

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**Thursday, April 2, 1981.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW**

**ENVIRONMENT**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Before 5 o'clock, prior to adjournment, I understood you to say that the water problem in Buffalo Pound is not your problem and has nothing to do with the Department of the Environment. I'm not sure if you really meant that or if, in fact, that's the case. I want to talk about the quality of water (as did the member for Arm River) in the city of Regina. Of course, we get most of it from the Buffalo Pound area.

I can't believe that you would take that approach or that attitude and say that it's none of your concern; it's not your department's concern and so on. I also can't believe that eight other members of your party with constituencies in the city of Regina — I see one sitting down just now — voice no objections and no complaints to the Department of the Environment for the quality of water in Buffalo Pound. If I have to be the only one in the city of Regina to do so, as an elected member of the legislature, then I will. I don't see the member for Regina Centre doing much talking about it, nor the member for Regina Wascana. I look around; I think there are only three here tonight . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, yes, the member for Regina North-West is here.

Mr. Minister, what have you done to date to improve the quality of that water? What are your plans? What recommendations have you made to whatever department you have to make them to, and when can the people of the city of Regina expect some improvement in their drinking water? I'll start with that.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, I'll try to avoid an argument or debate with the hon. member. I will repeat again that it is not the responsibility of the Department of the Environment with regard to the water quality in the city of Regina or in other urban centres in the province.

With regard to Buffalo Pound and the efforts of the government to meet the obligations of Buffalo Pound as a water reservoir for the Qu'Appelle chain, on the basis of the agreement that was developed under the Lake Diefenbaker project, I want to advise the member that last year we passed 70,000 acre-feet of water down the Qu'Appelle River. This is equivalent to a complete turnover of the total water in Buffalo Pound Lake, so there was a complete change of water in Buffalo Pound Lake from Lake Diefenbaker. Despite the water exchange, Dr. Hammer of the Saskatchewan Research Council was unable to conclude that large quantities of water would improve the taste and odor quality problem in Buffalo Pound. The taste and odor depend on algae in the lake, basically that's where the problems arise, which are strongly influenced by climatic conditions and the nutrients in that particular basin.

**April 2, 1981**

Last year it was noticed that a change in the dominant types of algae had occurred. It is likely in 1981, because the conditions seem to be developing in the same way they did in 1980, that that natural phenomena can occur again. It's a problem which is predominately brought about by climatic conditions.

One solution to that particular problem offered by the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina, as has been reported in the press, is that taste and odour can be cured by activated charcoal filtration at least in the short-term. With regard to the responsibilities we have assumed as a province, my colleague from urban affairs and I have met with the cities and have discussed a long-term study of water supply and quality. We see those as our responsibilities.

What I attempted to tell the hon. members before dinner concerning the pipe that goes out into the river (other than that we license the filtration plant) is that, in so far as the taste and odour, the mechanism for the distribution of the urban water supply and the system related to it are concerned, that is a city responsibility and not one of the Department of the Environment. We don't see that as our responsibility nor are we going to assume that responsibility. The hon. members on any other occasion would be saying the government should get its sticky fingers out of this local autonomy area and it should leave the cities to decide what they want to do. But you can't have it both ways. You can't say, in the case of a water supply system, that the government should be running around deciding what is going to be developed in terms of water for an urban centre, and in another situation say it should be out of there because of local autonomy, and local governments should be able to administer their own affairs without the government interfering. So, I don't know which one you want, hon. member. I don't know which one you want, but surely be consistent. The only consistency we've seen from you now is that you're inconsistent.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — For a minister who said he didn't want an argument, you're doing a pretty good job of arguing. You seem to be enjoying the argument very well, and I guess I did hear correctly before supper. I wasn't sure whether I had or not, but that's your concern, and it's tough luck for the city of Regina. I suggest to you that if you were sitting over here and it was a different Department of the Environment sitting over there, you'd be one of those people screaming about the quality and about the condition.

You don't have to tell me what causes it. I know it's the algae. And you don't have to tell me that it's a natural phenomenon, and you don't have to tell me that it's been brought on by climatic conditions. I'm aware of that, and so are the people of Regina aware of that. But you're going to sit there or stand there and tell the people of this city that it's their problem, and it's tough luck? You have polluted water in Buffalo Pound and the Department of the Environment says, "Fine and dandy. That's somebody else's problem. It isn't the problem of the environment department." That's assuming and accepting your responsibilities in a very irresponsible manner, Mr. Minister.

I must say that for you to indicate that you're talking about a long-term study with the city of Regina and your department . . . I can't understand it. You're saying it's not your concern and it's not the responsibility of the Department of the Environment, but on the other hand or out of the other corner of your mouth you turn around and say, "Well, we are conducting a long-term study with the city of Regina." Well, which is it? Are you responsible or are you not responsible? If you're not, then why are you conducting a study with the city of Regina? My God, we've been studying it for 75 years! How long do you want to study the problem that's existing? And how long do you want the people of

Regina to be drinking foul smelling water in this city? And this is exactly what we're drinking.

Now, they tell me you should put it through a filtration plant first . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . By his own filter. I know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Minister, I don't see this as a joking problem. I don't see it as anything very hilarious. And you're making very light of a very serious situation, and your concern should be one far more serious than what it seems to be. The member from behind who just walked in would be the first one to agree with me that polluted water is a serious concern, namely the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. But I certainly never hear this from the member for Regina North-East, or the member for Regina Wascana or Regina North-West, or Regina Centre or the Premier, who represents the constituency in the heart of this city.

I am told (correct me if I'm wrong) that the water comes in from Diefenbaker Lake into Buffalo Pound, flows through the pound and then comes out. The outlet is at the east end of the pound. I don't know whether that's correct or not. And the people who tell me are not necessarily experts but perhaps they have a point — by putting the pipe (instead of at this end of the pound) at the other end where the intake is, that would perhaps resolve some of the problem. Is that possible, or is that something you have looked at?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, I can tell the hon. member from the fact we have the information that it was considered, but it's not something that the Department of Environment has reason to consider. It's for the city to decide whether or not it wishes to move its intake pipe to the west end of the pond or to the middle or the top or the bottom of the pond. It's a matter for the city to decide that issue. Surely the hon. member can understand that the administration of the city must make some decisions with respect to its water supply.

I did indicate to the hon. member that there is a complete (in terms of volume) exchange of water in the Buffalo Pound Lake during the season. And, while the Department of the Environment is aware (because I think we have a good and continuous co-operative working relationship with the city) and is concerned about water quality, it's a matter (I can't answer the hon. member's question in any detail or with any degree of certainty) over which I, as Minister of Environment, do not have any responsibility or control.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Can I just ask the minister one very simple question? What is your responsibility? What's the reason for the Department of the Environment? Perhaps you might like to explain why you have a department and why you're the minister. What are your rules? What are your guidelines? Would you be interested in commenting on what the existence of your department is all about?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I'm not going to go into a lot of detail about that. I can tell the hon. member, however, that we are not responsible (the Department of the Environment) for the decisions with respect to water intake lines for the city of Regina. We're not responsible for that and we won't assume any responsibility for it.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, you've told me what you're not responsible for, how would you like to tell me what you are responsible for?

Mr. Chairman, I expect the minister to stand up and give me an answer to my question. My question is intended to be serious and not stupid. I want to know what the function and the reason for your department is. You're telling me what you're not responsible

**April 2, 1981**

for. What are you responsible for? You ordered a clean-up of the PCB spill, because of a possible danger to the water supply of the city. What are your responsibilities? You have pollution in the Buffalo Pound area of the lake. Pollution is pollution. Now, what are your responsibilities?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member opposite were serious about the question he asked, we would be dealing with the estimates on some sort of reasonable basis. The member wouldn't be standing and trying to make his political point and argument.

We have in the blue book of estimates for 1982, beginning on page 35, 14 items under environment. (I believe there are 14 or more.) They have to do with the administration, public information and education, policy planning and research, air pollution control, water pollution control, land protection and mines pollution control. I could go through these for you, but if it's a reading lesson you need, then I would suggest the hon. member go to day care or some place where he can inform himself on how to proceed on the basis of estimates. I can answer the hon. member's question if he wants to direct questions relevant to the estimates or some specific issues related thereto. I think it would be useful for us to get on with the estimates and to determine for the people of Saskatchewan whether or not the funds being appropriated here, in this legislature, for environment are being properly appropriated.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I recall a motion that was introduced in this House about two years ago when they voted \$1 for your department. I think it would have been appropriate for what you are worth in this department.

Before 5 o'clock I listened to the Attorney General criticize the opposition for not discussing policies of the government which . . . If you want to talk about it, it's a political forum. This is what it's all about. Now you talk about inconsistencies. He says that we don't do a job when it comes down to talking policy and talking the political points in this House. You get up, on the other hand, three hours later and criticize us for getting up and doing exactly what the Attorney General just finished, before dinner, saying that we should be doing. Now you talk about inconsistencies.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's called caucus schizophrenia.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's a good word for it. That's a really good term for it.

I still view your answers and understand them as being very flippant and you, for your part, as trying to be humorous about a very serious problem.

I'll ask you a question. Perhaps you'll come down to giving me some credible answers after a while. I don't know whether it's because you didn't have enough to eat or didn't have a rest in-between times. Maybe you'll get down to business and start answering some of the questions. Let me ask you this: is it a concern of your department or yours, as minister, to look into noise pollution in this province? Is that of your department's reference?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the department does not have any legislative authority for overall noise pollution control. We have been in the process, I guess within the last five years, of developing a noise pollution by-law for adoption by municipalities. The by-law has been developed and is being used and is

there for municipalities to adopt.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I would like you to repeat that because I only caught part of it. You say you have no legislative authority?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — There is no legislative authority. We have developed the by-law for the urban centres or for those who wish to use them. I understand that Moose Jaw has adopted the by-law. I don't know whether Regina at this point has. Regina apparently has not.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I know I could read the act and I haven't done so. I'd like you to tell me tonight, as well as the press and the rest of the people, what legislative authority you have in the Department of Environment with respect to water, with respect to noise, with respect to environment, period. Just give me some indications.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I don't know whether we have all the list that we can go down, but we can list some of them: The Department of the Environment Act, The Water Resources Management Act, The Air Pollution Control Act, The Litter Control Act, The Water Rights Act, The Drainage Control Act, The Environmental Assessment Act and The Water Power Act. Here's a brochure full of acts for the hon. member.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I'll have some reading material before I go to bed. I will look at them. I promise you that.

You say that you developed a set of by-laws for noise pollution. I presume you mean guidelines for cities and urban areas which they may accept if they want to, but which are not enforceable by your department. Is that what you're saying? Are those by-laws you're talking about used by your department and enforceable by it, or are they strictly for the urban areas?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — They're for adoption by municipalities in order that they may put them into effect in the same terms as any by-law, really.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I brought it up tonight because of the report that was submitted to you by Dr. Williams. Do you recall the report I'm referring to? If you do, what action have you taken on that report?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I believe the hon. member is asking a question as to what authority we have in the case of the brief or visit that we had from Dr. Williams. Is that in thrust of the question?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The question was this: what action have you taken with respect to the brief which was submitted to you?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Other than (as I've already advised the hon. member) to raise the issue with the Department of Highways and Transportation and the city officials, the Department of Environment has taken no action.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Have you raised the issue with the Department of Highways and Transportation?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, we have.

