

May 24, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

**CLERK:** — I'd like to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present today to open this sitting.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. MULLER:** — It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to this legislature a group of students from the Wild Rose Central School. There's 20 students. The teacher is Mr. Robert McKenzie, and parent, Mrs. Mackie.

This is quite a famous area just north of Holbein . . . One of the longest running 4-H clubs, beef clubs, in all of Saskatchewan — very competitive, I must say, because children from Foxdale have had to compete against them for years, and they are quite famous for that.

I would ask . . . first of all, I should say that we're going to be meeting for pictures and drinks at 2:30 . . . I would ask all members of the legislature to greet them here, and I wish them a safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. FOLK:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the MLA from Rosthern, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of 20 students from Langham Elementary School in Langham. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Roberta Loder, and by their bus driver, Stan King.

I would ask all members of the legislature here today to join me in welcoming them here and wish them a very happy visit to Regina, and an enjoyable day.

Thank you very much.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PARKER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of young visitors visiting us today from Pense School at Pense, Saskatchewan. The group is seated in the Speaker's gallery and consists of 27 students accompanied by their teacher and chaperon, Mrs. Debbie Quinlan and Miss Alexander.

I understand the group has had a tour of the legislature, and I trust that you found it to be informative and educational. I trust you'll also find question period to be the same way. I hope that you find your stay in Regina very, very interesting, and I wish you a safe trip back to Pense.

I would like to ask the members to join with me in extending a cordial welcome to the group.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Rights of Saskatchewan Water Corporation Employees

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I direct my question to the minister in charge of the new water corporation. My question deals with the proposed Saskatchewan Water Corporation and your government's decision to set itself above the law in dealing with the future employees of this corporation.

By way of information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the majority of the water corporation's staff will be transferred from other government departments and agencies where they have rights under existing contracts or collective agreements with your government. And a section of The Water Corporation Act says that your government will not have to honour any of these agreements.

In other words, you have unilaterally and arbitrarily decided to wipe out the seniority rights and other benefits built up by these employees. You have unilaterally and arbitrarily decided, as well, that you will not honour their current salary levels. In fact, the water corporation legislation even takes away the little bit of protection these workers now enjoy against unjust dismissals.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: why have you taken this arbitrary and unilateral action?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, first of all a few clarifications in terms of preamble. It's important to point out to the legislature and to the people of the province that a goodly number of the people who are coming to the water Crown — perhaps as many as half — I can determine that, but a goodly number — are coming from non-SGEU membership. The Saskatchewan Water Supply Board, for instance, is non-unionized, and it is our opinion that these people should have the opportunity to make a decision.

What we have done in the legislation is leave it open so that, once the corporation is in place, the employees will have the right to choose the bargaining agent that they determine is best for their purposes. I think it's also important to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in the Crown structure today the only Crowns that are represented by SGEU are the treasury board Crowns. Sask Housing, for example, Sask Tel, Sask Power, SGI are unionized, do not have SGEU representation. Saskoil is non-unionized.

What we are saying, and what we have said to the people who are moving — and I should point out here as well that no one was forced to move — the option was presented; the opportunity was presented to move to the Crown. Those people have been told, and it is true that they will maintain the salary scales that they are at, unless there is a promotion involved and it's higher. They will have a benefit package that is comparable, at worst, to the one they have now.

And so I don't believe that it's fair to call giving a group of people an opportunity to choose their bargaining unit . . . I hardly see that as arbitrary.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A new question. Mr. Minister, you have, I think, thrown a red herring into the discussion by suggesting that those who would have been transferred through The Water Corporation Act . . . those who would have been transferred from the water board would have automatically been part of the SGEU.

Admittedly, there's something to sort out, but surely, Mr. Minister, that is an argument for the careful process of consultation with those workers and their representatives to make sure that the change-over goes smoothly. It's not an argument, I would suggest, for the kind of arbitrary meat-axe approach which you've taken.

I ask: did you sit down with these employees and their representatives to try and settle on a process for redefining their duties and responsibilities. Did you even try consultation before you brought in the meat axe of section 12 of The Water Corporation Act?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll try and handle this with a straight face. We have simply put in place a process where the people who form the employees of the Saskatchewan Water Crown will have the opportunity to choose the bargaining unit that they feel is best suited to their needs. I have tremendous problems seeing what the problem is. No one has complained to us. None of the employees have said anything about losing pay or benefits, or the only complaint seems to be coming from the Larry Browns of the world.

I don't see . . . (inaudible) . . . We sat with the people who were moving, explained to them what the process was; that they would have the wage level they were at; that the benefit package, while not determined, would at least be as good as the one, quite possibly better than the package they have today.

And once again, it's a matter of freedom of choice, and if the party opposite is against freedom of choice, I don't know what I can say.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think the phrase you're looking for is "right to work," not "freedom of choice." That is really what you're doing, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, what you're also doing, I think, is setting yourself above the law. Essence of the section is that you exempt yourself from section 37 of The Trade Union Act, and that section specifically prohibits employers from taking advantage of employees by . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. Order. Does the member have a question?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question is, Mr. Minister: why do you set yourself above the law by exempting yourself from section 37, which is the meat of what you're doing in section 12.

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Speaker, once again I don't think anyone here is attempting to set themselves above the law or above anything else. We are putting in place a process that gives people the right to make a choice, and if that is against the law in this province, I suggest that . . . (inaudible) . . . Those people may choose the bargaining unit that they want to represent them.

I would remind you once more that a considerable number of the people who are coming to the water Crown are not members of SGEU. It seems reasonable to let those people become members of the water Crown and make a decision, as a body, on how they want to be represented.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A new question, Mr. Minister. Section 37 is common to most provinces, and in most provinces it applies to the public and private sector. I ask you, Mr. Minister, why you're different than anyone else who is involved in the process of a reorganization?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only difference here is that we are putting together an organization that will serve a very valuable purpose to the Crown; that in the initial stages it will be largely manned by employees who are currently in various departments of government.

There are also, as I indicated, many people who are not represented by SGEU. What we have done is taken an action that will allow those people to make a choice as to what bargaining unit they wish to be represented by.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question. Mr. Minister, you have not distinguished the water corporation. What you have made abundantly apparent is that there's a double standard. My question, Mr. Minister, is: why the double standard? Is it just force of habit that this government has a double standard everywhere, or do you people believe that somehow or other you should be above the law? My question, Mr. Minister, is: why the double standard?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a little difficult to comprehend. I don't understand what he's talking about — about a double standard. We're giving people the freedom of choice, democratic right. I think that's what this province, this country, is based on: a right to make a decision. And that's what we've done. We took . . . (inaudible) . . . action that, to us, made sense.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the minister agree that this freedom of choice, of which he speaks, gives the senior officers of the new corporation total freedom to dismiss without recourse to seniority, to ignore benefit packages, to ignore all union rights that are now in the union agreements, because none of those contracts will apply, and they will be solely at your mercy until a new contract is in place? Do you agree to that?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Speaker, I will point out to the Leader of the Opposition, the senior management consulted with the individuals who are being offered positions in the water Crown. The point was made that they would maintain their salary levels. Some were promoted and gladly came along. They would have a benefit package that was comparable — probably better. It remains to be seen. But nobody would be demoted. Nobody would lose anything in the transfer. That commitment was made and stands: that they will then have the opportunity to choose a bargaining unit to represent them.

