

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 22, 1978

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

MOTION

Federal Crown Corporations Committee

Mr. R.N. Nelson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next, move that this Assembly urge the government of Canada to establish a crown corporations committee similar to the Saskatchewan committee, so that the business of all federal Crown corporations may be effectively examined and controlled.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you, a group of 72 Grade Eight students, who are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery, from the Weyburn Junior High school, along with their teachers, Mr. Jim Nedelcou and Mr. Garry Kruger, and their bus drivers, Mr. Delbert Foote and Mr. Murray McCormick. This is the 12th consecutive year I believe that the Grade Eight Junior High has been represented here during the session, from Weyburn. I am sure that I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of you and all the members assembled, that we wish their visit here to be enjoyable, knowledgeable and educational and that they have a pleasant journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the House, 60 students from McCannell School, from my constituency, Grade Five and Six in the east gallery.

At McCannell School, Mr. Speaker, the Grade Five class had a mock parliament which I was invited to one day and which I enjoyed immensely. In fact it was not unlike, Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of the Legislature here during question period and it gives the students today an opportunity to see our question period in action which they will find is not unlike theirs.

I welcome them on behalf of all members and on behalf of you, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to seeing them a little later.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Weyburn for wishing to introduce my students from Oungre and it is apropos that he do so because he represented that area for a good number of years prior to myself.

I would like to introduce to the Legislative Assembly, a group of 28 Grade Eight and Grade Nine students who are situated in the west gallery. They are from Oungre, Saskatchewan and that means that they are almost American citizens since Oungre is about 10 miles from the American border. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr.

Singh, and chaperone, Audrey Portland and Mr. Bjorklund, their bus driver.

These students have already been to the RCMP barracks and after visiting the Legislature they will go the museum and I'm just guessing but probably after that they will stop at MacDonalds on the way out of town. On behalf of the rest of the members of the Legislature I would like to welcome you and hope that you enjoy the afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join with the member for Bengough-Milestone to welcome the students from Oungre. Some of these students also live in the Estevan riding and it is a pleasure for me to join with the member for Bengough and wish you the very best for today and have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SEDCO – Steel Plant

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of SEDCO. Yesterday in the Leader Post we had a lengthy story covering the potentially new steel plant which could be located here in Saskatchewan, an iron ore reduction plant as the story goes. The question that I have to you, Mr. Minister, is the story listed that there are some \$150 million available through both DREE and SEDCO. How much of that \$150 million has been allocated by SEDCO and has SEDCO in fact been part of the feasibility study of that plant? Are you considering in any way a partial percentage of government ownership in this potential plant?

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I think that question should probably have been directed to the Minister of Minerals Resources. So if you would like to answer it.

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I must admit I wasn't paying that much attention to the member and I would appreciate his rephrasing the question for me.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, I hope this doesn't count as one of my supplements. The question, Mr. Speaker, that is then directed to the minister is this that the story that appeared yesterday in the Leader Post that some \$150 million in capital was available both through DREE and SEDCO – and the reason I directed the question to the Minister in charge of SEDCO was because a definite amount of money has been allocated and secondly, if your department has been involved in the feasibility study of this potential plant? The third part of that question was, is there any attempt by the government or is the government planning on having any percentage ownership such as is the case with IPSCO?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we have been able to make definite or final decisions in relation to the question that the member asked. We have been working for quite some time with DREE, with IPSCO and with other federal government as well as officials with a number of departments within the government of the province of Saskatchewan to try and bring about to a completion the expansion at IPSCO. We do

not disagree with a proposal of participating directly in the IPSCO expansion if that is required. In fact, we have discussed that and it's a case, I guess of coming to some final agreement as to what level the government might undertake to participate if it is in fact required.

Mr. Bailey: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The paper indicated that in the report that was written to the Leader Post our expectations should not be raised at this particular time. I think the minister will agree that any indication of industry in Saskatchewan, new industry, is good news. We have had some sorry experiences with such things as the delay, say, of the heavy oil plant, the uranium tractor plant and so on. I'm wondering if the minister could give us any indication as to what time he would be in a position to establish and let the people know the validity; if this is just a story or if there is more concrete evidence than a newspaper report?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — I would like to answer the question because it seems to me that a couple of things are being talked about. With respect to a possible expansion at IPSCO, in order to — I am aware of what the member is asking — I am aware of what is being said here and I believe some people are not clear as to the answer. With respect to the proposed expansion at IPSCO, there are good grounds for believing that something may develop there fairly rapidly. With respect to a direct ore reduction plant (which I take it the story referred to) there is no commitment by SEDCO to make any money available. It is certainly a project which we would like to see proceed, but it is not a project which is likely to happen now or a few months from now. There is not likely be any quick announcement on that, since there are a good number of problems to be overcome before any direct ore reduction plant could be established in our province. A good deal of work has been done on it. I simply want to advise the House that it is not likely to be something which will be announced soon.

Mr. Bailey: — Supplementary question. This must be a record — I've got to three Ministers of the Crown today.

There is a concluding paragraph, Mr. Premier. It says:

The agreement has about \$150 million of investment capital available to it through SEDCO, DREE and other sources.

My original question was in fact, have you committed (has SEDCO) committed funds to the plan? I guess that's my final supplementary question. We haven't got the answer to that. Has SEDCO been in agreement, is there word from them that they will commit a portion of the \$150 million and how much?

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps there is some confusion. There has been some significant discussion in recent months in regard to the expansion at IPSCO based on sale of pipe for the Alcan Pipeline and there is potential of coming to a conclusion in regard to that expansion in the near future. There are yet some problems to be worked out there.

I believe you are asking more specifically about yet another expansion in regard to a direct ore reduction plant at IPSCO and I think that even though there may be some possibility for direct ore reduction at IPSCO it is some time away from taking place now. I don't believe that IPSCO would disagree with that, I don't believe that SEDCO would disagree with that, I don't believe that the representatives of the federal government who are involved in this whole steel agreement that we have for the prairie provinces

would disagree with that. We know that at some point in time there may be difficulty in obtaining a significant enough level of scrap to meet the demands of the prairie market and therefore we are going to have some other source and that initiates the interest in a direct ore reduction plant. We also have the problem of finding adequate ore bodies. I know that on occasion members have asked about the Choiceland ore body and/or the Kelsey ore body. I know members are aware that it's an expensive operation vis-à-vis strip mining that takes place in other parts of Canada and that the economics just don't appear to be there. None of these questions have really adequately been investigated at this particular point in time to give you a precise answer. The best I can do is that there is some optimism that at some point in time we will be able to add significantly to the IPSCO operations with a direct ore mill and then some of the other related steel industry that will go with it. It's premature to be able to answer with any kind of precision at this time, but we are working with all of the parties involved to see if we can't come to a final conclusion.

Mr. MacDonald: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons for the proposed expansion or the development of Choiceland was an ore reduction plant in an integrated steel industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Unfortunately the NDP cancelled this very important project when they took office. Would the minister tell me if they have an ore body in mind or where they are thinking now of finding a supply?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, as is customary of the members of the opposition they undertake to mislead, not only the members of the Legislative Assembly but the people of Saskatchewan. I noticed the member for Kindersley alludes to the fact that the upgrading facility has been delayed. There has been no such delay. The member who just took his seat says that the NDP government has cancelled the Choiceland project. He knows full well that the economics of the Choiceland project just don't stand up to the economics of the Kelsey ore deposit. If there is going to be a mining operation of iron ore in Saskatchewan, it would take place at Kelsey Lake rather than at the Choiceland ore body. He also knows that it is an underground mining operation which is very, very costly by comparison to the strip mining operations of iron ore in other parts of Canada. The economics of the matter is that we could acquire iron ore from some other province, ship it in here cheaper than we could undertake to develop the Kelsey Lake deposit. As much as we should like to develop it, it just doesn't make good economic sense to be paying more for iron ore mined in Saskatchewan than we could get it from some other source. There may be interim period of time, if we require iron ore for a direct ore reduction plant that it would come from outside the province. We're hopeful that the economics will at some point in time allow the development of the Kelsey project, but that has, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize, nothing to do with the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

Misstatement about Automobile Accident Insurance Rates

Mr. E.C. Malone (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — I would like to direct a question, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if you will just bear with me, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote a section, briefly, from the Budget of a few days ago.

On the Budget, on page 14, the Minister of Finance advised this House that because of fewer accidents per driver and fewer injuries there will be an average 5 per cent decrease in automobile insurance rates effective May 1, 1978. I think it is abundantly clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the decrease in automobile accident insurance rates has been triggered as a result of an order of Saskatchewan Public Sector Price and Compensation Board, direction SGIO, to return to the users of that service, the sum

of \$1,308,000. I would like to table this order that I have.

My question of the minister is, in view of this rather gross misstatement of fact contained in your Budget, are you prepared, today, to give this House and the people of Saskatchewan an explanation as to why this gross misstatement was there, together with an apology to this House for misleading it so badly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made in my Budget speech is perfectly accurate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Let me try to explain to the hon. member what happened.

Last year this government introduced a program called Safety '77. I don't know whether the hon. member heard about it. I hope that he was part of it. We also introduced the compulsory use of seat belts, which he opposed. I can tell the hon. member that as a result of the Safety '77 Program, as a result of compulsory use of seat belts there have been some dramatic changes in what has happened in the number of fatalities and the number of injuries. I can tell the hon. member that during the period January 1, 1977 to June 30, 1977, the number of fatalities and injuries increased by 22 per cent over the same period the year before.

Since Safety '77 was introduced and compulsory seat belts became introduced, the accidents or the injuries and fatalities for the period July 1 to December 31 dropped by 15 per cent compared for the same period of the year before.

Mr. Speaker, we had increased the premium rates prior to introducing the Safety Program. We did not know what the effect would be. Had we known what the effect would be then likely we would not have had an increase in the automobile insurance rates. The truth is that the Government Insurance Office was able to make this additional profit of \$1.3 million because of the co-operation of the drivers and because of the safety program and compulsory seat belts. This is what the Boychuk Board comments. We are taking positive action, not to return \$1.3 million to the automobile owners by way of insurance, but to return a benefit of 5 per cent reduction in premium rates equivalent to 4.3 . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, as benefits. We express our appreciation and thank the drivers of Saskatchewan for their co-operation. We hope that they continue the road they have started on and I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a further reduction next year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — A final, Mr. Speaker. I really haven't heard the question. I would suspect that perhaps we should hear the question first before . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No, but when I heard the original question I heard a lot of debate. I allowed the minister to give some debate in return and I'm going to cut the member off.

If he thinks it's important he can come back later with another question.

Mr. Malone: — But I'll need . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Let it rest.

Mr. Malone: — But let me, by way of supplementary, final or other wise, direct to the minister some statistics which he has in turn directed to me, Mr. Speaker.

According to the SGIO's annual report filed in this Assembly a few days ago, the number of claims between 1976 and 1977 increased by 3,200. The amount required to cover those claims increased by \$7.4 million — not reduced. Now once again, Mr. Minister, I say to you, are you prepared, today, to acknowledge before this House, that your statement in the Budget was a gross misrepresentation of the fact and apologize to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I'm surprised that the member is being so debatable in putting his question and that is against the rule of — Order, order! I'm considering whether I should let the member go on. I just want to warn him. I just talked to him about debatable-type questions which are not permitted by the rules of the question period . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — You should've talked to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: — I did. Now if the member for Indian Head-Wolseley wants to make a point of order he should get properly on his feet and make it at an appropriate time — (interjection — inaudible). Order! I'm just warning the member for Lakeview that his question is debatable like his first question was debatable. I also said the minister's answer was debatable . . .

