

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 18, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, 14 grade 8 students, situated in the Speaker's gallery, from St. Oliver School in Radville. They are accompanied here today by Robert Biss and Eddie Martin. I will be meeting with them in the rotunda area after question period, and then downstairs for drinks. I hope they find their visit here informational, perhaps educational; and I hope all members will join with me in wishing them a pleasant stay and a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Air Canada Silver Broom

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask all members of the legislature at this time to join with me in congratulating the Ed Werenich team from Toronto, which had the pleasure of representing Canada this past week, in winning the Air Canada Silver Broom world curling championship of Canada. They did a tremendous job this week. And certainly I'd be remiss if I did not also congratulate the Regina organizing committee for doing another tremendous job in focusing a lot of attention on our province, and indeed the city of Regina, on their tremendous job this week.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the member who has just taken his seat in congratulating the Ed Werenich rink and Laurie Artiss and his committee who did such an outstanding job in organizing the Silver Broom here in Regina. It is a credit to Regina, a credit to Saskatchewan; and it is a very considerable accomplishment for Canada to have won the Silver Broom again. One of the interesting and I think appropriate parts of the ceremonies were the recognition of previous Silver Broom winners, and in that regard I'm pleased to note that one of them sits in this House, and we are pleased to acknowledge his prowess at curling.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Pepin Plan

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. It concerns a document, apparently an internal document, of the Government of Canada which has come to

hand outlining relationships between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan. And I will quote briefly from it under the heading 'Issues in Federal-Provincial Relations and Economic Development.' And I quote:

At present the basis for agreement and co-operation under explicit instructions from the Premier outweighs any negative aspects of federal-provincial relations. The provincial interest in the free market and deregulation has led Saskatchewan to become far more neutral in the Crow debate, although local politics may preclude any overt provincial support for the federal initiative.

My question to the minister is this: is this analysis the reason why the government has taken so few steps to counteract what is very clearly a vigorous federal campaign in support of the so-called Pepin initiative at this time?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan are not going to be judged by some federal bureaucrat in Ottawa as to what our strategy is going to be. The Minister of Agriculture is today in Ottawa furthering the lobby against the Pepin proposal, and I hope, and we all hope, that he will bring back some results either now or in the very near future with regards to that. I don't think the Government of Canada . . . And if they do in their view, believe that we are happy with the Crow rate, have certainly got something else to come for.

We will be mounting a further attack later this week, early part of next week, primarily in the province of Quebec, again because we believe in the province of Quebec is where the weakness of the federal move on Crow is going to be found. We can spend a lot of time, like the previous government, telling the folks in Saskatchewan about what we don't like about the proposed Crow change. The reality of the federal government, if we're going to bend them and going to move them, we're going to have to do it with the political strength in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario. And that's where we're going to stop the Pepin proposal. We are confident that we are going to do something to in fact change or stop that proposal altogether.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — The minister will be aware of the propaganda barrage advanced by the federal government, and my supplementary to him is this: what steps does your government propose to take to provide information - written information - to the citizens of Canada to counteract this federal propaganda barrage which has been launched on the nation?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, this. I recall a previous government, another government that tried that same tactic, and it brought them very little results. I suggest to the members opposite, it's going to bring very little results to the federal government in Ottawa as well. You will see later this week or early next week an attack by the Government of Saskatchewan to try to counteract that type of what I believe is propaganda, as well as the member opposite. And I believe that we will mount just as good and more effective campaign than the national government will.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary to the minister. He will be aware that this campaign is already under way. Would he advise the House just what your campaign is going to be which will counteract this? Or are you asking us to accept your platitudinous statements that something will be done but you won't tell us what?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I've indicated and advised the House that announcements will be made very shortly with regards to campaigns, including advertising campaigns. It will be forthcoming very shortly. If the members opposite are not prepared to simply wait and see what that particular strategy is as it unfolds, then that's too bad. That's what's in fact going to happen. When we say we're going to do something in this government, we in fact do it, and the record speaks for itself.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — New question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the federal government has attempted to mislead the people of the province, and indeed the total population of Canada, and the minister is telling us that they have this great plan to fight for the Crow rate, could you explain to us why the transportation agency which used to be the mechanism used to fight for the Crow rate was disbanded in your recent budget? And if you're saying that the money is in Agriculture, why is it that \$10 million less is being spent in Agriculture this year as opposed to last year? Where is this thrust to defend the Crow rate when you're disbanding the very group who used to defend it?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I can advise the members opposite that you are not going to defend the Crow rate by having some small department in a particularly budgetary item within a budget. That's not how you're going to defend the Crow rate. The way we're going to deal with the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker, and the way we have today . . . The same thing that the lobby that's being mounted by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool . . . And they recognize, and they recognize that the soft underbelly of the federal government is in the province of Quebec, and that's what you have to get at. That's where you're going to have to move them, because they too are concerned with these proposed changes that's going to hurt the province of Quebec. And if those farmers in the province of Quebec start getting their backs up, Mr. Speaker, then the federal government takes notice, because that's going to cost them a lot of seats. And this is a political battle, Mr. Speaker, and you have to fight that political battle not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but also in Ottawa and in the province of Quebec.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I appreciate your opinion as to where the weak spot in the federal government is, but by the leaked document that we have, the weak link in the chain, by the federal government's own admission, is the provincial government in Saskatchewan - the fact that they are saying that the Saskatchewan government is weak on the Crow. Will you explain to me what you are doing to disprove that theory of the federal government that you, in fact, and your government are weak on the Crow, and for that reason they are moving on getting rid of the Crow rate now because of your recent lack of initiative in defending the Crow?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, this weak link theory that the members opposite talk about, it seems to me I've heard that story before. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Saskatchewan has no weak link on the Crow, with regard to the province of Saskatchewan. I believe, even this morning or Saturday, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* indicating that there, in fact, it was the province of Saskatchewan that were leading any kind of attack by any government.

Our Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Berntson, was the person leading the pack on the attack with regard to the Crow change, and I can assure you today that the Minister of Agriculture is in Ottawa trying to lobby and deal with those people down there the best way we see possible to in fact stop that Pepin proposal. We intend to move as it unfolds, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the efforts of Mr. Berntson is going to prove results - prove results for the people of Saskatchewan and for the farm community in the province of Saskatchewan. And I can say to members opposite, we in fact don't believe, but we could mount up another great road show like the former minister of agriculture where he tracked around the entire province, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, Mr. Speaker, through such forms, not as budgetary items, but things like the grain car corporation, that type of thing, and it was for nothing else, Mr. Speaker, than the political advantage of that particular government and it showed results on April 26th, and their political judgement on that was wrong as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — May I address a question to the Minister of Finance? Would he advise the House when we might expect to receive a statement of the government's intentions with respect to the policies it proposes to launch in defence of the Crow?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I take it that question relates to any advertising that we might look at doing in central Canada. Certainly that will be coming very shortly. With regard to exact time, simply stay with us and I'm sure you'll like what you see.

PCS Accounting Policy Changes

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the potash corporation, the Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, last week you filed the annual report for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I think that it's evident in that report that the profits of 1981 were \$141 million, and that was reduced to a paltry surplus of \$607,000. I want also to indicate to the minister that that does not, in my view, reflect a true picture of the profit-and-loss picture of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, because during the course of the year, on page 24 of the report, you have a change in the accounting policies whereby you have changed the depreciation and have in fact decreased by \$13 million the depreciation that would have been attributed to the corporation had you not changed it.

My question is: will you explain why you changed . . . why the change in the depreciation policy in the last year?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I just can't remember offhand the total reasons for the changing of accounting. It was brought to our board by the management group of the corporation and our board passed it. I just can't remember the details; I'll bring it back to you tomorrow.

Mr. Koskie: — In note number two, on page 24, it has this comment:

As a result of the change, depreciation and amortization expense has been decreased by \$13 million.

In other words, what you have done is to decrease the amount of the depreciation. Obviously what you have done is therefore cook the books in order to increase the profits. Is that a fact?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, for the last 11 months I have had no time whatsoever to be spending looking at ways to cook books, reduce profits, or anything else, of our crown corporations. Number one, we have no intention whatsoever of dismantling, doing away with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I'm hearing it in the press; I'm hearing it from you people across the road.

All you need to do is look at the price per tonne of potash. If we had stayed or maintained the same price level of 1981, we would have made a \$65 million profit this year. But the prices of the potash, world-wide, have gone down. We're having to compete with the Russians who are hauling it up the Mississippi valley and taking whatever price they can get for their potash. We're having to compete with that kind of thing. Until that demand or that supply-demand thing changes around, we're not going to be improving the profit picture. Otherwise, the 607,000 was the best that we could possibly do this year, but we're working on it to bring that back up again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I want to indicate to the minister that what you have done here is a very material change in the accounting policy. Why didn't you have the previous year's financial statement rewritten to incorporate this change, as is the common practice? Why didn't you follow that procedure?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, we have followed the recommendations and the suggestions of the management people that were in PCS while you people were there also. It's the same people that were there in that financial side of it, and it was recommendations that they made to us. Another reason that we had to reduce our profit was because there was \$7 million worth of ore piled on the ground which has deteriorated to the fact that we've had to write off \$4 million as well.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. My question is simple. It is this: if you had not changed your accounting policy, is it not true that your profit result would have been not a profit of some \$600,000 but a loss of more than \$12 million?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I understand it was a simple question. I'll bring a simple answer back for him tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Am I to take from the minister's answer that he does not know of the changes made which would have an effect of more than \$12 million on the profit of this company?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I'll bring the reasons back tomorrow. I recall the fact that we did approve it. I'll bring you the exact details tomorrow.

Use of Government Symbols in Constituency Newsletter

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier as minister in charge of the government's visual identity program. Mr. Speaker and Mr. Premier, you will be aware that since the mid-1970s certain symbols have been used to identify all official government publications and they are registered trade marks of the Government of Saskatchewan and they are to be used for official purposes only. I have

here a constituency newsletter issued by the Conservative MLA for Regina Wascana which contains advertisements for the Wascana constituency spring hoe-down and the like of that. Fair enough. But not so fair the fact that it has 'Saskatchewan Education' with the official symbol and 'Saskatchewan' using the official print, and the question I ask to the Premier is this: has the member for Wascana received the permission from the Government of Saskatchewan to use the official symbols in the course of his communications with his constituents?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the first I'm aware of that particular document. I'll take notice.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary. Mr. Speaker, the document I refer to, headed 'Saskatchewan Education, Legislative Report,' is one which advertises the Wascana constituency spring hoe-down on April 22nd and accordingly, that will allow the minister to ascertain what document is being referred to and no doubt the member for Wascana, the Minister of Education, can assist him in finding the appropriate document.

Mr. Speaker: — Do the members not have further questions?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — My question is this: would the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. The member rose previously to ask a question, and made a statement, and did not ask a question. I'll take a new question.

Environmental Impact of Nipawin Hydro Project

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to raise my question with the Minister of Environment. Some months ago, Mr. Minister, you gave this Assembly your unqualified assurances that the residents of communities affected by the environmental impact of the Nipawin hydro project would be continuously involved in the monitoring of those environmental impacts. My question to you is this: have you met with the residents of those communities, such as Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing? Have you involved those people directly in your environmental impact of that project?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, first of all, the environmental impact assessment was done through Sask Power Corporation. I'm not aware of how far it's processed, or where it is at right now, and in answer to the balance of the question, no, I have not personally contacted any of those communities that was mentioned.

Mr. Yew: — If you are intending . . . You have given your unqualified assurances that those communities would be involved, seeing as how they live downstream from that project. They are going to be directly affected from that project, and you gave this Assembly your assurances that they would be involved. Now my question to you, in terms of the environmental impact on those communities: will you see that those communities will be involved in terms of . . . You suggested, at one time or another, that there would be an environmental advisory committee established in those areas. Will you give your unqualified assurances that they will in fact be involved?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I never once gave my assurance there'd be an advisory environmental committee set up at any time because I have not set up any new committees since the start, and I have never once promised that, so that is not

a fair statement. Second of all, I will take a look to see what can be done, but in regards to promising it to be done, no, I won't. I'll take a look at it and see what I can do.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. On July 5th, 1982, Mr. Minister, I raised this question, and I'll read the question that I raised in this Assembly with you:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment. In view of the fact that rivers, lakes and wildlife habitats will be affected by fluctuating waters as a result of the Nipawin hydro-electric project, particularly in areas such as Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing, will the Minister of Labour, Minister of SPC and his colleagues (the Minister of Environment) give assurance that the environmental effects will be monitored closely with the communities affected? Will he give assurance to the Assembly that whatever ongoing environmental safety and protection measures are taken they will involve people living downstream, places like Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing?