I would point out, as well, that the option of moving was voluntary. Nobody was forced to go to the water Crown. It was pointed out as an option, a job opportunity.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, would the minister explain what sort of options were open to the people, let us say on the water supply board. They didn't need . . . The water supply board was moved holus-bolus. Now my question to you is: what option did they have? I'm aware they're non-union; this is not the point. My question is: what option did they have but to accept the holus-bolus transfer of their organization to the water corporation?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Minister, the members of the water supply board did not have an option if they were to stay in those positions. But I believe it is the point of the whole discussion. The members of the water supply board are non-union. I think they had every bit as many rights to be defended as SGEU does, and it's simply a matter of putting an organization in place where people can make a choice. That's what we're giving them.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that you seem to think that the people who had been in the water supply board, if transferred to the water corporation, would be somehow made to join some union, would you explain why you weren't willing to leave everybody with their freedom of choice? Those who were non-union would work for the new corporation and still be non-union, and those who were union would work for the new corporation and still be union, until they had an opportunity to resolve the situation in accordance with the law as it now exists and applies to all other employers. Why would you not do that?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Speaker, I suppose one could argue about staff morale and organization and trying to make the thing work. I think even the members opposite will admit that the concept is important to the future of this province. The intent is to let everyone make their own decision. They can choose to be unionized, they can choose to be non-unionized, they can choose the bargaining agent the union may want. Where's the problem?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — A final supplementary. Would the minister acknowledge that the problem lies in the fact that until they get a new certification and a new contract they're totally at the mercy of the minister and his decisions, and that so many people have already suffered from decisions by you or your colleagues that they are naturally and understandably apprehensive?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there was a question, but I will tell the Leader of the Opposition that if, in the period before a decision is made, any one of those employees has a complaint about the way they're handled, then come in and rake us over the coals, and it's legitimate. I'll guarantee you that they will be looked after and looked after well, and they will be free to make their own decision.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — One final new question on this matter, Mr. Minister. Will you admit, Mr. Minister, what is common knowledge, that your government is fundamentally opposed to allowing public servants the democratic right to bargain collectively, and you lose no opportunity to chip away at the right of public servants to bargain collectively, and that's what you're doing here? Will you admit, Mr. Minister, that this section is explicable only by your government's hostility to treating public servants as full citizens with the democratic right to bargain collectively?

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you look at this in an objective manner, you will find that we have given these people the right to make a decision, the right to bargain collectively, as they choose.

### **Occupational Therapist Program**

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It has to do with an area, Mr. Minister, where there is a chronic shortage of skilled employees and, of course, I'm referring to occupational therapists in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, you will know that it's well documented in the 1982 Saskatchewan task force report on rehabilitation. The crying need for occupational therapists has been established.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, at this time have you got plans to set up a program and fulfil the need in the province, of about 35 occupational therapists a year, at a time when the unemployment rate among young people is, as you have admitted, 18 per cent. We have here an area where there is a need for trained and skilled people and, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that the president of the University of Saskatchewan has called for such a program, have you got money in your budget this year to get this program going?

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Well, I'd like to thank the hon. member for raising this particular question. I've read a little bit about it in the media in Saskatoon in the last couple of weeks. If I could point out what the options are that we currently have with occupational therapy, and that is not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deny that there is, in fact, a need for trained occupational therapists within the province. We're not in any disagreement about that. We have three options, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is that an idea he's got, or is it just a stowaway in his head?

Three options, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The University of Regina is in the process of making a proposal to train the occupational therapists. The University of Saskatchewan, via the president, has made some kind of offer that he would, in fact, be interested in having the program if additional funding were to become available to the university. The third option is the interprovincial training agreement which we're currently pursuing, which gives us training places at universities in other provinces. At the moment, the third option happens to be the most cost-effective.

And one other point I would like to make for the benefit of the hon. member is, although the University of Saskatchewan president may, in fact, be in favour of the proposal, we have excellent indication from individual faculty members and others at the U of S, from the Faculty of

Medicine, that should any additional funds become available, occupational therapy would not, in fact, be one of their priorities.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, of the three options, the choice of going out of province and paying another university to hire professors and to train students, in let's say Alberta or British Columbia, where only 50 per cent of those people who are trained and paid for by the taxpayers of the province will come back to the province, I think is an erroneous choice on your part.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could inform the Assembly whether or not you have an agreement presently under way, or in the process of being completed, with the University of British Columbia, for 12 spaces in the coming year?

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — There is a discussion that is taking place. There has been no final decision reached yet. It is for 12 places at UBC, in addition to five places at U of A and four at U of M.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, supplementary. I would wonder if you could elaborate on the program that you're in the process of purchasing from the University of British Columbia, and the cost of this program. What will the taxpayers of the province be paying in order that a number of young people will have to travel out of the province to get their education? Statistics will show that only 50 per cent . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order.! Order, order! Order. The member from Shaunavon knows that on a supplementary question you're not allowed a statement before or after the question.

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You want a specific cost figure of the proposal? In the year 1985-86 program year, the number of students enrolled, estimated cost per student approximately \$10,000 per student, for a cost of approximately \$122,000. That would be the cost for that year.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, whether or not you see a problem with shipping . . . sending young people out of the province, when the president of the university says that already 50 per cent of the classes needed to complete the course in occupational therapy are in place at the university. Would it not make more sense, when we're talking about bringing the young people home, that a program would be set up in Saskatchewan, paid for in Saskatchewan, so that the people, when they're graduating, will work here in the province in the nursing homes and the home care programs and the other areas where they're very much needed?

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the long term, perhaps what the hon. member is suggesting would be something worth while and a worthwhile goal to pursue. I've already indicated it is not a priority within the University of Saskatchewan.

If the president thinks it is, he should perhaps speak to his Faculty of Medicine and perhaps some . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The board of governors runs the university, for the information of the hon. member. I thought he may have realized that.

If the president, however, in making his public statements, would care to discuss this at a board of governors' meeting, having had discussions with the Faculty of Education, he might understand that it is not a high priority within that faculty. And the 50 per cent of the classes to which he's referring — which, yes, are being taught there — they want to keep for the priorities they have already set for themselves.

And if we're talking about students out of the province, I would remind the hon. member about

the vet college we have operating in Saskatoon which covers not only western Canada, but we draw students from all over the rest of the country as well.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask the minister the question, whether or not the minister is saying that the University of Saskatchewan is not in agreement with the statement of the president that an occupational therapy course at the university in Saskatoon is wanted and needed by the University of Saskatchewan and the board of directors.

**HON. MR. MAXWELL:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I have indicated is that the president has indicated he is interested in having the program. To the best of my knowledge the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Medicine is not particularly interested. It is not one of their priorities.

### **Rafferty Dam Project**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. I direct a question to the Premier about the status of . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. I want to ask the Premier about the status of the Rafferty dam project.

Last summer he indicated to the public that, “We’re taking a good hard look at it,” I think were the words he used. I wonder if he could give me a brief update on where it stands.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been continuing to do research on the demand for electricity and power in the province of Saskatchewan and looking at alternatives. One of the alternatives may be an additional power project near the Souris River. If that’s the case, there’s two alternatives to cool the project: one would be air, and the other would be water.

The United States is interested in water management. The Governor of North Dakota and I will be meeting in Estevan in early June to further discuss the implications of water management to the Dakotas and Manitoba, as well. So it’s an ongoing process.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, and possibly to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The reason for my curiosity is a series of agreements that Saskatchewan Power Corporation has recently signed with farmers and landowners in the area of the Souris River valley which, at least in part, would be affected by a Rafferty dam project. And the minister may be familiar with the type of agreement — “feasometer” installation and access agreements. And I have a copy of the agreement here. It gives the SPC the right to undertake a series of water table level tests on the area in question for a fee, and it’s to be a three-year agreement with an option of renewal by the SPC, which suggests that the SPC has a continuing and long-term interest in this area.

The question that I ask is this: is the Premier aware of these agreements, and can he explain the purpose for which the power corporation is seeking three or six-year agreements to do water table studies in the Souris River valley?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the event that we did use water as a system of cooling, that we should be doing some research to know that if it’s possible, and to study the whole water level and the environment around the area. So I suppose it’s preliminary research to know what’s possible in the area if we decided to choose that option.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Brief supplementary there. The question I really ask is this: is the research being undertaken in preparation for the consideration of a dam project, the Rafferty dam project, or is it in research in consideration of some other research, not necessarily associated with Rafferty dam?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can take notice with respect to the various

reasons that the research may be going on, but it may be tied to both. It may be due to the Rafferty project and it may be due to some other.

### **Media Reception at Hotel Saskatchewan**

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — While I'm on my feet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took notice of a question yesterday, and I could just report to the Leader of the Opposition that the reception that he had asked me about yesterday was hosted by the private sector, and will be paid for by the private sector.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary then to the Premier, if I may say so. Could the Premier again offer some explanation as to why a reception hosted by the private sector would have the bill sent to Michael Leddy, care of the Premier's office, Room 7? Could you offer a comment as to what agency in the private sector is using your office as a mailing address?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier, that we were showing these particular movie producers and other people parts of the province, to show them the kinds of things that they might want to be looking at in terms of making a movie.

And if the hotel's decided to send the bill here . . . I haven't received a bill, so I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition got it, but that's the only explanation that I can give.

### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

#### **Local Government Finance Commission**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members of this House will recall that in the budget speech on March 21st of this year we indicated that our government would be establishing a local government finance commission to review the overall financing of local government in the province of Saskatchewan.

