipawin, the business community, the people in the surrounding area, people that are interested in park development and so on have been urging the government to build a dam in Nipawin.

Now I ask the minister, bearing all of this in mind, the opposition to the Churchill River, the opposition to Poplar and the proponents of the dam going ahead at the Nipawin site or near Nipawin, why is it necessary to continue with all of these inquiries? I don't think there has been a government in the history of this province or perhaps in any other province that's had so many inquiries as your government. I must say that I regard these inquiries with some suspicion because I am not sure whether your government has any intention whatsoever to follow their advice or not and I have already indicated to you my suspicions about what they intend to do with Bayda. But here is a situation where the people in the Nipawin area have no objection whatsoever to the plant being located there. Indeed they have urged the government, through their brief, to locate the plant there. For the other two areas that are in question, we have overwhelming opposition by interested parties to those two areas. Why is it necessary to prolong this? Now you have indicated that your department or you personally really have no preference one way or

March 21, 1978

the other. It may well be that when Mr. Messer's department comes up before Crown Corporations we will find that he does have a preference for economic reasons. That aside, why don't you get ahead and go on with the job, make up your mind and locate the dam at Nipawin?

I must say, before I take my chair, I am surprised the member for Nipawin hasn't been urging this on you in this House. I would have thought that he would be in closer contact with his constituents and would be in a position to argue the case on their behalf.

So that's my question, Mr. Minister, why don't we get on with the job and build the dam at Nipawin?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting that the hon. member says we are holding studies and the Board of Inquiry is holding meetings on the proposal for the Churchill and that it appears that no one is for it or not very many are for it and many groups have publicly stated their opposition to it. Therefore, let's turn the question around to the hon. member and say, "How would the public register its opposition other than through the inquiry process?" That is certainly one of the fundamental reasons for setting up a board of inquiry so that the public can be made aware of the power needs of the province and become aware of what the options are and if they have strong biases for or against a particular project a board of inquiry is the main public vehicle through which their viewpoints can be made known.

We are, I think, out in front in this province as far as the rest of Canada is concerned with the inquiry process. First of all we did require, in the case of Churchill, Nipawin and Coronach, that the proponent do a full-scale environmental impact assessment of the proposed project. Secondly, the proposal was public for some time before the Board of Inquiry was established so that when the public came to the Board of Inquiry they could comment intelligently on the proposal. It is true that we have had a number of inquiries, a good number of inquiries. I think we must realize that according to the policy we are following whereby major projects will be scrutinized by the public before the green light is given, that that is the era in which we live. I don't think today that society would let us build the Gardiner Dam again without environmental impact assessment. I doubt if the public would allow any government to build the Boundary Dam at Estevan without an assessment and public hearings. Perhaps, I misjudge the public mood on these matters but I think that in this province particularly that governments are simply faced with the proposition that before major development proceed they will be subject to public scrutiny and whether or not they like it I think that's the era in which we live and I think governments have to respond to the citizens, wishes in that respect.

MR. MALONE:— A few more questions, Mr. Chairman, I concede a debating to point to you and perhaps the inquiries were necessary. O.K. We've had the inquiries. I believe this is the second inquiry, is it not on the Churchill River? Is it not a second inquiry? Alright, it's a first inquiry, but it seems to have been going for years. That's why I say maybe it's the second inquiry but now is it now sort of abundantly clear to you, I'm sure that you're monitoring inquiries that there seems to be this overwhelming objection, at least at Churchill some concern is expressed by our American neighbours to further expansion at Poplar River, justified or not, I don't know, but again, I can't find in the press clippings that I've been looking at and the reports that I've had any real concerted opposition to the dam being located at Nipawin. Indeed, I think of all three of the choices, has the Nipawin project been welcomed warmly, encouraged to go ahead and I really don't see if your earlier comment about it really doesn't matter where the power

plant is located why it's not abundantly clear to the government to get these reports finished off, make up your mind and get on with the job at building at Nipawin. And I think it's best expressed probably, by a quote in one of the clippings I have in front of me, and I quote this from the P.A. Daily Herald. Frank Thompkins, representative for the Association of Metis and Non Status Indians of Saskatchewan said, "If there is not opposition to locating in Nipawin then what in the hell are we doing with an inquiry here to put a dam where there is a lot of opposition," referring to the Churchill River Inquiry. That sums it up pretty well, in my view, and I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if you can give me some additional information which would lead me to believe there are further problems when there apparently aren't further problems.

MR. BYERS:— Well, there are. . .the benefit I think of the inquiry is that the inquiry is really looking at the impact assessment recommendations whichever project you're talking about, Coronach II, or Nipawin or Churchill and that identifies those things that must be done in connection with the construction of the plant, if and when the plant is built. These are matters that were previously not considered in any great depth, if considered at all. It's all very nice to say we should barrel ahead and build the plant at Nipawin without an environmental impact assessment but I think no one argued against the Squaw Rapids Dam and we know that that was essential for instance, for our power needs and, therefore, built about 1960. However, if you've ever spent a day within a long shot of the Squaw Rapids Dam you will very well know that there are all kinds of problems there with respect to timber and the like, that may or may not have been adequately considered before that project was put in with all respect to the people who were making those decisions at the time the Squaw Rapids Plant was built. There are many factors to be considered in constructing any plant, factors that hitherto have been overlooked and therefore, one of the benefits of the assessment and the inquiry process is to attempt to minimize these after effects that can show up if proper procedures are not built into the project from the start.