And your unqualified assurance then was, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, 'Yes.' What have you done to date, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — First of all, as I said previously, I have not talked to those people at all. I didn't say that I had talked to them. And secondly, I did not, at that time, as the question indicated it, say that I would set up an advisory committee. I have never considered that, even. But I will consider (as I said previously) to talk to those people if that is necessary. But I have not, to date, done it. I will talk to the department to see what should be done and what can be done in regards to that.

I'm not quite aware of what impact that would have down there, in fact, if it may not be a plus impact, even. Because if I'm aware of some of that Cumberland delta, in fact, it right now has a shortage of water and with the build-up in the whole backwater it may in fact increase the amount of water in there. The biggest concern those people have up there is a weir being put in. It's nothing to do with the Nipawin hydro dam.

Mr. Yew: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This project has gone on for some time, Mr. Minister. And no doubt that there will, in any major project such as this kind . . . A major project such of this nature, will definitely have some impact, negative or positive. In this instance it could darned well be negative. Based on the wildlife habitat and the way of the people in the community has been, it will be a negative impact.

Now you gave this House your unqualified assurance that those people living downstream from that project would be involved, would be participants in that project. What is your position today? Are you or aren't you going to involve those communities? They are very little involved in terms of the environment, in terms of the employment prospects of that project. Now will you at least give those people the assurance that they will be involved in the environmental impact of that project?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — As I previously said, the environmental impact assessment has been done through Sask Power Corporation. I am not aware how much has been involved there. I did say I'd take notice to find out about that. I also told you that I would look into seeing how much or what should be done in regards to those communities. I'm not aware, particularly aware anyway, of how it would affect them. And one thing I would like to mention: that my door has been open, always open. I have a steady stream

of people in my office. My door is open and never once have I had anything from those people to me in regards to that. And I'm sure if they had any concern they would voice it, and if they voice it, I'll certainly look into it. I will look into it anyway, but if they voiced it, I would have looked into it sooner.

In regards to that advisory committee again, I want to make it very clear I didn't say that I would set up an advisory committee.

Legislative Program of the Government

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Acting House Leader in the absence of the House Leader. It deals with the tradition in this legislature as well as in most legislatures where the legislative program of the government is brought in within the first 10 or 15 days of the session. My question to the minister is this: today, being day 21 of this legislative session, we find that there is no bills of any substance on the order paper. I think each and every one deals with name changes with the exception of a private member's bill. My question to you is this: whether or not we can expect this week to have tabled in this Assembly a legislative program that would give the opposition an idea, as well as the public, of what your legislative program is for this session.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, later this day we will be introducing a bill, for example, the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. Now, if that isn't important to you folks, it is important to us, and it is important to the people of Saskatchewan. And the second one is a bill respecting Department of Economic Development and Trade. I know that's not important to you, but it's important to us.

Now, I think what we will be doing, Mr. Speaker, is introducing the legislative program as we proceed and as we go on. That program will be introduced in a normal way. I've been in this House four or five years now, and very often many of the pieces of legislation, many of the pieces of legislation came near the session. We're going to try to avoid that this year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Law Day

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to announce to the House and the people of Saskatchewan that today, April the 18th, has been designated as Law Day throughout the province and across Canada. Sponsored by the Canadian Bar Association and endorsed by the Government of Saskatchewan and the federal government, Law Day is designed to help raise public awareness of our laws, and to help provide an opportunity to learn more about how laws affect us. It is also hoped that this day of legal education and information will show the value of living under a legal system that protects and enhances our individual and collective freedoms.

Modern society is becoming increasingly complex as are our rules and regulations. In order to help keep pace with these rapid changes, a day has been set aside to offer assistance and education to the public.

Mr. Speaker, Law Day has a special significance, because a year ago yesterday marks the first anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution Act of 1981. This Charter of

Rights and Freedoms contained in the act enshrines our basic democratic, economic, legal, and equality rights.

Activities organized by the Canadian Bar Association and the public legal education association include interviews and panel discussions on radio shows, publication of reports, booklets, displays, and public seminars.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the public takes full advantage of this opportunity provided by the government and the legal profession. If it proves a success, Law Day will become a permanent event.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 17 - An Act respecting the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure and fulfilment, that I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, an extremely good bill, and with that Mr. Speaker, I introduce first reading.

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

Bill No. 18 - An Act respecting the Department of Economic Development and Trade

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, it's with further pleasure that I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Economic Development and Trade, another extremely good department, Mr. Speaker, and with that I move first reading.

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

Bill No. 19 - An Act respecting Residential Care Facilities

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, bill no. 3 and point no. 3, first reading of a bill respecting residential care facilities, Mr. Speaker. Another, I think, important innovative move by this government, and with that, I move first reading.

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

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Department of Rural Affairs Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Finally, Mr. Speaker, for today I would like to move a bill amending The Department of Rural Affairs Act. Again, I think, a monumental new act and I think something that will be a helpful and a big plus for the people of Saskatchewan, and with that I move first reading of that bill.

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

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day I would like to bring in a ruling on the request by the Minister of Finance. On Friday a point of privilege was raised by the Minister of Finance with regard to remarks made by the member for Shaunavon. I have checked the

record of last Friday and find that no member who had the floor uttered remarks which were either unparliamentary or which constitute a breach of privilege. However, it is true that on that day and on nearly every sitting day of the current session members from both sides of the Assembly have been making loud remarks from their seats which are uncalled for and which do not contribute to the debate in any way. Remarks made by members not in debate have in the past not been judged to be unparliamentary and, in fact, are not heard by the Chair. The Chair has repeatedly called the House to order and has tried to curb the disruptive remarks made by members from their seats. Therefore, I will once again repeat my request for all members to cease such poor behaviour and to resist the temptation to enter debate from their seats but instead to enter debate by being recognized by the Chair.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I have a copy of the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of Saturday, April 16th, wherein referring to the matter raised by the Minister of Finance, it is quoted by the *Star-Phoenix*:

This prompted echoes from Shaunavon NDP MLA Dwain Lingenfelter of ‘A little bit of graft going on there.’

End of quote. Mr. Speaker, I raise that as a matter of privilege of this Assembly, ask Mr. Speaker to take a look at that, and perhaps give us a ruling based on the statement by the member.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling has been made. I really can’t comment on what the press writes. I have no control over the press, but rather I must rule on what is discussed and raised by this Assembly in session.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I will be asking that we make, under motions for returns (not debatable), 1 through 21, debate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ENVIRONMENT

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 9

Item 1

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

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left here, I have Alan Carr, deputy minister of environment; on my right here, I have Hugo Maliepaard, director,

environmental information and co-ordination and assessment; directly behind me I have Rick Knoll, director of administration.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me, judging from the budget presented by the Conservative government today, that protection of the environment is obviously seen as a non-essential government service by the Conservatives. In fact, this is a negative attack on programs for our future, a negative attack on policies which are supposed to show some responsible moral leadership.

When I look at the budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the Department of Environment, I see that it has been out more than \$1 million this year. This is about 11 per cent, Deputy Speaker, an 11 per cent decrease. And I see that there are about 32 staff positions cut, about 19 per cent of the total staff for the department. Perhaps we shouldn't be too surprised, we shouldn't be too surprised, with the Conservative government's attitude towards Environment.

Most right-wing governments, such as the Conservatives, admit openly that they see laws to protect the environment as a nuisance which ought to be swept aside, which ought to be swept aside in the interest of business expansion and increased profitability. The Premier himself made his government's approach to environmental protection quite clear at the Open for Business Conference last October. He told potential investors that this Conservative government should, and would, improve private sector access to the regulatory process. And he promised that the government would number one, find ways of reducing compliance costs. But perhaps nothing sums up this Conservative government's approach to environmental protection, Deputy Speaker, as well as the following quote from the government ad. The ad last fall states - just prior to the Open for Business Conference - the ad asked a question: 'Who should attend the Open for Business Conference?' And this was the answer: 'Risk-takers who can respond quickly to an unfettered government industrial strategy that affords maximum business opportunities with minimum intervention in taxation and regulatory matters.'

The message was clear, Deputy Speaker. This Conservative government planned to do as little as it could to get away with in the areas of environmental protection.

The numbers in this budget confirms that. The land protection branch of the Environment, for an example, which among others, is responsible for the management of hazardous wastes, loses two staff positions in this budget, two staff positions.

As for funding, the land protection branch gets an increase of about 3 per cent, less than half Saskatchewan's inflation rate.

The mines pollution control branch, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is the branch which monitors, inspects and licenses all mines and mills in this province, including the uranium and potash mines. But in this budget, the mines pollution control branch loses five staff positions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and sees its funding cut by more than 150,000. These are just two of the cuts which contribute to the loss of more than \$1 million and 32 jobs in the Department of Environment.

So you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is an issue here that has to be contended with and questioned and argued in this Assembly. I begin my questioning today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the environmental impact on the Nipawin hydro project development. Just a while ago the minister responsible for this area, and I, were

at odds with respect to an environmental advisory committee for this area.

And I want to start, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with my questioning again in that respective area because it is an important area. It is an area where people in the Cumberland House/Sturgeon Landing basin, people in that basin, in that respective area were involved in the traditional way of life. And not only in the traditional way of life, they have accommodated to begin being involved in another area such as tourism. They have begun to become involved in the modern way of life and in a huge project such as the Nipawin hydro project development, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is an important area of concern for people living in that particular environment.

And I see myself as an opposition critic for this particular aspect of this legislature. My responsibility now lays to the fact that I have to find out some information so that I and the constituents that I represent and the people that are directly affected with that project, know what this government's position is with respect to the environmental effects of that particular area.

And to begin my questioning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to know what the minister has, in terms of policy for his government, when he gave his unqualified assurances that people in that particular area would be involved. I would like to know, for starters, what he has in mind. The project has gone ahead and what has he placed in terms of environment protection for that respective area? What has he advocated to have people involved in that particular project? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, while the hon. member was talking I was checking out to see about this Nipawin hydro dam. My understanding is that it was done with the previous government. An EIA was done in 1979. It was completed in approximately that year. There was a board of inquiry held. Most of those northern communities were invited, I understand, if not all. The only one that took part at all was Cumberland, and they were very, very reluctant to do so. Red Earth Indian Band may have taken some part in it. They weren't sure. But it was completed in 1979 with public participation in it. There was a public inquiry held - a board of inquiry held - in regards to it.

Everybody has had their opportunity to talk and look into it with the previous administration. Now, I don't know, maybe they didn't do a good job, Mr. Chairman. Maybe we should go back and take another look at it, but I would hope - it's provincial and the people's money that was spent - that they did do a good job, and I would have to think that they did do a pretty fair job of it or they wouldn't have went ahead with it. And each of those communities had that opportunity to take part in it, so I don't know what else that you can answer the member, other than we can monitor it from here on in.

He touched on a few other things, as he went along, and I'd just like to mention them. He was saying, earlier in his opening remarks, that the Department of Environment, first of all, had made a lot of cuts and that they had cut back a great deal in the amount of money - a million dollars, I think he used, and 32 positions. And he's absolutely correct. I mean there's no doubt about it. That's exactly what we done.