An Hon. Member: — You didn't tell him.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . and I'm warning the member that I'm in doubt as to whether I should let him go on; however I'll let the minister answer the supplementary and then we'll go to a new question.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I stand by the statement made in the Budget speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Filing of Public Accounts

Mr. R.L. Colver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Since it is now 15 days later than the latest that the public accounts have ever been tabled in this Legislature and 55 days later than the average time it took in the last six years, why has the minister not filed the public accounts in this Legislature for perusal by members of the Legislature?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I have checked on the Public Accounts; we have had some printing difficulties but I expect them to be completed in the matter of the next two or three days.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Would it be possible that the facts as stated by the Minister of Finance prior to, say, December of 1977, as it relates to the fiscal year ended March 31, 1977 when he talked about the deficit, the expenditure and the revenue, might possibly be less than accurate and that's why they're not tabled? Might it also be possible that the provincial auditor is concerned about some of the previous reports that he has given and wants to qualify his statement and the government is attempting to stall and delay before that is produced?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, that's a presumptuous question that the hon. member is raising. I have yet to see the Public Accounts — I do not know — the provincial auditor has not submitted his report to me. I don't know what the provincial auditor will be saying: they will be submitting the report and I will be tabling it but the kind of inferences and imputations that the hon. member is making, as usual, I am sure are going to be proven totally wrong.

Compensation for Shiplack Family

Mr. MacDonald: — I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General. Back in the early 1960s, the former government passed an act in this Assembly called The Crime Compensation Act where the victims of crimes received some compensation from the government. All of us are aware of the Fred Shiplack tragedy in Candiack in the picket lines with the Canadian Agricultural Movement. I would like to ask the Attorney General if Mrs. Shiplack, the widow and the family, qualify under The Crimes Compensation Act, first of all. Secondly, how would this be initiated and if they do qualify would the minister undertake to expedite any application that might be forthcoming?

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge and understanding of this particular case, the estate of the late Fred Shiplack would be entitled to apply to The Crimes Compensation Board. I believe the forms are readily available and I will make them available for the hon. member so that he can assist the family if that is their wish. The matter of expediting the proceedings, I am afraid, is not within the hands of the government. I think all members will agree the Crimes Compensation Board is a quasi-judicial semi-independent tribunal which has the right to deal with claims in the manner in which they appear before them. I am sure that the Board, however, will be very cognizant of any arguments along those lines that may be raised by the Shiplack family.

Mr. MacDonald: — I would perhaps redirect this question to the Premier on the same subject. CFQC has started a fund of voluntary contributions for the Shiplack family. Most of us are aware that very often, the compensation paid under The Crime Compensation Act to the victims of crimes is sometimes very low. I was wondering if the Premier or the government have considered making a contribution to this fund, initiated by CFQC. I think if they did so, or would consider it, this would provide some leadership for other people in the province of Saskatchewan and many of the other citizens. I would like to ask the Premier if he has considered it. If not, would the government consider it.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I can't say we have considered it. I have only very recently been made aware of the fund. I can say we will consider it. Clearly, the cause is meritorious. Just as clearly, there are certain problems with respect to precedence, and otherwise. We will have to give consideration to that and see what we

think is, in all circumstances, the appropriate stance of the government.

Answer to Question re Boot-legging of Alberta Gas

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member from Rosetown-Elrose asked, in very general terms, whether or not there was statutory provision with respect to the question of boot-legging gas from Alberta by Saskatchewan people. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not exactly clear as to why farmers would want to boot-leg gas from Alberta to Saskatchewan, since there is no tax on purple gas, which is what farmers use. It is roughly equivalent to the same price as the Alberta gas with the 10 cent reduction. To answer his question in any event, the answer is, it is covered in our judgement by The Field Petroleum Products Act, which would make this an offence.

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SEDCO. On numerous occasions in the fall session, I asked the minister questions pertaining to a transaction in Moose Jaw involving SEDCO and the Golden Acre Motel. In one of those exchanges I asked the minister if all documents pertaining to personal guarantees in that transaction, would be tabled in the House. Mr. Speaker, I reminded him of it about a week ago and the minister after saying last fall that he would table such documents, denied making such a statement. I would like therefore, to point out to the minister, on page 1611 of January 11th, . . . inaudible interjection. Will the minister, in the light of what is on page 1611 which I am sure he has looked at, re-consider and table the required documents — which he originally told this Assembly that he would. Will he now re-consider and put these documents on the table.

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is true the hon. member has asked me that question last fall and has asked it again a couple of weeks ago. I think I attempted to answer it. I told him if it was in the interest of SEDCO at that time, I would have tabled the document. However, the SEDCO people tell me it is not in their interest to table the document of that kind and I asked the hon. member if he was seriously interested in discussing the subject with me privately, I would be prepared to do so.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Minister, I am sure we are all aware that this is a Crown corporation and we're talking about the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Since the minister refuses to acknowledge his own words on page 1611 of Hansard, would the minister then at least follow the normal British Parliamentary tradition, where when you don't run your own department or that your word is not good if it's on the legislative record, will you tell this Assembly when we can expect your resignation?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I'll take the next question.

Metric Conversion

Mr. R.E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It is my understanding that the minister met with the hon. Tony Abbot, federal minister this morning. Did you, Mr. Minister, at this meeting raise the matter of a fund to assist small businessmen, mechanics and farmers with changing of tools, pumps and other related items that must be replaced or changed because of the metric conversion?

Mr. Vickar: — Mr. Speaker, no, we did not exchange any views on metric conversion. I might say at this time though, that our conversation this morning with the hon. Tony Abbot was a real favorable one because when he came to me this morning, he asked me for the brief on the new programs that we introduced in this House a couple of weeks ago. Mr. Abbott was delighted with our new programs and took them with him in order to be in a position possibly to complement our programs with the federal programs.

Mr. Nelson (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. After the ministerial statement, I wonder if the minister could tell us what plans the government of Saskatchewan have for financial assistance for the changing to metrics for these particular people concerned?

Mr. Vickar: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, our department does not have any programs of that sort. I think that's a total federal issue. I think the federal department will . . .

Grievances – Crown Prosecutors

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General. A matter was raised by the Saskatoon prosecutors in late February and a brief was forwarded to the director of criminal justice setting out the grievances and the concerns of at least some of the Crown prosecutors in the province of Saskatchewan. In that particular brief and the press release they indicated that their reaction would hinge on the reaction of both the Attorney General and the director of criminal justice. Can you tell us, are talks still proceeding with the prosecutors and their association in an attempt to ameliorate the grievances of the Crown prosecutors in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is that talks have been on-going for the entire tenure as far as I know (my entire tenure as Attorney General). Some few years ago an association of Crown Counsel was formed and these are the kinds of issues which have been continually raised and I fully expect them to be continued to be raised.

With respect to the press release which is in question, the Director of Criminal Justice has met on a number of occasions with the Crown Counsel and I am advised that the answers are understood and satisfactory. They are not fully satisfactory to me or to the Director of Criminal Justice nor the prosecutors but we see no major problem here.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — A supplementary. A review of the Attorney General's budget indicates there is only a staff complement increase of one in the Criminal Justice subvote, would the Attorney General not admit with his statement that the talks have been ongoing during his tenure as Attorney General that never have we seen the morale in the prosecutor's office as low as it is today under your direction as Attorney General and it's the first time we have ever had even an indication of a potential prosecution . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have a question?

STATEMENTS

SGEA Agreement

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker I am pleased to announce

that a tentative agreement has been reached for a two-year collective bargaining agreement between the Saskatchewan Government Employment Association and the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — This agreement covers the general public service employees. We expect that all the employees will be back to work tomorrow. I am not able to inform the members of the Legislature on what the detailed terms of the settlement are since it is paramount that union members be first informed the details of the settlement and have had a chance to express their views and have had a chance to vote on the terms of settlement.

I would like to express, Mr. Speaker, my person appreciation of the government to the union negotiating team and to the Public Service Commission negotiating team on their hard work and co-operation. I also want to express a special vote of thanks to Don Ching, the mediator, who helped both parties in a significant way and through his special skills made this agreement possible and mutually satisfactory to both parties.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make. I started when the minister began by thinking all that I would be saying is that I congratulate the government on concluding the matter and then as the minister proceeded he, in essence, said they don't have an agreement, it's not confirmed and they don't even have the firm details. I wonder whether the minister has not used ministerial statements as an opportunity to make a press release that negotiations are proceeding.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister's statement I am glad to hear that possibly the workers will be back on their jobs shortly. There are many things that the government has fallen behind on. One of them is, of course, the Land Titles area. I am hoping that the Attorney General will increase or put on extra staff, as he indicated earlier in the House that he would, to make sure that we get caught up in the backlog there. When we get into Budget would you like to indicate the amount of money that the government saved by getting into this fight with their employees for political reasons only?

POINTS OF ORDER ON THE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Malone: — I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, arising from the question period of today. I suppose there are really two points of order, Mr. Speaker, if I could deal with them both at the same time.

I assume Your Honour appreciates the position that I and other members find ourselves in, in question period. When we are ruled out of order by yourself and when you give us reasons, it is very tempting for us, of course, to get up and respond at that time. My understanding of the rules are that we are not allowed to. It is somewhat frustrating for us to be sitting here, hearing your reasons and not being able to get up and respond to them immediately. I am sure Your Honour appreciates that.

Perhaps, getting onto the more substantive point of order, Mr. Speaker, you ruled me out of order, I believe, by saying that I was debating and that I was giving debating

points rather than facts. I bring Your Honour's attention to the fact that I quoted directly from the Budget and that is not something that is arguable, it is a government statement which sets out certain things the government intends on doing and gives the reasons for doing them. I also tabled a letter, a copy of a letter, from the Saskatchewan Public Sector Price and Compensation Board. The contents of that letter are not debatable.

The reason I raise the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that it is a very, very serious matter indeed when it appears – and I stress the word 'appears' – that the Minister of Finance seriously misled this Legislature when he presented the Budget. The reason I make those comments, Mr. Speaker, is because of the contents of the letter that I tabled and because of an article that appeared in yesterday's Leader Post, which I did not have a chance to refer to and because of certain remarks that were made at the time the Budget was brought down, leading one to the conclusion that because of the order of the Saskatchewan Public Sector Price and Compensation Board the SGIO could cut its rate.

So I raise the matter, Mr. Speaker, in the sense I believe that if there is the appearance – and I stress the word 'appearance' at this stage – of a minister misleading this House in a document as important as the Budget . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order!

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, please. I am not going . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The member is now making the argument against the minister. I am afraid the member is and if he will check the record he will see that that is what he is doing. If he wants to say something further I will allow him to continue, otherwise I will respond.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, the whole guts of the situation, of course, is why I am asking the question. Is the question because of something the minister said and something that appeared in another document. Now the reason that I feel it is a very important matter is for the reason I indicated.

I put the situation to the minister and I suggested to him certain things which you took exception with. The minister in turn got up and he quoted back to me certain statistics and with respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the minister answered the question except by quoting statistics. I, in turn, took exception to the statistics he quoted. It was about that time that you rose to cut me off. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a very, in my view, serious situation and I was trying to get from the minister an acknowledgement that the Budget was correct, or that the letter was correct, or that the Leader Post story was correct. I believe it is perfectly within my rights, indeed my duty, to press the minister as hard as I can in this regard because we are dealing with a very serious matter when we are talking about a government document as important as the Budget. And, again, the appearance is there may be some errors in that Budget and we are trying to get at those errors. I believe it is appropriate at this time to do it rather than during Estimates or during the minister's own Estimates.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can speak to that?