**April 2, 1981**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Would you care to table any of the correspondence, reports or meetings that you had with them?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — We don't have the correspondence here with us. I don't have any objections to tabling any correspondence that we may have had with respect to that subject. I just don't have it here with me.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Oh, I can understand that you won't have it here with you. But my question, again, was this: will you give us any reports of meetings, correspondence and anything else that you've done with that brief which was submitted to you by Dr. Williams?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes. Well, I don't have any difficulty with that. Perhaps we could have the officials do as I offered to do for the member for Meadow Lake: develop a scenario of events in a chronological order with respect to this matter of the highway, or the noise pollution with regard to the by-pass.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you very much. I'll wait for that. Now, are you considering any legislation for noise pollution?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — No.

**MR. PREBBLE:** — I'm just going to make a few brief remarks with respect to this estimate. Members opposite have been raising some concerns about the quality of water in the province, Mr. Chairman. I agree that they have raised some valid points in this regard. What they haven't done is made any proposals with respect to how the Minister of the Environment or the Government of Saskatchewan might improve the quality of water. Members opposite, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately are not prepared to deal with the politics of the agricultural chemicals, which are perhaps one of the major sources of problems with respect to our water supplies. We know there are now on average something like seven herbicides and 15 pesticides showing up in Saskatchewan water supplies. That is obviously reason for concern.

In contrast to the proposal for a pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker (which is really not going to resolve our problem because the water quality at Lake Diefenbaker is not particularly high either), I think what the Government of Saskatchewan should be looking at is forming a Crown corporation to deal with the whole problem of water. It should be a manager of Saskatchewan water resources and look seriously at the possibility of a pipeline from northern Saskatchewan. This should be built by IPSCO (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation) to tap our water supplies in the North, which are known to be safe and clear.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this may sound like a rather radical proposal, but I say there has been a great deal of talk in the past. We are prepared to spend money on pipelines when it comes to natural gas and oil. But on a resource that's equally important or perhaps more important, water, we've never looked seriously at the possibility of such a pipeline. I think that the Saskatchewan government should study the feasibility of this.

Secondly, Mr. Vice-Chairman, if I could intervene amidst the remarks of the member for Souris-Cannington, I would say that the government needs, as I've said in this House before, to radically change its policy with respect to its total approach to the environment and health. This is most dramatically seen in the whole area of cancer and our approach to cancer, and the failure as a government and the failure of all

governments across Canada to recognize something. The solution to the problems of cancer and the coming to grips with the epidemic of cancer in our society lies with the clean-up of our environment. It lies with the clean-up of our workplaces and tougher regulation of industrial chemicals in the workplace. It lies in serious attempts to improve the quality of our food supply and to clean up a lot of the problems we have in that area.

I think right now there is a serious lack of co-ordination between the occupational health and safety division, the Department of the Environment, and the Department of Health when it comes to handling this problem. We've somehow separated the workplace and the general environment and the activities of public health inspectors in a way I think is inappropriate to deal with the many health problems now emerging as a result of our failure to deal with environmental difficulties. I say that's something the Department of the Environment must deal much more seriously with in the year ahead. We should attempt to launch a program in this province particularly in the area of cancer, which sees appropriations for the problem of cancer — both in terms of environmental research and in terms of the Department of the Environment taking an active role in working with the Department of Health to approach the whole cancer problem.

Now, the third area that I want to briefly touch on is the continuing problem associated with IBT (Industrial Biotest Laboratories), which I've raised many times in this House. I call again on the Minister of the Environment to post in all stores in this province a list of the 89 chemicals on the IBT list, which have still not been proven to be safe. In fact, we have every reason to think that many of them will be unsafe, since we now know that, of the tests which have been conducted on those chemicals and which have been reviewed by federal officials, 94 per cent of the tests for cancer are now known to be invalid. There are similarly alarming results with respect to the tests for birth defects and nervous disorders.

Our government, in light of the federal government's failure to act on this matter, has the responsibility to let Saskatchewan people know the chemicals on the list, and which products contain those chemicals. That list should be posted in every retail store in the province which sells those chemicals. It's not good enough for the minister to limit his public notification to an occasional press release; in fact, we should go further. All of those products, when they are sold in the stores, should carry a label stating that the provincial government is not able to assure the public that these products are safe and informs the public that these products have not been properly tested for safety.

I want to add that I think the Minister of the Environment should be going further than that. While we're waiting for final results on chemicals such as 2,4-D, the minister should use his powers under the existing legislation to ban products to be used in areas where their use is not absolutely essential, such as city lawns or the lawn of any person in Saskatchewan. Surely we now know that there are dioxins, not only in the esters but also in 2,4-D amines, which is a point that I think we have very much failed to appreciate.

The federal government has announced that esters are to be taken off the market because they've found highly toxic dioxins in those esters. What they haven't made very clear to the public is that dioxins have also been found in 2,4-D amines. One has to ask whether the amines have more reduced levels of dioxins than the esters. Since most parts of the manufacturing process for 2,4-D are the same for esters as they are for

**April 2, 1981**

amines, and if amines have a lower level of dioxin, what's happening to the dioxin? Are those dioxins being left behind in the wastes which come about during the chemical process? What is being done, particularly at a national level, with respect to checking those waste products? There's been no examination of that question at all. I say that in the interim, while we're waiting for the final results on 2,4-D, the minister should act to ban 2,4-D for domestic use on lawns and gardens in this province. I call on him to do that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleague here says, "What about the dandelions?" I say, I'd rather live with dandelions than with toxic substances in the environment.

I want to finish off by making a few comments on the problem of acid rain. We're increasingly beginning to appreciate the potential problems the tar sands and the heavy oil development pose for Saskatchewan in this regard and what the problems of sulphur dioxide and nitrous oxide travelling long distances could mean to Saskatchewan lakes and soils in the North. I hope the minister will also pay increasing attention to the evidence coming forward, that sulphur dioxide and nitrous oxide emissions may also be linked to increased lung disease, and may pose a special problem to those who are susceptible to asthma attacks. This is something that is just beginning to come out in the literature, and deserves more attention by the Government of Saskatchewan. I think what is particularly of concern is that despite the long time we have known of the potential problems that may come from heavy oil sands and tar sands development, we still have no real standards in Saskatchewan for nitrous oxide and sulphur dioxide emissions.

I urge the Minister of the Environment to act with all haste to implement standards in Saskatchewan for acid rain. It is only when we have our own standards in place, that we will be in a position to sit down seriously with the Government of Alberta, and begin asking them to implement proper standards for the tar sands and heavy oil sands developments. What is of special concern to me (what hasn't been raised in the House, and what, I don't believe, the minister has raised publicly) is the concern I have that the Alberta government is now giving five-year exemptions for acid rain standards to companies in Alberta that are developing tar sands and heavy oil sands — a five-year period in which the Conservative government in Alberta (as I suppose the Conservative members opposite would do, if they came into power here) is providing during which the companies don't have to meet the standards for acid rain. That is a problem, Mr. Chairman, that will have far more impact in Saskatchewan than it will in Alberta. That is a problem that the Minister of the Environment has to begin negotiations on with the Alberta government.

I asked the minister to provide a new section in the environmental impact assessment legislation, that allows the government to be able to turn down a development proposal on the basis of the past history of the company making that proposal. It makes no sense to allow companies into Saskatchewan to develop mines or other types of projects, when those companies have an atrocious record in other parts of the world, or Canada, or even Saskatchewan.

Our present legislation and approach, to simply say, "If you live by our rules here, on this particular project, you can operate," makes no sense at all. Right now, under the rules, we pay no attention if a company is propping up a military dictatorship in Latin America, or some other part of the world, as many companies operating in



Saskatchewan are. Noranda Mines is an example of that. It is operating in Saskatchewan with respect to potash, and it has several exploration ventures under way in the North with respect to uranium. A company like Canadian Occidental Petroleum, which is coming forward with a proposal to develop a uranium mine at Midwest Lake, has no business coming into this province. Canadian Occidental Petroleum really is a company that is 81 per cent owned by the Hooker Chemical Company. After the disaster and the legacy that the Hooker Chemical Company has left to us at the Love Canal near Niagara Falls, after the toxic waste dumps they have left there, they have no business coming into the province of Saskatchewan.

Companies like Union Carbide, which also have several joint ventures with SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) in northern Saskatchewan, have no business even coming before this government with a proposal for any kind of development in Saskatchewan because Union Carbide, Mr. Chairman, is the company that was responsible for training all the South African technicians who came over to the United States, in detail, how to operate uranium enrichment plants. Those technicians went back and within months of their training put the South African government in the position to develop nuclear weapons. Those are the kind of companies that are proposing to develop uranium in northern Saskatchewan. Those are the kind of companies, Mr. Chairman, to whom our government is saying, "We don't care about your past activities as long as you play by our rules now." I say that's not sufficient and I ask the minister again to add a section to the environmental impact assessment legislation that will give this government the power to automatically reject those companies, not on the basis of their proposal for development here in Saskatchewan, but on the basis of their past record which is truly a disgusting one. I'll close my comments there, Mr. Chairman, and I'd welcome the minister's comments on any of the points I have made.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I really don't know where to start nor where to finish, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure that I can sort everything out — I'm sure I can't. Let me try to deal with a few items, as I jotted down some notes when the hon. member was speaking.

The hon. member referred to a water distribution plan of some kind — piping water from northern lakes to other parts of the province of Saskatchewan. I can indicate to the hon. member that this subject has been under consideration for some time in the province, although not in a detailed way. I do believe there has been, over the years, some examination by PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration), our Saskatchewan Water Supply Board and by, perhaps, the Department of Agriculture's conservation and land improvement people and the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission. It has been looked at. I think what is happening now is that we're looking at this in more detail. Whether or not the consideration which has been given in the past to piping water from, let's say, the Churchill River system (the northern water supply system, if you will) down into the Qu'Appelle or into the Souris or into some of the other water channels and watersheds in the province will be followed up on cannot be predicted at this time.

The hon. member talked about chemicals and the use of drugs and what he believes should be the responsibility of the Department of the Environment — to advise the people, either by way of signs or by way of some public information in the stores which dispense chemicals that these are chemicals which are on the IBT list.

He also talked about environmental approaches that could be implemented for the

**April 2, 1981**

prevention of cancer. I gather the hon. member was saying that our environment is one of the great causes of cancer. I don't deny that. I would suspect that, but I read as well that many of the social pressures under which we live contribute to cancer and to the problems of health that we experience in our society today.

That's not lifting the responsibility at all from the Department of the Environment to assess and to evaluate the contribution of chemicals and drugs to the environment which will contribute to health instability or health problems in society. I'm not so sure the Department of the Environment is going to be so all-inclusive. I appreciate the member's point of view. But I think we're going to have to invite, at least, the assistance of the Minister of Health and some of the other departments of the government in order to be able to deal with these problems.

At the present time in the province of Saskatchewan we are not prepared to remove from use 2,4-D. That has been said by the Department of Agriculture, and that's been said by myself. I have said that when we can receive the same kind of evidence we received in the case of 2,4,5-T, we would initiate an action to take 2,4-D off the market, as we did in the case of 2,4,5-T. We don't have that evidence. I don't think the hon. member has it. I don't think he knows of a source which has it. If he has it, he certainly should present it. I've said it on other occasions, and I repeat it again: if that information is available to us and when it becomes available to us, we will act.