But let me tell you where we took that million dollars from, and where we took that 32 positions from. First of all, there were 25 vacant position - had been vacant for a long time. At the time that we were cutting those positions we were very sensitive not to cut the fieldman, the guy that was out to investigate a problem or to do an impact or whatever. But we cut the top administration - people that were on the top, people

that were very high-paid people. We cut those positions out because we don't need those 17 positions to run a very effective department. That isn't doing anything to hurt the environment. In fact, we even went further than that. We brought out other positions in. We're sending other positions out in the field where they can in fact monitor it much better. By doing that, we will save about one million dollars. Now \$1 million can be well spent and so something that is necessary within the province, whether it be something to do with water for the city of Regina and Moose Jaw, or whether it's to do with sewer in Saskatoon, or even up into the Cumberland area and the delta. Maybe we have to do something up in that area. But money will be wisely spent, and it's not necessary to say how many people you've got working for you, it's how well they work and how well they perform, and how well they do their job. And that is a very key to the whole situation.

And just one other thing: you mention that we haven't done anything in the Department of Environment since we became a new government. We brought in potash emission controls. We brought in guide-lines for reclamation of all the gravel pits. We brought in guide-lines for mineral exploration which was very well received by the mining, because what we done, we set out the basic ground rules so they know what they're working from.

And just one other thing that maybe we were touching on it, where you're talking about the cost of cutting out - I think you talked about five positions or something - and waste in environment, and waste in one of the departments here - I forget which one you mentioned here - mines and pollution control. This branch was set up originally just to deal with uranium mining, and then it branched out when they had the Uranium City problems to the clean-up of it, so there's more people put into there. That Uranium City - the mining there is pretty well cleaned up. The rules and regulations and whatever is necessary to clean it up, are pretty well complete. So, therefore, we don't need those five positions there right now. In fact, we're going to take some of those positions that were done, and we're moving them around to put them out in fields otherwise. Not necessarily them as per se, but the positions will be done in that direction.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to thank the minister for trying to explain to me the number of environmental safeguards that the present government has taken to ensure against adverse environmental effects on our province. But I have to reiterate my line of questioning because I wasn't questioning one specific area in terms of environmental impacts, adverse environmental impacts, and that is one area that has to my knowledge created a lot of public awareness at present. The minister will know that there are thousands and thousands of people entering our province to gain employment opportunity at this particular site. And the minister will know that people living downstream from this Nipawin hydro project are direly concerned. They're direly concerned because people in those respective areas have accumulated their livelihood, their income through the traditional way of life, and also they are advocating some new modern knowledge into ways that they can make their environment work for them.

They've got tourism in mind. There are people in this community that are involved in tourism. And in terms of tourism, you naturally fall back to the natural way of life because you want to retain that environment the way it was so that it attracts people from outside. In that sense, Mr. Minister, there still are a vast number of people that are still concerned about the natural habitat of that environment.

I'm not trying to downgrade the project that is in place to date. That project serves a purpose, not only in terms of energy, but it also serves a purpose in terms of jobs, in terms of training and employment for people in this province. And that is, I believe, something that must be.

But at the same time, you have to realize that people that are isolated, people that are out of (probably from the old line of thinking) this province, people that are isolated, the communication isn't quite intact. The major industrial corporations have always neglected that portion of this province. They have neglected that portion of this province because they felt, 'Well, people up there don't really mind. They are isolated; they don't really care.'

But I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, those people care. Those people now are beginning to be aware of the way this province is being developed. Particularly so, the whole of the northern administration district cares. They want to be a part; they want to be full participants of any development that goes on in the northern administration district. They want to be involved. They want to be informed. They want to be full participants.

They are not less than the people in southern Saskatchewan, although they may be native. I am native, and I haven't got the qualified education that many people in the southern half of the province have. But, we still have our feelings. We still have our commitments. We still have our principles with respect to the environment, Mr. Minister.

I want to know from you, Mr. Minister, how are you going to involve the people of Cumberland House, the people of Sturgeon Landing, and the people of the northern administration district with respect to future developments in the northern administration district? That is my questioning to you.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — The hon. member sort of got a little further from environment than just . . . At least, a little ways from what I think environment represents. I know that he feels strongly about retaining it as it is, but when you get into development and what we're going to do in development, it really isn't the role of the Department of Environment. The role of the Department of Environment is to see that any development that goes does not in fact hurt the environment.

In relation to tourism - and again, I suppose I'm diverging a little bit from environment - and the promotion of tourism in your area: certainly, and certainly we'd like to see the people, especially northern people, partake of anything that would be beneficial to them.

I think maybe we could even go back into housing; we've done exactly that with the housing, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. We went into all those communities and said, 'All right, what should we do? How should we do it?' Right now I'm getting a proposal that was put out by these people coming back to me on how we should handle the situation of housing.

I would think that we would handle the Department of Environment the same way when we have something to be developed in the area. Right to date I'm not aware of what they would like to have developed in there. I have not been the minister responsible for development of that area. My concern has been with the housing part, which I think we've done a relatively reasonable decent job with it, and with the Department of

Environment as far as the lakes and the quality of lakes and rivers. It is a tough situation, as we well know.

A lot of it relates outside our province. The water comes down from Alberta, comes down from B.C. I have meetings set up - I had them set up for today, but I cancelled because of estimates here - in regards to the transporting of water between one province another, the quality of the water coming in. I recognize and realize that that is a very important part of everything we do, is water, and that certainly relates to the native people that live in the Cumberland area, whether they work in the bush or whether they trap or whether they fish or whether they promote tourism or have their own livelihood otherwise.

But in regards to what's going to be developed there, gosh, that's not for the Department of Environment to decide. Our job is to decide how it develops and how it would or could affect the environment itself.

Mr. Yew: — With respect to the people and the communities directly affected, Mr. Minister, do you have any possible ways of having them kept informed on a continuous basis? And, that is my first line of questioning. And if not, do you then proceed to have them involved in some kind of a monitoring in terms of the monitoring system that you may have in place? I don't know whether you have now at this point in time, but if you have such an idea with respect to the monitoring system of that project, would you envisage having those people involved?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I'm not too sure of just . . . You said 'information,' and I wonder about what? You could maybe fill in in a second.

In regards to the monitoring system, I really don't know how we could involve these people in it. Like I said earlier in question period, my door has always been open and they have not, in any way that I know of anyway, made a representation to the department in regards to wanting me to be involved with the Nipawin hydro project itself or how it could affect them. As I said, too, just a few minutes ago, that when it was done by the previous government, the environment impact assessment was done, they seemed to have little or no interest at the time. Now it's maybe because they're unaware of what could or may not have been. I'm not sure what the situation was. But my understanding was that they had their opportunity, and they didn't at that time take part in it. I told you in question period I'd take a look at what could be done. I will take a look and see what we can do to involve those people. We want them involved too.

But in regards to how they can monitor the system, I would be pleased to have them come in and tell me what they could do to help monitor the system. I don't know, and I'm sure the department don't know, or it would have been done a couple or three years ago with the previous administration. My understanding also is that the Nipawin project itself will have little or no impact in the Cumberland House area because of the Tobin Lake catch basin in between. Now, it could be right if they are wrong, but that was the impression that was given when the environment impact assessment was done. Maybe you'd like to tell me: you'd like to know information on what? I'd like it so I could answer that one, but that's about the answer to the rest of it.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, I hate to belabour this point, Mr. Minister, but I have to take exceptions with a few comments made by the hon. member in respect to an issue that I want to take a hold of. I noted that you stated in your response to me that you don't know whether they are concerned. I want to take issue with that, Mr. Minister. I take Angus

Deschambeault, for an example, the president of the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan, the northern board of director for that particular area. And I also take the president of that local, Joe Fiddler. And I also take other locally elected officials for that particular area, like Harvey Young, overseer (in the South we would refer to him as the mayor of that community), and many other community leaders in that particular community. They are concerned about that region. They are concerned about the adverse affects of that project. And you tell me, in your response to me just a while ago, that you're not sure whether or not they are concerned with that project. Mr. Minister, I just want to reassure you that the people in that community are concerned. They are concerned because the number on question, and I will place it before you, Mr. Minister: how long do you see that project in existence, and how long do you see that project being an impact to that particular region?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — To answer the hon. member's question - how long will it be there? - I would hope that it'd be there for many years. I would think it's got a long, long life. I can't say for sure what the length of the power project is, but I would assume many years. And the impact, I would assume, will continue the length of the project.

Just relating back to that, what I said a few minutes ago, whether I said it correctly or incorrectly, what I said was: in 1979, when the environment impact assessment was done, at that time those people in there did not seem to have a concern. Now, whether they recognized the full impact of what may happen or not, I do not know. But I said: at that time they did not seem to have a concern, because they didn't take part in it, although I understand, through the former government, that they were notified and asked to be part of it and everything, which seems to be the proper way to have done it.

In regards to the Cumberland delta area, I know there's a concern up there now. But the dam is not in place. I know there's been no water there. But that has nothing to do with what's happening right now. The concern I mentioned in question period too, is the concern seems to be up there, not so much as the water that's coming, as to how to retain the water within that. And a weir on the end of the Cumberland delta would seem to be one of the deep concerns they have. That in fact would change all the environmental situations around there. But I don't know where the Nipawin power dam would have any effect on that. I think the weir itself would probably have a tremendously more impact on that area, and probably be well received.

We have done some looking into it. I know it's still being looked into. And I think that something like that may have more impact on those people in that area, both their livelihood and the way they live, than the Nipawin power dam would have.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of the environmental advisory council, I wonder if the minister would state to the Assembly the status of this environmental advisory council; whether or not this is still in existence or whether or not this has been dissolved, abolished or whatever.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, that's quite right. Right at the present time it's . . . I think about six or seven members' terms have expired. We have not reappointed anybody. It's just being held there until we feel, or till we've had a look at it to see how we could use it to the most benefit. I talked to the chairman of the board, and he told me at that time personally, that he thought that if we were going to reappoint an advisory council, we should get in a new direction and a whole new perceptive of what we'd like to see done with it.

So taking his advice, and I'm sure he's a very qualified man, we have just been sitting here taking a look at it, seeing what we should do, pulling together all the information we can, in fact, before we even thought of appointing another board. So at the present time it's not reappointed; it's waiting to see what we should do and how we should handle it, when a situation arises. Right now we don't have any major situation. We'd sort of like to see how we could develop it as a whole oversee of the province of Saskatchewan, and I think that's the direction they're looking for - not a specific idea but a general overture of the whole province.

Mr. Yew: — Again, Mr. Minister, I have to take up an issue with you. You state to me that there is no major situation in the province. Well, I state to you, Mr. Minister, that you do have some major situations happening in the province. There are potential of hazardous and adverse effects in terms of acid rain. But in terms of my line of questioning, how I get down to some more basics of major developments happening in this area, you have the major Nipawin hydro project development. Certainly, I agree with you, the major environment impact of that study was done in '79. But just recently, and more recently, you had five requests to expand uranium development in this province, Mr. Minister.

Now, I couldn't get my question responded to in point form, with respect to the environmental advisory council, Mr. Minister. If in fact you have abolished the environmental advisory council, how do you contend to replace the valuable service that this council had contributed towards this Assembly and towards the province? How do you perceive the public participation aspect of major environmental impacts in this province?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I was unaware that there were five had applied. I asked both my officials here and they are unaware of it. My understanding is there's only been one applied, of which an environment impact assessment has been done.

And I think I said earlier, or just previously here, that if something comes up such as an expansion to a uranium mine, that's the time we'd look at a council.

In regards to how you would handle a situation, as we go along, I think we've done quite well on that. I think I've talked to just about every group of people that would be . . . in regards to environment. I think I've talked to the wildlife federation. I've been working with the C&Ds. I've had a lot of environment groups in, and also from the industry. And industry is the one that's always the concern to the people how you handle it. And what we've been doing with industry is setting out some tight ground rules, and they're probably the most stringent in Canada. But they don't seem to mind as long as the ground rules are set out.

We've done that with potash; we've done it with uranium development in the North. The one expansion we allowed, the most stringent rules for uranium mining ever put in place was given to those people, and they're abiding by it. So I think, in regards to that, it's been done real well and real carefully. In regards to any future ones, if they come up, that's the time we'll take a good look at it.

Mr. Yew: — I wanted to enlighten the minister's perception of the issue that I raised just a minute ago, and I have it in front of me, Mr. Minister. It states, by the *Star-Phoenix*,

dated the 30th of March, that 'Cluff Lake seeks the approval of five new uranium mines.'