Mr. Speaker: — No, the member can't.

An Hon. Member: — Why?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I will answer the point of order raised by the member for Lakeview.

I think it is important when members rise during the orders of the day to raise points of order with regard to the question period that they raise the point of order and not the argument. Obviously, if there is a point of order to be raised then there must have been some rule broken and the member merely has to state what rule has been abridged and I will respond, rather than to make a complicated argument that existed between him and the minister. It is not my position to determine the facts as to whether the question is accurate or the answer is accurate; that is not my position. I merely have to allow the question to continue according to the rules that have been laid down for the question period.

Now, the member began his question by quoting from the Budget Speech, I suppose it is questionable whether or not he should do that since the Debate has been concluded and the decision has been made and we cannot re-debate the Budget Speech. That has been concluded. Now perhaps rather than to try to explain that to a member during the question period. I should merely move on to another member and seek a new question. I think I will do that in the future. I will not attempt to explain during the question period but then later on I will tell the member why I didn't allow the member to continue.

In the past it has not been a practice to allow the question period to be used for tabling of documents because that is not the purpose of the question period. This has arisen before and I have said to members that that is not what the question period is for and I think all members agreed when they established the rules.

Now, I don't know what rule the member thinks was broken but I believe that the rule that was broken in the member's question and subsequently in the minister's answer, was that the member was putting his question in a debatable manner. It states clearly in the rules for the question period: questions must be stated without preamble or speech or be in the nature of a debate. Now I think a check of the record will show clearly that the member's question was a debatable question and the minister's answer in fact, was a debatable answer. I was trying to get the members to adhere to the rules of the committee that they seek information during the question period and not debate subjects. That is what was happening, I believe, during the question period.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your remarks and raise by way of an additional point of order, a comment on the remarks . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member may raise an additional point of order but he may not comment on the remarks I think.

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Speaker, the additional point of order deals with the subject I raised earlier about cutting us off if you feel that our questions are out of order. I believe that is the rule if I am not mistaken, under the committee report, that you do cut us off. We seek an explanation; we seek it at this time by point of order. I draw that to your attention because of the embarrassing position we find ourselves in.

The additional point of order I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, is this, that in many cases in

order to get to a question you have to lay the groundwork and you have to lay the groundwork by stating some facts. Now it may well be that the government takes exception to those facts or that the members to my left take exception to those facts, but nevertheless they are facts.

Now I think it is a very thin line, Mr. Speaker, to say that some sets of facts are debatable and some are facts. Surely when we ask any question in this House whether it is of the Premier or the Attorney General, we have to in some way set the groundrules for what we are going to say and I would ask Your Honour to take that into consideration and also bear in mind that I think the spirit, if not the actual law in question period, is that you try to develop a question. You ask one or two to set up the third question. In this particular case the main question I wanted to ask was the third question and you cut me off. I accept your ruling of course, but I say to you that when you get into a serious matter like this one perhaps a little more latitude could be given to the questioner. If you feel we go too far, raise it at this point in time and warn us for the future time.

Mr. Speaker: — I agree with the member with regard to the first comment he made that I should not interrupt the member and try to guide the member on to the proper path if I feel he or she is wrong during the question period and I will try to adhere more closely to that in the future. However, I say at this time that members are not allowed to resurrect debates or resolutions or bills that have already been concluded. I am not properly in order if I allow the member to stand up and say, I am reading the Budget Speech, to the Minister of Finance and I want him to respond. The member may say and I think he has the intelligence to do this, that the Minister of Finance said at some previous time this. But when the member refers directly to the Budget Speech, a part of the routine of this House that has been concluded, then he puts me in a difficult position; I'm allowing him to resurrect a previous debate. If he wants to ask a question about SGIO then I give him the intelligence to be able to do it. I think he has and I don't think I should accept the resurrection of previous debates that are concluded.

If the members are concerned about whether the question was debatable and the answer was debatable, the record is there and the members may check it at their leisure.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE ENVIRONMENT VOTE 9

ITEM 1 continued

Mr. Chairman: — Order. We were on page 36. Environment, item 1. I acknowledge the member for Rosthern.

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The other evening I brought up the point that during the Bayda hearings it was indicated that any environmental facilities which are built on any project that the amount of cost would be deducted from the royalty payments. Do you give a letter of issuance telling them you have to do this, this and this for environment? Then do you check it, do you check the costs? Do you have an idea what the costs have been to the province of Saskatchewan on deduction of royalty payments?

Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Chairman, the company will in the first instance identify the environment measures that are proposed, those are the safeguards. The proposed works will in turn be reviewed by the Department of the Environment, that's our function. These are also subject to review by the Bayda

Commission. After this assessment the mitigation measures that will be required to be done will be made known to the company but at this time it's certainly premature to speculate . . . Maybe the hon. member disagrees but I say it's premature to speculate.

Mr. Katzman: — I'll rephrase my question if I may. The only thing I refer to because of the Bayda Commission is it brings this point to light. How much in the past years has it cost the people of Saskatchewan in less royalties to the government because of instructions that you have given?

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we certainly don't have those figures here in Environment. Those would be available from either the Minister of Mineral Resources I expect or the Minister of Finance. Environment is not the collector of the province's revenue, we're doing our best to set up a Department of Revenue in the government to deal with these matters. We aren't getting very much co-operation from your caucus to get that department set up, the Department of Revenue and Supply. We're not involved in the collection of revenues.

Mr. Katzman: — I realize you are not involved in collecting but you are giving the initial order that says, or you are making the initial agreement with whoever is putting in environmental equipment, saying we're going to put this in because it's going to help the environment. This is our cost and we're going to deduct it from royalties or deduct it from somewhere. What I am wondering is, how many of these have you got involved and what is it costing us, not only uranium but any other field where you make the order?

Mr. Byers: — I think the member ought to understand the process here. First of all the Environment Department specifies the works that are to be done. Secondly, we assume that the company then builds the works. Thirdly, any recognition for capital cost allowances is worked out with either Mineral Resources or the Minister of Finance, that is certainly not under the jurisdiction of this department. Our job is to specify . . . (interjection) . . . Well, I'm telling the hon. member that any recognition for taxation purposes with respect to the capital works is not under our jurisdiction, not under the jurisdiction of this department. That will come with Finance and Mineral Resources.

Mr. Katzman: — But you're stating, you specify what they're to do. Is there no check by your department at the end and, therefore, you say, yes, they did this and they claim it cost X amount of dollars to the mineral department or whatever department is involved? There should be a double check system. For example, in fire boiler inspectors there is a backup system.

Mr. Byers: — Well, the job of this department is to monitor the works. In addition the Atomic Energy Control Board will examine any works to ensure that they are done in accordance with the licence or permits that AECB provides to the developer.

Mr. Katzman: — If it will help the minister, let's forget the uranium industries proposal to the Bayda hearings for a minute. In other areas, do you instruct somebody to make environmental changes, areas which the province has sole responsibility for. Is there any way they get their money back through reduced taxation or something?

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, our job and take air pollution as an example, our job is to determine the best practicable technology that can be applied in that situation. For instance, what is the best air pollution control equipment to be used

with an asphalt plant. Now using that example, I believe that the federal income tax laws, for instance, allow something like a two-year write off for a company that installs air pollution control equipment on an asphalt plant. Now certainly the taxation aspect of it doesn't come within our domain. We are responsible for determining the best practicable technology to be used and therefore through our permits or our system of licensing or our system of permits we have the clout to insist that where these licences and permits are now in operation that the equipment be used.

Mr. Katzman: — What you are saying basically is the write-off of two years or whatever the income tax act covers, it covers all other areas except the one area that I referred to earlier. Is that correct when I say the uranium industry?

Mr. Byers: — No.

Mr. Katzman: — Would you tell me why I'm wrong?

Mr. Byers: — Well, the two year example, I'm just quoting from memory from one section of the income tax law that I'm familiar with, it will vary from technology to technology. It's not a standard rate.

Mr. Katzman: — Basically you are saying they get to write it off 100 per cent within their own income tax somewhere.

Mr. Byers: — I think any developer or any person affected by these regulations can get that information from the local income tax office.

Mr. Katzman: — My next point is, why is the government of Saskatchewan subsidizing its big multinational friends in the uranium business from France and so forth by allowing them the reduction on royalty payments rather than income tax? You know you are always giving us the big thing about the multinationals. Here you are subsidizing them.

Mr. Byers: — Well, I think the central question here is whether proper environmental equipment should be subject to the capital cost allowance provision as an expense for doing business. It is regarded as a legitimate expense for doing business.

Mr. Katzman: — Why is it deducted from revenue payments here rather than a deduction from a legitimate expense as in other areas and why is the government of Saskatchewan giving back royalty money?

Mr. Byers: — I think the member should direct that question to the province's tax collectors as this department is not in that business.

Mr. Katzman: — You're suggesting the Department of Finance or the Department of Revenue, which one, or is it Mineral Resources?

Mr. Byers: — It is a proper question to direct to the department that makes this concession with respect to royalties.

Mr. Katzman: — Now, in your budget, so that maybe we can get off item 1 and get rolling into the rest of the estimates, could you identify to me the vote in which the

Bayda Hearing is under? The vote in which all other hearings are going on in the province?

Mr. Byers: — Item 8, sub-vote 13. Page 38; that's the total for the Environmental Assessment Secretariat.

Mr. Katzman: — Where we would have all the other studies that are basically going on? I assume that item 8 is the grants to all the local communities and so forth but what about the dam projects and so forth, where are they covered?

Mr. Byers: — Any item related to the review of environmental impact assessments or public inquiries results from environmental impact assessments is included under item 13 – no, it is item 8 – in the total – it is 13, total for Environmental Assessment Secretariat.

Mr. Katzman: — None of it is under item 2, then, under Public Information and Education?

Mr. Byers: — No, we put it all in one spot so it was easy for you to find.

Mr. Katzman: — Before we move off item 1, I would like, while I have the opportunity, to read something into the record. If I may, then table a copy of what I am reading into the record. As the minister knows, the commission that we have before us that will be bringing us a report in shortly. There have been many studies done and because I have been watching it very carefully I did a study, a questionnaire of my own. I am not sure if he has the information but I will table it after I have read it . . . is there a point of order being raised or something? There was a survey done with the Rosthern constituency which had six questions in it. To put them on the record:

Question No. 1 – Are you in favor of uranium refinery in the Warman area?

The questions were 'yes' and 'no.' the replies were – Yes – 224; No – 803.

Question No. 2 – Are you in favor of the development of the Cluff Lake uranium mine in Northern Saskatchewan?

The results were – Yes – 351; No – 537.

Question No. 3 – Are you in favor of the use of uranium products in medical research and treatment?

The replies were – Yes – 599; No – 282.

Question No. 4 – Are you in favor of a vote by residents in areas which have been designated for sites of:

(a) The uranium mine – Yes – 818, No – 299

(b) A uranium refinery – Yes – 840, No – 183

(c) A nuclear power plant – Yes – 840, No – 183

(d) A dump for nuclear wastes – Yes – 834, No – 203

Question No. 5 – Are you in favor of Canada exporting uranium products? Answer – Yes – 334, No – 550.