I believe that that announcement, quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a very — and was a very important announcement with regard to that budget speech.

Today I would like to announce the make-up of the commission that will be established, and I am pleased to announce that the chairman of the commission will be one Ray Clayton, who will be leaving his position as deputy minister of education at the end of the month to devote full time to this particular commission.

Perhaps, as members of this House may or may not be aware, Mr. Clayton has been in the employ of the provincial government for some 19-odd years now. He has served three administrations. He has served in the area of Finance; he has served in the area of Urban Affairs; he has served, most recently, as deputy minister of education.

In the early days, in 1965 when Mr. Clayton first came to work for government, one of his jobs in the area of municipal affairs was to set up and put in place the first equalization grant program for rural municipalities. That was a fairly much of a model type program, and I think one that we can be proud of, and that has served us well.

I believe Mr. Clayton's experience with government and, particularly, his experience in his capacity with government, dealing with local governments, will serve us well, will serve the province well on this particular commission.

There will be seven other members of the commission, Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Don Rowlatt, who is associate deputy minister in charge of tax and fiscal policy in the Department of Finance will act as vice-chairman.



The government then asked the three various groups of local governments to appoint people to it: that is SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association), SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities). We have received those nominations from those three local government organizations and the people appointed, accordingly, will be Ike Thiesson, who is a farmer from the Aberdeen area, currently an executive member of SARM, and will represent that organization.

Representing SUMA will be Ted Brady, past president of SUMA, and presently the president of the national counterpart organization. Mr. Brady, as perhaps most of us know, is a businessman, farmer, and cattleman from Carlyle.

Representing SSTA will be one Nick Volk, a farmer from the Unity area, and who is also past president of that organization.

We have also named three members at large for the commission. They are as follows: a Mrs. Lol O'Shaughnessy of Prince Albert, a former council member, and a person with great interest in community affairs; a Mr. Herve Langlois, superintendent of administration for the Saskatoon Public School Division; and a Mr. Bob Linner, city commissioner of the city of Prince Albert.

We believe that this group assembled is a very capable and competent group and will be able to go in with their background in a variety of fields, whether it is in rural local government, in city government, or in school government, or as they relate to other forms.

Now obviously we were not able to incorporate every group that this commission could, in fact, impact on. We believe we've done a . . . have been able to assemble a very reasonable group of individuals to look at the broad range of problems associated with the funding of local government, now and into the next decade.

We believe that this is an important vehicle that we will use. We would wish them well, and we hope that when they come back with an initial report, which hopefully would be this fall, it would likely be that the commission would carry on for two to three years, that it will serve the government well, it will serve the people of Saskatchewan well and, by and large, it will serve local government well. Because if we are to go forward into the 1980s and the 1990s, I do believe that we must relook at this whole concept as to how we finance local government. With that, Mr. Speaker . . .

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Acting Speaker, I reply briefly to the ministerial statement of the Minister of Finance. I don't have a copy, so I was making notes, and I think I got the gist of the statement. I have no quarrel with the persons named to the committee, most of whom I know, and those I know I find to be able people who will make a substantial contribution to the commission.

I noted that there did not appear to be anybody who had any experience in the municipal field in the city of Regina, the city of Saskatoon, or the city of Moose Jaw. And since the problems of those cities are material, and a major part of the financing of local government, the minister may, if he's making further appointments, take that into consideration. I'm aware of the fact that Mr. Brady, in his capacity as president of SUMA, has some considerable second-hand knowledge of the problems of those cities and, accordingly, I am not suggesting that the concerns of those cities will go unvoiced.

I would make only one further comment. The minister indicates that the commission won't be reporting, in all probability, for a couple of years. It may well, then, not be reporting to the government which sits opposite, and, in any case, it is highly unlikely that the government that sits opposite will have any occasion to act on the commission report in this term of office. I am not dealing with the question of who would deal with it following the next election, but I do not

wish this government to be hiding behind the fact that they have appointed a commission to continue its policy of underfunding local governments.

Nobody who has talked to a school board member in Saskatchewan in the last period of time can find an occasion — that may overstate it only somewhat. The great bulk of school board people who talk to me say they're not getting enough money. And this can be solved, solved without waiting for the commission recommendations. Similarly, I think some of our local governments are under a good deal of pressure.

I ask the government only this: please do not use the fact that you have appointed a commission and are reviewing a problem as an excuse for underfunding local governments who have such an important responsibility to discharge in the service of the people of Saskatchewan.

### **Summary of Department of Environment's Future Plans**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. Today I'd like to give a brief summary of the Department of Environment's future plans. I'd like to outline some of the new initiatives which the Department of Environment has planned for the year ahead.

Saskatchewan is very fortunate to have a healthy environment. As Minister of Environment it is my responsibility to ensure that the enhancement and protection of this environment is carried out. My department must ensure that clean air, clean soil and subsoil, clean surface and ground water can be enjoyed by the one million residents of this region for many years to come.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would . . . We have incredible wealth and potential wealth in this province. But it also deserves careful attention and proper management in each of these main areas — air, water, and land protection. We have implemented new legislation, regulations, guide-lines, and programs to deal directly with some of the problems we face, or could potentially face.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the goal of my department is to take preventive measures now to prevent a problem before it happens, rather than correct a problem after it exists. To outline our proposed plan of activities for the fiscal year ahead I'd like to announce the following initiatives:

First of all, a new Department of the Environment act, an environmental management and protection act, which will be announced today, giving a clear mandate for the department.

Seven regional offices will be established throughout the province to provide our communities with technical advice and assistance in operating their sewage works, water works, and landfill sites.

Initiation of a site selection process for hazardous waste treatment and disposal facilities through the appointment of a site selection committee.

Revisions and upgrading of The Air Pollution Control Act and its regulations. Further, air emission guide-lines will be issued for the new thermal power plants and heavy oil upgraders.

New uranium and mining regulations will be enacted, and negotiations will be initiated with the federal government to clarify the regulatory process.

A white paper on The Litter Control Act will be issued in the fall to allow for the updating of the act and regulations.

An environmental hotline will be available to the public, either as a means of information or as a way of alerting the department of some adverse situation.

New regulations governing landfills and hazardous waste will be made available for public review and comment.

Department staff shall be working with industry in an effort to reduce the amount of hazardous waste being generated in the province, and to encourage further recycling.

Updated regulations governing water quality and controlling water pollution will be enacted.

New coal reclamation guide-lines will be issued for the Estevan area.

And last of all:

A designation of a number of ecological reserves in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Acting Speaker, more details of these initiatives shall be announced in the weeks and months ahead.

I believe that the citizens of Saskatchewan have a lot to be proud of in this province. And, through initiatives such as the ones I have outlined, I think it clearly shows that this government's intention is to ensure that Saskatchewan retains a very high quality of environment.

Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker. I just would like to say a couple of words in light of the short statement made by the minister. I find it interesting that after over two years he is coming forward with a very brief outline of what he plans to do in his last year as a member of government. I think he has a very short time to do the few things that he is talking about.

But I would like to say that in the past two years some of the things that have happened would indicate that the Minister of the Environment, in charge of the environment, should have looked at the policy of his department earlier on.

Of course I refer to the number of spills at Key Lake, and the lack of the meeting of the monitoring committee at that mine site. yesterday we asked questions of the minister about spraying of Crown land and referred to statements made by the member for Prince Albert, who said:

Hardy is not in a position to make that determination whether the project goes ahead or not. If it meets with the conditions of the environment, he can't tell them what to do.

And, Mr. Minister, I think that the image that the department has, since you have taken over, is one of weakness and one of not defending the environment of this province.

So if you have mended your ways as a result of the question period yesterday, and as a result of other things that have happened over the last six months where we have pushed the minister to become more involved in defending the environment of this province, then I would encourage him to go ahead and do just that.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### **Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Acting Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Local Government Election Act.

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

### **Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting the Practice of Physical Therapy**

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Practice of Physical Therapy.

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

### **Bill No. 73 — An Act to establish the Water Appeal Board**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to enact The Water Appeals Board Act.

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

### **Bill No. 74 — An Act continuing The Department of the Environment**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill, The Department of the Environment Act.

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

### **Bill No. 75 — An Act respecting the Management and Protection of the Environment**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Management and Protection of the Environment.

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

### **Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I want to, with leave, move first reading of a bill to amend The Legal Professions Act.