MR. MALONE:— I take it from your remarks what you're going to be looking in determining the final decision is really environmental impact and that is first and foremost in your mind as to where the project should be located. And the secondary consideration is the wishes of the people who are going to be affected. If you just consider what you said to me I think that is the logical conclusion that we can draw. Let me ask you in conclusion, can you give me what the cost of these inquiries has been to date (approximately, I don't expect the exact figures) and the anticipated cost until they are wound up?

AN HON. MEMBER:— Not a ten-minute speech, just the figures.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, I will provide the hon. member with the costs of these boards. Keep in mind that the Churchill Board has not completed its work so this is our estimated costs: Churchill River Board of Inquiry, \$132,410; the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, \$241,940. No, sorry. O.K. These are the total costs. Will you strike those from the record please. The total estimated cost of the three inquiries is as follows: Churchill River Board of Inquiry, \$265,800; Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, \$412,000; Poplar River No. 2, and the Nipawin Inquiry, \$113,000. Those are the estimated costs of the actual boards of inquiry. They do not include the costs of the Environmental Impact Assessment Reports. You will recall that the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the proposed Churchill project was a federal-provincial undertaking at an estimated cost of \$2.5 million. We do not have here at our fingertips, the costs for instance, of the environmental impact assessment reports by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation of Coronach Number 2 and Nipawin and so on, so those are not included.

March 21, 1978

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a series of questions to the minister regarding the Cluff Lake Inquiry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Saskatoon Environmental Society has suggested that this particular inquiry creates a false impression and the reason that they give is that in the inquiry there are some, according to them, there are some five phases that deal specifically with the Amok proposal and there is indeed only one phase which deals with the broader issues of the environmental impact. The society has asked that in order to correct this false impression that a number of things . . . they ask for a number of things. One of the specific things that they ask about is that the inquiry be extended to cover the whole area of reactor safety.

What, Mr. Minister, has been done in terms of looking into the matter of reactor safety; what kind of studies have been done; what have you found out? Do you have any information which can be passed on to people who are concerned about this matter?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Board of Inquiry has looked at a number of these issues like reactor safety. One could make a long list about waste disposal and all that. We are not building any reactors in Saskatchewan so that is not an immediate problem. However, the board's mandate is broad enough that it can make recommendations to the government on a great range of these issues if it wants to.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the minister, are you saying that there have been no inquiries made by your department in this regard whatsoever. You are leaving it entirely up to the board of inquiry? Are you saying that there have been no inquiries made through your department or have you not looked into this matter at all, through your department?

MR. BYERS:— No, we have not. The board has been asked to look at a number of these issues. With respect to reactors, we don't have any proposal to build one and the board will, we expect, make its recommendations as it sees fit on those subjects that it wants to recommend on.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Well then I would ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the broad issue of society's specific request that the terms of reference or the extension of the inquiry be granted, have you taken a position on that, that it will not be extended?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, when the inquiry was established about a year ago the government asked the board to report by November 1. At that time we did not know how extensive a work program Judge Bayda and his board would lay on. They did develop a very energetic and a very extensive work program. I forget the number of meetings they had but it was in the 70s or 80s throughout this entire province and many of them in northern Saskatchewan. Therefore, in that sense the request of the Saskatoon Environmental Society has been acceded to by the government and while Judge Bayda was asked to report last November, this is March 21, we are still waiting on his report. We felt this inquiry was vast enough that Judge Bayda and his staff should have ample time to investigate this problem thoroughly and to make their recommendations. We

have not pressured them to complete their report and we have had no formal indication when that report will be in and, therefore, I am assuming that they feel that they have had sufficient time.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Well, Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with the minister's point of view in so far as an inquiry has to have some limitation (it has to end some time) and I can appreciate that; on the other hand, this was the opportunity to examine the broader implications of the impact of the whole area of nuclear energy in the province of Saskatchewan. I am wondering about some of the other proposals. For example, reactor waste disposal, have you made any studies into that through your department or have you made any inquiries into that or will the board be in a position to report to you on that and are you leaving it entirely in their hands?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, these are the issues that we are leaving to the Board of Inquiry to advise the government on. The extent of the government's examination on some of the subjects you raise is confined to examining and studying current literature that is available to anyone on these subjects.

MR. LANE:— Another matter which was brought up by the Saskatoon Environmental Society, or broader issues, were for example, the social consequences of the use of nuclear energy, military uses of Saskatchewan radium, uranium, safeguards against nuclear weapons, proliferation and sale of uranium, and those kinds of things. Now I would like to ask the minister whether he does not think this is an appropriate matter to have been dealt with or should the inquiry, in your point of view, restrict itself entirely to the Saskatchewan aspect of uranium and the use of uranium?

MR. BYERS:— No, we certainly did not tie the hands of the Board of Inquiry to looking only at those aspects of uranium that are tied closely to Saskatchewan. The Board of Inquiry was asked to look at the broader implications and I think they are doing that.

MR. LANE:— Mr. Chairman, it appears almost more than coincidental that a lot of dates, in terms of decisions that are being taken with respect to uranium, are in or around the year end, November to this point in time. I ask the minister whether certain commitments have been made with respect to uranium developments by this government and that is why you would wish that the inquiry would have its reports in and completed at this point in time.