Certainly I agree with you in some preliminary statements that you made. There have been inquiries at the provincial scale and at the local scale with respect to uranium development in Saskatchewan. And certainly the government has moved to some extent to protect the concerns that have been raised at the local level and at the provincial level. But certainly there is, for this government, for this province, there is a lot more expected in terms of environmental protection, the health and safety of workers at the site.

The return for this investment, Mr. Minister, in terms of training and education - in terms of employment, we still have a tremendous long ways to go. As you know, this may again contend . . . You may raise issue with me in respect to my line of questioning, but we can't disregard the high welfare roll that people in the northern administration district are subjected to at this point in time, as well as the high unemployment rate that is recorded every day with the Canada Employment and Immigration Centre.

So, somehow or other, there leaves to us some issue that we must begin to try to address ourselves to. And in terms of the line of questioning that I started with, Mr. Minister, there are some major applications in front of us, and I ask you, Mr. Minister: how do you contend to handle those areas of concern?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, I think we're getting off on Labour now, not on the Department of the Environment. In regards to your quotation out of the *Star-Phoenix*, that was one mine expansion that was an EIA done on it previously. It was five small pits around the one mine. And that was the phase 2 of that expansion. A complete EIA was done. It's for public review right now. I don't know what else a person could do, like the controls are so stringent there. They're probably, like I said, the best in Canada. So I really don't see . . . And in regards to the employment up there, that would be done through a surface lease, and I'm not aware of what the surface lease is about or how it's handled . . . You would have to ask one of the departments (I don't know which one it's handled through), at that time.

In regards to the employment, I think that would be a Labour question. It's certainly a concern of ours and we'd like to see native employment; we've urged it in everything possible. Especially, again going back to the housing corporation in the North, with all the clean-up that's been done in the North, I understand all but one small group of units has all been done by northern people. In fact, we're just now fixing up a whole bunch of units that were dismantled. I have just talked to the administrator today, and again, that's going out to northern people, so we have a concern out there in regards to jobs. And in regards directly to the environment I don't know how that reflects on it.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In terms of the grants to organizations, Mr. Minister . . . And just before I go on, we probably have different views and different objectives in terms of our political stripe as to how the people in this province ought to benefit from major economic development expansion. I for one see that we have to have full public participation. I wish to add that in a particular area, the people directly affected by any major project ought to be fully involved, not only involved in the environmental impact of that project, but also involved in the social and economic benefits of that major project.

I want to stop there for a moment, Mr. Minister, and ask for your version, whether or not

you see those people as being involved, not only in the environmental impact of that project, but also as full participants in the social and economic impact of that project.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, certainly, I would have to agree with them. I think it's being done every place. I think we have involved them in everything we could . . . every project that's available, and every project that's coming up. Again, going back to the housing and even in southern Saskatchewan (and you call it southern and northern) we have involved, I think it's been about 20 per cent, 25 per cent native employment has been contributed towards the construction of a lot of the units. So we have involved, and I have been urging all the construction industry to use them in every phase.

What we'd like to see is the native people equal to everybody else; and I think it's time that they are equal to everybody else; and I think they'd like to be equal to everybody else; and I feel they can be equal to everybody else; and I think that's the way it has to be. I'm sure that the hon. member for Athabasca will agree with me that we have to do something up there to, in fact, create employment. We are working toward that I'm sure, something up there to, in fact, create employment. We are working toward that I'm sure, as a government, in many ways. I know a few that we are. But we have to . . . I agree with you that the more employment, the more social responsibilities they have, the better they will be and certainly the better all of Saskatchewan and all of Canada will be.

Mr. Yew: — Well, certainly, Deputy Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for the fact that the hon. member for Environment has expressed the same type of feeling that I have in terms of major projects in this province. If in fact that it should involve people at the local level - not only at the environmental impact level, but also at the social and economic levels - I hope that the minister, the hon. member for Environment, can carry that message on to his government opposite - that this is a necessity, that we are not backward citizens in this province, but rather that we are concerned about the major projects that are contemplated, that have been contemplated, that are being contemplated, and that will be contemplated in the future. We certainly want to be full participants. We certainly want to be involved in the type of developments that takes place in this province, and I hope that the minister will carry that philosophy and that belief and that commitment to his government, because at times I look at the members opposite and I find it somewhat futile to argue a point, particularly so in question period when members opposite tend to heckle and jeer you to the point that you're unheard of. And I want to contribute, I want to be a part of this Assembly, I want to contribute my experience in the way that the North can be involved, the way that the North should be involved.

I want to go on with my line of questioning, Mr. Minister. Seeing as how at the last estimate review you stated that the environmental advisory council was on hold, and seeing as how you pointed out that you may come out with an advisory committee of some sort (didn't state specifically what type of an environmental advisory committee you would have), but to my point of questioning: will you or will you not have an environmental advisory committee to oversee development in this province?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated earlier in the day that I would look at seeing what we needed for an environment advisory committee. I have looked at the other provinces. Everybody has a different situation on how it should be handled. We have been going out at a ministerial level checking what is out there. I'm not quite sure what I need there yet. Until I'm really sure, until I see a direction that I'd like to be able to give those people, I do not think that I will be appointing an advisory council on the environment, or any other council at the present time. So I would hate to say yes, I'm going to appoint one, but down the road we certainly will need . . . There's a

need there for something, and we'll look at it and at that time we'll bring it in. I do not know now exactly what it will be, and I have no idea, so I'd advise the hon. member that I do know, I don't know.

At the present time it's on hold, the advisory council, because the chairman suggested that I take a look at it before I appoint anything else. I haven't taken a look at what I could bring in. Right now we're looking at what Alberta's got, what Manitoba's got, what Ontario's got. Until we're satisfied that we can take maybe the best of all, or none, or bring our own in, I'm not going to appoint any advisory council or any other committee at the present time.

Mr. Yew: — Well then, Mr. Minister, how do you foresee public participation, public involvement in the monitoring of environmental adverse effects on major projects in this province, Mr. Minister? How do you see people being involved in this government, in this mainstream of development that you have taken in respect to the province being open for business?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think maybe we have a little different policy than the former administration. We have what we call 'our door is open' policy. My door has always been open and will continue to be. The department door will always be open. If there is a concern or a need by anybody out there, they can contact the department. If they're not satisfied, they can contact me, and I'll see that it's looked into. I think that's the way it should be, and that's what we call an open door policy.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of the waste research area, vote 9, subvote no. 6, Mr. Minister, and in response to your major federal government program that you referred to in our last estimates, could you tell this Assembly then, Mr. Minister, what is the status of this major federal-provincial program that you came back to me with in our last estimates?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, my understanding is that the federal government has been in fact working on a - I couldn't call it plan but an outline - in regards to how it could be handled. They said they'd have it to us within six months. We have met with them, I think twice now over the last four or five months in regards to our input into it. They're to get back to us on it within six months on how it can be handled, how the whole waste management itself . . . they would like to see it handled. At that time we will be addressing it.

Mr. Yew: — I didn't quite get your response, Mr. Minister. You mentioned six months. I'm not sure. Could you clearly identify to us then when we can expect an announcement of this essential program?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, after we've had a chance to look at them when they bring them to us. They haven't brought them to us yet. We're hoping to have them before fall. At that time we'll take a look at them. At that time we can maybe get more information on their entire plans.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, I wonder what your department and your government foresees then for the interim period in terms of effects of uranium mine wastes on the environment.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, first of all, I think it's very well regulated right now, both by the federal and provincial government. It's going to continue . . . the monitoring will continue until they bring in a suggested program of how they would like to see it. At that

time we'll look at it and we'll evaluate it.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of getting back to grants to organizations, Mr. Minister, you may not have that information with you at present, but I wonder if you may pass that information on to me at a later date in terms of grants to organizations?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — We have it but we'll pass it over to you.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of the Qu'Appelle Valley development agreement, Mr. Minister, I have here some notes that I've prepared in terms of my assessment of the budget. And I would like the minister then, to maybe comment whether or not his government has completed items . . . channelization, items number two, the pollution control system for the intensive livestock operations, three and four items, tourism and recreational developments and finally the fish hatchery. Seeing as how this agreement will be finalized, Mr. Minister, in short time, could you give this Assembly your assessment of that particular agreement and could you give this Assembly your version of what can be expected out of that agreement for the ensuing months hence?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in regards to the Qu'Appelle agreement, the completion, now, I'll just read a paragraph here I have:

The completion of the conveyance channel which is one of the main thrusts of this program could not be possibly achieved during the remaining of the year of this agreement.

And basically that is because we run into some problems where native bands didn't want us going through their area. We've been negotiating with those people in regards to it. I understand that one or two of the bands now have agreed that it would be okay. But the thing is, the agreement expires in March 31st, 1984, and we just . . . You well know that it couldn't be done in one year, the conveyance through any of the bands. So what we're doing now, we'll be going back to the federal government to look for a new agreement that would in fact allow us to go through with a new . . . that can complete the conveyance channel through the . . . hopefully, through all the reservations.

We have to have their approval. They haven't given it to us yet. One or two have indicated they may. We're hoping that we can work out an agreement with them there so that we can go through there. We can't impose it upon them. That's the last thing we want to do. We want to work with them. We'd like to be . . . Again, as I said earlier, we want them to be part of and not forced upon. I think they are starting to recognize that now. We hope they will. We hope we can work with them. We're making an all out effort to do exactly that.

In regards to some of the funds, and they don't all apply to the Department of the Environment, but we have \$50,000 to work on agreement evaluation in regards to what I was saying. Agriculture has somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$491,000 for channel work and livestock pollution controls. P&RR has \$1,342,000, and that's for the fish and wildlife development at Regina Beach and Nicola Flats, plus some tourist area. Also, the fish hatchery is being completed.

Urban Affairs - I understand there's about \$682,000 being done in the Moose Jaw effluent for irrigation to get that out of the channelling system. There's a total of about \$2,556,000 that's in the budget for that area this year, fully realizing that to complete

that channel down there is a necessity. We don't need to be flooding land.

We know that in the previous years a lot of head-water channelling was done and forgot about the bottom water, the receiver of it. We found that out when we were out in the water committee hearings. It seemed to be the thing that was done years ago: you started at the headwater, you drained down, and forgot about the receiver. I think we recognize that, and we're going to deal with it accordingly. So, to deal with it accordingly, we have to have approval of everybody along the way.

We've set \$50,000 aside in our budget just to deal with that, to get the approval and to work with the people in regards to it, so we can go ahead with a channel that will in fact be beneficial both to irrigation where they can make a living out of it farming and use it for irrigation at the same time and not have any flooding on their land. So I think it's a positive step. It's the right way to be going with it. And hopefully that over the next six to eight months we can come up with an agreement, and then come up with a federal-provincial agreement to go ahead with it.

Mr. Yew: — Just a short question, Mr. Minister. In other words then, you haven't completely completed the Qu'Appelle Valley development agreement. It's still being negotiated; the final completion of those talks haven't been made final. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's partly correct. The agreement runs out on March 31st, '84, and we'd have to renew the agreement. But to renew the agreement, we've got to have a reason to renew it, so we need this channel agreement from all the native bands and everybody else involved. And we'd like to do it so it's beneficial to all. So we've set aside some money this year to get out to do an evaluation and an assessment to see how we can go about doing it, how we could work with the bands, how we can work with the other people to get it done, and then go to the federal government for an extension of the agreement or a new agreement.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, before the extension of any new agreement, I wonder: do you expect a full comprehensive report with respect to those ventures undertaken by the province and the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I'm not quite sure I understand your question in regards to a comprehensive report. If you're referring to are we going to involve the bands, the people on the way, I think I've indicated that. Referring to an environment impact assessment being done, that'll have to be decided as we deal with these people to decide what they want. We're doing an assessment of what we would think would be necessary. It's certainly open to the public for their comments. There'll certainly be lots of public input into it. We'll do it so everybody's well aware of it. It won't be done behind the scenes or anything. Everything will be up front. I don't know what else we could do as a government to make it more accessible, so it will certainly be accessible. It'll be there for public input. Nothing's agreed yet. And that's what it's all about.