Question No. 6 – Do you feel you have sufficient information by media or other sources to properly answer the above questions? Answer – Yes – 638, No – 367.

If I may have a page I would like to table this. The return is in the neighborhood of 20 per cent for the minister. Would the minister look at question number four and the returns on it? Is there any indication within your department to make sure that, as is indicated in question four, the people of areas that are designated for these type of sites will be given a vote which will be considered in the final decision of any of these projects?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the member raises an interesting question. The survey itself is an interesting survey. I hope he is prepared to give the House assurance that he has forwarded this information to the Bayda inquiry.

Mr. Katzman: — If I may interrupt. Upon completion of the survey, Mr. Bayda was given a copy of it.

Mr. Byers: — The so-called proposal for the Eldorado nuclear refinery is one that comes under federal jurisdiction, not under the jurisdiction of the province of Saskatchewan. I hope in all his public pronouncements the hon. member for Rosthern is making that clear just so as there is no misunderstanding about this in the province.

We have somewhat scanty information on this proposal. We understand that at this point in time a detailed environmental impact assessment is being undertaken by consultants for Eldorado Nuclear Limited on the Warman and other sites. I want to assure the hon. member that at this time the Environment Department, Environment Saskatchewan has not received a detailed environmental impact assessment report to develop a refinery from ENL. We simply do not have one. We have insisted all along that if such a proposal comes forth that it would be subject to public hearings because we feel the public hearing approach is a more logical approach than merely holding a referendum in the area that might be affected. Any such proposal has to be reviewed also by the federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel. Our position is simply that if and when such a proposal does come forth from ENL that it will be by way of detailed environmental impact assessment. We would then require that public hearings be held so that the public and all interested parties in the province have the opportunity to put their position to a board set up for that purpose. That is the process that is being used.

I would really like to hear the views of the hon. member as to whether he disagrees with that process. I think that it is time we heard from the Conservative caucus in this province, in particular, what their views and what their policies are with respect to:

1. Environmental impact assessment on major projects before any decision is made to proceed with development.
2. That the information contained in the environmental impact assessments be made available to the public so there is ample time for discussion, six months or more. Ample time!
3. That there are public hearings established so that all interested parties can make their views known to a board that is competent to collect the views and analyse them

and assess them and put forth a recommendation.

That is the environmental process that we are trying to make work in this province. That process is far and ahead, well ahead, of the process being used in any other province in this country. I think that the people of this province have a right to know whether or not the Conservative Party agrees with this particular process, because it has implications for them, not only on the provincial scene, but it has implications for the national scene. I think that it is time they got out of the woodwork and let the people of this province and of this country know whether we are going to follow a policy like this, which we have set up and are using in Saskatchewan, or whether they are in bed with their Tory cohorts in Ontario where public hearings are shafted and denied on proposals for major developments with respect to uranium and other major issues. I think the time for them to stand up and be counted is here. I think there is no better time than in the consideration of these Estimates for the environment critic for the Conservative caucus to let us know what the Conservative policy, provincially and nationally, is in this regard.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, very interestingly now the minister . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order! I have on my speaking list, Mr. Malone. Would you like to be put on the list, next?

Mr. Malone: — Mr. Chairman, if I could interrupt the Tory filibuster for a few moments to direct some questions to the minister, which may be of more significant importance to the ramblings of the member for Rosthern.

I think it is apparent, Mr. Minister, that you for some time now have been conducting negotiations on behalf of the government with the International Joint Commission. These negotiations are, of course, about the Coronach Poplar River Project. I wonder, Mr. Minister, just what advice you have received in connection with . . . I am sorry, I am getting a bit of background noise here and I am not sure you can hear me — but I am wondering if you can tell this House what advice you have received in connection with the operations of the International Joint Commission and whether you have retained counsel to advise you as to how negotiations with that particular body are to be conducted and, indeed, who is acting on your behalf in representations to the IJC.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member's first question — have we retained counsel — we have not retained outside counsel. We have been using the services of the Department of the Attorney General. As to who really acts on my behalf, who is the senior public servant who carries on the negotiations on these international matters, the answer is, my Deputy Minister, Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Malone: — Are you suggesting to me that you have no direct communication with the IJC, that it's either Mr. Mitchell or, on a legal matter, that the representatives of the Attorney General's Department act in your stead and on your behalf and that you don't enter the picture?

Mr. Byers: — I didn't hear your last question?

Mr. Malone: — You mentioned the Attorney General's Department, you mentioned your deputy and I'm saying to you are you saying to me that in person you do not become involved with the IJC, that you rely on Mr. Mitchell to write on your behalf or you have the Attorney General's Department represent you on matters of a legal nature?

Mr. Byers: — Yes, I have made formal presentations on behalf of the province to meetings of the IJC.

Mr. Malone: — Your only involvement is making presentations at a meeting?

Mr. Byers: — I'm sorry, I didn't get your question, Mr. Malone.

Mr. Malone: — I say to you is your only involvement with the IJC when you have appeared before them and made a formal presentation?

Mr. Byers: — I have made for instance a formal presentation on the matter of water apportionment when the IJC held joint hearings in Scobey and in Coronach back in 1976.

Mr. Malone: — Your only communication with IJC. Your personal involvement, minister, has been when you appeared before the commission at Scobey and the other location in Montana, 1976, is that correct?

Mr. Byers: — Well, I have had correspondence with some of the members of the IJC — I did make a formal presentation to the IJC public hearings at Coronach. I also attended at Scobey. They were parallel hearings really on the matter of water apportionment.

Mr. Malone: — What does the correspondence consist of? Do you have a continuing dialogue with them? Have you sent many letters to the IJC and do you have this continuing at this time?

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have had some correspondence with the Canadian Chairman of the International Joint Commission to seek clarification with respect to some of the procedures that they were using and to identify some of the concerns that we had relating to the Coronach-Poplar River matters.

Mr. Malone: — Are you prepared to table that correspondence? I assume you don't have it with you now but are you prepared to table it later? It looks as if we're going to be a while on this estimate.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, I would give the hon. member an undertaking that I would like to check with the Canadian Chairman of the IJC to ascertain if he has any objection or if he approves of tabling these letters. If he is in agreement then I would certainly be prepared to make them public.

Mr. Malone: — I thank the minister of that undertaking. When this correspondence commenced with the IJC were you at that time familiar with their modus operandi and how the commission was set up and under what rules of procedure that it works, and the duties of the members of the IJC and so on, were you aware of this at the time you started communicating with them by letter?

Mr. Byers: — In general terms, I hope the hon. member will realize that though I am not a lawyer, I understand in general terms how the IJC works or is designed to work as it relates to the boundary water treaties and other matters. I have, I think, a general knowledge of the operation and the functions and the objectives of the IJC.

Mr. Malone: — When in doubt, no doubt, you would consult with counsel or Mr.

Romanow's department or with your deputy minister?

Mr. Byers: — Yes.

Mr. Malone: — Well, I happen to have with me, Mr. Minister, some letters which I am going to table and send a copy over to you. One of these letters is dated November 29, 1977, it is purportedly signed by yourself and is addressed to Professor Maxwell Cohen, QC, Chairman, Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, Slater Street, Ottawa. The other letter which I wish to table is to yourself, dated January 9, 1978, I believe it is, although it is difficult to tell from the xeroxing and the stamps on it, from Mr. Cohen to yourself. It is abundantly clear from this correspondence, Minister, that you don't have the slightest idea how IJC operates. May I suggest to you, a reading of the letter from Professor Cohen to yourself would lead any reasonable person to the conclusion that he takes you to task for intervening with the IJC in the manner which you did. I suggest to you that it is improper for you, as a minister representing myself and everybody else in Saskatchewan, to have acted in the manner which you did. The letter you sent to Mr. Cohen made many allegations about governmental officials in Montana, and so on. I will come back to those allegations in a minute. Let me just quote a few remarks from Professor Cohen's letter to you, which I think will be of interest to members in this House.

Extension of your concern about the nature of these hearings and the role of the Commission to a characterization of submissions from the government of Montana, and senior state and federal elected representative, as misleading and containing many unfounded statements, was, in our opinion, unfortunate. Your representative, who was present at the hearings, ably presented the views of your department. Indeed he spoke on three specific issues that had been previously raised at the hearing. The safety of the East Poplar Dam, information exchange and air quality. Moreover, Mr. Mitchell had two opportunities to respond and it was our impression that, in his presentation, the Saskatchewan view-point had been fully and forcefully put. Thus, we believe it to be regrettable, that you characterize in a critical way, the random and specific statements by third parties as not assisting the information gathering process.

And further on, Mr. Chairman, (inaudible interjection)

As indicated above, Commissioner Ross believes strongly that copies of your letter should be sent directly to all the interested parties, who gave the evidence to which you refer and to which your letter objects, particularly the government of the United States, Montana, and the elected representatives, for their comments and replies. It is Commissioner Ross' view, because of your charges and allegations with respect to their evidence, and statements to the effect that these were misleading and unfounded, such parties are entitled, as a matter of due process, to an opportunity to reply on the record, with respect to all of these issues before the Commission itself, responds.

Nevertheless, the Commission believes, notwithstanding the strongly held position of Commissioner Ross, it is desirable that you have our reply now, so that you may be aware of the extent which you have misjudged the nature of this commission, its preliminary hearing process, and the consideration that is due to all parties giving evidence before the commission.

Your reliance, particularly on the Canadian section of the commission to protect legitimate Canadian interests, represents a misunderstanding of the role of the commission. Etcetera.

Now, I say to you, Minister, that it was entirely improper for you to have correspondence to the commission in this manner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: — I say to you as well, Mr. Minister, that again we see this crazy situation of this provincial government, triggering a conceivable international incident. I suggest to you, Minister, that we now see these letters and we now know why the IJC has responded in the manner that they have. I am asking you now for some explanation for your behavior in this regard, and some indication from you that it is not going to happen in the future, so that our relations with the IJC can go ahead on a friendly, amicable basis as they always have in the past.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, I, and the members of this government in Saskatchewan, are as anxious as anyone in this province to co-operate and work with the International Joint Commission. The views expressed in Mr. Cohen's reply to my letter of November 29th, are his views. The basis for my letter to Mr. Cohen was to bring to his attention and to the members of the commission, the fact that we were concerned that, at the hearings on the water quality matter it did not appear to us there was a great effort being made, either by the commission or its council, to ascertain whether or not some of the information presented to the International Joint Commission was in fact accurate and if decisions are to be made on the basis of information that the accuracy has not been tested and properly tested, then I think that is a legitimate concern for me, as Minister of the Environment, to bring to the attention of the Canadian Chairman of the International Joint Commission. That was the basis for my correspondence to Mr. Cohen dated November 29, 1977.

Mr. Malone: — Is it not a fact, Mr. Minister, that the meeting you are referring to, where you made these allegations of things being unfounded and so on, that that very meeting was attended by your very able deputy, Mr. Mitchell, who is sitting beside you now? Is it not a fact that at that particular meeting Mr. Mitchell had the opportunity to refute, explain, discuss the allegations that you found to be unfounded? Is it not clear from Professor Cohen's letter that Mr. Mitchell's remarks and submissions were well received and considered by the IJC as being proper submissions and that what these communications that I am talking about now really do is indicate that the IJC was perfectly satisfied with Mr. Mitchell's representations and his position there and let's say simply that you are getting involved in a situation where you shouldn't be involved?