MR. BYERS:— Well, as I said last night at least three times that, in consideration of our estimates, those companies that are undertaking exploration work do so with the full knowledge that they will assume the risks in the event that there is a decision to curtail future development.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, there has been some public discussion about this matter of whether or not this government, in relation to this inquiry, will be in fact making its decision on the basis of the inquiry. Now, some suggest that decisions with respect to uranium development have already been made and that your department and this government will be ignoring the Bayda Inquiry to a large extent. Now, the government's response has been that that is only one aspect to be considered and I am just wondering if the government isn't using that as a back door out so that when the time comes and decisions have been made and the Bayda Inquiry is unfavorable to the government's position, they simply then have a back door to escape from and they can say, well, that was only one aspect that we were to take. Now, if by coincidence, the report would be favorable to the position which the government would take at that time

March 21, 1978

then of course everything would be all right for your position politically. I am just wondering whether or not you would care to meet that matter and inform this House as to whether or not you have taken hard decisions with respect to uranium development in the province.

MR. BYERS:— Well, I know there are some groups of people that are found in certain political parties in this province who don't have much faith in the inquiry or public hearing process. We could give examples of that, where developments were undertaken without any public hearings, like in dear old Ontario and the like. We were sincere in setting up the Bayda Inquiry. We set up the Bayda Inquiry and gave it its terms of reference which were broad in scope. The Bayda Inquiry has operated at all times at arm's length from this government. It is an independent inquiry in every sense of the word and it will continue to be an independent inquiry.

I don't believe, for one minute, that any government could get people from the bench to sit on inquiries and work as hard as Judge Bayda and his staff have worked over the past year and a half, if they had pre-instructions from the government as to what they were to report on.

I think the people who try to peddle that kind of belief in that government inquiries could be so structured and that there are people who will serve on them, are doing neither their country nor the inquiry process any justice. The public of this country expect that when inquiries are established that the people on them will be competent and in this case I believe they are; that they will do their analysis; that the public will have ample opportunity to put in their views, their two-bits' worth; that the people on the inquiry will have the power to call for information, data and statistics from the best advice available, wherever it is available from. And on the basis of that their recommendations will be made.

This government gave that mandate to Judge Bayda. We are still waiting on his report. We have not changed our course on that and to suggest at this time that the government has its mind made up and as is suggested, from time to time, that the Bayda Inquiry is a sham, that is absolutely totally false and rejected. I think that a great number of people in this province reject that. That is a belief that is harbored only in the minds of a few Conservatives in this province.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I think, deliberately misinterprets what I have put before the House. He says that perhaps there will be no faith in the inquiry. Well, I don't think that anyone suggests, nor did I suggest, that the people of Saskatchewan do not have faith in Judge Bayda and his inquiry. He suggests that they were sincere and the government was sincere in setting up the Bayda Inquiry. I might question that. That he operates at arm's length of the government — no question about that. Can't believe that the government, says the Minister, could get a person of the qualifications of Judge Bayda from the bench to do this kind of inquiry and then in some way manipulate him — I have no quarrel with that. What I am saying is this. It is common knowledge, Mr. Minister, that you are caught on the horns of a dilemma because at the time that you were shutting down the Amok projects you had just come out of a very tough party convention, in which the element of your party came forward and said: "Look, let's look into the environmental aspects." It was for that reason that you left Amok on the hook for many millions of committed dollars. Then you come in with a very convenient political tool. I am not saying you are manipulating Judge Bayda. I am saying are you going to listen to what he has to say at the end of the day when he comes in and he gives his report and he says, now here are the recommendations. What I am asking

you right now and you've conveniently avoided answering the questions, have you taken firm decisions with respect to uranium development? I suggest you have. Now why don't you answer that question? For example, what kind of uranium mines are already committed and are going to be unveiled conveniently after the Bayda Report comes down? In some way your government or your department will try to paint the Bayda Inquiry in such a way to make it look as best as possible for the decision you have already taken. I am not suggesting any impropriety on the part of Judge Bayda or his inquiry. Obviously it would be improper and I don't in any way, shape or form attribute that motive to the government. I am saying, will you listen to him when the time comes, when his report comes down?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to Cluff, the Cluff people were advised in 1973 that they would be required to do an environmental impact assessment report — 1973. The environmental impact assessment report by Cluff was not completed until the fall of 1976. The responsibility for that assessment report rests with the company, Cluff. They were a little late in getting it done. But they knew the rules from day one, from 1973, that they would be required to do the report and that it could be subject to a public inquiry. So that should come as no surprise to them. I can't tell you offhand what work is going on there now. There is some further exploration work going on, but they were required to do the report, that it would be subject to a public investigation. That is the mandate (one of the mandates) of Judge Bayda, are the proposals in the environment assessment report for mitigation purposes adequate and sufficient. Those are the things that Judge Bayda has been asked to report on. In so far as the rest of the industry is concerned, they are continuing with their exploration work, whatever it is, diamond drilling or ore sampling, or whatever, but with the full understanding in other places that any of their projects could be halted and that their company could be asked to restore the area as a result of a government decision following the recommendations of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry. That's the state of the business.

MR. LANE:— The simple fact of the matter is that to say that it came as no surprise to Amok to get shut down, is simply not in keeping with the facts. Now I invite the hon. minister to deny that Amok had interim approval and on the strength of that it spent tens of millions of dollars. They had their contracts lined up and in place and it was only after that particular NDP meeting in which this became an issue within your political party that the thing was pulled out from under Amok and that then they were told that there was going to be some hold-ups and further study in this regard.

Now, I would like to ask you also on the broader question, if you have not taken hard decisions with respect to uranium development in the province and you haven't said 'no' but you haven't said 'yes', I would invite you to tell the House why this budget has included \$40 million for uranium development. I suggest to you the \$40 million is on the books because of the fact that you had made these decisions.

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, on the first question, with respect to Cluff, all approvals concerning Cluff were conditional on the findings and the subsequent decisions of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry.