Mr. Yew: — I suppose what I was trying to get at, Mr. Minister, is an interim report so that the people in this province and, particularly, people in the area would have an idea as to what has been achieved through the federal-provincial program, or agreement, in respect to the Qu'Appelle Valley development agreement.

Certainly, in the minds of the people involved directly at the local level, they would want to know whether or not the agreement has achieved some benefit for the province and for the area concerned. My question then was: do you expect an interim report? And if

not, if you don't expect an interim report, then how do you see the people obtaining this type of information? Do you see them getting the information after the completion of this Qu'Appelle Valley development agreement, or prior to the completion of this agreement?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that there's an annual report done every year that details all that's been done down there. So I would say that it's done yearly now, and it's been done over the last few years. It isn't something that we brought in. And it will continue as long as we're working with it. So I don't know what else we could do.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

In terms of regulations and guide-lines for the reclamation of strip mining in areas of Saskatchewan, my question to the minister is: last month your department was working on a set of guide-lines at the last questioning of estimates - guide-lines and regulations for the reclamation of strip-mining areas in Saskatchewan. If those guide-lines and regulations have been completed, Mr. Minister, can you advise this Assembly when we can have copies of such?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, my understanding was - I think I've mentioned a few minutes ago - we brought out guide-lines for mineral exploration. Right now we're having discussion with the industry on the reclamation of these areas down there so they will in fact be presentable and be reclaimed to an acceptable level by everybody. We're working on them right now; we're discussing with the industry right now in regards to that. And we're doing it similar to what we done with the potash emissions. We sat down with both the Saskatchewan potash corporation, and all the other industries. We sat down and said, 'All right, here's what it is,' and we discussed it. And I think it was in the process even before we took over as government. We completed it. We're going to do the same thing now with reclamation of the areas such as the coal mines.

Mr. Yew: — Can the minister advise if those new guide-lines and regulations, when they can be made available to the public?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd have to say that we're just discussing right now with the industry, and we couldn't make them available till we've completed discussion similar as we did with the potash emissions. We'll do the same situation: once we have come to an agreement with the industry and met what we felt was safe and acceptable standards as a department at that time, we'll make it available to the public. It's an ongoing thing and anybody can have their input into it, so it's basic by the industry and the Department of the Environment. We want some very stiff guide-lines. We're asking for them. We're working with them so that it's still an acceptable level, you know, so it isn't a complete financial burden, but we certainly expect to have it in a decent and a reasonable state and we're working towards it and we will, in fact, bring in good tight regulations.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of tailings at Lake Athabasca that you and I both discussed at the last estimates, Mr. Minister, you stated to me that negotiations between you, the province, and the federal government were being carried out for the health and safety and other environmental effects of that Gunnar and Laredo mines may have on the region. Can the minister advise this Assembly if their study and their negotiations are

complete?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, that's the same one we're talking about in regards to waste pollution, and we're working with the federal government. We've been meeting with them a couple of times. They're drawing up what they think is draft regulation, or draft type of regulations. When they get them drafted up, we'll take a look at them and see what our evaluation of them are, and at that time we will be able to at least look at making a decision on how it should be done. But no, we're not aware of . . . We've met twice, I think twice, already with the federal government - most at ministerial level. It's been an ongoing discussion at deputy minister level continuously in regards to these draft regulations. Until they had brought back to us what they would like to see there, you know, there's really not much we can do beyond the point of putting our input into it.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, at the beginning of my presentation here with respect to estimates with regards to your department, the Department of the Environment, I quoted that your government has scrapped policy planning and research, public information and education, and also environmental assessment. And you have also decreased from the budget that we had, or the former administration had, in March of 1982. This portion of the budget for your department decreased by 2 million, and from your budget of last year, last fiscal year's estimates, it is again down by 1 million. Can the minister advise me, advise the Assembly and the people of this province, how you foresee replacing those very essential type of departments that provided public input, public participation and involvement and information?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I think the hon. member has looked at the estimates and he realizes that what we have done is co-ordinated them into one unit under the environment information, co-ordination and assessment. And what we've really done is took a lot of administrative people and brought them all under one, with one administration and the job being done underneath. I don't think that you need to pass paper from one desk to the other a dozen times. That don't make performance. Performance isn't based on how many people you have. Performance is based, first, on how much you do and how you do it. And second of all, in regards to the Department of Environment we took over, to get information out of there was like trying to pull teeth.

Right now we have taken the Department of the Environment and made information to the public a number one recognition within the department, because if you look, information is the first word that's within that department. And we did that with a reason: so that the people of Saskatchewan would know where to go for information. And I think that's very, very important. If you're going to protect the environment, the people of Saskatchewan have to know where they can get the information from to be able to do that.

In regards to the difference in the money, I could tell you one thing. Over the last three years previous to us, the department, although they had in their estimates a large number, there was \$2,260,000 that was never spent. So it didn't matter how much you put in your estimates; it's how much you spend and how you spend it.

Mr. Yew: — I took note of your response, Mr. Minister. You stated a couple of times, information to the public is important, and I agree with you. Information to the public is very important, direly important, but not as important, Mr. Minister, as public participation in terms of the effect any major development will have in any particular area, Mr. Minister.

And I, from experience, go back to the provincial inquiries. These were provincial inquiries held in this province with respect to Cluff Lake, Key Lake and Elizabeth Falls, Rabbit Lake, and you can go on and on with respect to quite a number of major developments in this province, that were held. Public participation was an important aspect of the former administration. I have to say this, because they not only involved people at the local level, they also involved people that were involved in one industry or another.

With respect to those provincial inquiries, there evolved some major recommendations as to how those projects would be implemented and how they would function, in terms of the project itself, and how the public would have access to information - not only access to information, but also how the community would be involved in involvement of the social and economic spin-offs of such projects. I want to again go back to this quote, or statement that you made in terms of information. Certainly, information is important, but public participation is also equally important, Mr. Minister.

I understand the member for Moosomin is getting a little irritated with my line of questioning, but the important aspect of this is the fact that people have to be involved in this province. Right now the Nipawin hydro project development that is in existence, and that seems to be a highlight in this province, it seems to me that there is some misdirection. We have apparently quite a number of people involved in that project in terms of the employment benefits, in terms of the major contractual benefits, people involved from out of this province.

Some time ago I questioned the Minister of Labour, and I wondered just how much involvement the people from that particular region would have in terms of the employment benefits - the spin-off of employment and the spin-off of business opportunities - and he got back to me and he stated that there would be 95 to 98 per cent provincial content in the employment and in the business spin-off for that project. I ask the ministers now, you know, with respect to the existing major projects that we have in this province, how do you co-ordinate your Department of the Environment with the other major concerns that communities have, that this province has, on those major projects in terms of employment, in terms of the social benefits of those major initiatives taken by this province?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I'm not just sure of all the questions there, but just in answer to a portion of it, since 1972 there's only been seven boards of inquiry. The last board of inquiry was in 1979. That was in Nipawin hydro project. There hasn't been any in two years with the previous administration, and there was none in 1982. If there is a need for a major, if there's a major development coming up, an EIA would certainly necessary, a board of inquiry would be necessary, and it would be carried out.

Mr. Yew: — I have to say at this point in time, then, Mr. Minister, that the major reorganization policy that your government has undertaken is nothing but a smoke-screen, in terms of how people would foresee your government's initiative is, with respect to major development in this province, because when it comes right down to it, Mr. Minister, I as a critic for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan have to raise a question with the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan with respect to major initiatives in this province.

And what will happen ultimately, Mr. Minister, is that when the estimates come up for DNS he is going to refer me back to your department with respect to major policy

developments in this province with respect to environment, with respect to the social and economic offerings by those projects. What ultimately is going to happen? People at the local level will be confused. People at the locally elected level will be confused; they won't know what your department . . . In terms of monitoring, in terms of regulations, in terms of guide-lines and regulations, people are confused as to what your government's policy will be, Mr. Minister.

And I have to seriously question that policy, that philosophy that your government has adopted. When it comes to major projects in northern Saskatchewan, when it comes to major projects in this province, there is somehow or other (there is; there has to be) some way that your administration, that your government can provide information with regard to your whole approach to social, cultural and economic developments in this province.

Right now, there are problems with the surface lease agreements in Key Lake and Cluff Lake. The line of questioning is that the committees that were given the responsibility to oversee those developments - to review, evaluate the benefit or the things that are not being adhered to by the mining companies or by the government, to oversee, evaluate and recommend on the projects in northern Saskatchewan - those committees that were given that responsibility have not met for such a long time. In fact, the Cluff Lake committee has not met for one year. And the other committee with respect to Key Lake has only met once.

Now in terms of the surface lease agreements, Mr. Minister, I had some discussion with the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and he has stated to me that all the regulations and all those policies have been adhered to. But I have my qualms; the people at the local level have their qualms and have their reservations as to whether or not those regulations and those policies are being adhered to by your administration. And at this point in time, Mr. Minister, I wonder - if you are the Minister of Environment, and if you are concerned about those projects in northern Saskatchewan, if you are concerned about the people at the community level and at the provincial level, and seeing as how that we should put priority that 95, 98 per cent of the people in this province ought to benefit from those projects - I wonder if the minister would at this time give me his assurance, like he did at the beginning of my line of questioning, that the people at the community level will be full participants, not only in terms of information, but also in terms of employment, in terms of the social benefits of those projects.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we're diversing off far from the Department of Environment. The Department of Environment's responsibility is certainly to monitor and to regulate. In regards to giving the opportunity for employment, it is certainly equal. And I would like to think it's equal for everybody in Saskatchewan. We have basically made it available to each and every one wherever you are. I would think that the employment isn't only for native people, that it would not only be in the North, but would be in all of Saskatchewan. I think that's the role we have to play. I think this idea of an imaginary line up there, you know, is far-fetched. It's time now that we all recognized the province of Saskatchewan, fully realized that the further north you go the more problems there is, and there has been. And that could relate back to some of the things that's been done before.

So, really and truly, the Department of Environment's role is to regulate and to make sure that the environment is protected. But it certainly isn't the role to develop. If a development occurs, like I said earlier, and it's a major development, we'll make sure that a committee's set up, that there will be a board of inquiry, if necessary, and

whatever is necessary to protect the environment and to make sure it is protected before it starts. And I think that's an acceptable situation because it was done previously.

I can't see nothing wrong with that. And at the same time . . . you know you get unemployment. I'm sure the Minister of Labour, or the minister responsible for DNS, or some of those for economic development in the North . . . It's certainly needed. It's recognized. I don't think anybody denies that. But the role and how it would be done is not the Department of Environment's responsibility. And certainly we'll do whatever we can to help make sure that the environment is protected, and if we can do something along the way to help create more jobs, that's great too.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of the fact, Mr. Minister, in terms of the fact that the environmental advisory council is now abolished, would then the minister agree that somewhat or other public participation, in terms of environmental adverse effects, is somewhat diminished?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — No, I would have to disagree with that, with the hon. member. I don't think that anything is diminished. I think there's pretty stringent rules and regulations wherever there is.

The environment advisory council has not been abolished. As we've said, we are looking to see how it could be re-established, or established in a different . . . with a different perspective to it. I think that's fair. I think that was done on the advice of the chairman that was responsible before. He personally advised, before we went any further, that that would be a good role to take. He said, 'Don't rush into it; take your time and make sure what you do is right.' I think that he's a professor, I think he's a very intelligent person, and certainly he had the opportunity to look into it over the last couple of years and to make that type of an assessment. I have not, and I cannot make that type of an assessment. I have to go by the people, the public, that it feels that way.

Until we feel confident, and until we think or feel confident we can appoint it such a role that it would be beneficial to the people and to the environment, we haven't done so and we don't intend to do so.