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

### **Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## SECOND READINGS

**Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in his budget address of March 21, 1984, my colleague, the Hon. Bob Andrew, announced certain tax changes. Bill 68, An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act provides for one of these changes. This bill provides a tax on a package of 25 cigarettes, from 52 cents to 67 cents, effective March 22, 1984, and the tax on 25 grams of fine cut or pipe tobacco goes from 21 to 27 cents.

There's no tax change for a cigar having a retail value of 20 cents or less, but there is a slight increase of 2 cents per cigar selling in the 21 to 40-cent category, and a 12-cent increase for cigar retailing over 40 cents.

Mr. Speaker, these changes will bring our rates closer to the overall average of those in other provinces, and they are expected to yield an additional \$14.3 million in this fiscal year.

The province of Newfoundland still has the highest tax at \$1.19 per package of 25 cigarettes, and they also add on their retail sales tax, as do the provinces of Ontario and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Tobacco Tax Act be read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce bill No. 69, an Act to amend The Liquor Consumption Tax Act.

This bill repeals the requirement of liquor licensees to pay a 10 per cent security deposit at the time of the purchase of liquor. It is normal practice in provinces with sales tax on liquor and other goods to have tax collectors remit their tax collections to the government subsequent to their actual collection.

This practice was not followed in 1979 when the previous administration introduced The Liquor Consumption Tax Act. Under this act, liquor licensees are required to pay a 10 per cent security deposit at the time of the purchase of liquor. The security deposit is subsequently allowed as a credit and deducted from the licensees' future monthly tax remittances.

In our view the security deposit requirement is inequitable because liquor licensees are the only sales tax collectors required to pay a portion of their tax collections in advance. This requirement does not apply to tax collectors under the E&H tax act.

This bill will ensure that liquor licensees are treated in a fair and equitable manner in remitting of tax collections.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 69.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 64 — An Act to provide for the establishment and Maintenance of Public Libraries**

**HON. MRS. SMITH:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Today it's my pleasure to present to this Assembly the second reading of the new Public Libraries Act.

Libraries, as many will know in this Assembly, had their beginnings in this province in 1912, when the open-shelf book service was initiated at the request of the women grain growers. Women, it should be noted, have placed a major role in library development in this province, and still do.

The library system, as we know it today, developed according to the groundwork done by the 1967 library review committee. The corner-stone of the committee's recommendations at that time embraced the concept of uniting all libraries in the province into a co-ordinated, one province system. The success of this concept is very much in evidence today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and is a credit to all those persons who have worked hard in the intervening years to create a system which became a model for regional library development.

Today, library services are considered an essential service in rural and urban communities alike. The development period has passed. The system has matured, and is mature. To properly reflect this maturity, Saskatchewan the government is presenting a new public library act for the consideration of members of this House. Not only does the new act reflect the maturity of the library system, but it will also allow the system to grow and improve as society grows and changes. This is the first major overhaul of The Public Libraries Act since the 1969 legislation which formed the basis of today's system. The new act will strengthen, streamline, and clarify the function of libraries.

The objectives of the new legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are designed to strengthen the research, co-ordination, and the leadership role of the provincial library; to recognize the autonomy and the maturity of the library system; to provide flexibility for libraries to enable them to respond and adapt to local needs as identified; and to clarify the respective roles of regions and local boards; to streamline the decision-making and problem-solving process; and to ensure that participation in the funding process for all participants is as equitable as possible.

The new legislation being proposed will achieve these objectives. That is the objective of it. Further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the legislation is both beneficial to library users, and is, I believe, generally acceptable to the library community. The legislation is the end product of what I consider to be a very extensive consultation process.

The government has consulted closely with both the providers and the users of library services. I believe a consensus has been reached on the future course this legislation will set for libraries in this province. Under these circumstances, I anticipate that perhaps the members opposite will see fit to support the legislation.

The government has consulted closely with both the providers and the users of library services. I believe a consensus has been reached on the future course this legislation will set for libraries in this province. Under these circumstances, I anticipate that perhaps the members opposite will see fit to support the legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before commenting on the legislation specifically, it is important that proper recognition be given to all those who participated in the process of developing contents of this legislation.

Firstly, I would like to commend members of the trustees and the library associations, regional boards and local boards, the legislative review committee, and the public; members of the advisory board, and also public servants, who contributed to the development of what appears to be a consensus for change. Their contributions were made in the spirit of co-operation, dedication, and purpose, which has become the hallmark of that which is made in Saskatchewan.

Now for the contents of the bill before the members of this legislature today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The major thrust of the new library legislation focuses on four basic areas, and these include: (1) updating the mandate of the provincial library; (2) updating and strengthening the mandate of the minister's advisory board; (3) recognizing the Regina, Saskatoon, and the provincial library as provincial resource centres; and (4) providing a framework for consistent and stable growth that reinforces the autonomy of regional libraries.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to comment in some detail on each of these areas . . . First let me address those aspects of the legislation directly affecting the regional and municipal libraries. The one fundamental feature of the library system in this province is, without a word of doubt, local autonomy.

This is recognized in the legislation, and particular care has been taken to preserve the integrity of the grass roots support of the library system. To this end, the legislation will delete the section where the minister may appoint a member to a regional library board with subsequent representation of the member of the executive committee of the board. It will also remove the minister from the approval process related to maintenance and auditing board operations. It will also remove ministerial prerogatives from legislation that allows for systematic reviews of library services in a region.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these deletions recognize, and they give credence to the fact that local board members are responsible custodians of libraries, and they are indeed capable of setting a positive course of action without a ministerial presence in their board rooms.

Further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, steps have been taken and are reflected in the legislation that allows boards to provide the best possible service to library users, an objective that is foremost in their minds. In this regard, the roles and the responsibilities of local boards will be clarified and defined, strengthening the board's ability to act in a decisive manner.

Also, legislation provides increased input for smaller cities in setting local levies which apply to their municipality. The lack of sufficient representation has been a major complaint of the cities as they contribute a high percentage of the regional revenues in relation to their representation on the regional board and executive.

To remedy this situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the legislation stipulates that the municipalities contributing over 25 per cent of the annual municipal grants to a board, the grant increase of that municipality will not come about without its agreement. There are five municipalities affected under this section, including North Battleford, Moose Jaw, Yorkton, Swift Current, and Prince Albert.

Another positive feature of this legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, focuses on regional reference and provincial resource centres. It is recognized that the information explosion of recent years makes it impossible for any library, regardless of size, to provide all the information its users may require. Sharing resources among all libraries will achieve the best services for all library users. At the regional level, such centres can provide a faster and more efficient method of delivering library materials.

And it seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it makes sense that such centres be located in communities within a region. Such centres will provide basic general information frequently in demand. The centres will be governed by a board and receive funds from the region.

Further to this, the two municipal libraries, Saskatoon and Regina, along with the provincial library are being recognized as resource centres at the provincial level. The legislation under consideration will strengthen their role in this regard. Because of their size and their expertise, they can develop as specialized resource centres and provide advanced reference services to participants in the library system. Under this legislation, library materials being held in the system can occur in a very logical and reasonable manner.

Before moving second reading of this bill, it should be noted that the changes in the legislation are aimed at updating and strengthening the roles of the provincial library and the minister's advisory board. As the central advisory group to the minister, this board has played a very major role in the development of Saskatchewan system of libraries. Its new role will centre on the

co-ordination of services, since the library system has eclipsed a development period.

The board will be instrumental in advising myself and library board on matters respecting co-operative initiatives, and on the co-ordinating of library services in this province. An additional responsibility of the board will be that of assisting regions and municipalities to settle their disputes where mediation has failed.

The mediation process for settling disputes between the two parties will be set out in regulations under the act. Either party, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be able to request assistance from the board in settling a dispute that cannot be resolved through mediation.

The new board will have its representation expanded to include the urban and rural municipality associations and other organizations deemed appropriate. The advisory board will comprise not more than 15, and no less than 12 members, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The role of the Saskatchewan library, as it will be called under the new legislation, will be updated and strengthened in a like manner. Except for northern Saskatchewan, implementation of regional libraries is now complete. And consequently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new role of the provincial library will focus on research, co-ordination of services, and effective leadership, in addition to the existing functions in this system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government believes that library services must remain relevant to the needs of the users. Libraries, too, must continue to provide residents in both rural and urban communities with equal access to information. These are challenges that take on major dimensions in the rapidly changing social and technology environment in which we live in today.