With regard to a ban on domestic use of 2,4-D esters and amines, I don't know what the implications of that would be, and I'm not prepared at this moment in time to consider an active withdrawal or ban on the domestic use of 2,4-D. Here again, I believe it's a matter for federal health and welfare. If the federal agencies who test these and who register them (or if they don't test them they should, and if they register them they should have them tested and know where the testing is done) are prepared to register them, then at this point in time I think the responsibility rests squarely upon them. That doesn't mean to say it lifts the burden of responsibility from the Department of the Environment. We should continue to press upon Ottawa the necessity for it to act in a more responsible way with respect to registration of chemicals.

I don't know how you set a standard on acid rain. And if you set a standard, I don't know what you'd do to control it. Because once it starts to rain and you have a standard, if it doesn't meet the standard, I don't know what we're going to do to stop it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, maybe we can put that under an authority in a new act. What we do have, however, for the hon. member are regulations under The Air Pollution Control Act. I can send the hon. member a package of acts and regulations, as well. Under The Air Pollution Control Act there are standards — ambient air quality standards, pollutants, suspended particulates, P soluble particulates, soil index, potash, sulphur dioxide, sulphation, carbon monoxide. There are regulations here where standards are set, but I say again that's what goes up or that's what comes out of the stack.

Even being able to control the ambient air standards within the province of Saskatchewan does not mean necessarily that acid rain or acid precipitation which comes to this province will necessarily come from the smokestacks of our own industries. The situation in Sweden is one in which they have protected their industries and have governed and managed their industries very well, but they still have an acid rain problem. And it isn't generally thought that it comes from that country, but it comes from other parts of Europe. I suggest to the hon. member that I think his proposition is certainly worthy of consideration. I think it's a matter which we need to deal with. The

hon. member should also recognize that if we are going to deal seriously with this matter of acid rain, we are going to have to deal seriously with how we generate energy and whether or not we're going to continue to burn fossil fuels. If we don't burn fossil fuels, if we don't want to put dams on the rivers, and if we don't want to use various other kinds of resources for the generation of energy, then we're going to have to deal with this problem one way or the other. It's all right to say that we should reduce these, but I think, if we improve upon the standards of emissions to overcome the acid rain problems, other problems are likely to follow.

The hon. member referred to the question of assessing the background of industries with respect to the registration or licensing of industries. He was indicating that the background or the experience of the company should be taken into account. We debated that last evening. I said that I was prepared to consider it as a matter of interest and as something which should be reviewed. We're prepared to do that. However, at the present time, I am not sure that I can agree with the member. If, in fact, there are regulations in place to deal with a particular situation, then I think the regulations should apply. If we haven't been applying the regulations well enough, I think, then, we should. I probably haven't answered all the hon. member's questions but I tried my best.

**MR. WHITE:** — Last night a subject came up that I wanted to pursue, but time ran out. I listened to the member for Kindersley talk about a western power grid when he was questioning the minister and proposing this as an alternative to the generating station for SPC that the minister's department is examining. I want to pursue this a bit because I don't think the member was too well informed and I wouldn't want the public to be misinformed about it. I think they should have a bit more information on it. The western power grid that's being proposed is, for those who aren't informed about it, a high voltage line running from Manitoba through Saskatchewan to Alberta. A somewhat similar type of proposal was looked at in depth by the SPC some years ago and it was rejected. I want to raise a question or two with the minister on this.

The reason for the rejection was that the Manitoba power system was connected with the mid-western U.S. power pool through Minnesota. The Alberta power system was connected to B.C. which was connected to the western power pool in the United States. And the two power pools were connected themselves. Now by joining Alberta and Manitoba through Saskatchewan, we would have been connected to those two power pools. The operation of the interconnection was none too perfect. The two power pools in the United States were hooked together and then problems developed and the connection broke down. So you didn't have a stable situation and on those grounds SPC rejected it. It would have led to breakdowns and outages in Saskatchewan and it was felt that it wasn't good for this reason. Now, I would like to ask the minister (he seemed to be fairly well informed on this) if he could tell us if this drawback of this technical problem still exists? I have some further questions.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I don't know how this relates to environment, necessarily. In attempting to answer the hon. member's question, I say that I don't believe that that problem now exists. I believe that it does not exist because the original plan was to deliver 230,000 volts (I don't know if it is AC or DC volts or a tie). The new one, nevertheless, will, in fact, deliver 500,000 volts of direct current in its tie. I suggest that, while that may be of interest, I really don't know what it has to do with environment.

The hon. member, I think, was making a point with respect to the debate that we were in last night. Some members opposite, who are not here this evening, were attempting to

**April 2, 1981**

make a point about shutting down a proposed operation in the southwestern part of the province, and going with that Manitoba power grid system. I agree with the hon. member on the points that he made, as I think the assumption that everything is jolly and should be adopted forthwith, without any further consideration, only points up what the hon. member has said: that it is not as clear and as concise as the hon. members opposite would like to suggest.

**MR. WHITE:** — I wish the member for Kindersley were here. The member for Kindersley was, in effect, suggesting dropping what I see as a very thorough environmental investigation into power plants and rushing through a hurried one to approve a transmission line as a replacement for that. And I want to point out to the member, just as he was talking about a 230,000-volt line before, that it's close enough there. The original proposal, quite frankly, was for 230,000 volts AC. The new one, as he said, is for 500,000 volts DC. The member for Kindersley was proposing to bring in this line. Now, the line would be a triple terminal line at 500,000 volts DC. He is supporting this and suggesting that it be built quickly. There has not been a line of that type built on the North American continent and, I don't think, in the world. There have been lines of two terminals, but not three. So he is really suggesting dropping this one thing and going for something else that costs a lot of money, hasn't really been tested, and doesn't look at the environment properly.

**MR. GARNER:** — By the minister's own admission, this has nothing to do with environmental estimates. Last night it was ruled out of order and now you're allowing this to go on tonight. Would you please rule on this? And let's get back to environmental estimates.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — In allowing the member to continue, I've been looking at the subject matter that he's bringing up. It has previously, in the province, been taken under an environmental assessment impact study for both the transmission lines as well as the production of power. I think these are the estimates under which to listen to it. I think that he has taken a very long approach, but that's normal for this committee.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The point I believe you missed, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in your point of order (and if you like I will raise another point of order) is the fact that he was replying for the minister. It is not the duty of the backbencher to be replying on behalf of a minister. The questions are directed from this side to ministers and not to backbenchers.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to now go on to my question to the minister. Has a proposal been submitted by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland for the pipeline from the north to the south?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — No, not that I am aware of.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You know, Mr. Minister, I didn't think it had been. The member rose earlier and criticized and condemned the opposition for not offering any proposals. I was sure that he had not either. I want to say this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that I will be watching with very deep interest tonight or tomorrow (whenever we vote on this item 1) whether or not the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is going to be supporting the government in the environment vote. I say this for this reason. He accuses, condemns and criticizes the government for the lack of co-ordination between the Department of the Environment, the Department of Health, and the department of occupational health.

The minister, in reply to the member, indicated that he would review and consider the problem of acid rain. I asked him earlier to consider the problem of noise pollution and of the water quality of the city of Regina. Of course, he paid absolutely no heed or attention to my request. He heard it, but his reply to me was, "It's not our problem. It has nothing to do with the Department of the Environment." The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland asks him to consider the problem of acid rain. Of course, being a member of the same party, he said, "Yes, we will give that serious consideration."

I will finish by saying that I want to see, tonight or tomorrow, whether or not the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland will vote on his principles on his convictions as to whether or not he will support your department, because we won't be voting in favour of your estimates or of this vote, that's for sure — not with the attitude that you have taken with respect to your responsibilities. At no time did you receive the criticism from this side of the House (perhaps we should have been criticizing much more than we have) that you received tonight from the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I give you notice now that there will be a standing vote because if that member is in this building, I want him in this House to vote on this department.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman and Mr. Minister, I would like to go into the acid rain aspect of the environment and go into it with a little more sincerity than the member opposite who raised the question. I would like to know what studies your department has done regarding the acid rain problem in Saskatchewan. What moneys have been spent in the past? What are your projections for the future? We can take just one example of the fish in the lakes in Saskatchewan. The fisherman up North (and this would reflect in the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, as well) doesn't care whether it is Canadian sulphur dioxide or American sulphur dioxide. They are just concerned about the acid rain problem in Saskatchewan, how it's affecting them, and what your department and you as minister are going to do about it.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, there has been in my judgment a fairly active program by this government and by this department with regard to identifying the problems of acid rain in Saskatchewan. We have come to the conclusion that there is at the present no conclusive evidence indicating an acid rain problem in Saskatchewan. The hon. members may not agree but that's the conclusion to which we've come. Dr. Hammer undertook a rather extensive study in northern Saskatchewan and other parts of Saskatchewan. There has been an ongoing series of studies which involve the Saskatchewan Research Council. I say to the hon. member that is not sufficient nor is it the end of the study; but it is a serious beginning with regard to determining what the situation is in Saskatchewan and what the potential hazards are.

I want to give the hon. members some information. I didn't have this available when the hon. member for Sutherland was asking questions and I didn't answer them because I didn't have it down. But I want to give you the yearly sulphur dioxide emissions for 1980 so that you can get some perspective on how we are in Saskatchewan, and whether we will ultimately be able to protect ourselves against what is normally referred to as acid rain. Manitoba, for example, produces 718,000 tonnes of sulphur dioxide emissions annually; Alberta 704,000 tonnes; Saskatchewan 46,000 tonnes — or 3.1 per cent of the total sulphur dioxide emissions. I'm not sure that even with the strictest of standards in Saskatchewan we will be able to preserve our northern lakes, which the hon. member has referred to, or whether we are going to be in somewhat the same kind of situation the Scandinavian countries find themselves in today.

**April 2, 1981**

The state of Montana is over 90,000 tonnes, and the anticipated Poplar River (the two units down there over which we've heard a great amount of debate over the last number of years) was 27,300 tonnes. There is every reason to have concern and to maintain a constant vigil with regard to this matter of the burning of fossil fuels and to strictly adhere to the emission standards which we have established. I indicate to the hon. member that I'm not sure whether even by doing that we will be able to control the problems. They come as a result of the return to us of those things we put up in the first place.

**MR. GARNER:** — Articles that appear in *Maclean's*, for example — quotations like this are sincere and very scary. Finally there are health costs. One study estimated that 5,000 Canadians may die each year because of acid rain related sulphates. Mr. Minister, you can point out the figures for Alberta, Ontario or anywhere else. What representation or communication have you had with not only your colleagues in the other provinces in Canada, but with your American colleagues and the federal minister? There is no point in taking the attitude that we have only a small percentage of it in Saskatchewan. What's the point of cleaning our own act up if no one else does?

I believe it is your job, as Minister of Environment, to discuss this with the other people, with the other ministers in Canada and the Americans, because something must be done. It's for the future; that's what we're all here for. As Minister of the Environment for the province of Saskatchewan, it is your responsibility. Would you answer me? What communiqués have you had with your colleagues internationally?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — With regard to international communications, that is communications with the states of the United States, this really is a matter of protocol. I have had informal discussions with the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of Montana, but with regard to any official discussions, it is a matter of protocol which, obviously, needs to be dealt with by Ottawa because the accords between nations are not developed by provinces but by the federal system on both sides. We attempt not to offend our federal counterparts in that regard.

With regard to our communication with our federal counterparts and the discussions which they have ongoing, we have participated in both air quality and water quality through the IJC (International Joint Commission) and the long-range transportation committee, and bilateral committees involved with respect to that. There has been an ongoing communication by the officials of the department with national counterparts, with federal communications going across the border because of the protocol arrangements.