Mr. Yew: — Just a couple of more questions, Deputy Chairman. In terms of the water rights branch, I noted that you have an increase of \$500,000. Also an increase of about five persons for this particular branch. I wonder if the minister would be able to tell me what the staff are being paid to do, in terms of the particular branch in question?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman and hon. member, in regards to the expansion of both the hydrology branch, and especially the water rights branch, with the five additional people, we felt that water is certainly, and should be, and is a high priority in this province, and it's in every province in Canada. We also recognized that water, not only water for usage in municipal use, but for irrigation, but also drainage - all that fell under water. And it was time that we started looking at water as a very valuable resource. So that's one of the reasons that we increased the number of people within the department.

Just to give you an idea of what the department of water rights branch would be responsible for: they'd be responsible for licensing surface water, ground water, and water power developments; permits construction operation of drainage developments; controls and regulates water projection operations; investigates and resolves water-

related complaints and problems; collects and compiles information on water resources; licenses water-well drilling machines; provides geo-hydrological assistance to other branches; assists in ensuring the province meets inter-judicial water obligations; assists in the collection of industrial water charges and water-power revenues.

Mr. Yew: — In our last review of estimates, Mr. Minister, I raised a question with respect to the spraying that had been done at the Primrose air-weapons range. And I had commended your department at how expediently that you were able to get a firm grip as to the spraying of this very dangerous chemical in the area. But at the same time, I also cautioned your department.

I also suggested some positive recommendations in terms of how we can work as a unit in this province to ensure that that type of dangerous chemical was not ever sprayed in our soil again. And I referred to you the Primrose bombing range agreement and our Department of National Defence range agreement that was arrived at back in 1952-53; and that also this agreement had expired; it is a perpetual agreement, no doubt. And that is one question that people at the local level didn't understand, or a clause that was not understood at the local level. But certainly it was a perpetual agreement, one that expired back in '73.

Since then you have had interim agreements to that effect. and seeing as how you have interim agreements, an agreement there that can be reviewed and modified at the provincial and federal level. And I, at the time of our review of estimates, suggested to you that that particular issue ought to be addressed at those federal-provincial talks.

At this point in time, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you can advise the Assembly whether or not you have taken the initiative to ensure that that type of spraying of a dangerous chemical will not happen again in our province.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, certainly, Mr. Chairman and hon. member, we'll certainly advise them of our concerns about it. I've addressed it previously, as you're well aware. It's under the Department of National Defence, as you well know. They have the right to supersede whatever we want to do as long . . . They can use any chemical they want, as long as it's licensed by the federal department of agriculture, which it is. Actually the lease agreement falls under the department of DNS, and we'll certainly be advising them of it too, but really we have no control over it if it's a licensed product, which they did use up there in department of Agriculture Canada. We did the best we could to stop it. We've asked them not to do it without informing us first. We've asked them to have us monitored, for us to have our input into it. They've assured us before it ever happened again they would do that. I have no control over whether they will or will not keep that type of assurance. They do, in fact, have last say. And when they have last say, you know, there's not too much as a province that we can do about it.

Mr. Yew: — I'll certainly take it, Mr. Minister . . . I would certainly want to keep in touch with you on that particular issue.

Getting back to another one. I see my colleagues want to also enter into the estimates here. With respect to the Island Falls project on the east side, specifically, Mr. Minister, two miles out of Sandy Bay, we have this project, this Hudson Bay Mining and Development Corporation project. I understand that you have a specific task ahead of you negotiating on behalf of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. I wonder if your department, at this point in time, is involved with those negotiations, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, I understand all we do is issue the permit for the operation of the plant. It actually comes under Sask Power now. It's been taken from the Department of the Environment and put under Sask Power, so maybe when you come up in estimates in Sask Power, you could pursue that a little further, because I don't have the answer to particularly what negotiation's been going on and what hasn't. So I would ask you to take it up with the minister responsible for Sask Power when it comes up in the crown corporations.

In regards to the rest, all we do is permit it, and it's been an ongoing thing for quite a while.

Mr. Yew: — Pardon me, Mr. Minister. I couldn't get the full response to my question. Did you say, or did you not say, that your department is not involved?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — That's correct, the hon. member. All we do is permit the operation of it. We have nothing to do with the actual operations itself; it's under Sask Power Corporation.

Mr. Yew: — It's pretty difficult again, it's that primary question that is of concern to the people at the local level in Sandy Bay. As a member of the cabinet then, Mr. Minister, I will raise a question with you. When do you expect the conclusion of those talks or those discussions and negotiations with the community that is directly involved? It may be an unfair question, but as a member of the cabinet, you ought to be able to respond to that.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I don't think it's my responsibility to respond to it, so I would refer you to the minister responsible for Sask Power Corporation. I'm sure, at that time, he'll answer it for you.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Co-chairman, I have no further line of questioning at this point in time. I want to thank the minister and the officials involved for having responded to questions that I have raised in terms of environmental protection for this province. And with that I may want to leave it to my colleagues to raise certain concerns that they have. Thank you very much.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a few questions to the minister.

Mr. Minister, during the discussion with the member for Cumberland, he has indicated a considerable concern that in implementing programs of new directions in your department, that you will, in fact, consult with the interested groups. Can we get a guarantee from the minister that indeed, in implementing new programs and new directions, that he is, in fact, consulting with interested groups?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I think the member from Quill Lakes either didn't hear quite clearly or didn't understand what I said. I didn't say, 'implementing new ideas or new programs.' I said, 'implementing new projects,' and that's a little difference. That's where a project comes into the area. Certainly we'll keep the people in the area, and have their input in it, if it's a major type of project.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, can the minister give me a guarantee that in respect to running his departments, and in introducing new programs or new directions within his

department, that there will be public consultation, particularly with interested groups which would be affected by the implementation of such programs?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, we do have what we call an open-door policy. I mentioned it a couple of times. Second of all, with the running of the department, I would hope that the deputy minister and the administrative people are competent enough people that they can run the department without my input into it even. The direction that we would only be giving would be policy-type direction. But the direction of the administration of the department, I'm sure there's qualified people there to run it. So I would hope that they are qualified enough to run it and nobody would have to put any input into the running of it.

Mr. Koskie: — Obviously, Mr. Minister, you don't understand the question. The question, what I am talking about, is the implementation of new programs which, in fact, involve policy - policy set by you and your cabinet. That's what I'm talking about. I'm not talking about the ordinary day-to-day administration of the department. I'm talking about the implementation of new programs and new directions which affect people.

What I want to know is: can you give us your guarantee that in fact you will involve the public, that there will be a consultative process before the implementation of new programs?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, just in answer to the hon. member from Quill Lakes, I thought I told the member from Cumberland earlier, in regards to the potash emission regulations, we worked with the industry, with the people, in regards to what should be brought in for safeguards. In regards to guide-lines for reclamation of gravel pits, the RMs, the industry itself was involved in what's needed for there. There were people who were brought in; we listened and we had a lot of hearings over that. In regards to guide-lines for coal mining reclamation, we're in the process right now of doing exactly that. In regards to guide-lines for mineral exploration, we've done exactly that. I would think that we do have, and have listened, and will continue to listen in that regard, in regards to how the policies are formed.

Mr. Koskie: — As a follow-up, Mr. Minister, recently you put into effect new pesticide controls, and I read here a statement from the president of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. He says that he's pleased with the pilot project, but though happy with the thrust of the pilot project, Charlie Phelps said Friday, 'The Saskatchewan government should have worked more closely with SARM. We've been involved in this since day one,' said Phelps, who first heard the details of the program on television. 'They should have talked to us before the announcement.'

How is that consistent with what you've just got finished telling me? Obviously you aren't consulting, even with one of the largest organizations in the province. Either your statement of consultation is inaccurate or Mr. Phelps's, and what I would like to do is believe Mr. Phelps.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I'm glad the member decided who to believe there because when I saw that in the paper I also was deeply concerned, because we had met very closely with SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities). And in fact just about two days before that, the secretary of SARM was over in my office, Lorne Wilkinson, and we discussed it, and he looked it over. And let me tell you something else, Mr. Member, Mr. Minister, or hon. member, at the same time, when that come out

in the paper, a fellow called Lorne Wilkinson phoned me and he said, 'I got to apologize for that. That's an incorrect statement.' And he said, 'Any calls that come in, I will take them personally because I do not agree with that.' So if you will just contact Mr. Lorne Wilkinson, he will in fact inform you of how the situation was handled. And I will tell you something else while I'm up here is that SARM was consulted, were consulted at all times, and so was the safety council, and so was SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association).

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I just want to say to the minister that this is the statement of the president of SARM, the elected representative, who says you didn't consult. And I want to say that I believe what he says. And going back to an executive officer of SARM hardly satisfies the situation. I think what you should have done is to gone back and publicly apologize to the president for not involving them in a program which they had much interest for a long time. Obviously, your policy is a closed policy. You're going to implement it and then afterwards tell the details in respect to the programs. And I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan are getting fed up with initiatives. This was supposed to be an open government. And obviously, the evidence is here.

There is no openness. What is happening is that the bureaucrats in the department design a program and then they talk to the bureaucrats of another organization like SARM, rather than to the elected officials, and come up with the details of the program and don't even involve them. I think that's regrettable. It wasn't happening in the past. And I think that certainly that as the officials of these bodies who are used to firsthand consultation will react accordingly . . .

I want to go on to another matter and that is the water drainage control act program. I would like to ask you whether or not there is in existence, or do you still have under your jurisdiction water drainage control act in respect to the setting up of watersheds and the drainage of farmlands? Is that still under your jurisdiction, or did you toss that out in your efficiencies?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I'll answer the last question first. Yes, we do have a water drainage control act. And in regard to the statements you just made a couple of minutes ago, in regard to pesticide container clean-up: for 10 to 15 to 20 years, there has been absolutely nothing done, nothing done in regards to them being scattered all over the province. There had been no consultation with anybody. There had been no program. They had been left. In one year we have brought in a program that in fact . . . It's a pilot type project that will in fact, that will in fact go towards cleaning up these cans.

And second of all, are you insinuating that the staff at SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) was either incompetent - that I shouldn't be contacting them because I don't know any others - or are you saying that they aren't telling the truth? Because somewhere along the line one or the other is not correct. Are you telling me that the staff that was hired by SARM is incompetent?

Mr. Koskie: — No, really, basically the minister again is somewhat confused. Any allegations of incompetence is not directed to the staff of SARM, nor to the elected officials. The incompetence is directed to the minister, in the way in which he is running the department. So I want to clarify that for the record.

Since the minister still has, under his jurisdiction, the water drainage control act, I would like to ask the minister what steps have been taken in respect to the continuation

and the establishment of the watersheds throughout Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Chairman, there has been no watersheds committees appointed. Basically, I think what we done here just a few months ago, two months ago in fact . . . Four . . . three cabinet ministers and Mr. Muirhead travelled around the province to identify water concerns, and it was called the cabinet committee on water concerns. Before you appoint a lot of people to positions, you better have defined what is needed, and we felt that there is a lot needed in this province in regards to water, and it should be well defined. And until such time as it's all completely defined - and you know we've had many, many briefs; they are all being gone through now - when it's defined, at that time we'll take a look at it.

Mr. Koskie: — I'd like to ask the minister, then obviously the concept of establishing watersheds . . . Is in fact what the minister is saying that he is not proceeding with the basic concept of the watersheds?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I made it very clear a minute ago, but I'd like to make it very clear again that there's a very, very broad scope of water in the province. To go piecemeal, one little bit at a time, as the former administration did, got them nowhere. They had no water policy. What was their water policy? It hasn't been defined. We are now in the process of defining one - a water policy, a water management, for the province of Saskatchewan - which has never been done before.

Mr. Koskie: — What is the minister's present policy on water management?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — In regards to that, I think I just said that we are at the present time formulating it. It'll all be announced in due course.

Mr. Koskie: — Am I to understand that at the present time the minister operates in a vacuum?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — In answer to the hon. member from Quill Lakes, I'm not sure who was operating in a vacuum because they had never once went around the province to identify anything before.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — And, in fact, I have not seen since we took over the department any policy there whatsoever. So in 11 years you had never once set out any type of water policy. I'm not too sure where the vacuum was, but there's no vacuum here. We've already started out to formulate a policy which will be in place in very due course.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to remind the minister that indeed we had brought in the water drainage control act. We had an extensive consultation with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and the various organizations in this province - extensive - unlike the minister who bypasses them. And we did, in fact, have in place the establishment of the initial watershed. One watershed was, in fact, set into place and was proceeding. And I think that what we have here is a case of a government which was totally unprepared to govern. They have absolutely thought out no direction to governing - no water policy whatsoever. So they send a little political machine around - no expertise attached to it, as far as I know, and very limited - and trot around the province. I want to say that the research on water in this province, the established

research, was second to none in any other province.