Mr. Byers: — I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member, the Leader of the Liberal Opposition, has ever attended public hearings of the International Joint Commission. I have attended only two hearings and I acknowledge that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is much more skilled in court proceedings than I am. The number of times I have been in court, I could count them on one hand with my fingers and one was a case with the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. But be that as it may, I want to say that the process used by the International Joint Commission (and I am not criticizing it) I am stating it as a matter of fact, that there is not an opportunity for cross-examination at the International Joint Commission hearings. I attended hearings for one whole day when some 38 briefs were presented on let us say the water apportionment issue. The Commission did allow a great deal of latitude and very few of the briefs submitted were

actually on the question of water apportionment.

Be that as it may, the only opportunity afforded to our chief official, Mr. Mitchell, at the hearings to bring to the attention of the Commission any inaccuracies that may have been presented in previous briefs, was at the time that he put the Saskatchewan position. There is no opportunity under the Commission rules for cross-examination nor to test the accuracy of information presented in briefs. Now that is the way of the Commission and we do not make the rules under which the Commission operates.

I was merely bringing to Mr. Cohen's attention our concern that the proceedings of the Commission do not permit the testing of the accuracy of the information nor cross-examination.

I can well understand perhaps why the Commission operates that way. Otherwise the Commission hearings could get into (in some cases) a cross-fire where you have an environment where heated exchanges could occur. But this was the basic reason for my letter to Mr. Cohen raising with him what I thought was a very valid concern on the part of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Malone: — I think it is fair to say from Professor Cohen's reply that he took great expectation to the manner in which it was raised and I think the minister will agree with me that there are certain channels of communication with the IJC, whether they are desirable or not, I think the custom is to go through those channels of communication. Now, IJC is rather an august body that's been operating for many, many years, to my knowledge. I don't know how they conduct their procedures but I suggest to you that there has been no apparent objection the way those procedures have been conducted in the past. I think it is intemperate of you, to say the least, to be critical of them in a so-called private communication to the Chairman.

Let me say as well, you don't know how the IJC considered and received those briefs. You make the statements about the briefs being unfounded and so on. Now, the IJC is there just to make those considerations they're to determine, based on the expert advice they obtain based on their experience, what's well-founded and what's not well-founded. I don't believe, Mr. Minister, that it is incumbent upon you, as a Minister of the Crown, to put yourself in the rather humiliating position of being taken to task by the international agency for the actions that you have conducted.

Now, let me just ask you some questions about your letter and I quote from your letter of November 29, 1977:

It is my view that the submissions made by or on behalf of the government of Montana and senior state and federal elected representatives, were misleading and contained many unfounded statements. Further on: In my view it would be most unfortunate if the commission made decisions affecting fundamental matters on the basis of unfounded and untested claims of elected representatives in our neighboring state; representatives who, of course, have no responsibility for the negative impacts of such claims in Canada.

My first question to you, then, is what senior state and federal elected representatives were you referring to in your letter; what representatives of the state of Montana, what representatives of the United States of America that were elected representatives?

Mr. Byers: — I think the hon. member is as well aware as I am of statements that were being made in the press prior to my sending this letter. There were requests for information made public, stated publicly, requests presumably to us, requests which we had never received. I don't think it would be appropriate in this House to go out and being in and lay out on the tables of this House all of those files and newspaper clippings. I'm sure any sharp student of current events in this province is aware of the kinds of statements that resulted in us writing this letter. I simply want to say to the hon. member that the contents of this letter reflect the concerns that we had with respect to some of the processes. I think it was proper to bring them to the attention of Mr. Cohen; I have since had further correspondence from Mr. Cohen and I think, as a result of that correspondence, there is now a better understanding. Perhaps the tone of this letter may have been a little harsh in places and sharper than it need have been; nevertheless we were striving to make a point on behalf of our province. The letter went to Mr. Cohen over my signature; I will accept responsibility for the contents of those letters and I think that, when an issue as great as this is posed on behalf of the people of the province, it is my responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, to bring those matters to the attention of the proper authorities. I did that. I did it on behalf of the people of this province. I accept responsibility for doing it and I will not apologize for having done it.

Mr. Malone: — What you are really saying, Mr. Minister, is in the same manner that the minister in charge of SPC said in this House in the fall, that you feel quite free to slander and defame these elected — so-called elected officials of the government of the United States of America and the government of Montana. I say that's what you are doing when you get up in this House and when you send letters to the IJC and when your colleague, the Minister of SPC in this House, says that these people are making statements that are not well-founded or they are not informed, that they are misleading untested claims. You get up and you make these sweeping statements; you damn them publicly and then you don't have the courage to get up here and say which ones you are talking about. I say for shame for that particular action on your behalf and on behalf of the Minister in charge of SPC. You've done this time and time again; you took it under your authority, presumably, to write to the IJC and make these statements in a letter without identifying people, without identifying the concerns that you have, without saying what statements were ill-founded or unfounded, what claims were untested, what representations were misleading, which contained unfounded statements.

I say to you as a minister of the Crown that surely you have a greater responsibility than you have shown by these letters and by your public statements. If you are going to take this approach surely we can expect of you some identification of what you are talking about and whom you are talking about. It is just not good enough to come in here and say, no good purpose would be served at this time or I don't have to say these things at this time. You make these statements about the so-called statements by the officials of Montana and the US. But it wasn't their statements that caused the IJC to order construction to be shut down on the Coronach Poplar River project. It was because the SPC failed to provide sufficient information to the IJC that the order was granted. Now, presumably it was nothing to do with what the Montana people said or the American people said that caused this project to be shut down, it was because of your government failing to provide information that was required by the IJC to make the decision they had to make. So it does not do you very much good to come into this House and say it is all the fault of the Americans, all the fault of those people in the United States, when it is your fault for getting us into the situation that you have gotten us into at the present time.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member may want to overlook the major issues that are really being sorted out here. The first is that the International Joint Commission did make a request to the two governments that the work halt at Coronach. That was the IJC recommendation to the two federal governments. Within hours of that request going from the IJC to the two governments, I called a press conference and I believe it was attended by the hon. Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, in which I expressed the view that in my opinion the IJC had overreacted. Subsequently, the IJC request to the two governments to halt Coronach, stop Coronach, was reviewed by the two governments. It was reviewed by the Government of Canada; it was reviewed by the government of the United States. The Canadian position was put forth; the American position was put forth. There was a special meeting in Washington to deal with this IJC request. And as a result of that meeting the two governments agreed not to accept the recommendation of the IJC for a halt on the Coronach project. Those are the bare, hard, cold facts which cannot be ignored. The IJC is a body that only has authority to make recommendations to the two governments and in this instance the IJC recommendation to the two governments was not accepted.

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, some time ago, some considerable time ago, the Minister of the Environment suggested somehow that we, in the Progressive Conservative caucus, are here to answer his questions. He is going to question us about our stand. We are going to be happy to provide that to him, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that you probably should have ruled him out of order because I don't think it is the minister's job to question us about our policy. It is our job to question the minister about what has happened in terms of his department in relation to the Government of Saskatchewan. The minister suggested and asked us the following questions. Do we believe in environmental impact studies? The answer is, yes.

Mr. Rolfes: — No you don't.

Mr. Collver: — Yes. You see that is like the young people that the Minister of Social Services has been involved with for so many years as a teacher and he is now trying to copy them and say, yes, no, yes, no. The other question that the minister asked us, Mr. Chairman, was whether or not Progressive Conservatives believed the public are entitled to information pertaining to the environment in which they live. The answer is, yes, we do. Thirdly, the minister tried to suggest to us or ask us whether or not we believe that there should be, before projects of major importance to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and to any particular area, public hearings before the development occurs. The answer to that is, yes, absolutely. That having been said, Mr. Chairman, now that we have provided the minister our policy or our understandings of what should happen, let's just examine for just a moment, what has, in fact, happened in relation to this government and in relation to those very three questions.

Does the present government believe in environmental impact studies? They say they do. But while the study by Mr. Justice Bayda is going on, they are developing, with their multinational friends in the northern part of Saskatchewan a great many projects which seem to be going ahead.

An Hon. Member: — How long since you've been there?

Mr. Collver: — Well, about a year and a half ago. About a year and a half ago up to Muckta Lake, a very interesting project at Muckta Lake. Very, very interesting and a beautiful part of our province. I recommend that to the member for that part of the

constituency. I doubt that he has ever been there.

Mr. Chairman, should the public be entitled to information on the environment? The minister has asked us whether that is our policy. Should the public be entitled to information on the environment before the project is proceeded with? I ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, what information was made available to the public before the Government of Saskatchewan started optioning land around Warman? The answer is, none. Zero! Nothing! The public knew nothing about it until suddenly these people appeared on their doorstep to auction off their land, for something they didn't know anything about.

The third question, public hearings. Do we believe in public hearings? We said, yes. Does the present government believe in public hearings? I am sorry.

Mr. Byers: — He said referendum.

Mr. Collver: — Referendum. Do we believe in referendums, absolutely. Who was it called for, I say to the minister, who was it called for the public's entitlement to make the decision on something that they had had a great deal of information, such as the compulsory use of seat belts, that they had entitlement to a vote on that before it was implemented? It is called, Mr. Chairman, the difference between push leadership and pull leadership.

Push leadership is, order people to do it today and then propagandize them tomorrow to convince them that it was a good thing.

Pull leadership is, ask them what they want and then enact, then enact the legislation.

Public hearings, Mr. Chairman. The NDP, do they believe in public hearings? They say they do. They say they are interested in public hearings, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, sincerely I ask . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Let's get into the department.

Mr. Collver: — Good grief! The member for Regina South wants to campaign now from his seat. He tells me he has been out around the constituency three times. He said he is on his third time, but not from his chair, I don't think.

Do they believe in public hearings? The answer is, No. They say they believe in public hearings, but they go ahead and act on this uranium thing anyway while the public hearing are in process. They go ahead and commit millions of dollars of the people of Saskatchewan's money, to these projects, before the results are known.

In the Budget, alone, I think the number is some \$40 million for potential uranium projects through SMDC. I believe that is correct. I would have to check. But I believe it is certainly in the millions.

Mr. Byers: — This isn't a two-bit government.

Mr. Collver: — Oh, the minister says this isn't a two-bit government. That is the understatement of the year, this isn't a two-bit government.

One billion, five hundred million dollars worth of borrowing, Mr. Chairman, in the last

18 months. That is not two-bits, that's for sure. Just for the information of the members opposite, because they seem to talk in billions of dollars all the time. I just thought I might relate the term, billion, to them. One of our candidates, Mr. Grant Devine, in Saskatoon, said this the other night and so I am repeating him.

He said it is a billion seconds since the end of the Second World War. It is a billion minutes since the year 44 AD, 44 years after the birth of Jesus. It is a billion hours and man wasn't even in existence. He hadn't even evolved from the amoeba. You are not a two-bit government all right. \$1,500 million worth of borrowings, more borrowings in 18 months, certainly is an impact on the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, on this particular department, I would like the minister to answer this question. Since he wanted the Progressive Conservatives to give our policy, would the minister be prepared to give the NDP policy on those three areas, in the light of the government's actions on the Bayda Commission and in the light of the information that the public was entitled to prior to the options being exercised or being taken in the Warman area?