I believe the proposed new library legislation will go a long way in assisting libraries in meeting these challenges. Based on the co-operation among municipalities and libraries and the general public, the continued success of the Saskatchewan library system will, indeed, be assured. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with pleasure that I move second reading of Bill No. 64 — The Public Libraries Act.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to join with the Minister of Education and to concur with the facts that, indeed, in Saskatchewan we have had, indeed, set up, prior to this government assuming office, a very remarkable library system throughout Saskatchewan — one that was well recognized and acknowledged as being one of the best library systems in Canada.

And I want to indicate that in respect to the process of bringing up to date the act that has been introduced by the minister, I welcome the participation of the very various people that are involved. Certainly that type of input is, indeed, very important. And that, I may say also, had previously been carried on to a large extent when we were in government.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the bill has, as the minister described . . . purports to do a major overhaul of the previous existing legislation. I want the opportunity to have this act reviewed by all parties interested and, accordingly, I want to get some feedback in respect to the proposals that are changed within the act and, accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn debated.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Schoenhals that Bill No. 66 — **An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Water Corporation** be



now read a second time.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to have this opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make a few brief comments on this bill today.

I note with interest that the government has taken more than a year to develop this legislation — more than a year, and more than \$3,000 in studies. And yet it waited until the legislative session was more than 50 days old to introduce this bill, and now calls it right away for debate.

The minister has claimed that this PC government has now produced a plan, a direction, and a structure. Those are his exact words — a plan, a direction, and a structure. The people of Saskatchewan can certainly see that he is trying to produce a structure. That's what this bill is all about. Its only reason and fact is to provide a different administrative structure, a bureaucratic change, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's what this bill is really all about.

To be sure, we hear the government claims that it has what the minister talked about — a plan, a direction regarding Saskatchewan's water resources. But we have to ask the minister: where is that plan? What is the plan of this government re water resources? Where is the direction, and what is the direction?

Major questions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but no answers. So in short, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this bill is already a disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan. No clear water policy, no plan, no direction. Just a bureaucratic structure.

And I would just like to touch on a related matter for just a moment. We understand from the minister's remarks and other evidence that the government intends to amalgamate the water supply board, plus some services in the Department of the Environment, Urban Affairs, and Agriculture. That means that some 150 or so provincial government employees will be directly and immediately affected.

I would ask the minister to explain a few things at this time, if he will. Just which employees will be affected? How will they be affected? Will they be given the same cruel freedom of choice — termination made famous by the Minister of Highways? How will their present seniority and benefits be affected by the minister's bill and his plans? These employees and the people of Saskatchewan deserve a clear and immediate answer to these questions.

The minister and his colleagues have said a good deal about how they are now sure to resolve the major water issues in Saskatchewan with their new bureaucratic solution. This is a Crown corporation. But while we hear them mention the problems, we don't hear them mention the solutions. And the people are already beginning to ask: how will this new corporation address and resolve the problems in our communities?

No solution to the Moose Jaw water pipeline. Last year, New Democrats and others told this PC government that good water means jobs, and good water makes sense. We indicated to this government (and as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been studies carried out by the hon. member for Arm River), and his recommendations to the government were that a pipeline should be built, that that was the best way to serve the water needs of the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. And we indicated at that time that we supported that glossary, and we indicated that if they were to build that pipeline that it would create many jobs in building the pipeline. It would also create many jobs at Ipsco where the employees at Ipsco would be producing the pipe for the pipeline, and they most certainly need that type of security, and the contracts that would go along with the pipeline.

It would also mean good water for the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw, and I don't think anybody can question the fact that that is a need, and it's a very important need, and one that is not being addressed properly in this province. The cities of Regina and Moose Jaw have been led to

believe, through budgets and through promises, and through hearings that were held by the member for Arm River and his commission, that the water problems would be solved and that a pipeline would be forthcoming. However, today we have not seen that. We still have no commitment on the pipeline. A new corporation, but really no solutions to the problems.

What about the need for improved sewage treatment facilities in many of our communities, including Saskatoon? There is still no solution there, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What about complaints about water quality in Rosetown, or in the R.M. of Laird? Still no solutions, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And what about the complaints to this Conservative government about inadequate provincial assistance for municipal water projects from Estevan, Moose Jaw, and Yorkton? Still no solutions. And what about the difficult policy issues surrounding drainage, irrigation, and watershed management? The minister claims that this bill provides solutions, but he knows it does not. The issues remain the same. The problems remain.

We note that the minister has not claimed that this Conservative government has allocated more money for water programs. There is no substantial increase in their recent budget. Just about \$30 million for a wide range of water-related programs and services — just about the same as last year.

I would like to express a particular disappointment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the minister and this government have once again neglected northern Saskatchewan with their water corporation, and with their water policy. Why is there no reference to the huge Churchill watershed and basin, nor the huge Athabasca and the Great Slave Lake basins in north-western Saskatchewan?

More than 90 per cent of Saskatchewan water resources, of course, are in the North, and yet we have no acknowledgement of this by the minister — no mention of the unique characteristics of our northern communities, northern residents' economic reliance on water resources.

We see the clear-cutting of our forests, and we see that a lot of our rivers and streams are drying up in northern Saskatchewan — just another example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of how this Conservative government has abandoned the people and the communities of northern Saskatchewan.

To conclude these brief remarks today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to summarize some of the major reasons why the people of Saskatchewan have become disillusioned with the PC government — disappointment that has been reinforced, once, again, by the bill now before us.

The people are tired of the government's hollow boasting that it is solving the water policy problems. All it is doing is a bureaucratic tinkering. No recognition of the urgent need for financial assistance for municipal water projects, no resolution of watershed management issues, no concrete, positive action — just studies, more talk, and a new structure, and one more example of how this government is ignoring and abandoning the people.

With these brief comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my remarks on the bill today. We will likely have more comments and questions for the minister when the bill reaches committee. I will not be opposing the bill in principle at this stage.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**HON. MR. SCHOENHALS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to close debate on this motion, I must say that I'm pleased to see that the opposition are supporting this bill. Obviously it is a bill that brings into place an organization and a structure that has been long needed in this province.

In responding to a few of the remarks of the hon. member in his comments, I would simply say he referred to the factor of time, that it has taken a while for this to be brought forward. I would

suggest to him in response that, yes, it's taken a little time, but what you see is a rather thorough investigation of an awful lot of problems, some of which he mentioned and, in fact, a plan and a structure that will have some very long-lasting and far-reaching effect on the province of Saskatchewan. I believe the members opposite agree.

He indicated that the bill was nothing more than a bureaucratic shuffling. The only comments there that I would argue with are the "nothing more" part. Yes, it's a bureaucratic shuffling because it was long, long overdue. In this province in recent years it's been impossible to get a single irrigation project under way, far less something as far-reaching as some of the items that he mentioned in his comments. There is no question that a bureaucratic shuffling or reshuffling was necessary in order for the people of the province to come to understand what was, in fact, in place to deal with water problems.

I'm not sure that that's necessarily an indictment of the previous administration. I think it's something that evolved over time. Maybe in some cases it was handy to have that there. It enabled you not to bother making decisions and you could simply shuffle paper around through various departments. We don't propose to follow that tactic, which was a very common one of the previous administration.

He mentioned a number of projects that are certainly long-standing in this province, a number of problems. I would suggest to him that none of those are new. I don't think he named one single problem that has been identified since April 26 of 1982. Those problems have been around for a long time.

We have attempted to put something in place that will deal with some of these things, and I would be pleased to answer specific questions when we come to committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that this legislation, as I indicated, will be a very meaningful piece of legislation, will have a tremendous impact, over time, on this province. It is, in fact, unique in Canada — possibly in North America — and put Saskatchewan in the forefront of dealing with this resource which, I think everyone agrees, is one of our most valuable resources.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Schoenhals that Bill No. 67 — **An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Water Corporation Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

#### ENVIRONMENT

#### Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister please introduce his officials?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left here, I have Alan Carr, deputy minister of environment; behind me, I have Hugo Maliepaard, executive director of assessment and co-ordination; and right directly behind me, I have Bill Howard, executive director of environmental protection services.

#### Item 1

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Minister, I have several important issues I'd like to address under estimates of Environment. They are, basically, items related to the major hydro developments at Nipawin, and also Sandy Bay. Those developments affect Cumberland House, Pelican Narrows, Sandy Bay, Sturgeon Landing, and surrounding communities mentioned, such as Nipawin. And also I'd like to address with you the spraying projects that have occurred in northern Saskatchewan, and also the spraying that will occur in the future.