I want to indicate that the farmers of this province certainly are not going to be very patient if, in fact, the circumstances put upon them the drainage problem, because this was being addressed by the previous government. I think now that we've gone into this delay tactics again of trying to establish a policy which . . . Obviously any party should have a policy before they come into office. I think it's going to be a great disappointment to the farmers. I've been talking to many farmers and they're saying, 'What is happening to the development of the water drainage control act which we helped to establish?' And I say, 'Well, what happened is that there's been a change of government and they're doing nothing. They are reviewing, reviewing and reviewing, and as a consequence,' I say to them, 'there's very little that I can really recommend to you.' Certainly we had a policy established whereby the development of C&D was under Agriculture and the water drainage control act was under the Department of the Environment and there was co-ordination in respect to the two.

And the province had all been analysed as to drainage systems. I believe there were some seven watersheds, if I'm not mistaken. Accordingly, they were going to develop this and they were going to allow the local people, the local people, to develop and implement a policy which would best suit that particular watershed.

I'm very, very disappointed that the minister now indicates that he indeed has no policy in respect to water management and that the best that we can do is to wait for the future.

I'd like to know from the minister: how long do you think it will take you to review, review, and continue to review?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in answer to the review and review, I would hope that as long as we're government we review everything that comes up. I think that's what happened previously, that they had never reviewed anything.

In regards to the watersheds: you know, it's a fact, one watershed was established - one. That's piecemeal. What we said is we need an overall water policy for the province of Saskatchewan.

In regards to C&Ds, there has been none over many, many years, as the C&D and now the drainage control are in conflict. They should be under one department. They should be working together for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. What has happened was that the drainage was always done at the headwaters. They forgot about all the receivers at the other end. There was no policy to say what should be done. It was done on an ad hoc basis. It is time, in this province, that we done it on a policy-type basis that you know what it's going to reflect on - the receiver as well as the sender at the top.

So, therefore, we need an overall water management policy, and we also need an overall drainage policy, together.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I would just like to remind the minister that in respect to the C&D, that it was the policy of the government, indeed, to work out an overall drainage policy, and had that presentation to the major organizations of this province. But also, in respect to the implementation of C&Ds, that it allowed the residents in the particular municipality to decide whether or not they wanted to go forward with the C&D. In other words, what we were doing is allow local autonomy. Farmers had to vote on whether

there was going to be a C&D. I believe they had to get two-thirds percentage in order to proceed. Now you are saying that that type of local autonomy is now going to be removed from your policy, because obviously you have criticized the local autonomy that was instituted under the previous government in respect to C&D?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I think we're in the Department of Agriculture's jurisdiction. But in regards to C&D, what I said was that there was no overall policy to direct those individual C&Ds on how the water should be drained. And, in fact, if you don't know who's going to receive, if a C&D is draining at the top, what about the farmers at the bottom? That was never once taken into consideration.

There's a word: C&D started out . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It means conservation and development. Conservation. Conservation of water in our province is, and will always be, a number one priority. Conservation relates to irrigation, to the overall policies of farming.

And another thing in regards to . . . You're talking about how we handled things, or how we go about it. One thing we don't do, we don't develop the policy first, and then go to the people second. We go out and listen first, and then develop the policy. So it's sort of a change-over from what it used to be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, in respect to your review of your annual review, and your review of coming up with a water policy, I want to know whether or not that will in fact be under your jurisdiction. Will the Department of Environment be in fact putting in place the water policies, or will it be the new crown corporation that you have established, and will that new crown corporation be attached to Environment? What is the, sort of the organizational chart?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well I think there's only one person who could answer that and that's the Premier of the province, in regards to what department or who'll look after a crown corporation. I would say that the Government of Saskatchewan will formulate the policy in regards to water.

Mr. Koskie: — What I want to ask you: you have indicated here a criticism that the water drainage control act, or the control of drainage, was under the Environment, and C&D was under Agriculture. What I am asking you now: since you said that, you obviously intend to have both the C&D and any water management or the drainage control under the same jurisdiction. Is that the intention?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Again, that would certainly be for the Premier to decide what that would be. What I said was that with C&Ds on one hand draining, and The Drainage Control Act which affects the farmers, the end receiver, maybe it's about time that they were all looked in one concept and all be in a type together. And that's the way maybe it will end up. I don't know. I'm not to judge that.

You know, it's hard to say how a government should act in regards to the people, but I think the first thing we have to do is recognize that the people that received water on the bottom end has to be recognized as well as those that drain on the top. And so I think . . . I spoke at a C&D meeting not very long ago, and I stressed the word 'conservation' and the need to control and to be regulated drainage in regard to the receiver, and I think it was very well received by the C&D group themselves, because I think they

recognize it - they're very intelligent people - and they recognize that although C&Ds at one time was just drainage, it is time for the conservation to be brought into it. And I think they also recognize that the rights of the people who receive the water should be recognized when the drainage is taking place. And I know many places in the province where headwaters were drained, and down below many, many farmers were flooded, and I think, and I know, that it's time that it's all looked at in an overall concept plan of water management.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask the minister . . . There was the environmental advisory council. I'd like to ask the minister whether or not his department has received from this council its report on the environmental decision-making in Saskatchewan? Have you received that report?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Yes, the department has received it, but I haven't had an opportunity to review it yet.

Mr. Koskie: — When did the department receive that report?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I'm not sure, but towards the end of '82.

Mr. Koskie: — And are you telling us that a report was received near the end of '82, several months ago, from a body, an environmental advisory body, which is entitled 'Environmental Decision-Making in Saskatchewan,' and are you indicating to us that you have not even turned your mind to read that report from that body? Is that what you're telling the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — At the present time it's being reviewed by the department, and they will be making a report to me. As you fully realize, it's a very extensive bunch of work put in . . . It's a very extensive book, I guess you'd say. It's a very, very thick book. It has a lot in it, and I just haven't had the opportunity or the time to do it properly, so the department in the meantime is reviewing it and will be making recommendations to me on it. I think that's a normal procedure done on very extensive reports.

Mr. Koskie: — It may be the normal procedure, Mr. Minister, but the normal procedure is that if you commission a report which is a very important report, that normally the minister will deal with it with some urgency. I'm asking the minister when he intends to have a look at this report. How soon?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — My understanding is it was commissioned by the council themselves and it hasn't been endorsed by the council, so I'm not too sure of the official part of it. We do have a report of it (or a copy of the report); they are breaking it down so that . . . and making a report back to me on the recommendations within it. When I have had an opportunity to go over it with the staff entirely with it, at that time I'll be more prepared to speak on it.

Mr. Koskie: — Will the minister make the report public?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — The report is not . . . Certainly we'll be making it public. The report was not our report; it was done by the previous government. It was under . . . It's entered at 1982 or so. I would think certainly we'll make it available to the public when we've had an opportunity to look at it.

Mr. Koskie: — There's one other area that . . . When the member from Cumberland was discussing the massive cuts in your department - over \$1 million cut, 32 positions cut . . . And I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that I am getting sick and tired of that government alleging efficiencies while, at the same time, indeed cutting services. And that will be the net result in respect to the massive cuts that you have initiated here in respect to the Department of Environment.

And certainly I think, Mr. Minister, it's coming clearly home that this government, in its open to business approach, is certainly going to accommodate, and accommodate to the full extent, any new venture in this province without the necessity of protection of the environment. That is our fear.

And I want to ask the minister, in respect to his tenure as Minister of the Environment: has he in fact carried out in the department, or initiated any impact studies during the course of the year?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, first of all, in answer to the hon. member, the department never does the environment impact study. It's always done by those that's industries or whatever is related to that. So the proponents do the study. There's some going on right now; I don't know how many, but there is some going on right now. But the department does not do any EIAs.

Mr. Koskie: — But obviously the minister and the department certainly do request that an environmental impact study be done and that the results of that impact study be made available to the Department of Environment. And what I'm asking you: can you detail to us - give us a list of all the impact studies which you have requested and which are being carried out by the private sector in which you will be getting a report back?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Certainly we'll send the list over to you.

Mr. Koskie: — I didn't hear your answer. What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — We'll get a list together and send it over to you.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I want to specifically ask in respect to the heavy oil upgrader whether or not the department has to date requested that an environmental impact study be done for any site in Saskatchewan. And surely you should know that.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in answer to the hon. member from Quill Lake, I don't know if it's a heavy oil upgrader and where. Certainly the departments aren't aware of one in . . . (inaudible) . . . so we haven't been requested to date, no.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to the justification of your cut in staff in administration, which you denoted as being efficient, I look at the staff, the personal staff of the minister, and I find a Darryl Blinkley, special assistant; Fay Brunning, EA; Nancy Martin, EA; plus Gerald Muirhead, MLA, Legislative Secretary. I would like the minister to give me the salaries of each of Darryl Blinkley, Fay Brunning, and Nancy Martin.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Certainly we'll get them together for you and send them over to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, it's a question to the

minister with respect to the chemical cans. I am not sure, Mr. Minister, that I understand what your program is. I did read the material which came out of your office, and, frankly, I'm not sure I understand what your program consists of. Perhaps you could explain it for my benefit today.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, I can go into it in complete detail or just the basic. The basic of it is that the site's established by the RMs, if they so wish, and a lot of them have indicated they want to. There'll be voluntary-type sites established. The department will send out somebody to inspect the site to make sure it's safe for the type of a can to be put on. There'll be a crushing unit come around to crush the can. And then the can will either be stored on site or if we can get - and we haven't got it finalized yet - Ipsco or a steel mill to take the steel, it will be sent off to the steel mill to be melted down. But we haven't got that . . . The steel mills yet haven't decided or haven't agreed to accept them to date. We have looked at some proponents in crushing them, and we can crush 10 cans down to 5 inches which will give you about a 30-pound compressed piece of metal that will be all . . . (inaudible) . . . together, which would basically leave no residue, or very little if any residue, in them at all. We've asked the farmers to rinse them three times before they bring them there. Any residue that's left in the can will be caught, contained, and stored and will be shipped out to be either stored or destroyed, probably stored down in the southern United States. So, basically that's the way the program sits.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, is it anticipated, Mr. Minister, that the cans will be permanently stored at these sites or is this just, in a sense, a kind of collection depot until you find some other place to store them?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, we're sincerely hoping that one or the other of the smelting plants will take them. And we feel they will. Like I said, it hasn't been finalized yet and we're still dealing with them. They will be temporary on site. And if they can't do it, then we'll have to haul them and store them, and either bury them or store them on a safe site. And as you know, a safe site would have to be selected for that. But it hasn't been selected. We're going to store them on site for this year; we'll crush them down, they'll be very little. Once they're crushed down - 10 cans into five inches takes up very little space - it will be a very compressed type of can.

It's a pilot project. There may be some faults with it. If there is we'll correct them. We didn't go out on a major scale because we wanted to pilot project it for one year. I think it's a normal procedure; most things are done that way. We felt there was a real need out there, and it was time it was done. We've addressed the issue for this year on that type of project. Like I said, if there's some errors or we haven't done everything just right, we'll change it around.

Mr. Shillington: — What's the nature of your discussions, with Ipsco, I gather? When you say you expect them to be melted down, what's the nature of your discussions? How vigorous and intense is it? What precisely do you mean when you say you're having discussions with Ipsco?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, first of all, to make clear, I didn't say Ipsco, I said one of the steel mills. I know you interpret here, and we would hope that they would take it. We've asked them once; we asked previously and they had said no. They may still say no, but one of their answers was that they couldn't arc them properly; there was residue in them. They have open-hearth furnaces. We respected that. I don't say that anyone will take it. We're hoping that one . . . There's a couple closed ones, one in Manitoba, a

couple in Alberta. It may be necessary to haul them to there. If there is we will have to do it. We would prefer not to bury them or to store them. If we can have them taken away and destroyed or smelted down is certainly the best answer. We don't have that exact answer, but for the time being we're going to store them on site, crushed on the local site.