With regard to the second question, there is not \$40 million in the Department of the Environment estimates for any uranium development.

MR. LANE:— Mr. Chairman, another matter that has been raised, that I would like to refer to, in the Saskatoon Environmental Society, is the effect of the biological effects of

March 21, 1978

low level radiation. Has your department done any studies with respect to this?

MR. BYERS:— Well, on the subject of the effects of low level radiation, particularly as it applies to plants and animals.

MR. BYERS:— This matter, I understand was covered in the assessment report. Both the group in Saskatoon that you refer to and the Department of the Environment felt that the coverage and the data on that subject was inadequate. I understand that Mr. Bayda engaged some expert or specialist on this subject to undertake a further investigation of it. I don't know all the details of it.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly switch to another topic of concern in this minister's department now. The whole topic of alternative energy sources in the province need some hard study at this time. I understand that your department was responsible for the building of a solar home in the city of Regina. Could you tell me whether that is indeed so and who the group or the individuals were that did the actual development of the solar home.

MR. BYERS:— No, we weren't involved in that. The solar home was built by the Department of Mineral Resources and the Sask Research Council. There was no direct funding — Mr. Chairman, if I can get the hon. member's attention — there was no direct funding by Environment for this project. It was other agencies of the government, Mineral Resources, Sask Research Council and others.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Was there any input from your department or any supervision by your department or were you called upon for your expertise through your department?

MR. BYERS:— There was input from our staff, I expect most likely from the Planning and Research section, staff input, into the planning of it.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— So in other words I take from that that you have some knowledge of what was happening. I am given to understand that this particular home ran over budget to the tune of approximately 300 per cent. Is that correct?

MR. BYERS:— Well, I would suggest that you direct that question to the people who provided the money. There was never a dollar identified as such for the solar home in the Environment budget.

MR. WIPF:— Mr. Chairman, you talked about some radio activity clean-up or some radon samples that you took. . . .you have to get your partners shut down there . . . You talked about some radon tests that you took around Uranium City and you mentioned also that you had found samples of radon gas at Camsell Portage and Fond-du-Lac. In what kind of environment did you find this at Camsell Portage and Fond-du-Lac? Were they land fills? You didn't specify where you found them.

MR. BYERS:— We found them around the rectory and another place was in the RCMP barracks.

MR. WIPF:— In some of the special studies you have undertaken you have done some intensive winter water quality sampling up at the Gulf mineral area in Wollaston Lake. What brought on these intensive studies that took place up there?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, the Environment Department was concerned that there might be radio active materials getting into the lake because this uranium mine near Wollaston has now been operating for two years. There has in the last year been considerable improvement in the losses of RA226 into the receiving waters because of a number of developments. I am told that both the mine water and the discharges from the mill aren't being treated together. The settling ponds have been expanded and these kinds of improvements made so that the situation there is a good deal better.

MR. WIPF:— You say the settling ponds have been expanded, can I take that to mean that your settling ponds before that were not of the capacity to handle the flow that came out of this mill and was probably contaminating the waters into Wollaston Lake? Did you find this?

MR. BYERS:— Our tests showed no contamination in the hidden bay but the quality of the discharge wasn't in our opinion satisfactory and, therefore, our Water Pollution Control Branch plus the federal regulatory agencies (you are as familiar with them as I am) asked that the company make these improvements.

MR. WIPF:— You found that the discharge was higher than I suppose would be allowed. Had this gone on for the two years before you got it inspected and were you monitoring this discharge for the two years previous? It took two years to get around to checking this discharge out?

MR. BYERS:— No, it hasn't gone on for two years because in the early stages of the mine's operation there were no discharges in the settling pond, so it hasn't gone on for two years. But the testing has and is taking place to establish what the desirable operating level should be and this is being sorted out with the company and Environment Saskatchewan and the other federal regulatory agencies so I don't think you and I need to worry about it. It's in good hands.

MR. WIPF:— Well have you established a factor yet of the discharge of how high it should be and is it controlled to that factor that you have established?

MR. BYERS:— People who know something about this and understand it have — I don't know if I would understand the numbers if I saw them — I am told it's in hand and I'm willing to take the word of the people who are the specialists in this field.

MR. WIPF:— Well, then I take it that this is satisfactory as far as you are concerned then.

I want to go the Saskatchewan Forest Products. In your annual report you have some complaints that said there had to be some clean-up work done of smoke emissions at Carrot River. When did those complaints come in and how long did it take you to straighten out the problem that is there and is it, at this time, working within the capacity that you set or within the limits that you set? What were the emissions and what was the problem?

MR. BYERS:— Well, there were problems there and I have discussed some of this with the member privately. It was with respect to air pollution and the officials of our department are working with the industry to endeavor to correct them.

MR. WIPF:— This is the Carrot River one and it says in here there are smoke emissions from the incinerators at Carrot River. What I want to know is, how long after you got complaints did you act on this and has the Saskatchewan Forest Products put in these

March 21, 1978

improvements that you have recommended?

MR. BYERS:— Well, I can only report on Big River, the action taken there.

MR. WIPF:— You say you can only report on Big River, not Carrot River. It's in your manual.

MR. BYERS:— I'm not sure that we're clear on the question you're raising.

MR. WIPF:— Well, there may be a question; it says, "In the Saskatchewan Forest Products complaints were received regarding excessive smoke emissions from the incinerators at the Saskatchewan Forest Products operation at Carrot River," not Big River. "The division indicated to the company that improvements are necessary." What I am asking is, how long after the complaints came in did your department step into this and have something done or recommend that something be done, and is the improvement that you recommended in place yet? It doesn't say the year that this took place in.