I'd like to also address issues related to acid rain, and compensation that's been paid out to Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting from Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

I'd like to, more specifically, Mr. Minister, I'd like to begin with the area of spraying of valuable forest resource in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, I want to address more specifically the spraying that's being done by Woodland Enterprises, as I mentioned earlier this week during question period. The minister will confirm . . . the minister confirmed that his department is powerless and that because the federal departments of agriculture and environment gave Du Pont of Canada permission to experiment with chemicals containing 2,4-D, the province can do nothing to stop it.

Mr. Minister, this is unacceptable. Woodland Enterprises is a division of PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company), a company owned by your government. As the owner, you could refuse to do the spraying. As the minister responsible for Saskatchewan's environment, you can tell Ottawa you won't allow Saskatchewan's North or any part of our province to be used — to be used as a testing ground to experiment with the defoliant sprays.

Earlier this month, Mr. Minister, American chemical companies were ordered to make restitution to Vietnam veterans exposed to agent orange, an ingredient of which is 2,4-D. Court action is under way in New Brunswick respecting defoliant spray programs which took place in the 1950s and the 1960s, when spray containing 2,4-D was used to kill brush, clearings, etc.

Mr. Minister, chemicals containing 2,4-D are known to be disastrous, dangerous, and I want to question, yourself particularly, Mr. Minister: did your department inquire about the chemical Velpar? What is known about it, Mr. Minister? Why was permission given to allow Saskatchewan to be used as a testing ground? And also, was your department consulted prior to the federal government's decision? Did they ask you for input?

And I'll leave it at that for now for your comments, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I don't know what the member was talking about — agent orange. I'm not sure what he was referring to. That's a combination of a lot of sprays before you get to agent orange. What they're doing up there . . . The only test that's been done is of Velpar, which I'm not exactly sure. I don't have the specifics on it, because it's a test pilot type of a spray. What would be done in the 500 acres that's proposed to be sprayed in August — they would use Roundup, which will even be 2,4-D, so I really can see no problem. Roundup is used by many farmers certainly on farms all over the province. I've used it myself, and I'm sure every farmer has.

The only concern or the main concern that we had was if it was near water bodies or if wildlife was involved in it. We'd asked to have those two things identified. We've also asked to have the public completely notified of everything that's going on and to have public consultations. So the public would beware, and they would have their chance to have input in as well.

You fully realize that it's the federal department of agriculture and federal department of environment that approved both of these, and we had some concern over the jurisdictional rights of who should or shouldn't approve sprays. And that's some of the things that would have to be worked out. It should have been worked out a few years ago, and it hasn't been, and I

believe it should be, as well as you.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister advises this Assembly that he is uncertain about what the spray is all about and what its effects will be.

I say to the minister that you've been in office, in your portfolio, for 20 months. You've got the expertise and you've got the authority to look into the spray to find out what the chemical, what type of chemicals are used in that spray and to find out exactly its effects on the North, on the environment and, particularly, the wildlife resource, the water resource, and other renewable resource areas that this spray will have an effect on.

I say that it is your obligation and your duty to find out specifically what kind of effects — harmful or positive, whatever — that the spray will have on that particular environment that this spray is going to be used on as a testing ground, for the people involved in the project.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that this test pilot, this 50 acres, what it's all about is to see what the effect would have on northern forest, or any kind of wildlife, or the lakes, or streams, or anything else around. That's why one of the areas that was picked had no streams, basically, near it. This is a test pilot project.

Agriculture Canada does all these kinds of testing, and they will be sending them to us, and it's an Agriculture Canada test pilot project.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I'll have to get back into very specifics with the Minister for Environment. As I stated before, he's been 20 months in this portfolio, and he's got the expertise, he's got the advisers, he's got the technical staff to check into the matter very carefully.

We have seen other developments in the past that have ignored public participation, consultation, etc. And I have had a good number of calls from people in my constituency, people in northern Saskatchewan, people that will have . . . that are concerned about the possible effects of those spraying projects that your department is endorsing.

And I say to the minister that you ought not be endorsing any test pilot projects until you can assure the people, the communities, and the public — the people of this province — that there will be no harmful effects or side-effects a year from now, five years from now, or 20 years from now, Mr. Minister. Certainly you must have the expertise in your department to ensure that those requirements are had.

And as I was asking you earlier, Mr. Minister, did your department inquire about the chemicals? Was it known . . . What was known about it? Pardon me. Why was the permission given to allow Saskatchewan to be used as a testing ground, as an experiment project? Was your department consulted by the federal government? And, finally, did they ask you for your input, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — My officials say that, first of all, to get all the information from Agriculture Canada is hard to do. They're very reluctant to give us any because it's very confidential, sort of a test. It's a test pilot project with a new type of spray, the one we're talking about.

But going back to the larger one that you're referring to, first of all, be very much aware that 2,4-D and Roundup have been used by farmers in this province for the last I don't know how many years. I think the side effects and all that are known. They're known to the universities; they're known to all the technical people.

Second of all, what it is, it's a new type of forest conservation. It's a test pilot to see if they can increase the productivity of the forest. But I'll just read a little bit of what went on in regards to this one pilot project, the second project that's proposed up there for August.

It started back in March of 1983. The Prince Albert Pulp Company presented a proposal to treat 500 acres of jack pine plantation, and they were asking to use 2,4-D. Since then it's been changed; they're going to use Roundup.

In May, department officials met with wildlife, fisheries, lands, forestry, field services, and Saskatchewan Environment. They all met to discuss this proposal. Those in attendance agreed in principle that the proposal was acceptable, but three requirements had to be met. The three requirements was they had to choose a different location because of the close proximity of a high-profile trout stream.

Second, arrange for the fresh fish water institute to monitor any stream adjacent to the spray area for any impact on the fisheries resource, to prepare a public information package for department approval, and present the package as a public awareness program.

And on top of that, since then, an information package was prepared and has been presented to the company employees, Department of Parks and Renewable Resources, Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce, the Little Bear and Fishing Lakes tourist facilities, and the CBC did an interview.

There's plans for talk shows, to service clubs to go on a talk show on Prince Albert radio, attend cottage association meetings, conduct an advertising program, do newspaper and TV advertising of awareness of it, so the public will have full input into it.

I would have to think that that is making the public aware and the public will have lots of opportunities to, in fact, bring out their points. If they have some concern that we have missed as a department, we as a department feel that if they're using Roundup, it is a known spray used by, I'd say, just about every farmer in Saskatchewan at one time or another.

I can't say much more except that I think it's a test pilot and they meet all the requirements to protect our streams, to protect our wildlife, and that package is in there. I would think that it should be looked at as an experimental program only.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to ask the minister, very specifically, in that area of the spraying project, the immediate area, were there any postings initiated by your department to notify the public about those experiment projects, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, my understanding is it's only accessible by helicopter. It was sprayed by helicopter with a 50-acre area that was not accessible to anybody, and there was nobody in the vicinity at all. It was very low foliage. It was only a few feet high that they were spraying, and it was sprayed by helicopter at a very low altitude, so I don't know what else could be done. I would think that would be as protective as anybody could be.

**MR. YEW:** — And so, Mr. Minister, you're admitting then that the area is not posted. The public and any tourists on any holiday could come in and take a hike into the area and come into contact with this spraying project. And, Mr. Minister, seeing as how you cannot verify that this chemical is not hazardous, they could very well come into contact with something that will definitely have detrimental effects on them. It will certainly have some ill or health effects on people that come into contact with this chemical.

So you just verified with the Assembly then that you have taken no precautions in terms of setting up postings in the area to notify the public — to notify the public of this project.

I'll go on, Mr. Minister, with my next question. I want to ask you very specifically, Mr. Minister: can you assure this House that every precaution that can be taken has been taken, and that wildlife in the area will not be affected — wildlife, the water resource, the people of the area, and the natural resources of the area, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that . . . I don't know . . . Is it mile, I believe, 169 north on the La Ronge road or whatever it's called . . . and it was about, I understand, 15 miles or something off of the road into the bush. I would think about the only thing that would read the sign would be a moose up there, and I'm not too sure that it's in moose language.