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the policy is well known in the interim policy for the Environmental Impact Assessment program. It's clarified further in the terms of reference provided to the Bayda Commission, namely that for exploration purposes in the uranium field, private or joint ventures, or on whatever basis, while the Bayda Commission was undertaking its study, it was business as usual for other companies in the field of exploration. They do so with the full knowledge that if there is a dramatic change in government policy that results in the ceasing of any further uranium development, then companies are continuing with their exploration work with the full knowledge that they will be responsible for restoring the works to their original condition or as near thereto as possible. That, I thought, was fully understood by all members of this Legislature. It was certainly understood by the people who are undertaking any mining exploration work.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, that \$5,874,000 that the Government of Saskatchewan is proposing to spend in the forthcoming year, I wonder since the public accounts have not been tabled in this Legislature, which does make it difficult for members of the opposition to do their job, could the minister let us know what the expenditures for the year ended March 31, 1977 were for the Department of the Environment?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has posed a question that is impossible to answer on March 22 because the end of this fiscal year is . . .

Mr. Collver: — Not 1978.

Mr. Byers: — Oh, you asked for 1977?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the answer to the hon. member's question is contained on page 61 of the annual report - \$4,029,377.22.

Mr. Collver: — Would you repeat that number?

Mr. Byers: — \$4,029,377.22. That's expenditures for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1977. Page 61, annual report.

Mr. Collver: — Of the Department of the Environment?

An Hon. Member: — Oh dear, is that a public document?

Mr. Byers: — That is a public document that is tabled on . . .

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, how does that relate then to the overall financial statements of the Government of Saskatchewan, is that number inserted in the overall financial statements — is this a sub-report of public accounts, is it?

Mr. Byers: — I'm probably like you, Mr. Chairman, I confess that I have not read all of the annual reports and documents that have been tabled in this House. I haven't read them all yet.

Mr. Collver: — Well then, I just don't happen to have this — I am sure that you have this here — what was the amount budgeted for that year, Mr. Minister, and while you are at it what was the percentage overexpended by the budget?

Mr. Byers: — We don't have that information here but if it is needed to assist you in your work for the rest of the Session, we'd be glad to provide it for you.

Mr. Collver: — Thank you very much. I just didn't happen to have mine here, either. The point I was trying to make was, that it appears that the Department of the Environment, as with every other government department, seems to spend more every year than has been budgeted for. Well, it has been the case and I was just interested, since we don't have yet the public accounts for the year end of March 31, 1977 — it does make it difficult to do the appropriate job. For the \$5,800,000 budgeted for the forthcoming year, in the light of the Department of the Environment's foul-up of Poplar River, as I think, outlined succinctly by the Leader of the Public Party, in the light of the Department of the Environment's foul-up of negotiations, discussions pertaining to the uranium development in the province of Saskatchewan as I think, rather succinctly outlined by the member for Rosthern. I wonder if the minister could answer, what projects, if any, or what benefit have the people of Saskatchewan received from the Department of the Environment? What jobs, for example, have you done that have not been fouled up?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, I thought we had a good record of performance in delivering good service to the people for the money that this Legislature approves.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I think the minister can appreciate the question and answer it. What projects has the minister, of material size, don't talk about the minor ones, what projects for the province of Saskatchewan, has the Department of the Environment examined — other than the uranium development and the Poplar River project. Those two we've seen and discussed and found were fouled up. What projects of material size were not fouled up?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, I could answer the hon. member's question by reading the annual report into the records, if that would make him happy. That would probably be the best accounting of our stewardship. We're involved in a good number of programs relating to environmental management. We are responsible for the Qu'Appelle implementation. We think we're doing a good job in that in spite of the problems and the frustrations that arise from time to time. I think the annual report attests to something like 10,000 water projects of irrigation, water treatment, sewage

treatment. We have been involved in the last several years with the federal government on some 30 task forces to develop air pollution control standards. We have put into place a permit and licensing system, the results of which should be visible on the skylines to anyone in the Regina area. As a result of developing guidelines the IPSCO air pollution is not virtually solved. One could recite a very long list of achievements in that regard. I invite him to look about him as he drives through the countryside, and to read the annual report and some of the literature that comes out, to see some of the very significant changes that have taken place around the potash mines and the oil fields, along the Qu'Appelle by this government; notwithstanding the very comprehensive assessment that was done in his own constituency for a possible power development on the Saskatchewan River upstream from Nipawin. The list is virtually endless.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, the only job that I heard him talk about, the major project that he talked about was the dam for Nipawin. Have those studies been completed, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Byers: — The assessment studies . . . the decision of Saskatchewan Power Corporation to do the assessments I think were announced in this Chamber by the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation. Mr. Messer, two sessions ago – about two years and a month ago if my knowledge of history is correct. That may have been one of the days when he wasn't here and we didn't have a current printed Hansard then.

The studies have been published and have been a public document now for several months.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the environmental studies are not completed until the public hearings are completed. I thought that was what you just stated. It is also my understanding that the public hearings have not been completed pertaining to the Nipawin dam; that the decision has not been finally reached and that the Department of the Environment is responsible for ensuring that the public hearings the Department of Environment, through Sask Power and with Sask Power – that's what you said you were going to be spending your \$5,800,000 on, were going to be involved in terms of having the public hearings and completing the environmental studies and completing the studies across the province. Is that not correct and this has not yet been completed?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the environmental assessment report on the proposed Nipawin project has been printed and has been a public document since October, 1977.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, the environmental impact study document that he referred to has not been accepted by Sask Power pending the outcome of public hearings. That is surely the case. Sask Power has not announced that it is proceeding with the Nipawin dam because the public hearings have not been completed and therefore, which public hearings are going to be a portion of your department's expenditure, surely. More people are going to be required to attend all of these public hearings. That is part of next year's budget is it not?

Mr. Byers: — Well, we just had a long dissertation by the hon. member for Nipawin about what I understood to be the Tory policy on assessments. Now he is somewhat confused as to the status of the Environmental Assessment Report by SPC on a

proposed power plant in his constituency and he wonders where that is at.

Let me go through it again for him: (1) the assessment report was commissioned a couple of years ago. (2) the assessment report was printed and made public in October. (3) the assessment report is now being evaluated by the Bergstrom Board and they are also looking at Nipawin, just to bring him up to date. The report is complete. The mandate of the board is to determine whether the protective measures proposed in that report are sufficient and to recommend any changes. Maybe they will recommend that the dam be built 40 miles downstream or 80 miles upstream. I don't know what they will recommend, but be that as it may.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Minister, have they recommended any further studies by the department as a result of their examination both in terms of the hearings so far, which have not been many. Have they recommended any further studies or can we anticipate a report based on the studies that have been submitted to them?

Mr. Byers: — The Bergstrom Board has been asked to evaluate the environmental assessment report and to report to the government by June 15, 1978. They are now in the course of doing their work.

As a matter of fact, they either have or they will be holding hearings in the Nipawin area very shortly. Their terms of reference are quite broad and any changes they want to recommend they are quite free to do so.

Mr. Katzman: — The minister made some early comments in reply to a question — he laid three questions on me. Mr. Collver, the member for Nipawin, has answered those three but I would like to go into something a little further and I am glad the hon. member is back in his chair. He used to be the former minister for SEDCO. You said that you want public information and we agree we want public information, then why does the minister state that the reason he doesn't want to tell anybody about what they are doing and why they are trying to buy land is because it might cost them a dollar. If you check into the release of the hon. member, it was the Minister, Mr. Messer, who tried to hide it from the people of Saskatchewan as they tried to buy land. Now where is the public information there? He denied that was the purpose until we were able to prove it to him and then he had to admit it. Where is the public information there? You were trying to hide the facts because you feel you can put out your propaganda to get what you want and not to give the people of this province honest information. Now if you would like to comment on why he did that?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member implies that the provincial government is somehow involved in a proposed refinery in the Saskatoon or Warman district but that is simply not the case. First Eldorado Nuclear we understand has been looking at a site or so in western Canada for a proposed refinery for a number of years but before they obtain approval to construct any refinery anywhere ENL (Eldorado Nuclear) will be required to present to the environment department of the Government of Saskatchewan the detailed environmental impact assessment report and at this point in time — this is about the third session when I discussed this matter — things have not changed. ENL have simply not presented such a proposal by way an environment impact assessment report to the Government of Saskatchewan as of this fact and therefore there is no proposal. There is simply no proposal and I don't know how you get this all mixed up about buying options for land and all of that because it is not related to any concrete proposal that the government has at this point in time from ENL, we simply don't have a concrete proposal from them.

Certainly the Bayda Commission is charged with the responsibility of looking into all aspects of uranium mining and processing and refining and the like and I am certain there has been submissions presented to the Bayda Commission on these issues. We are still waiting for Mr. Bayda's report. I don't know what he'll say about refineries, I haven't the slightest idea but it is simply presumptuous at this time to assume that there is a refinery around the corner because there has been no proposal from ENL. If we ever get one, if we receive one, they will be subjected to the same strenuous procedures with respect to making their documents public, holding public hearings and we don't anticipate a referendum. This is a question which the authorities have very carefully dodged today. The hon. member from Rosthern implied the way to make these decisions is to hold a vote. If you are going to hold a vote then apparently you don't need any public hearings. Now, apparently he and his leader are not on the same wave length, they are out of sync here somehow because the leader today, at least, supports the process we are using yet the member from Rosthern seems to think the way to settle these matters is by way of a referendum. So there's apparently not total harmony in the Tory camp, in the Tory caucus on this subject because they seem to have different views within their caucus as to how these matters ought to be resolved.

I ask the hon. member from Rosthern, who I understand to be the official environment critic for their caucus, to state his party's position so we would have the benefit of it. The leader obviously didn't want him to speak on that subject and the leader intervened and we got the leader's view which temporarily today is different from the view of the hon. member from Rosthern. Now, maybe tomorrow the positions will be changed, I don't know, after they have a caucus meeting.

Mr. Katzman: — Obviously, the member wishes me to repeat what our leader said and of course, I totally agree with our leader. It is unfortunate that you can't be notified by your fellow members of Cabinet what your fellow members of Cabinet are doing. You state that it is Eldorado. Then why are the titles in the name of Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation? Isn't that a Government of Saskatchewan corporation? Do you need copies of the documents that tell you because your fellow Cabinet ministers won't tell you what they're doing because they are scared you might interfere because you are the Minister of Environment? Are you suggesting that because I say to you that the people of the area that are going to be affected by any projects should have been contacted by vote or referendum, take your choice of what wording, if they are in favor of a project — there are many areas in this province that would like to have a project of this nature. There are many areas that want no part of it, so why would you be bothering to force it down the throats of those who may not want it, without asking them and where there are other areas who are asking for it, you are not even asking if they would like it. You're ignoring them. I would suggest that's part of your public inquiry and that you shouldn't keep your ears just listening to the member, the present minister two chairs over from you, who didn't want the public to know that you were involved, who didn't want the public to know that you were trying to acquire land for a uranium refinery. Nobody was supposed to know because it might cost you a dollar. You were trying to hide it from the public. You weren't being honest with the public and I wonder how often, in this Eldorado or in uranium, this \$40 million we're talking about, are we going to find out after that the government has gone in and put their shoulders into it and their money into it but not told the public of this province that they are getting involved until we have to call upon the Minister of Environment? Let's get something in there and make a public inquiry. We are in trouble from our own membership. That's what the problem is: you are getting stomped on from your own membership. You weren't going to listen to the people of this province. You didn't care about the people

of Warman and their opinion; you were going to go ahead with it. Let's not beat around the bush, that's what you were trying to do. Your argument was dollars and cents. It hasn't cost you a penny more than was originally suggested the price would be on that land. Here, you are saying to me that there is disharmony over here. Let's talk about disharmony. How come your fellow Cabinet ministers aren't telling you what they're doing when it affects you? That's Cabinet, Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, do you want me to give you copies of all the land transfers? You know, let's play the game upright.