MR. BYERS:— Well as a general policy if there is a complaint lodged with the government department about air pollution we undertake to examine the complaint and then proceed to work with the company, regardless of which company it is, to endeavor to correct it. As a general rule we obtain the co-operation of the company. Sometimes it takes a while and sometimes it involves expenditures of very sizeable sums. If you want the detailed information on any particular plant, when the complaint came, what subsequent follow-up action was taken, we can provide that to you but we don't have all of that kind of detail here with us as you can appreciate.

MR. WIPF:— Can you tell me if this work that has been recommended by your department has been started? Is there construction work or work being done at the Carrot River Plant that will take care of this problem? Has it been done yet, or is it still on the drawing board, or is it finished, or are you in the process of it?

MR. BYERS:— We don't have that information here. I can't tell you if or what work has been done specifically. I will give you an undertaking to provide you with that information but we simply don't have an up-to-date report on every plant in the province here at our fingertips.

MR. WIPF:— In the Simpson Timber area there were complaints of excessive ash and soot emissions from the wood waste incinerator. Modifications are to be completed there. Have those modifications been done? I suppose they are being done this year in 1977 and 1978 it says, but I would like to know if you know then how long after Simpson Timber had these problems and when the report came to you, how long after that was Simpson Timber told to get their plant in shape?

MR. BYERS:— Well, on the Simpson Timber Plant at Hudson Bay there were complaints about excessive ash and soot emissions from the wood waste incinerator operated by Simpson Timber at this point in Hudson Bay. As a result of this investigation by our department we obtained a commitment from the company to improve the operation of the incinerator. An investigation in 1977 indicated that some modifications were completed and a significant improvement in air conditions was noted and I understand that the company plans further modifications for 1978 and 1979.

MR. WIPF:— Have you had any indication at all that because of the cutback that is

going to take place at Simpson Timber and because of the shortage of wood and not being able to get wood, will these modifications still be needed because they will be cutting back on the actual production? Will these modifications still be needed when this cutback is implemented?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, our understanding is that the modifications planned for 1978 and 1979 will be proceeded with. The plant will continue to operate so therefore these modifications will be required and we have no reason to believe that the company will renege on its commitment to install them.

MR. WIPF:— Mr. Minister, my concern on that was because of the big cutback that is coming in the production of that mill there. I was wondering when you recommended this work being done was it recommended when this mill was running at full capacity and seeing that there is a cutback, is it still necessary to have this work done?

MR. BYERS:— Well, we have received no request from the company that the modifications plan should not go ahead. They are apparently not upset about it. I don't know why the hon. member is. We have had no representations from the company to suggest that these modifications should not proceed.

MR. WIPF:— Mr. Minister, the other area where there was a problem and I mentioned it to you last fall, was in the Big River area where ashes and cinders were flying all over the area and setting fires on adjacent properties. What has been done there, at this point, other than hiring two or three people to go around with wet blankets and put out the fires?

MR. BYERS:— This is at Big River?

Well there were some complaints regarding excessive smoke emissions from the incinerator of Sask Forest Products at the Big River planer mill. Our air pollution control branch advised this company that improvements to their incinerator were necessary. Therefore Sask Forest Products indicated that they would move the planer to Bodmin, the site for the new sawmill to use the unused capacity of the incinerator at this new location. I understand that the move is to be completed early in the 1978-79 fiscal year. The problem will be looked after. I have had no complaints from the local member about it.

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Chairman, is there some reason that we have to take this sort of talk from the minister to the junior members?

Mr. Minister, I notice under Administration, on item 1, that you are reducing the number of people involved from 36 to 33. I don't know whether you had that question asked initially or not, if you have, I apologize. Could you very briefly tell us what is going on there and what sort of changes they are?

MR. BYERS:— Well when we first prepared the budget for this department we very carefully examined the need for every position and in this particular administrative branch we were able to, we feel, cut the establishment by three.

MR. THATCHER:— Well would the minister tell us then when he made these cuts (and of course any cuts in the size of your over-sized, bloated civil service is certainly

March 21, 1978

welcome to all taxpayers) but would you tell us what kind of people they chopped, were they top-level executives or bureaucrats or were they lonely, underpaid secretaries, clerks or what level of fat did you chop in other words?

MR. BYERS:— Three permanent positions were deleted, two clerk stenos II and one clerk IV.

MR. THATCHER:— Well I suppose, Mr. Minister that we should have been surprised had it been anything else, but. Naturally we couldn't move to chop off the executive types. We would have to get the kind that, I suppose, can't defend themselves.

Mr. Minister, I notice under Administration, that you are budgeting for a 9 per cent increase in salaries under your administration. I assume that these are your top-quality people, that these are the ones when you have to make a decision, the ones that you turn to. And you are budgeting for 9 per cent. I find that sort of interesting because it would appear that people that are walking with these picket signs day after day out in front there they seem to be walking when less than 5 per cent is being offered to them (or in that vicinity). But at your top level here we are budgeting for 9 per cent.

Then we move to item 2 which is your public information on Education Services. We have got five people there and you are budgeting for 9 per cent there — 8.7 per cent to be exact.

Then we get down to your third group which is your Policy, Planning and Research — well I don't know your department all that well. In a lot of departments we would maybe term that the hack department, but I don't know whether that's true in your department, but they only get 6.8 per cent.

We get down to the air pollution control and I grant you air pollution really isn't all that great a problem in Saskatchewan, but they are getting the great total of 5 per cent.