With regard to the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers, this has been an ongoing subject. I am not sure the agendas are complete for the council this year, but I would be surprised if there were not an item on that agenda for discussion about this particular problem. I am going to send across to the hon. member Saskatchewan Environment's brief to the subcommittee on acid rain of the standing committee of fishery and forestry's public hearing on February 16, 1981, in Calgary.

This is a serious subject; there is no question about that fact. It is treated seriously by the department. I share the hon. member's view that this is a subject which, in my estimation, will be the subject of the future — perhaps more so than the development of nuclear power. I believe it is a subject which not only parallels, but perhaps surpasses,

the impact of nuclear power development in North America. I truly believe it is a matter to which we have to give immediate and grave attention.

**MR. GARNER:** — I am going back to my original question that we started out on — talking about studies that have been done in the province of Saskatchewan. I would like to know a dollar figure of some of those studies but, basically, what I'd like to know is, according to these studies, what damage has already taken place in the province of Saskatchewan as a result of acid rain?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — With regard to the hon. member's first question, I think up to this point in time between \$80,000 and \$100,000 has been spent on studies. The study by Dr. Hammer, as I indicated already, did not find (and I may stand to be corrected on this) anywhere where damage had occurred, although he did find that acid rain was occurring in areas of northern Saskatchewan and that there were other areas of risk in northern Saskatchewan.

The Saskatchewan Research Council, I understand, will be writing its final report on the studies that it is doing. When that report is released, we believe that there will be some more detail as to whether or not there has been damage, although I think, again, damage is not suspected but there are areas of risk. Therefore, there needs to be action taken to hopefully prevent such damage. I'm not sure that we can prevent it. But certainly we may be able to do something within our province and impress our studies upon the province of Alberta and the province of Manitoba particularly, because the area which I understand is at greatest risk is around the Flin Flon mine or the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon. They have been, for some number of years, producing an output of sulphur dioxide which exceeds our standards (which, I think, the hon. member was referring to but in reference to Alberta).

Manitoba has just given approval for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to proceed without any reduction of their output. In other words, Manitoba is just relaxing its standards and going ahead with the output that is there and not attempting to deal with issue. So we've got problems on the east side of the province, but they are problems which we have to deal with other governments about, and I'm not trying to stress that any more than just to make the point. I tried to point out to you the difference, in terms of just straight tonnages, between the chemical waste coming out of the industries in Alberta and Manitoba as opposed to what's coming out of our own stacks in Saskatchewan. Even though we may be able to clean up our act better than we have, we can't impose our standards upon other provincial governments, but certainly we can impress upon them the urgency of the matter, not only to our own province, but to theirs.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, I'm interested in this topic of acid rain also. At present we have two thermal generating plants in the province, at Estevan and at Coronach. Discussion over the last few days has been about another one for Gravelbourg and I hear a rumour of one being perhaps located just north of the city of Regina. Can you, Mr. Minister, give me and this Assembly your assurance that the most efficient and modern methods of filtering the products out of the smokestacks will be used? Are the most up-to-date and efficient filtering systems in place at present at Estevan and Coronach? Will you give us assurance that, as Minister of the Environment, you will make sure that when the thermo-generating plant is built at Gravelbourg, and when one is built north of the city of Regina, they will also have the most efficient means possible to safeguard this province from their fall-out and the resulting acid rain?

**April 2, 1981**

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I can say to the hon. member that we do not presently have the most up-to-date kinds of collectors in our plants. However, we do believe that in the case of Coronach, with the electrostatic precipitators, we are doing a good job. What we said at Coronach was that, if it were found that they were not going to do the job, then we would require some additional kinds of equipment to be included in the stacks there. That will be monitored. Montana and Saskatchewan have an ongoing joint-monitoring program to watch that process.

With respect to Estevan, I think that the electrostatic precipitators are not in the stacks there. While we believe we have some idea about the tonnages which are going into the atmosphere there, again, they're about the same as the number of tonnages out of the Poplar River plant. We feel that those tonnages are within our standards. They meet our objectives. We think that that is satisfactory at this time. However, I commit to the hon. member without any degree of reservation that, if we find that these industrial developments or stacks begin to develop more tonnages or if the standards begin to decline as a result of ongoing concern by the public, we'll deal with that issue when it comes. We certainly commit ourselves to dealing with it on a basis which will require that they meet the new standards if new standards are set.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You know, Mr. Minister, I sit with interest listening to you. You're concerned that there may be a problem down the trail. That's what I'm talking about. I accept your figures that we may be the lowest. But if we're building two, three or four more thermal plants in the near future, I think it's most imperative that we have the best material in there to screen these things out — scrubbers or whatever you may call them.

I want to tell you why I raised this. When I went home Friday, I received a letter from a 16-year-old kid from the Indian Head high school, who asked me to question you on the very topic which I am on right now. She said that she had been led to believe that we, in Saskatchewan, do not have the best equipment. That's where this question comes from. There's a 16-year-old girl out there wondering about this and wondering about her future. To me, that meant a lot. I hope it does to you.

I want to quote just a bit from a recent book published in 1980, on the topic of acid rain. It's called *Acid Rain*. The North American Forecast by Ross Howard and Michael Perley. You may have read the book; I don't know. I found some of these things quite startling and quite informative. This book was published in 1980. I'll just take a few quotes from it. I'll be glad to share the article with you, Mr. Minister, if you'd like it. It says: "One recent prediction runs close to \$5 billion over a decade for Canada alone." They are talking about the economic cost — \$5 billion that could affect the Canadian economy as a result of acid rain. And it says that the cost of acid rain is so enormous that it could undermine the financial stability of an entire region and national economies. Now things like that are rather shocking to me. It goes on to point out that there was a study done by the federal government in August 1977 by the National Research Council of Canada. It estimated the direct annual loss of forests due to acid rain at that time to lie between \$1.2 billion and \$2.8 billion.

If it's affecting the forests and so on, what if acid rain isn't checked? And that's why I talk to you about Saskatchewan. I agree that some of it is going to be coming in from the other areas. As my colleague has pointed out, with your work with other environment ministers in other provinces maybe this could be stopped. But your mandate and your prime responsibility is right here in this province. If it's causing that degree of loss economically in the forests, what is happening to our cereal crops as a result of acid rain? What might happen in the future if we do not use every means to check this? You



know, if it's affecting the growth of trees, it would seem logical that it will certainly affect our bread and butter — our cereal grains. So looking at the economic costs, and then as my colleague pointed out (and I'd like to go a little further) there are the health costs. And it says in this article:

One study estimated that at least 5,000 Canadians may die each year because of acid rain related sulphates. Other researchers put the figure at 187,000 deaths a year in the U.S.

Sulphur dioxide alone causes \$1.7 billion worth of health care costs each year in the United States. The costs will almost inevitably be higher by the time the research is in.

Now I just pointed a few of those things out to try to impress upon you the importance of acid rain and what it might do to the future of this province unless we take . . . You know I don't think we can spare the horses on these scrubbers. If that's the most modern and efficient technology, then I say to the Minister of the Environment, "Let's get them in place."

Have you done any studies, or have you consulted with North Dakota or any of them concerning the effect of acid rain on the cereal crops? Is there any research into that? I believe there's probably some in the States. What do you know about that?

Another thing I was going to mention is the blight and the fall-out from our potash mines. I understand there's a rumour around (and maybe some of the members who hold seats in the northeastern part of the province could shed some light on this) that there's a bit of difficulty getting the land to build the Bredenbury potash mine. The farmers in the area, even though they see the economic benefit of having the potash mine in their area, are concerned about the fall-out or the blight upon their farmland. I wonder what studies Saskatchewan Environment has undertaken pertaining to this, if this is a serious problem, and if it is correct that people are not wanting to have their land expropriated for the proposed Bredenbury potash mine because of blight and fall-out from the potash.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I'm really delighted with the comments from the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I think this is an important subject. It raises, however, a point which is of interest to Saskatchewan people at the present time. I think it points up a real dichotomy in terms of the debate which is going on out there. We are expressing, not only in Saskatchewan, a good deal of alarm in some sectors of the public. I am not saying it isn't warranted or that it should be glossed over. There is a debate going on about the development of a nuclear energy system or what we are going to use as our energy fuel of the future. There seems to be decisions being made out there that are not going to deal with the suppression of the use of fossil fuels, but rather with an increase in the use of fossil fuels.

I am sure that the hon. member would have been impressed by the guest speaker, Dr. Hare, who was at the recent seminar on climate change. Professor Hare simply took historical and current data, plugged it into a computer and moved it forward to the years 2000, 2020 and so on. He wasn't making a case; he wasn't trying to sell something. All he was attempting to do was to say that these appear to be the historical and current facts. We've put them into a computer and let it do its own kind of drafting from there on.

**April 2, 1981**

He was dealing with these matters of the burning of fossil fuels and the problems of air emissions and so on which, as a result, may well affect the climate in the future. I think it is a very serious subject. I agree. We have read into the record the deaths which are estimated to be occurring now with regard to acid rain and the sulphur dioxide which we are talking about. Yet, there is a debate going on out there about estimating what might happen if we use another energy source.

I'm not here advocating that, but it seems to me that we are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel in relation to this whole matter of acid rain. I think it is paramount in real terms because we measure it, we can taste and smell and feel it and it is affecting us now. I think that somehow some of the groups out there in our society must come to grips with this fact and decide whether we are going to continue to stick our heads in the sand with regard to this issue or whether we're going to debate it on the basis of facts rather than a motion.

I'm pleased that the hon. member has raised this issue in the manner in which he has, because I agree with his point of view. I believe it's the subject of the present and of the immediate future. He has quoted those things and I agree with him.

Let me go on with regard to the buffering action which our soils are apparently able to produce in the South because of the particular kind of soils that we have. As I understand it, Dr. Hammer's study did some minor assessment of the southern soils. I understand that our crops are not suffering in this case because of the particular kinds of soils we have here and because of the buffering actions of the soils themselves against the acid rain.

The matter of potash air pollution is just now being recognized. We have, as a result of the recognition of the possibility of this, I think developed our first standard with respect to potash emissions, or air standards. I don't want to get into a debate again, but now that the member for Regina South has returned, I would like to refer him to subvote 8, which puts into effect a mines waste research secretariat for \$605,000, and I hope he doesn't vote against it. I'm sure he wants to see it; I'm sure he wants to vote in favour of having a mines waste research secretariat in order that we might be able to assess some of these problems with regard to acid rain, air pollution by potash mines, as well as by uranium mines and so on. I draw the member's attention to it. I do it perhaps a bit facetiously, but I do it in response to the hon. member for Regina South.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You mentioned that the blight from the potash mines was just kind of coming into focus. Have you some studies which indicate why you say "just coming into focus" or is that just this year? We've been mining potash for a while now.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — As I understand it, the studies were done some three or four years ago. What we're doing now is responding to those studies. The officials inform me it is estimated it will cost around \$8 million for potash mines to get themselves into a position where they can begin to put some controls on the air emission. So we're moving in that area. I am admitting to the hon. member that probably we should have been there before, but the studies have been completed and we are now responding to those studies.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You say, "We're responding." That means the potash mines in Saskatchewan are starting to put in the controls necessary to stop this blight.

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — The member for Kelsey-Tisdale was standing several times.

Did he have a question?