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — I know the minister of the Environment has been awfully badly battered these days but I have a few questions I want to direct to the minister. How many civil servants — extra civil servants — would you say are employed or have had to be added to the staff to carry out the provisions of the Qu'Appelle Implementation Program? Are there any figures there that you may have?

Mr. Byers: — There are seven from The Department of the Environment. There are, however, staff in other departments of the provincial government working on the Qu'Appelle but there are seven from Environment.

Mr. Birkbeck: — That's just in your department, seven in your department?

Mr. Byers: — Yes, if you wanted to know the names — if you wanted a list of the other departments that are involved with the Qu'Appelle implementation this year, I think I could give you that information. Agriculture, Municipal Affairs, Tourism and Renewable Resources, Culture and Youth and SEDCO.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Mr. Chairman, if I might. I understand some of those questions could be directed under item 8, we might leave those and move them down.

A more direct question. Did the Qu'Appelle Implementation Board apply to the Pheasant Hills special planning area for recommendations for improvements on the Qu'Appelle River below the Round and Crooked Lakes?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, each conveyance improvement proposal is discussed with the special planning area that would be affected.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Mr. Chairman, I just have a few short questions. I will be through them very shortly. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, do you not agree that some of the improvements that may or may not result in the Qu'Appelle River Basin, especially in the Qu'Appelle River area, is that Round and Crooked Lakes area are causing other problems downstream in particular as it pertains to the farmers in that area? I just wonder if you have a few comments on that, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Byers: — Well, the proposed improved channel conveyance proposals have been studied with a great deal of care, the effects of the improvements have certainly been on the downstream. People have certainly been studied and examined and the best information we can get is that the proposed conveyance improvements will not eliminate flooding under all circumstances but will substantially reduce it. The proposal is to improve the carrying capacity of the channel to a minimum of 500 cubic feet per second; in places it's now only 50 cubic feet per second. I think as a general statement that most of the farmers in the valley welcome the decision to proceed with these conveyance improvements.

Mr. Birkbeck: — That's, Mr. Chairman, that's just where there seems to be some disagreement between you and me and in particular, as it relates to the special planning authority that representation on that board indicates to me, that in fact, the farmers are not content with that particular arrangement. That they feel that there's a certain amount of wildlife that is moving into that area. There are a number of farmers that are being forced by government to sell their property; I understand there are about 7,000 acres acquired for flood control and that's one of the areas. I'm not referring to, I think, maybe, you misunderstood my question. What I'm saying that there are farmers downstream that are having to vacate their land and those that are still maintaining their land have extra problems like, wildlife coming in there, that were not there before, and they're not being compensated for that. Do you agree with that, Mr. Minister? Have there been any problems brought to your attention with regard to what I've just presented to you?

Mr. Byers: — Well, all I can say to the hon. member is that if the Pheasant Hills Special Planning Commission has some concerns about the proposed conveyance improvements that they should certainly feel free to bring them to the Qu'Appelle Valley Management Board. The board would be more than delighted to hear them. The overall conveyance improvements proposed were recommended and studied. The Qu'Appelle Valley Development Association which has a long history of promoting good works in the valley, in principal, supports the idea of conveyance improvements. That doesn't mean that there will not be particular problems caused in particular areas, if the proposed conveyance works are proceeded with but we think that, through the establishment of the special planning commissions which are comprised of representatives of local governments who are right on the scene where the action is or where the action is proposed, they are in a good position to judge the merits of any proposals. If the Pheasant Hills special planning commission has some concerns about the proposed works it should meet at once with the Qu'Appelle Valley management Board, the Implementation Branch.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Mr. Chairman, maybe if I would just give you a more specific example in what I mean when I say that farmers in that area are incurring some losses, and I refer to two farmlands and two lands that are being farmed by the people down there.

There was a study done by the Lower Qu'Appelle special planning party which shows that, over the last 10 years, there have been over 3500 cultivated acres per year out of production, due to flooding. According to the Qu'Appelle River Conservation Study, Appendix Three, they say that their loss per cultivated acres would be about \$93 - \$93.63. Therefore the yearly loss per acre would be that amount times 3500 acres, which would be the equivalent of \$327,705 lost per year. Now then, if you read on in that statement, it says – that the government study indicates there is only \$5,075 per year average loss in the Lower Qu'Appelle. To me, there's quite a lot of difference in the two statements. I rather feel somewhat confident at this point. The study done by the special planning authority is very close to right as – you know the people down there have signed individual statements pertaining to cultivated acres of losses and that's been done by the majority of the landowners down there. Now those are more specific figures and there seems to be a conflict in your statements there.

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I have harrowed as much as the hon. member for Moosomin has ploughed but I've done a bit of both and he's trying to pit the farmers' figures against the engineers' figures and I suppose that's a nice sporty game. The point is that the proposed channel conveyance improvements are designed to

reduce flooding. They will not eliminate flooding; they will reduce flooding and will therefore reduce some of the losses of the magnitude he has referred to, whether he uses the farmers' statistics or the engineers' statistics. I don't know whether anyone has really accurately quantified the dollars or acre losses in the Qu'Appelle, from flooding. Anyone who travels across that Qu'Appelle – and I do, perhaps as much as anyone in this House because I have to cross it to get to my own constituency and I do see the flooding that's taken place between both Craven and Pasqua Lake, and I lived in the Qu'Appelle Valley for a couple of years when it flooded between Round Lake and Crooked Lake and we know that those losses are very, very high. I think the point is that we're prepared to undertake, as a joint federal/provincial program, a \$5.25 million dollar conveyance program, subject to easements and consents being obtained. We are starting at the lower part of the funnel and working upwards where the consents have been obtained. This work is going to take at least seven years to do and I think you're either for the program or you're against it. We, as the provincial government – the federal government agrees – believe that we're justified in spending this kind of public money for channel conveyance improvements of this magnitude to alleviate the very severe flooding that has occurred and to reduce the losses that the farmers have incurred as a result of that flooding. We are not giving anyone a commitment that it will, when these works are completed, end flooding for all time. No one is suggesting that for a moment but it is designed to substantially reduce the kind of flooding and reduce the losses that the farmers have suffered over the years. I therefore hope that, because some of his constituents will benefit from this, the hon. member will see fit to at least vote for this appropriation.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Now, Mr. Chairman, to being with and to prove the point, the minister suggests that I'm being political, somewhat, in my approach in asking some questions in this regard and I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I'm not being political. In fact, I don't have any constituents that are affected by that Qu'Appelle River. As a matter of fact, I'm acting on behalf of the member for Saltcoats. Those are his constituents and they're contacting me and I have a responsibility to ask you questions so that we have something to reflect back on (and that is your word) as was stated here this afternoon, so that I would have some future reference. Now very clearly, Mr. Chairman, I have to ask these questions. If I have people come to me and ask me to seek information on their behalf as residents of this province, then that's what I have to do. So for the hon. Minister to suggest that I am being political, very mildly put, is not very mannerly, Mr. Chairman.

Now he speaks of all this flooding down there and I am not using my words, or not trying to suggest that the farmers are right when they are placing values on their land, or that you are wrong when you are placing a value on that land, and it is not a question of whether or not I am for or against this program, that isn't the question. What we are discussing here, some of the problems there of and hopefully between you and me in our discussions this afternoon we can resolve some of those problems. The answers that you may give me are hopefully some good answers I can take back to those people to clear up some of those problems.

Now if I might refer directly to the flooding. Using the program that are in place now, the different boards and authorities that are involved in this, doing the studies and having an exchange of information, let's refer to a study compiled by the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment, titled "The Qu'Appelle River Conservation Study, Appendix III" in which a lot of the Qu'Appelle rezoning is based on the flooding problem. The study tells us that the lower Qu'Appelle has had very little land loss due to

flooding. That is contrary to what you have just been telling me now. You have been telling me we are doing all these wonderful things and buying up all this land and putting these farmers off their land and having to raise them to higher points in the area to farm and you are not paying them enough for their land to purchase new land of equal value. That's a problem.

I am only using the information which these various boards have provided and I think that you should look very seriously at that because this report, by your department, is in conflict with what you just said now. I just want to know very simply now, is that true what I have just asked you, or is it not?

Mr. Byers: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to compare one study with another as to which is more valid and which statistics are more reliable.

We think the time has come for – the studying has been done – and it is now time to act. And we are acting by asking for approval for funds to proceed this year with conveyance improvement that are part of a seven year conveyance improvement package. We know there have been losses. Each farmer can quantify his own. In doing these studies I expect farmers have quantified them and engineers have quantified them and hydrologists have quantified them and wild life federations have quantified them and you could study and study and study and you could argue about the results and meanwhile the ravages of the floods would continue. We think the study has now been done and it is now time to act and we are acting by seeking the approval of this Legislature for funds to get on with the conveyance program, a conveyance program that I think the farmers of the Qu'Appelle support, that most of the people in the Qu'Appelle support. I am sure the hon. member for Qu'Appelle supports improved conveyance capacity, because one of the greatest beneficiaries of improved channel conveyance capacity is certainly the town of Lumsden. Tantallon, which was beleaguered by floods year after year, it took this government \$60,000 to build sufficient dikes in Tantallon to protect a village that was ravaged year after year with floods that made the National News. Maybe the town of Tantallon would make the National News hereafter because it is flood ravaged, but the people of Tantallon I am sure, can sleep better at night now that those dikes have been built there by an NDP and the federal government. You can argue about the statistics; maybe the hon. member is quite qualified and competent to engage in that kind of dialogue. We think the studying has been done, it is now time to act. We are prepared to act, we've got the money in the Budget to act, and I ask him to let us get on with the job and vote for the money that is here so that we can clean up this mess that has plagued the people of the Qu'Appelle for the last sixty years.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Mr. Chairman, I get the feeling I should be coming to a conclusion in my line of questioning. The minister seems to be getting somewhat irate and I don't want to get him going this afternoon too awfully hard. Really you are missing the point. You say that you have spent \$60,000 to provide funding for flood assistance in the town of Tantallon, and those people are going to be sleeping well at night now. That may well be, but I am telling you the farmers down the river are not sleeping so well any more.