Then moving down to water pollution, of course if you happen to drink your water in Moose Jaw or Regina, I think, the Minister of Mineral Resource's comment on St. Patrick's Day, when we had the green water that, you know, straight Regina water was probably pretty indicative.

Anyway, the people in the water pollution control are getting 6.8 per cent. My question, Mr. Minister, is simply this. Why are some people getting nine; why are some people getting as low as five and why are those people who are walking out in front with their placards, the most defenceless ones of all, why are they being offered a ridiculous amount of 5.5?

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, there are many, many factors that determine the dollar appropriation for salaries. There is the matter of vacancies within the department. Secondly, not all substaff may be eligible for increments; others may not be because they are at the top of the salary range and, therefore, one cannot make a blanket general statement as to what the provision is for salary increases.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— I note on page 25 of the annual report you list your environmental impact assessment. The listing of the environmental impact assessment indicates a strange inconsistency in your government department operation.

Are those the only two areas, the environmental impact being done by SPC and that is

the two lines that are referred to, and the plan in Nipawin?

MR. BYERS:— No, those are the two major ones. We are in the process of developing an environmental impact assessment policy. We have an interim policy. The ones referred to in the book are the major ones. During the past year approximately 50 projects have been processed through the impact assessment policy. Of these about 25 have been exempted from the need of an impact assessment. Twenty-five have required overview assessments and four have required detailed impact assessments.

MR. LANE:— Well, I suppose I will get my questions out under subvote 1. I find it strange that we have seen more environmental assessment studies by the government opposite and they wave these studies proudly and they advertise most proudly, the environmental assessment that they are doing, and how they want public inputs and how they are not going to damage the fragile environment of Saskatchewan in all areas and yet the activity has increased dramatically and, of course, there is a substantial reduction in the budget for environmental impact assessment. I am referring, basically, to subvote 8.

I am wondering how the minister can account for the deceiving inconsistency. Are we to add further to what I perceive to be the growing evidence that these things are just really a sham and that the government is holding off as a public sop and is really going around and doing what it wants to do anyway?

MR. BYERS:— Well, first of all, the main elements of Interim Environmental Impact Assessment Policy are, first that assessments are required where the project will have a major impact on any geographic area, or where there is a major commitment of a provincial resource. That is the basis for requiring an assessment.

The responsibility for doing the assessment rests with the developer. As I indicated to the hon. member there have been 50 projects processed through this Interim Impact Assessment Policy in the past year.

The major reason for the decrease in that in expenditures is that we anticipate a reduction in the number of public hearings related to this environmental impact assessment process. The Bayda Inquiry on Cluff Lake is almost complete. The Churchill Board has completed its hearings and is expected to report in June. The poplar River No. 2, Nipawin Board of Inquiry will be reporting about the same time as the Churchill Board of Inquiry. Therefore we do not anticipate inquiries in the coming fiscal year of the magnitude and involving the expenditures that Bayda and the Churchill Board as well as the Bergstrom Board will require.

MR. THATCHER:— If I could move into a slightly different area. There is concern among livestock producers in the Qu'Appelle Valley Basin — I refer to an area primarily north of Regina. It is primarily in the constituency of Qu'Appelle but certainly some in my constituency of Thunder Creek. There does appear to be on the part of the Department of Environment some intention to greatly restrict livestock operations in the Qu'Appelle Valley and in the areas which drain into the Qu'Appelle Valley. Could the minister very briefly outline his government's and his department's intentions in this area to the livestock producers who have made their livelihood for many, many years in this area?

MR. BYERS:— Well, first of all, for those farmers or ranchers who want to set up new livestock enterprises, we are working with them and will encourage them to locate so that the dangers from runoff are minimal. For the existing livestock operations along

March 21, 1978

the Qu'Appelle we are attempting to identify those that are having an adverse effect on the Qu'Appelle. We have a program through the Qu'Appelle Implementation Program to relocate a number of these livestock enterprises. We are prepared to put up funds to assist in the relocation. There is a program under way to contact the existing operations and holding discussions with them about relocation. This was one area identified in the Qu'Appelle Report and there is a lot of money in the agreement for the relocation of existing livestock enterprises. We think that is a sensible approach to take.

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Chairman, at least I finally heard an admission of some sort from the minister — this is probably more than some of the ranchers that operate in that area have ever had from your department. At least the minister has said it that it is his government's intention to cease the livestock business . . . or in essence to run the livestock producers out of the Qu'Appelle Valley. That's, in essence, what the minister just said. Now will the minister tell me — because some of these ranchers out in this area have been there for 100 years. One of them which always mystified me was one of the . . . well, I believe it was his grandfather who was one of the founding fathers of the CCF, he's not now, the grandson sure isn't. Some of those operations have been there for 100 years, very close to 100 years. Now what are they suddenly doing now that is so atrociously harmful that they must be run out of there? What exactly has happened in 1977 that they must be removed out of that basin? Obviously life has gone on in the 100 years that they have been there. Chances are if they stay there another 100 years, life may just possibly continue to go on. But what great evil has your department all of a sudden noted in the Qu'Appelle Valley Basin that these people must be picked up, taken right out of there and say, we'll help you start somewhere else. Tell us so that we can take it back to them, Mr. Minister.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not the intention of this government nor the federal government with whom we have a joint agreement to run the livestock producers out of the valley. If the operators who have been there as pioneers and their offspring for a hundred years and if they can continue to operate their livestock operation so that they will not adversely affect the runoff problems and if they can take the proper steps to ensure that the operation will not be harmful, if they take such steps then they can stay there.