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, according to Dr. Hammer's report (just leafing through it quickly), by the year 1990, while we now are sitting at 46,000 tonnes, we will be at 90,000 tonnes in the province of Saskatchewan, and the biggest increase is from the thermopower plants.

Now, I know you are aware of it and I know you are concerned about it. We are sitting at 46,000 tonnes. Very hopefully, action will be taken by you and by your department to ensure that we don't reach this figure of 90,000 tonnes referred to in Dr. Hammer's report.

I can see now why the people in the Assiniboia area and the Meadow Lake area are concerned about having these thermopower projects in their area. I'm not going to dwell on the Assiniboia situation, but we are talking about 6,000 acres of farmland down there, and that's a lot of good farmland, Mr. Minister.

Going back to Dr. Hammer's report, from 46,000 tonnes to 90,000 tonnes by 1990 is a scary figure. I believe that you, as a minister, are aware (we brought this to your attention) and you will take action even if it means putting the scrubbers on at Coronach so we don't reach the 90,000 tonnes level by 1990.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, I appreciate the hon. member's point. I want to correct you. You're not reading from Dr. Hammer's report; you're reading from the intervention which we made to the Alberta hearings. And the numbers have been prepared by the department.

I'm not taking away from the significance at all of our increase from 46,000 tonnes to an estimated 90,000 tonnes by 1990, but the same estimation for Alberta goes to 1.056 million tonnes in the same time; Manitoba stays roughly at 718,000 tonnes per year. We talk about scrubbers at Coronach. The estimated cost for the inclusion of scrubbers into that power plant was around \$50 million to \$60 million. Now that obviously is going to mean something on the power bill when you add that kind of cost to one particular unit and if you then go on to other units and add that cost. I'm not saying that it isn't important. It is. But again it's a matter of assessing what you want to do.

I just wanted to read a figure into the record so that the hon. members will be aware. You'll remember that Inco (International Nickel Company of Canada Ltd.) at Sudbury, requires for that single plant 900,000 tonnes a year. We're talking about a total out of Alberta by the year 1980 of very close to the same thing.

**MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I have a few questions for the Minister of Environment concerning a proposed route from Highway 168 across to Highway 3. I brought it up with the Minister of Highways and Transportation about the highway going across without an environmental study and he assured me a few weeks ago that it would be done. I just wonder if he's brought it to your attention yet and do you intend to do it?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — One of our officials is coming to give us an official word with respect to it. I know the road that the hon. member talks about. It has been a subject of some consideration and of some telephone calls to my office and to my home as to

**April 2, 1981**

whether or not it was going to go ahead. The information which we have (and it may change when our official comes in) is that there has been no environmental impact assessment done. It may well be underway, but the statement hasn't come to our office with respect to it as yet. But maybe we'll just wait till the official comes in and perhaps you have another question.

**MR. HARDY:** — The question is very similar. Last summer or early spring we had a fire up in Hudson Bay area, the Woody Lake fire, and a tremendous amount of forest burned which affected wildlife, a lot of lake shores and resort areas. Has your department done any kind of environmental study on the impact on our lakes, rivers and wildlife, in particular? Have you done anything toward reforestation of the area?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — No, we don't do environmental impact assessments on forest fires. We would find ourselves just run to death on things like that. Maybe we should. I'm not saying we shouldn't; I'm just saying we don't. It hasn't been a policy to evaluate or to try to assess from an environmental standpoint. The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources does its own assessment with respect to commercial forests and other kinds of considerations relevant to its needs. But so far as the Department of the Environment is concerned, we don't do an environmental impact assessment on a large forest fire.

**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Minister, I think, with all due respect, that that type or enormous size of fire, which has done so much damage in our area, has an effect not just on the forest itself, but on the people around. The main impact was that lake resorts which were building up for tourism have now been just about completely destroyed. I think maybe it's time that the Department of the Environment took into consideration some of the aspects of a forest fire and looked into it. I'd urge you, in the future, if you haven't done it now, to take that into consideration where the fire has been of such an enormous size as the ones in the Hudson Bay area. I know you're nodding to your Minister of Tourism and he says he has done one. I think last year I asked for an inquiry into the Woody Lake fire, but I haven't got it yet. I don't know if he's going to give it to me this year. But I would urge that the Department of the Environment look into what happens to everything, all the wildlife, the lakes and the rivers, when we do have a fire of that size. I'll be addressing the Minister of Tourism later on that.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, I can appreciate the hon. member's point of view, but, boy, there's just no way we can do those now. To do a proper environmental impact assessment on a fire the size of the Woody Lake fire would probably take at least two years to do. It probably would be in the neighbourhood of (and I can only guess) a \$100,000 touch or even more, maybe \$250,000 if you're going to do it right. After the two years is over, you have the study and have spent the money. Maybe you can come to the conclusion that there has been some economic and social disaster and a number of other things and you can estimate the dollar value, and so on. I think it's a good point. I'm not disparaging what the hon. member says but I think it's something that we just can't do at this time.

With regard to the question that you raised on the highway, we're aware that someone is making a proposal with regard to that project. It's under review at the moment and we will decide whether or not an environmental impact assessment is needed. Because I know the country and the magnitude of the project, I could say that it will, very much in my opinion, require some sort of an environmental impact assessment.

**MR. HARDY:** — In regard to the last answer you just gave me, are you telling me that you

are prepared to go ahead with an environmental study before the highway is allowed to go through there? You realize full well that in that area there is what we call a wildcat wilderness area. It is probably the last of the wilderness left in the northeastern part of the province. Another thing that a lot of people are very concerned with is the trappers and the wildlife federation. I would urge that all these people be contacted before you make a decision of not going ahead in the environmental study, and I really urge you to go ahead with one.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, I said to the hon. member that we will consider it stopped here formally, but obviously the magnitude of the project will require an environmental investigation.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions I want to ask. It seems each time I question you, Mr. Minister, we're always interrupted by the supper hour. It's happened twice now, but I'll finish up here as quickly as possible.

My questions are concerning the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer. Last year you were not able to answer all my questions. You said it was in the courts. Now I understand that it's not in the courts, so maybe you can answer some of these questions. We have discussed this very little over this last year and perhaps, just to start off, you can tell us what you've done as Minister of the Environment to control the spread of any more PCBs at Federal Pioneer. What have you done in this last year? Bring us up to date.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, we issued the minister's order for clean-up. The company responded to that order. We didn't get ourselves into court as we thought we were going to, but Federal Pioneer has carried out most of the recommendations of the National Research Council. They have spent about \$750,000 toward the carrying out of those clean-up objectives. I don't want to go into the details unless the hon. member wants to know them. He's probably been on the site to see what they're doing anyway. That's what has happened since last year at this time.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Are you saying, Mr. Minister, that the PCBs there are all taken care of and that there is no more problem? Have you moved them away or have you not moved them away? Are they still there? Mr. Minister, in 1976 the total cost of moving those PCBs, I understand, was in the neighbourhood of \$25,000. In 1979 the cost to completely remove those PCBs was approximately \$3 million, as estimated by the National Research Council in Ottawa. Now, can you tell me whether the matter has been completely settled? Have you and Federal Pioneer completely come to agreement that they will just let them sit there? You've never explained to me what you have done. Did you decide on that retaining cement wall? Did you go that way or are you some day going to move them out into a cement pit? You've never told me that. I want to know exactly what your plan is, Mr. Minister, that figure must be getting close to \$5 million. If it went from \$25,000 in 1976 to an estimated \$3 million in 1979, it has to be getting close. If the PCBs are still soaking into the soil and you've done nothing to stop them, the figure has to be in the \$5 million range; there's no other way.

The Attorney General thinks it's a joke. Well, I'll tell you, when it's costing \$5 million or \$6 million, it should be stopped. Perhaps you haven't spent that kind of money yet, but you're going to if you remove the PCBs from that site. If you can tell me they've been removed for \$750,000, that's fine, the matter is closed. Let me know what's going on.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, we could go into all sorts of detail as to what is going on at the site. We've been issuing press releases; there has been an ongoing

**April 2, 1981**

report in the media as to the step-by-step process. The media representatives have been on the site themselves and they have been reporting on this. The project is not fully complete; it's still under way. I don't know whether we need to take up the time of the House for the details. I'll try to give the hon. member as much detail as he wants with respect to the barrier which we're putting around — the depth of the barrier, how it's being put in, and the engineering design, if he wants it. Bentonite is being poured into this barrier so that there will be a sealing-off of the movement of PCBs laterally, at least. Perhaps I can send him a copy of the press release. Some of the details are there.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Minister, I just asked you a very simple question. Are the PCBs still out there or are they not?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, they are. Part of the clean-up of the PCBs was to clean up those shallow contaminated soils and store them on site. I think that is in the news release. I think that has been the debate which has been going on in the media and the public ever since they started there. Yes, they are there. They are intended to be there. They are intended to be removed from the position they are now in, and they are intended to be stored and covered in a particular way. That is part of the clean-up exercise.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — You can send out all the press releases you want, and I have read them all, Mr. Minister. The people out in the country and the people of the city of Regina want to know. You go down 11th Avenue and ask the first 10 people you see, "What are you doing with the PCBs over there?" They don't know. You won't get on the radio or television and tell them what is going on in the city of Regina. You won't tell them whether PCBs are still on site or not and whether they are going to cost somebody \$3 million to \$6 million.

You have never answered those kinds of questions in a press release, saying whether you are going to move them out to a site or build a retaining wall. Is it going to be a 200-foot retaining wall around Federal Pioneer? Have you satisfied the Department of the Environment that this is going to control the PCBs? Can you prove to the city of Regina that there are no PCBs in the drinking water of this town? Can you tell them how far from the aquiferous system PCBs are at this moment? Because they are soaking more into the ground minute by minute, and you know they are.

You know yourself (and we are not going to get into something which is going to take a long time to hassle over tonight) that environment was responsible in the first place by going to that site and issuing the order in 1976 to cover the PCB spot with pavement until it saw what they were going to do. Now, until you come up with some concrete answer (and these press releases have not made it concrete to the people of Saskatchewan), what are you going to do with them? Are you going to move them away from there, or take care of them there, or not? What is your real answer to that? You are not really answering me. We can get off this very quickly if you would just answer some questions. Yes or no?

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — I tried to indicate to the hon. member that I could give in great detail if he wants it, I suppose, the method by which they are proposing to clean up the spill at Federal Pioneer. I can bring to the hon. member all of the publicity which we have given on it, all of the statements which we have given to the media and to the public with regard to it. But in order to preserve some of the time this evening with regard to the estimates, I will just say this.

The shallow contaminated soils are going to be dug out and stored on site. That is part of the recommendation of the national research council. The member has that report. He can read the report, I would hope. He knows that is part of the recommendation. We are carrying out the recommendations almost verbatim which were given by the National Research Council, with the additional innovation of putting this barrier of bentonite down 30 feet in depth and developing wells so they can pump out the sump. The water will migrate, of course, to the wells and the liquids will be pumped out and put into barrels and stored — if not on site, in a suitable place. All of these are techniques which are being implemented at the site in order to be able to clean up. Now, I can't give you the engineering design, the engineering detail and the professional response to this particular method of cleaning up. I'm not an engineer, and I'm sure if I begin to deal in engineering terms the hon. member won't understand me anyway. I am saying, and I have said publicly, that as far as the Department of the Environment is concerned, and, I think in accord with the National Research Council's objectives, we are satisfied that the things which are being done now meet the criteria and the objectives and the order which we set out for Federal Pioneer to adhere to.