I would think that any spraying that's done that would be anywhere in the vicinity of people, or people could be in the vicinity, will certainly be made well aware. If there is a large area going to be sprayed, such as the 500 acres, definitely there would be that type of requirements.

In regards to the wildlife, that's a statement I made a few minutes ago. I said: until we're satisfied that the wildlife and the water is not going to be in any way damaged, we're not prepared to give our go-ahead. And until we're satisfied there, we definitely won't be in approval with it.

**MR. YEW:** — In your last comments, Mr. Minister, you're referring to the second area that is proposed to be sprayed. Mr. Minister, I was referring to the area that is sprayed already.

You mentioned that there is no population in the area, no people in the area, and that possibly the only persons or the only thing that will be affected is probably the moose. And he also went on to mention that moose don't read.

But, Mr. Minister, I want to assure you that we in northern Saskatchewan, a lot of our people in northern Saskatchewan, derive their living from the land. We don't go to just our immediate area. Many trappers and fishermen and people of northern Saskatchewan travel for miles a day in order to gather food. We travel 40, 50, 60 miles per day into remote areas to use that resource which we have been traditionally accustomed with.

I don't accept your statement that no one is in the area and that no one will be affected in the area. That is a very lame response by yourself, Mr. Minister.

I want to go on and ask you again, Mr. Minister: was an environmental assessment study filed by Woodland Enterprises or PAPCO with respect to your department?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, in regards to his last question, the answer is no. There was no environment impact assessment done.

In sort of a comment in regards to his comment in regards to the moose in the area, you must remember that it was the sand ridge, that moose do not graze on sand ridges. If he comes from the North he probably knows that because they only graze on red willows or water lilies or that type of habitat. It was pine with poplar in it, so they wouldn't be in there grazing. And if you're spraying in a very controlled area, I think that it'd be very safe to say that they wouldn't be affected.

**MR. YEW:** — So you again admit, Mr. Minister, that there was no environmental impact assessment study done with respect to this experiment project of spraying this chemical in one of our forest resource areas. And I say that is a poor record for your Conservative government. It just indicates to me and to the people of this province that you have certainly have no sense of responsibility and direction with respect to our wildlife resource, and with respect to our non-renewable resource, with respect to our renewable resource areas. Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: did you or will you consider holding public hearings with respect to further developments of this nature?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — I'm sorry, I missed the last part of the question. I understand it was would there be any public hearings. I think I read it out to you that there would be public hearings with just about everybody that's involved up there. I could read it again to you, if you like.

With the Fishing Lakes and Little Bear and Fishing Lake operators and facilities, there'd be a talk show on Prince Albert radio. They'll be talking to all of the service clubs in the area, the cottage associations. They'll conduct an advertising program on newspaper and TV.

I don't know. I have to say that's . . . And they are going to meet with just the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce, all the operators in the area. I would have to think they were going right to them to meet, so I would say it's even better than a hearing.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to raise a question with the minister. He indicates that there was some initiative taken by his department to allow for public hearings. This is all new to me, Mr. Minister. This is all news to us. I want to ask you very specifically: when were those public hearings held? What date were they held? Which people were communicated with? Which people were consulted with? And what communities and groups and organizations submitted briefs to your department with respect to those experiments, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Chairman, I think he's confusing the 20 hectares of land that was being sprayed, that was sprayed on, I think, on last Friday. I forget the day I told him it was sprayed on. And he's also confusing it with the 200 hectares of land that they are proposing to spray. The initial, the first one, there was no public hearings held on it. It was done in an isolated area on a test pilot approved by Environment Canada and Agriculture Canada with Du Pont industries, and it was done in the woodlands area. That's very specific.

The other one. There will be all these. I listed all the available opportunities that people have, and it's just about every type of opportunity that's scattered over many days, so they'll have lots of opportunity to have their input into the second spraying, if it does go on and meets all the department's requirements, and that would be some time in August.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to inform the minister that the government's way of holding public inquiries and public hearings and having public input, as I understand it, your government contends or, pardon me, feels that holding radio ads and TV ads and dishing out all kinds of public media propaganda is a way of holding public hearings and stating that this is sufficient public hearings . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's called propaganda.

**MR. YEW:** — It is. A colleague of mine says that is called propaganda and certainly that is what it is — propaganda. Only one side of the picture is presented: your side of the picture. You haven't heard from the people's side of the story.

Those radio ads and TV ads and paper ads that you have dished out, and the propaganda that your office sends out, is just certainly not adequate enough, Mr. Minister. You are going to have to get right down to the community level, down to the organizations that are affected like the fishermen's associations, wild rice industries' associations, the northern outfitter's associations, the trappers' associations, Saskatchewan wildlife, etc. Those are the organizations that ought to be consulted and invited to participate in a public inquiry. We ought to hear the other side of the story.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to go on and dispute some of the statements made earlier by the minister when I was referring to an area that relates to agent orange. As I mentioned a little earlier, this month and American chemical company, or several companies, were ordered to make restitution to Vietnam veterans exposed to agent orange, and the minister replied back to me a few minutes ago that 2,4-D . . . He tried to downplay the effects of 2,4-D. And I want to say to the minister that certainly a part of the chemical that is used in agent orange, which is a deadly chemical, is 2,4-D.



And I have here a news clipping with me, Mr. Minister, that tells me and the people of Canada that some 15,000 Vietnam veterans have fought for many, many years to get the chemical companies that are involved in the development of agent orange to recognize their plight. They have had very dangerous . . . They were affected very drastically in terms of agent orange. Agent orange affected them in terms of health visibilities, permanent disabilities and, in fact, some people have lost their lives with respect to this chemical. And I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that 2,4-D, which is a part of the chemical contained in agent orange, is a dangerous and very disastrous and a very deadly chemical. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that you ought to hold a public inquiry, a full public inquiry, before you do any chemical spraying in any part of this province.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, I don't know how we got off on something in Vietnam. I think it's a little far away from the environment in Saskatchewan.

First of all, just to clarify it, 2,4-D is not agent orange. It's a combination of 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, which has been banned by your administration four years ago in the province of Saskatchewan. So it can't even be sprayed in here, so you couldn't create that type of a pesticide if you wanted to . . . or a problem.

In regards to . . . I don't know what you're trying to tell me in regards to the public not having input into anything that we do as far as inquiries. I remember travelling around the province about a year or so ago, and I would think that we went to 10 communities. We had over 200 public briefs, I guess you would call them, presented to us in regards to what they saw as water concern. Since then we've addressed the issue. I would think we listened very well to the grass roots.

But one other thing . . . are you . . . I get the impression that what you're saying about 2,4-D or Roundup — 2,4-D isn't even being used — Roundup is that you're saying that the farmers spraying it on the field are really . . . what you're really saying is that they're involving themselves and using a very dangerous product, and you're referring it to warfare. I don't think the farmers would like that very much in regards to that, because they have to spray it to maintain the weed control of their crops. So spraying the fields for Roundup is a necessity used by farmers.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I just want to ensure that any . . . well, let's go back, Mr. Minister. You're trying to again downplay the possible or the potential harmful effects of what I'm questioning here in this Assembly.

The project that I'm questioning, and one that has been carried out already, plus the one that is under investigation by your department, are, to my information, to what I understand, and to what I can gather from talking with people in those areas, that could possibly get affected is that this is an experiment, but it definitely has an effect because the experiment is being carried out on a forest resource. And I ask you, Mr. Minister, if you will consider holding full public inquiries into those experiments, because people have contested and have argued and have questioned your endorsement of those projects. And it has been suggested to me, Mr. Minister, that your department ought to carry full public inquiries into those new experiments, testing of this new chemical, before you go ahead.

Initially in our question of estimates you were uncertain as to what this chemical was, what its effects would be, what your department's role was, and to this point in time you're still uncertain. That's the conclusion that I can arrive at. And I'm asking you, Mr. Minister: why don't you hold a public inquiry and get some people involved in those decisions?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we could go on and on here, but a public inquiry into the use of Roundup that's used by farmers, like I said about three times now, every summer, and just about every farmer in this province has used it one time or another. Just to make it very clear, this is only in the experimental basis. It is being done in the four western provinces. It is

being done to see what will happen, or how much it would improve the growth of our forests, which we have to have for yours and my future generations. It's being done in an area that . . . They've been instructed that it cannot be done in an area that is adjacent to water or streams or if there's wildlife that will be affected.