We are working — we, meaning the province and the federal government — are working closely with the farmers to identify those that are a runoff problem and we are prepared to provide financial assistance to relocate, because certainly the matter of water quality was one of the major areas addressed in the Qu'Appelle Report. I want to say again to hon. members of the House that we know the position of the Conservative Party with respect to agreements under the Canada Water Act. Discussions were going on between this province and the federal government to bring in the Canada Water Act under which we can do water studies such as the Qu'Appelle, such as the Souris and it wasn't until the Conservative government under John Diefenbaker was thrown out of Ottawa that the federal government had the foresight and the courage to bring in the Canada Water Act under which we can do these studies and undertake these programs to clean up river basins, like the Qu'Appelle. That is what most civilized countries of the world are doing. Tories obviously object to this. They object to clean, pure water for drinking and for recreation and the like.

Last year I went to Argentina for a couple of weeks to a United Nations meeting on the subject of water. There we heard presentations from many countries of the initiatives in various countries to manage their river basins and their water and land resources associated therein.

You know some of the countries such as these we sometimes think of as the primitive countries of Africa. There are instances where six and seven and a dozen countries have actually bound together and formed an agreement with seven or eight countries to manage the water resources and the land resources of a river basin. That's the model used throughout the world and most countries are undertaking initiatives such as we are doing in the case of the Qu'Appelle to protect our valuable water and land resources. But to the Conservatives this seems to be a queer approach which somehow they do not understand. We are not undertaking any great vast brutal program here to evict long standing livestock enterprises from the Qu'Appelle Valley. There are certain standards which we feel that modern day society feels such operators should comply with ! because the effects which any one user has on the water has implications for the rest of society. We don't think, we don't believe that one individual's rights should supersede those of all society. We have a responsibility to our fellow men and to the rest of society to ensure that the water resources are not abused and contaminated. This program that we are undertaking here to clean up some of the existing livestock operations and provide financial assistance to relocate them we think is sensible and decent.

MR. THATCHER:— Well, Mr. Minister, like everyone else in the House I am growing very weary of your filibuster. Mr. Minister, I find some things in your comments, difficult though they may be to listen to, with some degree of validity. You know, Mr. Minister, I suppose we all remember back a few years ago when we decided that we had poverty in this country, all across North America. So then we ordered our universities to crank out the social workers to eradicate poverty. We cranked out the social workers, X number every year, cranked them out year after year in our universities to the point where we have built in a bureaucracy, so that we can never eliminate poverty because we turned poverty into a profession for a bureaucracy to feed upon. So, consequently, we can never eliminate poverty because the bureaucracy will never allow us to. There, Mr. Minister, a few years ago, about ten years ago, pollution suddenly became popular. Then we ordered our universities to crank out environmentalists. They cranked them out and we, of course, every provincial government, every state government, every federal government in North America and elsewhere had to have a department of environment. Frankly I sometimes wonder for what purpose because really I cannot help, as an ordinary citizen, to think that this department, like many other departments of the environment is not particularly unique. You spend more time going around looking for trouble and trying to create trouble than you will ever solve.

I point to the problems down at Poplar River. Look at the hassle we are in with the Americans! Where was your department on this thing? A little bit of simple public relations — goodness sake, what do you have all these people around for? What is this big budget being spent for? Something as basic as that you couldn't even solve because you couldn't even be bothered communicating with the Americans. Where was your department?

Now you've got some defenceless livestock producers and some of them are maybe odd when a government man drives in their yard — I don't know why they should be but some of them probably are because some of them throw their weight around pretty good. You've got them upset; you haven't told them why; you haven't told us why any of them have to be removed. I defy you, you tell me tonight why one of them has to be picked up, why he must be relocated? Instead, it is your intention to clean out that valley, each and every one of them. Well maybe not tomorrow, maybe not next week,

March 21, 1978

maybe not even in this debate, but it is your overall intention (the unquestionable intention) of your department to eventually clean that valley out of livestock. Tell me why. What are you referring to? What pollution? What pollution is there there that hasn't been there for 100 years? What is suddenly there that cannot be handled in today's modern technology? For what reason? Tell me one. Then, Mr. Minister, I would love to go with you to a meeting of some of these livestock people. I would love to hear you tell them and I would love to hear you handle their questions. You can start tonight, Mr. Minister.

MR. BYERS:— Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the hon. member does not know that the Legislature of 1971 (and I don't need to remind him who was the government of that day) put on the statute books of this province an act called The Pollution By Livestock Control Act, 1971, by the government of the day, which apparently had more foresight than the Conservative Opposition seven years later — a requirement enshrined in law that required any new livestock venture of a certain size to meet certain standards laid down by the government. That's The Pollution By Livestock Control Act, 1971.

In the case of the Qu'Appelle, that act applied to new ventures or to extensions of existing ones. The hon. member I am sure is well familiar with it. In the case of the Qu'Appelle we are simply asking that those livestock enterprises, existing ones that may be contributing some pollution to the Qu'Appelle waters be treated as if they were new ventures.

MR. McMILLAN:— Mr. Chairman, I am bringing a little new blood to the question period here. Two simple questions, firstly of the minister. I would like to know what area you budget for your departmental advertising in and if you can give me some idea how much you budgeted this year for advertising.

MR. BYERS:— Advertising, \$34,060.

MR. McMILLAN:— What subvote do you find that in?

MR. BYERS:— Total advertising in all subvotes, \$34,060, a very modest budget.

MR. McMILLAN:— Which subvote do we find that under?

MR. BYERS:— Advertising is in a number of subvotes. That is the total for advertising in all subvotes in the department's budget.