I don't know what more I can say to the hon. member. We're satisfied. You may not agree that it's good enough. That's fine. That's your point of view. But I'm saying that as far as we're concerned in the department, we are satisfied. I, as the minister, have been satisfied with the actions which are being taken by Federal Pioneer, both in carrying out the order and in fulfilling the objectives of the National Research Council's report. We are doing as much as is humanly possible to meet the objectives and the criteria for cleaning up the site, in order that there will be no hazard to the Regina water supply system.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Now, Mr. Minister, of course I don't agree with the way you've handled the PCBs, but I will accept it if you will give me every bit of information that you have on the plan at Federal Pioneer. I don't mean tonight, as long as you can get it to me.

But I'm going to tell you, Mr. Minister, that you have completely blundered, which I've told you before. You said that you're not a professional and this kind of stuff. There has been so much professionalism in getting rid of the PCBs at Federal Pioneer that it makes a farmer like me, who knows how to use a bucket and a truck, just sick to death. It's ridiculous. You could have taken some quick action years ago and removed them. You never will admit that. You just let them go until it has cost somebody. I know what the plan is: it's to get Federal Pioneer to pay the shot here. It's an absolute shame that they have to, when you gave the order to let them sit there from 1976 until now.

It would be the same thing, Mr. Minister, if I had a transformer containing PCBs on my farm which broke and put PCBs on my soil, and I didn't know what to do with them. So along comes environment and says, "We don't know what to do with them either. We'll put some pavement over them and then we'll come back and tell you." Maybe I could get them moved for a few dollars now; then you'd come along in ten years and say it will cost a few million dollars. Who should pay it, the government or me? Now, that's what you've done.

No matter who pays for it, Federal Pioneer or the taxpayer, you can't tell me there hasn't been a terrific cost to the taxpayer too, with your ridiculous delay in this. You've never admitted to us that those PCBs could have been moved to New York at \$500 a ton in 1976, when they would all have gone into the back of your farm truck or mine — 1,500 gallons. It's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard — letting it go into tons of soil. We

**April 2, 1981**

wouldn't have gotten into this little spit match here if you had stood up and guaranteed to the people of Regina that there are no PCBs in the water at this very moment.

What have you done for testing? In 1979, when the PCBs were supposed to be in the drinking water, you were testing several times a day. Have you done any testing since? What have you done in the last year to prove it to yourselves? It's a sure thing that you would never tell the people of this province and the citizens of Regina whether there are PCBs in the drinking water. They never would have known if it hadn't been for the press. Now, tell us whether you can assure us that there are PCBs in the drinking water and how far from the aquiferous system the PCBs are at this moment. That's all I've asked you, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I'll be able to convince the hon. member. We've been at it for many years now — trying to convince the hon. member that, in my judgment, in the judgment of the National Research Council and in the judgment of any of the experts who give us advice, what we're doing is an appropriate and responsible way of dealing with the PCB problem at Federal Pioneer. The hon. member isn't going to agree with that — he never has and he never will. It's a straight matter of difference of opinion. I don't know why, Mr. Chairman, we continue to plague ourselves with this kind of debate because it's not going to get us anywhere. We're just going around and around in circles. He'll ask the same questions and I'll give the same answers. There's nothing more I can give the hon. member.

I suggest to you that the National Research Council was . . . I say it again, you have the report on your desk and if you'll open the covers, you'll see there are some recommendations in there to which we are adhering. I have issued an order to Federal Pioneer to clean up on that basis: to clean up its site and to store some of the contaminated soils on site. We have gone the additional route of approving the installation of a barrier of bentonite 30 feet deep. That has been approved by all of the experts and the officials inside and outside the province with whom we've consulted. There has been ongoing testing of the Regina water system, by our officials, for PCBs. On the basis of their report, there are none.

Now, I don't know, maybe the member has been up there with his little bottle of water again taking tap samples. I don't know. I don't know whether he has or not but all I can tell the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is what I have repeatedly told him over and over again. There isn't anything more I can say with respect to the matter and if he asks further questions, I'll try to answer them but I think we're just spinning our wheels.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Minister, you're right. There is no sense in our going on because when we come to drinking water, you've heard from the member for Regina South. When it comes to you from the nine sitting members of the city of Regina and the two sitting members from Moose Jaw, you do not show any interest in improving the quality of the drinking water in these two major cities and intervening towns which amounts to approximately a third of the population of Saskatchewan. You've shown no interest! We heard from the member for Regina Wascana heckling and grinning when it comes to talking about drinking water quality. There goes the minister there starting to grin; this is what causes this agitation between us. Why don't you be like a man and admit that we've got a problem. There he goes. There he goes. You'd think that he was a monkey! I'm telling you.

Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You think that I can't read — of course I



can read, Mr. Minister, because it says in here exactly, and you have not followed what Dr. Gordon Butler from the research council has said at all. You and I will have to get together and fight it out in the hall, I guess. But, we're just wasting time. I have to say to you and put it on the record you're an incompetent cabinet minister for the way you've handled the drinking water in this province and the PCB spills and that's the last I've got to say.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Minister, I sometimes listen and I listened awhile ago when you suggested that perhaps I should reconsider my position tonight. I thought maybe I should because, in all fairness, I believe that the people around you are dedicated servants of the public and do a pretty good job in the Department of the Environment. Unfortunately, I can't feel the same way and express the same thoughts about the minister. That's simply because in your capacity as minister you would be able to direct and offer the solutions and provide the assistance that I believe the people of this province need. Without any further argument or discussion or debate on the point, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the member for Arm River:

That this committee does not have confidence in the Minister of the Environment for failing to take action in providing necessary assistance on noise pollution and water quality control in Saskatchewan and therefore, this committee urges this Assembly to reduce the minister's salary to \$1 per year, as a symbolic gesture of this committee's lack of confidence in his ability to direct his department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. I rule the motion by the hon. member for Regina South, seconded by the hon. member for Arm River, out of order for the following reason. I refer all hon. members to the second report of the special committee on rules and procedures December 10, 1980, which states:

The practice of permitting substantive motions to committee of the whole and committee of finance be discontinued. Parliamentary authorities clearly prohibit the moving of substantive resolutions in committee of the whole while a bill is being considered clause by clause or in committee of finance while the estimates are being reviewed.

I refer all hon. members to Beauchesne's *Rules and Forms of the House of Commons of Canada*, Fifth Edition, paragraph 491, page 170.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 14 inclusive agreed.

Vote 9 agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

## CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

### GOVERNMENT SERVICES

#### Expenditure—Vote 13

Item 1

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce my officials: Deputy Minister Dennis Foley; Don Nevill, director of property and planning; Ian Laidlaw, executive director of operations; and Doug Archer, director of administration.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank the department for their annual report — they are finally learning. I notice the questions that I always start with in the estimates are now answered in the annual report. The amount of space each department has; the tenders . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . For a rookie member you sure have a big yap.

Mr. Minister, as I was indicating, I notice that the space allotment is all there for the first time; all the contracts that you had last year, the bidders and the amounts they bid are now in your report. Going through your tenders though, Mr. Minister, I noticed that there was the withdrawal of one that was good. It was a low tender, and they withdrew it. Could you advise the House why that happened?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the contractor in question withdrew his bid voluntarily because he had made an error and decided he did not want to have the bid stand and withdrew it for that reason.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I realize you weren't the minister of this department during the last year. Therefore, some of the issues you will not be responsible for. But to make sure we're on the same ground rules here, my understanding is your department only looks after buildings for departments of government and not for Crown corporations. In some individual circumstances you lease space to Crown corporations, but in most cases you are just concerned with the departments of the government and not the Crown corporations. Am I correct in that?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — That's correct.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I think each year in this committee I have indicated my dissatisfaction with the accounting method which your government uses on cost accounting for the services you provide for departments. For example, the Department of Environment (the one we just handled earlier this evening), you have space allocated to them worth about \$250,000 in total. That takes in their types 1, 2 and 3 space. My estimates, using your data book here, indicate approximately \$250,000 is invested on their behalf. Is there any move within your department to consider a charge-back situation, therefore showing the true costs of all departments, or is it your intention to continue to operate along this line?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the proposal the member makes is that we look at a system similar to B.C.'s, something like a Crown corporation for office buildings and space. We have looked at that idea and we've dismissed that idea. The main reason is that the money for buildings and for allocation space is in our department; one agency does the accounting. The accounting is done in the department as opposed to spreading the money all over the government and other departments. To administer that, if you were to have it, means double accounting. Having the Department of Agriculture, the departments of health and social services and what have you responsible for their own space with their own money and competitively bidding means more administration. It means handling money more times and that all costs money. The reason we don't do that is for one basic reason: it's much more inexpensive and

much more efficient to have the space requirements of government all in one agency, under one roof, and have the space provided accordingly.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, let me just change the topic for a moment. Over the past year or two there have been new buildings named: the Tommy Douglas Building, the Sturdy Stone Centre and I believe even an Auburn Pepper Building of some kind. Could you inform me how many government-owned buildings you have named after former members or members?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we'd have to give the member a list of buildings. We don't have a ready number. We couldn't tell him if it was 10 or 12 or 46. We'd have to supply him with a list; we don't have that handy.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, maybe you could tell me how many you have named after premiers of the province other than Mr. Douglas.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the number of buildings named after premiers in this province is two: the T.C. Douglas Building and the Walter Scott Building.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is it your plan or the department's plan from now on to name buildings after (as I see you've been doing for the last year) MLAs and so forth? I lay before you my concern; I lay politics aside and suggest that you should be considering all the former premiers of the province no matter what political party they represented in this House (with family permission, obviously). I suggest you should consider naming government buildings after them.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the member asked if we have a policy to name buildings after premiers or important people in the province like Tommy Douglas. We all agree he's a very important person, both sides of the House. The answer to the other part of the question about Walter Scott is: it was part of the celebrate program that we decided we wanted to name something after him, and that is why it was done. There is not a readily defined policy of naming buildings after premiers in the province; however, it's under review and we'll certainly consider it in the year coming. We'll try to define a policy accordingly.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You mean you have no policy on naming buildings? That's just what you said. You have to have some kind of policy.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that the member is asking us to define something which is not totally defined. Our policy, in regard to naming buildings, is to recognize people who have made an excellent and outstanding contribution to our province. We've named buildings accordingly. If the member is asking us to define, specifically, who the next building is going to be named after, I can't do that.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister responsible for government services to provide, as the member for Rosthern has indicated in his question, the policy for the naming of buildings. For you to say that you don't have one surely isn't going to wash with the opposition. You must have a policy. If you don't have a policy, then you have a guy in a backroom who comes running out every once in a while and says, "Hey, there's a name and there's a building." I mean you must have something.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's the policy.

**April 2, 1981**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — That could well be the policy as the Attorney General says. That could well be. Policy or otherwise (and I would draw the Attorney General's attention to this, as well), for decades this government has been naming buildings and streets, and anything they can get it hung on, after themselves. I'll tell you that we're going to make it a little bit interesting this evening. I'm going to disagree with the member for Rosthern. I don't believe that we should be naming buildings after ourselves, as members of the legislature. It wouldn't matter if I was a member of the legislature or just anyone. I don't think that people, generally speaking, should be naming buildings after themselves, or having groups of people name buildings after them for good works which they may have done as they travelled through the trials and tribulations of mankind. I'm sure that the member for Weyburn would concur with what I'm saying, on that side of the House, more so likely than any member of this Assembly.