You got the money, and you say we have done the surveys and we don't want to discuss the figures, the figures can be conflicting in any area. You can, in fact, be saying things that are contradictory to what those very figures are indicating in the reports. That does not matter, let it go by the board – never mind a few farmers who are losing some money, we've got this thing in place. We are going to put the dikes in place, and we are

going to create recreation, we are going to try to get some tourism in this province. That would be a good thing to do, because you have sure got one heck of a difference in trade now in tourism. But, I suggest that you might be doing it at the expense of your Minister of Agriculture. I don't know how much you have spoken with him, because he sure has got to be checking with those farmers in his constituency. I tell you there are a lot of them that are not happy. I am only suggesting to the minister and his whole program, take a look at this. Get down there and take some of these people into consideration. Some of these people, Mr. Minister, are on these boards and are on these programs that are making recommendations. That is all that I am saying.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman. Perhaps it escapes the memory of the hon. member for Moosomin, that the Qu'Appelle study, from whence all these grand schemes have come, was initiated as long ago as 1968. That is ten years ago. For the last decade, interest groups and individuals along the Qu'Appelle and throughout Saskatchewan, (the Qu'Appelle drainage system serves about one third of the population of this province), have had a chance to put their input into the various proposals that we are now about to proceed with. I could take the time of the House to review the various processes that were used to consult the public and the interest groups that are affected. I hope you will take it as read. Even at this point in time, all the t's are not crossed, nor are all the i's dotted. We indicated a year ago, our willingness to proceed with the conveyance program. The procedure is there, through the special planning commissions and the Qu'Appelle Valley Management Board, and the Qu'Appelle Implementation Office, which is headquartered in the hon. member for Qu'Appelle's riding, out at Fort Qu'Appelle, a great federal/provincial effort. And if there are particular individuals or farmers who are not satisfied with the proposal, then surely they know who their local councillor is. They know who their representative is on the Special Planning Commission. They are free to go to them and if they have requests to modify the plan, the Qu'Appelle Valley Management Board will certainly do its level best to accommodate the wishes of any citizen.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, I asked you a series of questions the other night on the land use policy of the government. I asked you for the names of the officials involved in the planning and preparation. I am not talking about the public officials that are held up, I want to know the names of the individuals who were involved in the research. I ended up the series of questions the other night about who are the working officials, interdepartmental officials, involved in the land use and you indicated that it was chaired by your deputy. I would like to know the actual names of the officials involved in this process because I have some deep concerns. If you want to give me the list prior to subvote 8, I think it is, when we come back. I am quite prepared to let you prepare it and give it to me on that basis.

Mr. Byers: — We will attempt to get the list. I am not sure we can get it before five today, but let's see what we can do.

Mr. Lane: — Well, you will undertake to supply it?

Mr. Byers: — Yes, I will undertake to supply it. There are sure no dark secrets about that. We wish everybody knew who they were.

Mr. Lane: — The member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Snyder) indicated the other day that one was, perhaps, looking for some sinister plan to continue the long stated goal of

the NDP and that is an ownership of the farmlands of Saskatchewan under a new land tenure system wherein individuals are lessees. I indicated to you the land use workshop which sets out the philosophy of the Land Use Policy Committee. I have doubts that that land use policy, in detail, was done by the superficial heads of the Land Use Committee and was, in fact, done by the working officials involved. In that, one of the criteria for the land use policy was to provide a suitable system of land tenure in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, you don't need to discuss land tenure when you are talking about land use. Land use deals with the type of use to which the land is placed. Land use does not concern itself with whether once that use is determined, whether it be a co-operative, a corporation, an individual or whatever, a tenant, or a landlord. That is irrelevant to the question of land use. But I say to you, and I think the evidence is given by one of your MLAs opposite and former Cabinet Minister, is I think is proof positive that this whole land use exercise that we are going through is really an attempt by the government opposite to develop a new land tenure policy for the province of Saskatchewan. I am referring to a statement that was covered in the Leader Post today and it is a statement purporting to quote, John Kowalchuk, MLA for Melville, where he says and he said most emphatically, "There is no way you can divide the question of land by discussing only land use without discussing ownership." Now what does ownership have to do with land use? What does a land tenure system have to do with a land use policy?

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, the guideline statements to which the hon. member refers did not come out of some dark room of an office in the provincial government. These guideline statements came directly from the two workshops where the input came from 19 organizations in this province. That is where they came from. These are the issues which the 19 organizations that we asked to spearhead this project put forth as possible guidelines. Secondly, those guidelines on philosophy and objectives are now the subject of discussion at 30 workshops in this province. The provincial government doesn't have any preconceived notions as to what the ultimate policies ought to be. We are prepared to put before 30 community workshops some philosophical ideas and some objectives that have been advanced by 19 credible organizations in this province, to test those philosophical views and to have those philosophical views and objectives tested by the people who will take the time, trouble and expense — and I suggest there's a very good response to these workshops by a great many people in this province who are interested in the whole question of land use, land tenure and a variety of other things — so as to give the government some direction, to give some direction not only to the provincial government but to local governments, and to the national government as well. I think it's inappropriate to suggest that there is somehow a preconceived policy (although I'll admit those are not the actual words of the hon. member) that there is a policy all laid out here. We are in the process of trying to evolve a policy, by permitting the citizens of Saskatchewan, through a series of community workshops, to shape their own future, shape their own destiny with respect to land use which covers many, many critical areas. That's the process we are using. We may not have answers on these questions for years to come but at least the process has evoked an awareness in Saskatchewan that land use is a subject that we ought not to sweep under the rug, that we ought not leave in the hands of the experts and the speculators and whatever, that it is a resource with which all of us ought to be concerned and to attempt to develop some sensible policies be it on land tenure, forest management, land classification or whatever. There is no simple approach to this problem. You can argue about what is your definition of land use, what is your definition of land tenure and what is your impression of a proper size of farm, should that be discussed, and on and on and on. These are questions which have been

raised by 19 credible organizations in this province. I think they have done a creditable job. I think the community meetings, where we are getting input from individuals, is a desirable way to go. I acknowledge the proposal from the Liberal government the other day that perhaps we should even consider going back into some of those areas and having future meetings because there are still further inputs that could be obtained and we are certainly willing to make that accommodation.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

Mr. Katzman: — Other Personal Services, that's an increase from 0; for what particular reason?

Mr. Byers: — The increase in Other Personal Services; there is some extra money in here for a temporary employee that will be used in the public involvement program on the development of the Land Use Policy program, that's the main function.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Who is that individual or is it paid under a contract of service? Was there a contract of service signed?

Mr. Byers: — We don't have the individual, they are not persons on staff. There are funds here for 18 person months.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Is that going to be an advertised position?

Mr. Byers: — It will more than likely be a summer student.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Well, O.K. Perhaps I can cover it all at once. Are there any individuals in the department who are employed under a contract of service or are there any personnel management companies that the department pays to hire individuals?

Mr. Byers: — We have no contract employees other than the chairman of the Churchill Board of Inquiry.

Item 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Would you supply for me at some time, the names of the individuals involved in that particular branch, their qualifications (and I'm not referring to court staff, I'm talking about those actually involved in the policy planning and research)?

Mr. Byers: — Yes, we can do that.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — And their salary?

Mr. Byers: — Yes.

Item 3 agreed.

ITEM 4

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — This particular branch, from the annual report, is obviously very, very inconsistent and I say very selective in its manner of enforcement of its mandate. One goes through the annual report and one finds that when it comes, with one exception, in the private sector, that action was insisted upon and pretty severe expenses were in fact, incurred, but when it comes to the government sector you don't do any. I say that you have got a double standard of enforcing the laws of the province of Saskatchewan.

If one takes a look (first of all we start on page 7 at IPSCO) one does the complaints about the study of air quality they show that dust levels exceeded a provincial standard. So what happened? The division established another monitoring program and a new filter system was established - the Baghouse Filter system was installed on IPSCO's Number 3 and Number 4 furnaces.

We go to United Chemicals – a complaint there about the sulphuric acid plant near Saskatoon. That plant has now been shut down. Cypress paving – complaints about excessive dust emissions from the asphalt plant near Moose Jaw. After investigation the division – the company agreed to install additional dust control equipment and that equipment has made a significant improvement. Simpson Timber . . . modifications resulted in a commitment by the company to improve the operation because of complaints of excessive ash and soot emissions. Modifications are expected to be completed in 1977-78. Federated Co-op; complaints of excessive dust resulted in a commitment by the company to adopt stricter house cleaning measures and incorporate other procedures to reduce dust emission. Top-Line Feeds; the company agreed to install additional dust control equipment at its feed mill completed in September 1976. Frankana Minerals; a dust fall monitoring program had to be established, the company installed new dust collection equipment. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool resulted in a commitment to install additional dust equipment. Pool Elevators in Stoughton, same thing. Now, there's one exception to the fact that all of these private sector co-operative companies and that's the Vermette's Post-Treatment Plant which is still under investigation.

But, let's take a look when the department goes to Saskatchewan Forest Products. Complaints were received regarding excessive smoke emissions from the incinerators at the Saskatchewan Forest Products operation. The division indicated to the company that improvements are necessary. That's like being slapped with a wet noodle, you know. It's very, very strange when you've got this very inconsistent, and I say somewhat hypocritical approach to the enforcement of laws in Saskatchewan. And when it comes to the private sector you want action. You want these problems cleaned up and yet when you're dealing with the government Crown corporations, you're afraid to ask. And I suggest to the minister that in fact, he is to be condemned for the double standard of air pollution monitoring which exists in the province when the government has the heavy hand for the private sector but just indicates the problem to the Crown corporations.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, a couple of points. We are in the process of developing standards for air pollution control equipment. We can use a permit system to license air pollution control equipment if it is adequate and meets the standards. We do receive complaints from individuals and other sources. When we receive such complaints, we deal with the problem be it in the private sector or in the public sector. We get complaints relating to both sources. It is true that some of the privates have been asked to close, or other action taken. In the case of Carrot River, the plant was built close to a

house where there was a problem with air pollution and Sask Forest Products, in that case, assumed the cost of moving the house. Now, that is an example where we were not lenient with the Crown corporations and there are other examples.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Well, I think you just proved my point as well, when it comes to Crown corporations, we'll move some poor Saskatchewan citizen out of the road, rather than clean up the problem. But with the private sector, United Chemicals had to close down the Sulphuric Acid Plant, I'm not sure it's related, and I don't know if it is related to the action. There is a very inconsistent position on the part of the Department of the Environment as to the application of the laws and the environmental standards of the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is incumbent upon the government and its officials to make it clear that the rules are going to be applied the same. Now, I would like to know, other than having the House move, what other action – I would like you to table in the House before we finish your Estimates, or before the House finishes – what order was given to Saskatchewan Forest Products, when the investigation started, when the first complaints were started? I am pleased to go through a series of questions on this but I think we are going to find that there is a double standard of law enforcement in the environment area.

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Chairman, there is no problem in preparing a chronological report on the steps followed to deal with the air pollution problem concerning the Carrot River mill.

Item 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I would like to receive the chronological order of action taken from complaint to order on the ARMAC chemicals, CSP foods – is there a complaint against Prince Albert Pulp?

Mr. Byers: — No, I wouldn't say there is a complaint. We do continuous monitoring at the Prince Albert Pulp mill.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — The same thing with Sask Forest Products, again under the water pollution control area.

Mr. Byers: — Yes, we'll provide the hon. member with that information.

Mr. Katzman: — The water control people have been doing a study at Clark's Crossing on the South Saskatchewan River. Do you have the data on that?

Mr. Byers: — We don't have that information here. We are doing some work there.

Mr. Katzman: — If we stopped at this point would you be able to have that the next day, or would that be too difficult?

Mr. Byers: — I am not sure that we can have it for you the next day but we will try. We can supply what we have. I'm not sure that the studies are done or completed yet but we can give you a report on the information that we have but I'm not sure that we can do it within 24 hours.

Mr. Katzman: — Could you do two things, the one that's being done near the dam and

March 22, 1978

there's one at Clark's Crossing. I think they are both done by the environment people.

Mr. Byers: — Which dam are you referring to?

Mr. Katzman: — The one in Saskatoon, the Weir (?).

The Committee reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION DINNER

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call it 5:00 o'clock I would like to remind members again of the Commonwealth parliamentary Association dinner this evening and issue the latest bulletin on the guest of the Canadian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Instead of Dr. Foster M.P., it will be Senator Sid Buckwold representing the Commonwealth parliamentary Association.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 o'clock p.m.