Mr. Thompson: — I only have a few questions, Mr. Chairman, I want to direct to the Minister of the Environment. Could you indicate to the House whether the responsibilities for the surface leases that they have in northern Saskatchewan on the mines have been transferred over to the Department of the Environment or do they still remain with Department of Northern Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — They still remain with the DNS.

Mr. Thompson: — I would like to ask you a few questions. And I'll turn to acid rain, Mr. Minister. Could you indicate to the House where the monitoring stations for the acid rain are situated in the province?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I couldn't indicate to you where the stations are. I could indicate that there was a report, an ongoing analysis of it. It's the second year in a row that it's been carried on in northern Saskatchewan - in the Cambrian Shield area - in regard to acid rain. My understanding is that there was very little or no acid rain the first year. I haven't seen the report for this winter; it's done through checking of the snow. I can't answer you where the stations are because I don't have it with us here.

Mr. Thompson: — You talk about the tests that are being carried out with the snow, but there is air pollution regarding acid rain, and I believe that you are a partner in the activities regarding the acid rain and the stations. I wonder if you could give us a report as to the air cleanliness that you are receiving out of the station in Cree Lake?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I don't have the information but we'll certainly . . . But we'll provide it to you. I don't have the information with us, but we'll provide it to you, in regards to Cree Lake; we don't have it with us today.

Mr. Thompson: — But you are a partner with the acid rain tests in northern Saskatchewan. Is this a joint venture with the federal Department of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Yes, it's a joint venture with the federal government, the Alberta government and the Manitoba government.

Mr. Thompson: — Are there any indications that the acid rain fall-out is increasing in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — No, there isn't.

Mr. Thompson: — I would like, Mr. Chairman, now to turn to another program that you have in the province, and that is the northern forest clean-up program. And I believe that program is where you go and clean up dumping sites along our highways, roads and canoe routes, and along the river. Could you indicate to the House how that program is proceeding and how many sites you have cleaned up in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — My understand is that it was not done in '82, and is not

proposed to do in '83, because when it was done in '81 they found very few problems at the sites, and they've been cleaned up quite well. So it was never carried on in '82 or in '83; it will be in '83.

Mr. Thompson: — I see in your report here that . . . And you indicate to the House that it's not taken place in the last year. For the second year in a row, the department contracted a litter clean-up team in northern Saskatchewan. Are you indicating that this did not take place?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, the last annual report we have is '81-82, and it does say that in there, but that was the '81-82 year. The '82-83 year, or the '83-84 year, it's not proposed in it.

Mr. Thompson: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm a little bit confused. You indicated, and I have the '81-82 report which indicates that 2,400 kilometres of roadways and 570 kilometres of canoe routes were looked after by a private firm. Are you saying that this did not take place?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Again in answer, it took part in the '81-82 estimates which ended on March 31st, 1982. It did not take place in the '82-83 estimates or the '83 now. We're just starting '83-84 estimates and it will not be in there. What it says in here is correct. That was done on the 1981-82 budget. It wouldn't be the budgets that we're talking about, or not the '82-83 budget.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Chairman, then you no longer will be carrying on this program of cleaning up these sites and checking into them?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — My understanding was, and it was previously done before we became government, that the understanding was that it was, there was really no need for it. The sites were cleaned up quite well and the monitoring that was done on them showed that they were being left in a fairly good condition. So it was decided even prior to us becoming government that it wasn't needed. So it wasn't a decision really of mine. It was just a carry on of the department.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's one last part here I would like to ask you a few questions on and that's the radiation division, regarding Uranium City clean-up. I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you indicate to the House whether or not you are still going ahead with the clean-up of Uranium City, regarding the Uranium clean-up with radiation?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — There was 69 homes originally in the program and there's still 36 are still occupied. And we're going to wait to see where Uranium City goes before we make any decision on what we're going to do with these ones.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, are you not maintaining the equipment, the monitoring equipment that is now in Uranium City? Are you not maintaining that equipment?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Yes. The equipment in the 36 homes is still operating.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I would like to ask of the minister. I first of all would like to make a comment on the total budget, or the lack of budget, and say that we in the opposition are very disappointed in the cut-backs in staff

and disappointed with the low profile that Environment will be given over the coming years. And I suppose that's not too surprising when at the Open for Business Conference and the messages that were sent out to the private sector from other areas of the world was that this government would cut that sort of thing, and that those types of regulations would not be too strictly enforced. But I think that for the people of Saskatchewan the result of that kind of a policy are going to be devastating over the coming years, and we will soon find that cuts in the areas like land protection and mines and pollution control where the staff was cut by almost 50 per cent, that those kinds of cuts will soon come back to haunt us. My initial question to you, Mr. Minister, is in the area of the Richardson oil spill. Can you give us an update on to your involvement of your department in that oil spill, and what repercussions you see coming out of that for the Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, my understanding is that Energy and Mines has been the lead group in regards to it. All we are doing is monitoring it and giving advice. Basically, we have nothing to do with the clean-up. We're there for information and to make sure it's done. But Energy and Mines has been the lead group doing it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I imagine Energy and Mines has an interest. I think, in the not so distant future, the Department of the Environment would have had a particularly keen interest in the fact that many, many thousands of gallons of oil spilt onto land in Saskatchewan. I'm surprised that you say this isn't important, and that you're allowing another department to take a lead role. What I would like to know from you is whether or not the burning off of the oil . . . What kind of an area we are talking about. Because I'm sure if you've been involved in this before, you will know that in burning off oil on . . . The topsoil of that area is not productive for many, many years afterwards. Can you give me an idea of the number of acres that were involved in the burn-off in the Richardson area?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, in regards to the hon. member's question, first of all, as he well knows, we do care about what goes on. Second of all, is that Marathon Oil would be responsible financially if there is a financial responsibility for whatever damage is done on the property. They were the company involved.

In regards to the clean-up, our concern was that it didn't get into the rivers, into the Wascana Creek, that we don't . . . That was our main concern. We are to monitor, and be sure that it was in place, that it didn't happen. That is the role of the Department of the Environment - to regulate and be sure that the controls are there, and that's exactly what we've been doing. The policy that we enforce, it's the same policy that was there before. It hasn't been changed. There has been no direction to change it whatsoever because it was doing a good job. We recognize it. You don't change every policy when you come in. That's one of the policies that wasn't changed. So if it wasn't doing good before, I'd like to know about it so I could change what is necessary.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, as the minister will know, it's not the policy that's written on paper that counts. It's the enforcement of policy. My question to the minister was: how many acres were involved in the burn-off of the oil? The original question was: how many acres will be affected by the company? Whether you're saying it's Marathon Or Murphy Oil, or whoever it might be, can you give me an indicating of how many acres were actually burnt off?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — You were probably right that it was Murphy Oil, first of all, but second of all, in regards to, you were saying, about the policy carried out, the same

people are working in the same department. It hasn't been changed, so I would hope that they're carrying out the same type of policy.

In regards to the acreage, we don't have the number of acres, but we'll get it for you and we'll forward it to you.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's surprising the minister wouldn't have that kind of information with him when it's a very current event and one that on a day-to-day basis, I imagine, his department is monitoring and I would have thought would have known that in a moment.

The other information I would like on that oil spill . . . You say that it's not Marathon Oil but Murphy Oil. I would like that clarified, also, how many gallons of oil were spilled and whether or not any of that oil is ending up in the water that's running into the major water basin of the Qu'Appelle. If you'll give me an outline of where that's at and whether or not you're expecting a report from Murphy Oil, if that will be made available and made public . . .

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, my understanding is there was an estimated 40,000 to 80,000 gallons. I don't think anybody has a direct figure on that. And it's my understand also that a little bit got into the Wascana Creek, that's it's being contained by booms so it doesn't get away, and they're sucking it off with vacuums to clean it up. I think it's going along quite well. I think that the company - and I don't know the name of the company. I stand to be correct. I might have made a mistake one way or the other, but whatever it is, they're monitoring it. They're doing exactly as being directed by the Department of Energy and Mines and also from advice from the Department of Environment.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, am I correct in assuming that the reports were accurate which said that there would be no charges laid in this incident?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — I'm not sure if there's any . . . I've had no discussions on whether charges will be laid or not. I'm not sure if it was the fault of the company or whether it was the fault of nature. The ruption of oil lines could easily be a ruption of frozen ground heaving, and that would be an occurrence that nobody could control. If there was negligence there, well, I suppose then that's the time you would consider it. It may not be negligence because we all know water lines break and oil lines break and everything else, and I suppose that's . . . You know, that's one of the hazards the company goes through and the rest of us. The thing is to clean it up and get it cleaned up properly and to do it right. And they have worked very co-operative with us and have done everything that's been asked to do. I feel that that is a responsibility of theirs and they've carried it out, and we haven't asked anything more of them.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, you'll be well aware that there is a considerable difference between water lines bursting and oil lines bursting. I'm sure that that doesn't take a great deal of explanation to realize that when a water line bursts there's very little environmental damage. But what I would like to also remind you is that if an oil company, in creating profits, has a pipeline which is worn out and is no longer serving the purpose, they will consider, if there are strict environmental laws, whether they replace that line at 20 years or 40 years. The point that I'm making is that if they are allowed to carry out oil spills with no repercussions, either from the Department of Environment or Energy and Mines, that they will allow those pipelines to stay in long

after they should be replaced. And I think it's your job and your responsibility as a minister to see that these regulations are enforced. And oil companies have been known to allow pipelines to get into a state of disrepair where you're having oil pipelines burst on quite a regular basis. What I would like to find out from you is whether or not you can tell me how old this pipeline was, and whether or not the company has plans to replace that section of the pipeline where the break occurred.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Well, it really falls under Energy and Mines.

Mr. Vice-Chairman: — Can we have order so that the minister can answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — It hasn't been used for about three years, my understanding is - that's only an understanding. I'm not sure of the facts there, but we can get you the information and send it to you. In regards to all that points, I don't think there's anything that we can do other than to make sure it's cleaned up. They've had a . . . I'm sure that there is a need of a pipeline . . . (inaudible) . . . The expense has been very great; they've lost a great number of gallons of oil. The cost has been extremely high cleaning it up, and if it continues that, you know, the cost gets very high. So I'm sure as a company, if it's not a good pipe they would look at it. As a province, we certainly will get the information for you to find out how old it is, the quality of the pipe, and have it monitored.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to change to a different topic, and that has to do with an earlier comment you made about studies and reviews being made on major projects in the province. Are you telling us that every major project that goes ahead in the province of Saskatchewan, that you do a major environmental review on?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — No, I didn't say every major development gets an impact assessment done. I said, if it doesn't meet the requirements of all or there could be a social or economic or environmental problem there, it may be asked to be done. I think that's been the normal procedure before. So nothing has changed that way.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the issue of an upgrade, Mr. Minister, can you tell me whether or not any studies are under way at the present time, dealing with the location of an oil upgrader in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — We haven't done any studies that I'm aware of. Our department doesn't do any studies. If there's some going on, I'm unaware of it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, in regards to people who work in your department and work for you, I understand that Mr. Muirhead is a Legislative Secretary to you. Can you tell me what his expenses are for the present year, whether or not you have a budget set up within your department for that, and if so, what it would be?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — As far as I know for '83-84, no; we have no additional budget set up for '83-84 at all this year.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, it is funded out of your department, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — The Legislative Secretary is funded out of the Executive Council.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Including all the expenses that would be associated with that

position?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — My understanding is we pay his vehicle expenses.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, his vehicle expenses would be what? Is he . . . Does he have a CVA vehicle at his disposal or has he got a car that was purchased particularly for him? Or does he use one out of the pool?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — My understanding is that he can have a pool car if he's doing government business, we're sending him out on behalf of myself or to do something. If he used it for other than that, and I think it's normal procedure - everybody's in the same position - if he uses it for his own personal, he has to pay personal expenses on it.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 p.m.