Mr. Minister, I want you to provide to this committee the way in which this government, through your department in particular, has handled the naming of buildings or any other artifacts which you may be naming after yourselves, before we move off item 1. I contend that there has to be a policy there. I'm not going to accept, and I'm sure the member for Rosthern isn't going to accept, that you don't have a policy. We know that you must have some means of achieving this wondrous thing.

I would ask that while you're searching through government to find out how this happens, you take a little time to search back through history. You might take note, throughout the course of mankind, where man has, in fact, named buildings and different things after himself. Let me sum it up this way. Where he has created monuments unto himself, if you like, where he has created his own idols . . . The Romans were the best example of that. Check and see what happened to the Romans.

That falls into the philosophy of the NDP government: holier than thou and morally upstanding. I would ask you to question your own ethics. That's why I disagree with the member for Rosthern. We haven't had an opportunity to name anything after ourselves. Maybe some of us would have been led astray with that wondrous power that you boys have had, by and large, over the last 40 years. As I say, the member for Weyburn is not going to disagree with me. You may do well to check the history of mankind and you might read a few verses out of the Bible too, where it says that you should not build idols unto yourself.

You as man, as an individual, whether you are in government or what you're in, are not supposed to take the credit. The credit of any government or the credit of any man or the accomplishments of man in society are not our own but are God's. That's clear in the Bible. If you are so moral and upstanding as you think you are then I suggest that you have a basis right there to cease naming buildings after yourselves as being great accomplishments. And there are many. I would just conclude by saying, check the history of men who have done what you have been doing over the last 40 years and see what happened to them. While you are doing it read the Bible. Provide to this committee the numbers of buildings, streets and maybe there are even trees that you have planted in the name of your members. I don't know. But whatever you have done in trumping up your glory, we'd like to know how you achieve that wonder. Thank you.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I guess we could spend all night on this issue. The member for Moosomin would like us to believe that somehow the NDP government is going to fall on the issue of how we name our buildings or who we name our buildings

after as did the Roman Empire. I would ask him to search in his memory; generally we decide who falls and who rises during election time. That's only a year or two or three away and we'll find out who falls and rises at that time.

In regard to the naming of buildings, I can only add that buildings are named after people who we feel have made an excellent contribution to the history of this province and I think that nobody would disagree with Tommy Douglas or Walter Scott.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, the member for Indian Head says, "What about Mr. Fines and what was his contribution seeing as SGI named a building after him?" I am certain the member for Thunder Creek could give us a long story on Mr. Fines but I don't think I'll go into it. I'm not quite as colourful on my feet as he is.

Mr. Minister, the point that I was making is the first premier that you named a building after, other than the Scott building. which was because he was the founding premier . . . I am trying to understand why you have omitted premiers of other political parties who have made contributions to this province whether they were from your party or not. I think that we should consider all premiers. We may not agree with them. We may not think that they have contributed that much to the area, but they still were premiers of this province. That alone should rate some respect, and significant buildings should be named after them. That's my argument. Most of them are deceased. They have given something of themselves for the betterment of the province and I suggest you consider that.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the member asks about the C.M. Fines Building. I would only submit to him that the C.M. Fines Building is a Crown corporation building and we would not be involved as a department in regard to the naming of the SGI building.

In regard to other premiers, he makes mention of other than NDP premiers. Walter Scott was not a New Democratic premier (at least to the best of my knowledge, unless someone can correct me.) I think he was a Liberal premier, so it's not true that we based it only on NDP premiers. Again I would submit that Walter Scott was the first premier of the province and because it was the Celebrate Saskatchewan year it was important that we name the building for that reason. If he's trying to search out a policy, we look at those kinds of reasons. I guess if you want to look at the T.C. Douglas Building, you'll see that its occupant is health. I don't think there's a man who's contributed more to the health program in this province than Tommy Douglas, and it's appropriately named because of that.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, if you want to get into a political argument, we can start one. We'll be at you for two or three days. If you want to stay on your estimates, then stay on the estimates. You make the choice. I don't mind getting into a political argument because I think I can handle you with one hand tied behind my back. Let's get down to the annual report and the facts that I have in my computer print-out.

Mr. Minister, your predecessors have always been courteous enough to supply me — at least twice a year — with a copy of the computer punch-out of the space allocations of government services. I would ask you, being a new minister, if you will continue that practice, which was started over the last year and one-half.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes, we will.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I thank you for that. Mr. Minister, all through your computer print-out, the figures and the explanation which you give seem to balance very well. I have no argument against the government owning enough basic space for its needs.

My concern comes in your annual report. There is indication of an amount of space which you have moved out of where there was still time left on the leases. I would like to know if you have the approximate cost of the space you vacated in the previous year on which you were paying rent until someone else took over the lease or you settled the remaining time on the lease.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's difficult to answer the member's question. He's asking about leases we pulled out of before they actually expired. The answer is that there would be a number of leases on which there may have been a couple of weeks or a day or two or three left when we moved to other quarters for whatever reason. I guess the only thing we can do is supply him with a list of those spaces. To name them, we'll have to sort out which ones were in that category and try to calculate how much was lost in revenue. But it would not be a great deal of money and we would have to sort through the computer listing to find which buildings or which leases would fall under that category.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, on pages 30 and 31 of your annual report, you show vacant property in 1979-80, some of it for 12 months. Now that's property that you own yourself, I believe. Assuming the amount of 12 months I see here — 11 months — the majority of them are over the six-month period. There must be a reason for that amount of space. I would assume that some type of vacancy would also be reflected in your rental space. If I'm wrong there, tell me so. Or produce the figures to show it.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — I guess the only thing I can offer to the member is that on page 30 — the page he makes reference to — it lists very carefully the amount of square footage that was involved and the reason why it was vacated. I'll give you examples: under renovation, surplus space, major renovations, moving to other areas, vacant space due to improper size, vacant space again for renovations, and the list goes on and on, on pages 30 and 31. I'm not sure if I understand his question. The list is here of exactly what space is vacant and the reasons for that. And if you look at the majority of the reasons, they are because of renovations taking place, or else the space was not adequate or suitable for the client group and other space was being found for them. I guess it's the only answer we can offer. I maybe don't really understand his question.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Well, basically, Mr. Minister, what I'm suggesting if this is the case with your own property, that it's vacant due to your not finding a proper client for it . . . You have, over the past years, rented space. The agency has grown and had to move to a larger space. The space was left vacant and sometimes you could find another government department to move in and sometimes you couldn't. So I'm asking you how much space you paid lease rate on that was empty? I'm just using page 30 and 31 to show that in your own property you have that problem, so you must have it with the leased space.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, if the member would look on page 30 at the table itself, in the first two columns it has the usable area in square metres. And in the first column it states what is leased, and if he looks down there he will see that Sask Tel's Lorne Street building has 1,300 square metres under renovation for the provincial auditor and social policies secretariat. If he goes on down further, he'll see under leased space that the Avord Tower building is under renovation for revenue, supply and

services (that's 170 square metres); at Credit Union Central there are 120 square metres vacant due to non-availability of a proper size agency — on and on and on. So there's a column for leased space and there's a column for owned space. There isn't a total. We'll have to total it up for the member if he wants, but in the annual report, on pages 30, 31 and 32, it has the square metres of leased space and the square metres of owned space that are available and for whatever reasons the space is vacant, as well.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I realize that is there. My concern is this space that was given up. You terminated the lease; you said to the owner of the base building, "We don't need that building. We have no agency that can go in there; will you let us out of the lease?" How many months did you have to pay to get out? Or did you end up having to pay the lease with the space still vacant?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member opposite, we did not leave a lease in the year under review on the table here. There's no leased space here that was left prematurely. When the agency vacated, that was the day the lease terminated. So there's nobody leaving prematurely and thus no extra cost or extra burden.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, we might as well start out with the insurance. Where do you obtain your insurance? (I almost know what the answer is going to be.) But, I want to know the dollar figure that you pay to that company.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that with respect to capital projects, whenever we have a capital project, we ask the contractor that he insure for the capital phase of the project and we review to make sure that he has insurance so that the thing is not in jeopardy.

In regard to buildings that we already own, we do not carry any insurance. All government buildings do not carry insurance.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, you may not keep any insurance on the building itself, you do have liability and that kind of insurance I would assume.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — The answer is no. We're self-insured.

**MR. GARNER:** — Okay, Mr. Minister, we'll come back to that one in a minute. Can I have the list of executive employees and the salaries paid to them?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, we'll forward a list over later.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, in your annual report, page 23, I noticed "all tenders rejected;" that would be the September 28, 1979 tender. Could you indicate the why all tenders were rejected?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the project was substantially over-budget and we retendered and redesigned the project so we could come back into a budget we could afford.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, what you're saying is that the tenders all came in much higher than you expected. You either changed your specs and retendered them, or you didn't go ahead with the building. Which way did you go?

**April 2, 1981**

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the process that went on was that the project was terminated. It was restructured so that we dropped one phase of the project and went ahead with the building with one phase less and we decided we'd do the other phase (the interior phase of the building) at a later retendered date.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, over the past, using the T. C. Douglas Building and the major building in Saskatoon, you basically were your own contractor, in most cases, your own general. And, the major reasons for that (I assume) is the excellent deputy minister you have and his capabilities in that field. Do you use that same criteria when you find you get a bid that you feel is too high and tender yourself on it with government services?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — I am advised that in regard to the Tommy Douglas Building the member made mention of, he is correct that we worked as a team with the major contractor, Cana Construction. We operated on the basis that we were, in large measure, project manager with regard to the building. That's basically because of the people we had in the department, who were capable of doing it. It was one of the larger projects and that was part of the basic reason why we did it.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I ask the second part of the question: do you tender on some of your own work when you feel the prices from outside are too high?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — No.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, last year there were quite a few questions raised on orders for return about the costs of renovations within the Legislative Building and there were questions on the Tommy Douglas area, which was found unfit by the Department of Labour, occupational health. Could you tell me what the costs in both cases were for the renovations, i.e., for the Legislative Building plus the cost to fix the Tommy Douglas Building basement because of the occupational health concerns?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the renovations to the T.C. Douglas Building which the member wants to know about were carried out by a fellow by the name of Mr. Jones who did a study. The study cost us \$8,000 and the recommendations and the cost to put it in place cost us \$30,000.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Could you send me a copy of what you just referred to — the report?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — What is the space now being used for, since his recommendations came through?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it's the same space it was originally intended for: printing and photography. It's still in place and it's solving their problems.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — So it's the same group of people back in there now who were there prior to the study and you spent \$8,000 for the study plus the amount of money to fix it up?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — I am advised the only people who are not there are four people who are in different office settings. Other than that, the same people are in that area.



**MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Minister, I see under tourism and renewable resources there was \$18,000 spent on a fish culture station at Fort Qu'Appelle. Would you like to explain what was involved there?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the initial study done on the hatchery was by Underwood and McLellan and the amount of it was \$18,000.