MR. McMILLAN:— What kind of advertising are you looking at doing, the general sort of stuff, Nipawin, Poplar River, the inquiries, Churchill River Board of Inquiry, Bayda Inquiry, the kind of advertising you use to promote those meetings or do they receive separate funding to do the promotion there?

MR. BYERS:— The advertising money is for items like boards of inquiry. However, we are required to advertise certain regulations. We are required to give notices of certain things so that this money can show up anywhere from the Water Rights Branch to the Administration Branch for a great number of things that we have to advertise for in the course of a year. For example, there was a proposal with respect to the control structure on Gooseberry Lake. I believe we undertook some advertising for that. I don't know what branch that was in, but take that as an example.

MR. McMILLAN:— Are you planning any advertising campaigns along the line of those that we have been seeing in the last couple of days from the Department of Industry and Commerce both in print, media and on the radio which are designed more rather than strictly a purely informational program to try and persuade the public to be receptive toward the department as a whole rather than to provide information or advertise safety or any specified function? Do you plan on carrying out any of that kind of advertising in the upcoming fiscal year?

MR. BYERS:— We do some informational advertising.

MR. McMILLAN:— I am sure you do. Are you planning any major newspaper campaigns or radio campaigns like the Department of Industry and Commerce which is currently in the process of trying to persuade the people of Saskatchewan that our economic climate here is as sound as the Canadian dollar. I just wondered if you have budgeted here in your Estimates to try to do that same type of advertising for the Department of the Environment.

MR. BYERS:— Our advertising will be directed for matters relating to the regulation or the posting of notices and I expect that the main thrust of the advertising is to help enhance the public's awareness of environmental matters in Saskatchewan.

MR. McMILLAN:— Well I'm sure the minister will be as good as his word. It may be a problem but one other question I would like to ask is, under which sub-vote and how much have you anticipated you will be spending this year on the use of government aircraft for either your personal use or members of your department?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, in preparing a budget it is necessary to put some numbers in for aerial use. The total requested is \$10,640 and that is for such things as aerial photography and flood assessments and the like.

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Minister, may I ask you, and I don't know whether this area was covered or not. If it was, please inform me and I will modify my questions. Would the minister tell the Assembly when Coronach was originally conceived, the whole concept of the SPC project down there was conceived — exactly what influence did your department or the Department of Environment place into the entire project?

MR. BYERS:— First of all we were involved starting about 1971 in the physical examination of the coal resources. You may recall that the province entered into an agreement with the federal government for coal search to determine if adequate coal resources are there to build a plant. In 1972 Environment began an investigation of the availability of water. Then going on to 1974, the Environment Department outlined to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation the kinds of environmental impact assessments that would be required.

MR. MacDONALD:— Just say, yes or no.

MR. THATCHER:— Mr. Minister, I strongly urge you to accept the advice of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. He is a very sage individual, I must say a marvellous teacher, a tremendous instructor and a very astute politician. Since this new marriage which has happened of late between the gentlemen over there and the fellows here, I urge you to pay far more attention to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley because when it comes to battle in this place nobody knows any more about it. I highly recommend his advice.

March 21, 1978

Mr. Minister, in pursuing up the comments he just made I see a role in SPC, in their decisions. What happened then, if as you say your department was involved from the start and are still making recommendations as to the kind of pollution and water control standards that we have to have? What happened or how did this strong feeling of animosity with the state of Montana happen? In other words, how could your department or SPC or whoever was at fault, how did the situation with our neighbors to the south ever develop? Why was it allowed to develop? Why didn't your people head it off?

MR. BYERS:— Mr. Chairman, we feel that we have done almost everything within our power to ensure that relations have been good between Canada and the United States as well as Montana and Saskatchewan and North Dakota, on this.

To give you a little background, remember, very well, the early stage of this project that the then Minister in charge of SPC, Ken Thorson, and I met with the Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Christianson then Lieutenant Governor of the state of Montana, on at least two occasions. Their officials were here and our officials were there. Relations were very good between the province of Saskatchewan and the state of Montana. I have had at least three meetings, I believe, with Governor Link of North Dakota about the Souris and other matters. On the subject of air quality, those matters were worked out on a bilateral basis between officials of Environment Saskatchewan and officials of the state of Montana to determine the level of air pollution control equipment that would go in the plant. We have worked very closely with external affairs, in turn dealt with the Secretary of State in the provision of information. A project of this magnitude does have problems. I want to say to the hon. member that in the case of the Poplar River it's one of the few international rivers where we do not have an apportionment agreement to divide the supply of waters in the Poplar River. It was on the initiative of the officials in Environment and the province of Saskatchewan that the decision to refer the matter of water apportionment to the International Joint Commission originated. I thought that was a very positive step on our part. That matter is being resolved.

With respect to water quality we have asked the Bergstrom Board to look at the international implications of this project. The International Joint Commission decided a couple of years ago or thereabouts to instruct its Water Quality Board to do a water quality study and they will complete their work by the end of 1978. The Bergstrom Board is obliged to consider any recommendations that may come from that. I don't know what other processes were available. I am somewhat shocked that certain individuals within our own province keep trying to stir up this make-believe problem that exists mainly in their minds between the state and the province. I think that we have certainly been co-operative with our neighbors across the line and we will continue to do so; at the same time we will also take every step to ensure that our legitimate rights are obtained and respected.

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Chairman, I think we have set a first in this Legislature tonight with about four hours on item 1 for Environment. I assume that members of the House will be more in a mood tomorrow to continue it again for another couple of hours or more. In light of the situation, I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 o'clock p.m.