**MR. HARDY:** — Was that \$18,000 spent just for the study to see if a new hatchery should be established or what should be done with the old one?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, it's a study that is involved in the designing of the fish culture station, and the work in that report will be the standards that will be set for the redesign of the station.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Can we have a copy of the study?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can supply the member with a copy of it. When I say it's a study I shouldn't be referring to it as a study. It's just a list of what the design specifications and plans of the new project should look like. But we'll supply the member with a copy.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, on page 6 you indicate that you've done some studies on energy and efficiency. Would you like to indicate what the results were?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, to save the benefit of a long explanation in the House, we'll send over a report. It's 23 pages long. It shows what the planned maintenance program for energy conservation would be in the department. It shows the controls and structures that have been put in place, monitoring programs and performance acceptance of all the buildings. It has a list of the buildings that have already had work done on them, what the benefit was and all that data. If you want a copy, we would be happy to table it for the member.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, just one more time. You assist, occasionally, Crown corporations in finding space, or do they find their own space?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, in the annual report there is a section on the space co-ordination committee. They are the people who decide who's going to allocate the space and who the project is going to be done by. As a rule, we try to assist our client groups, namely the line departments of the government and Crown corporations wherever and whenever we can be of assistance.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Basically, I think what you're saying is that only if you're asked to assist Crown corporations are you involved. Is that correct?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Correct.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just one moment, Mr. Minister.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Has Sask Housing asked for any assistance in finding space in its recent move?

**April 2, 1981**

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, yes it did.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — An additional question. Services provided — in your department, how many? I know your deputy has a government car. How far down does it go?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — People who have vehicles or people who require vehicles are people who do a lot of travelling around: project co-ordinators, project managers and those kinds of people. We have a listing of who has vehicles, if you want it. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be more appropriate if members ask the question under central vehicle agency. They would have a complete list of which vehicles are where and it would be more accurate. I can only ask the members that they direct their question to the Minister of Revenue and Supply when central vehicle agency comes in.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 18 inclusive agreed.

Vote 13 agreed.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW**

### **GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

#### **Capital Expenditure — Vote 14**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — As I indicated earlier, you supplied me with enough documentation to make the estimates be done very quickly. Will you supply me now with the documentation on items 1 to 9, which are all the construction of buildings? Could you indicate what they are on all of them now or when we go down to the vote?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to table it. We can table the whole pack from agriculture right through if he wants it done.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like a moment or two to peruse that list, if you don't mind, before we agree to going through the numbers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Under the new rules, it is my duty to shut her down at 10 o'clock. Is it agreed that we continue? Agreed.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, under, I would guess, government services vote 4, there is an indication of the amount of funds for furniture and fixtures. Is that basically the filing cabinets and that type of thing, or is it construction furniture and fixtures?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — No, Mr. Chairman, it's the filing cabinets and desks and what have you.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, the past year has been a prime example of a problem within your department on this exact item. You continually, I would say from the months of January until March when your budget ends, are short of equipment because your budget does not allow you to bring in sufficient amounts (and I am aware that you have a large volume of fixtures that probably arrived either yesterday or will in the

next day or two) so that you can cure the shortage existing in many of the buildings. Could you indicate for how many more years that procedure is going to continue, where that you seem to be on a short budget and have to wait three months all the time for supplies? Or is there a point when you think you are finally going to catch up?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess it's pretty hard to solve the problem the member makes mention of, because we'd be criticized if we had too much furniture and we're criticized because we haven't enough. I guess somewhere you have to strike a happy balance and we are trying to do that. We would be severely criticized, I think rightly so, by the member opposite if we had excess amounts of furniture, just as we are criticized when we have an excess amount of leased or occupied space. So I guess it's trying to strike a balance so that we are not excessive or are spending too freely in regard to furniture.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, at least you're not, as you say, like the potash corporation that leases filing cabinets and never even uses them. It has them for 12 months and pays rent. That I can document.

Mr. Minister, most of the items for government services seems to be little bits and pieces. There's no major project under government services itself this year; am I correct? I'm just perusing this list.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — The member asks if we have any major projects out of the DGS budget. If he looks under the heritage fund budget for major projects, archives and the STI building are some of the major projects. Yes, there are major projects.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Lloydminster office building — that is all to be in this year, or is it already started? I noticed there were funds last year; it seems to indicate there were funds either coming next year or in this year.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the office building the member makes mention of is in Lloydminster — the beginnings of the site and the drawings, engineering and design for the P.O. building in Lloydminster. That's a major project as well.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — How many years will that take, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — It is to be completed by the end of 1983.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 and 3 agreed.

#### **Item 4**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is this the last payment this year for the Sturdy Stone Centre, or is there more to come?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, it will only be minor dollars on the Sturdy Stone Centre. We don't have the exact figure but we could supply the member with the cash flow on the Sturdy Stone building.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — The sheet you've passed me shows 76.9 — I assume that's \$76,900.

**April 2, 1981**

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — \$76,900.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is that the final on the construction?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — That's correct.

Item 4 agreed.

Item 5 agreed.

**Item 6**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — On item 6 I notice a large amount of building, as I was indicating, especially one in Yorkton. It's a large amount. The others seem to be a smaller amount. Are they finishing those first four projects or are they starting projects?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, in the list that we submitted to the member, if he looks at the top of the page it has, "ongoing projects — project number HI0673" and a whole list underneath that with a subtotal and then it has, "new projects approved." If you want to know which ones are new and which ones are old, just look at the bottom of the page and you'll see the new projects.

Item 6 agreed.

**Item 7**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is this the finish of the fire-fighting situation, or what is it?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the member wants to know if this is the end of all the fire suppression projects. It's the only one that we have in inventory that is in progress at the present (to the best of our knowledge).

**MR. KATZMAN:** — It's a building that you're involved in here. I assume it's in the North or is it in Prince Albert?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — It's in the Nisbet Forest right outside the city of Prince Albert.

Item 7 agreed.

**Item 8**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, under social services here, you have the Prince Albert, Saskatoon correctional and several others which come to the figure that you indicate, as well as the nursing homes. The Minister of Social Services has been making suggestions about new programs and facilities. Are they for construction next year and therefore we're not seeing some of them here, because they are just in the planning stage? The nursing home in Saskatoon, that was referred to in the House earlier, to replace the sanatorium, is that under the health budget?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the list of new projects for social services is listed. If you look at the bottom page again, you'll see Lakeside Nursing Home, Wolseley; Valley View Centre, phase 2, Moose Jaw; Kilburn Hall, and right down at the bottom,

Correctional Centre, Regina, \$1 million.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, I heard you mention Lakeside Home, Wolseley. Will you tell me what you're trying to do there?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it's in regard to emergency fire escapes, and improvement in that area.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You wouldn't consider an expansion while you're doing it, would you. Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Well, I think that question should be answered by the Minister of Social Services.

Item 8 agreed.

#### **Item 9**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, we see this Qu'Appelle fish culture station again, that was asked about earlier. You have a total cost, you indicate here, and the amount is about two-thirds of the total to be spent this year. Could you inform me what you're doing there?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the money that you see allocated here will be primarily for equipment and for upgrading of the water supply and water cooling, as well.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I notice that you're going to construct an inn in Moose Mountain Park, and it's going to be totally done this year. Could you elaborate a little further on that particular project? At least the funds are indicated to all be spent this year.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what kind of explanation the member wants. It's sort of indicated by saying it's in Moose Mountain Park. Planning is under way in the department. I couldn't table a copy of the drawings, because nothing is complete yet, but it will be in due course.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, the indication here is, and it's the only one I see, that the total funds will be spent this year. The project is going to be started this year, and totally completed in this budget year. I'm asking you why no other department has those kinds of benefits coming to it, yet tourism (for some strange reason) does?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I have no comment.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — The minister must have some idea, if he has the money allocated, what type of expansion or improvement is on line for the current year— in the budgetary review that we're discussing tonight — and I think that it would be fair to all members if we had that information tonight.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't have that information with us here tonight. We'd be happy to provide the member at a later time with the information that he's looking for.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — All right, then, I can take that as your commitment to the committee

**April 2, 1981**

to provide that information.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — That's correct.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I'll get back to my concern one more time. You say you have no plans available. Last year in the House we talked about it, if I remember correctly. You're going into a hotel or an inn, whichever name you want. I don't know if you're going to build it and put it out to contract for somebody to run. We don't know if the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources is going to run it. Is it being built for the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources and are you going to run it? What kind of building is it going to be? You've never managed to do something in one year before. All of a sudden you're improving or something.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what kind of picture the member is trying to paint, but the project itself is in the DGS budget. It's an estimate at this time — as close as can be estimated as are 50 or 60 or 70 other projects in DGS. He wants to know, I guess, what colour the side of the building is and what kind of windows it's going to have. We can't provide that right now. We can only go by an estimate of what it would cost us to build a similar structure. In order to get a figure on the paper and to build and budget accordingly, that's the way it has been done in the past and will be done in the future.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, by this time you know if it's going to be a stick or if it's going to be block. You have an approximate idea of the size I would assume, and so forth. You know if you're going to have it all done with this fiscal year, you should have by now some of those answers.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the member from Moosomin, we'll supply the information. He wants to know the square footage in it. We can't tell him. We don't have the information here. But we'll certainly provide the member later on with the information.

Item 9 agreed.

Vote 14 agreed.

## **HERITAGE FUND**

### **BUDGETARY EXPENDITURES (RESOURCE DIVISION)**

#### **GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

#### **Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 14**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, once again I assume this is the completion of that project?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes it is.

Item 1 agreed.

**Item 2**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, is this the same again, the completion of a project?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, if the member is referring to the Provincial Laboratory, it's the beginning.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — What's the total? I notice there were funds last year and funds again this year. Do you know the total cost of the project once it's completed?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised the total project will be \$7 million.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — \$7 million. How many years until this project will be completed? I notice in this case, you have not quite spent \$2 million between last year and this year. How many more years until it's completed?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, when I said \$7 million, I should have said \$7.4 million. The completion date is August 1984.

Item 2 agreed.

**Item 3**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — What's the total figure that you have spent on the restoration of Saskatchewan House and the refurbishing and the furnishing of it?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the total fees for the years 1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81, and this calendar year, 1981-82, will be \$4.5 million.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Now don't you wish you hadn't let it go into wrack and ruin and kept it up in the first place, as it was in 1944?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, is this the final year?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes, I believe it is. Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, does this include the artefacts you've been trying to get back, which were sold, given away or disappeared? Have you replaced most of the things you needed?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes, the majority have been replaced.

Item 3 agreed.

**Item 4**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — This was the 75th birthday project. Do we know the final projected costs for this project?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — The costs estimated will be \$6 million and the scheduled completion date will be July 1984.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, could you inform this House where that project is

**April 2, 1981**

going to be, other than just in the Wascana area?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the preferred site would be the old university grounds, but negotiating is still going on with regard to it. The second proposed site is the Qu'Appelle Diocese. We haven't decided the exact site; it's under negotiation at this time.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Isn't some of that same area where the CBC was planning to build?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — No.

Item 4 agreed.

**Item 5**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Is this the expansion of the technical institute in Moose Jaw or what is it?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes.

Item 5 agreed.

**Item 6**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — How many years until this one is going to be completed?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — March 1985.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, I have just one question for the benefit of my seatmates. You might be able to answer this one if I can get your attention. Could you tell the members sitting around me what those two buildings, which are being built in Wascana Park, are?

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Mr. Chairman, the member will have to wait patiently for the Wascana Centre subvote, because it has nothing to do with our budget.

Item 6 agreed.

Vote 14 agreed.

**HERITAGE FUND**

**BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE (RESOURCES DIVISION — SUPPLEMENTARY)**

**GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

**Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 14**

Item 1 agreed.

**Item 2**

**MR. KATZMAN:** — When you referred to the \$4.5 million, I hope you were including the



money that came out of the heritage fund.

**HON. MR. GROSS:** — Yes.

Item 2 agreed.

Vote 14 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:28 p.m.