I think that . . . And the public will be made very much aware of it through TV and radio and talk shows and consultation with just about every group that's in the North there. And any group that's missed — I'm sure if they contact our department, we'll be sure that they'll have their chance to have an input into it. I really don't know what else can be done to not only protect the environment but to see what we can do to improve our forests for our future generations. And if there's ways that we can bring that forest on-line, without hurting our environment, the same as the farmer does to his wheat fields to improve his wheat crops, then we better take a serious look at it, because in the future if we don't do it we will not have forests to harvest or jobs for people in the North.

And I would have to think that the hon. member over there has to be concerned about jobs for people in the North. But as future generations — their jobs and their forests — because forests not only relies to the jobs of forestry, it relies on . . . Wildlife relies on it and certainly any of the game animals that's affected there, our fur-bearing animals, all that relies — and our tourist industry, which is becoming a part of the North, relies on it too. So I would think that it's certainly worthwhile that we take a serious look at what we can do to improve our forest in the North, and at the same time protect our environment.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say to the minister that certainly I agree with the seriousness of this issue, and that is why I am questioning your department's performance thus far, Mr. Minister. I haven't had very many answers to my questions to this point in time, but I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that we have to protect our resource. We have to protect our forest industry, our renewable resource sectors, our non-renewable resource sector as well for future generations.

We can't be so selfish as to consider our immediate future. We have to look for generations ahead so that your children's children can have something there to appreciate and to enjoy. And this is why, Mr. Minister, I question your department's performance to date, and your government's commitment to those very valuable resources. And this is why we are going through this exercise. We have to fine out exactly what your department, what your government has done to this valuable resource, and rightfully, we have to raise arguments about your commitment to that area.

Mr. Minister, I want to go on and raise several questions here with respect to, again, your government's record. Your government's record to date has been very . . . There's a lot to be desired in terms of consideration, in terms of regard, in terms of involving, and in terms of benefiting communities and the people of this province, particularly communities that are affected.

I'm going to go now with an area that is brought to my attention from people in northern Saskatchewan, and they involve the major hydro projects that are presently affecting the people in northern Saskatchewan. I refer to the Nipawin hydro project, and also the Island Falls project in Sandy Bay. To this point in time, Mr. Minister, the only people that have benefited from your policies have been big business, the bond dealers, the banks, and your corporate friends. And people at the local level, at the community level, people of northern Saskatchewan particularly, have missed out entirely in terms of social and economic benefits. That is a fact. That is a fact, Mr. Minister.

And just to state this on the record, Mr. Minister — and I want to see if you can dispute it — big mining companies get compensation, and I want to use the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company as an example. It got \$58.5 million for a 50-year-old, run-down power plant at Island

Falls. They had free water for 50 years, but that wasn't enough, Mr. Minister. The people in that community haven't had any social and economic benefits that anyone in this province knows of, and certainly the people in that community know the full effects of those developments that have occurred for years and years.

As I mentioned, Mr. Minister, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting got \$58.5 million from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and, as I was saying, that wasn't enough. The town of Nipawin got \$1.5 million compensation for disruptions caused by the construction of the Nipawin dam. The town gets the economic benefits. And I don't argue with that, Mr. Minister. The town ought to get some economic benefits. But what I am arguing about is that communities that are directly affected, or will be directly affected, are communities living downstream from those major projects — communities like Cumberland House, Sturgeon Landing, Pelican Narrows, Sandy Bay, Denare Beach, Creighton, Beaver Lake are the ones that are certainly losing out. There's well over 1,000 people employed at the Nipawin hydro project, but only seven of those people are from those areas I just mentioned — the communities that will be directly affected.

In terms of Sandy Bay, the Island Falls project has been in the books since 1927. To this point in time, \$58.5 million has been paid out to the HBMS. Nothing has been given to the people in that community. They've been excluded altogether. I want to hear your reaction to that, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Chairman, I think negotiations for prices of projects is not in the Department of Environment's realm of what they should be talking about, but I will just briefly mention it.

First of all, Island Falls was purchased by the former administration, or the deal to purchase was signed by them, and whatever the amount was, if you're stating that's what it was.

Since then we tried to sell it back to them; they wouldn't take it back. They didn't even want it back again. So no, I would think that, first of all, it wasn't our decision to buy it and, second of all, we can't sell it back to get our money back if we wanted to. So it's there to stay, I would assume.

Third of all, you were talking about their . . . Second or third, you were talking about the benefits to the town of Nipawin. And I would hope that the member would feel that any community, whether it be Nipawin, or Cumberland House, or wherever in the North, Pelican Narrows, any benefits comes to the community, it certainly has to be good benefits, especially if they are put into the benefits right directly into the community, such as Nipawin was, into recreation and whatever.

Talking about downstream benefits, and I'm just going to go back a little bit here. It's back to a question that you asked a long time ago of . . . made back in 1982 in regard to that Nipawin. In fact it was July 5, 1982. You asked me a question at that time and what you asked me was:

Will the Minister of the Environment, in view of the fact that the rivers, lakes, and wildlife habitat will be affected by fluctuating water as a result with the Nipawin Hydro-electric project, particularly in the area such as Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing . . .

And then you go on to say:

Will the Minister of Labour and minister in charge of SPC 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 the people living downstream in places such as Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing?

Then you sort of contradicted yourself. In this year you asked the question of the Premier, and you made the statement then, that you said:

Mr. Speaker, the assurance to establish an environmental advisory committee was given to me in this Assembly July 5, 1982.

It's in *Hansard*, and basically my question is a follow-up whether or not your government will proceed to establish an environmental advisory committee . . . (inaudible) . . . living downstream.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I answered the question in . . . or Mr. Chairman, when I answered that question in 1982, I said, yes, we'd keep the communities involved and informed, and we will. But I never at any time made the statement that I would set up an advisory committee, environmental advisory committee. I just want to clarify that because I never did say that.

I believe that those communities downstream should be involved. I believe they should keep informed. But I don't believe that the need to set up an environmental advisory committee is necessary at this time, because the main reason is the Nipawin hydro plant is not on-stream yet, and hasn't really affected down . . . hasn't affected at all downstream users, or affected any communities downstream. So I just wanted to clarify that while I was up here so that you'd be aware of the situation.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you, seeing as how you raised the subject of the environmental assessment committee, or environmental impact committee — you claim that communities are involved, or should be involved.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, very specifically: how do you propose to involve the communities that will be affected hence — the communities of Cumberland House, Sandy Bay, Sturgeon Landing, Pelican Narrows, Creighton, etc.? How do you propose to involve them in terms of the communities having specific input involvement in the direction of what the projects are into the policy of those major projects?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well that's a good question from the hon. member from Cumberland. We would have that concern, because when they held environmental impact assessment hearings around the province — they had them in Red Earth, they had them in Cumberland and Sturgeon Landing — my understanding was that very few, or none, and one case nobody showed up even to have any objection or to listen to what was going to happen.

I would like to know, and probably would need some direction from my department in how we could involve those people other than keeping them informed. And I think they should be kept informed so they could involve themselves with it if they know what's going on.

To date, there has been no change due to the Nipawin hydro dam, because there hasn't been any water being held back. It's just under the construction stage. Should there be some changes, or should the people of the area notice that there is some changes, then maybe that's some way to get them involved, and maybe they could tell us how they'd like to become involved in it.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I spent several days in Cumberland House just the other day dealing and discussing related issues such as the one that is being discussed at the moment.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your way of involving the communities, your way of consultation, is nothing short of token gestures made on the part of your department, on the part of your government. If you want the communities' input, why don't you establish specific monitoring committees or environmental committees that have specific terms of reference into input on policy development of those projects. That is what I call meaningful involvement.

If you will have an organization set up through legislation that can react to policies initiated by your department, by government, or by the industry, then you will have public input. But if you go into the communities, or if you dish out radio ads and TV ads, that's not hitting the people, and that's not getting into the people, and that's not what you call community involvement, community input.

You established specific mandates for the local organization to have input into policies. That is what I call environmental consultation and input by the communities, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not just sure what the question was, but in regards to community involvement as far as environmental aspects are concerned, since I became minister, from Cumberland area I've had at least three delegations in to talk to me in my office. I've met with them and we've discussed a lot of things, and a lot of it was due to the Cumberland delta area and such things as you're aware of out there. I've had a delegation in from Island Falls area to talk about some of the environmental aspects up there in regards to the water, the lack of water, the flooding in some areas. I would think that's community involvement, and if there's any other way that I can keep them informed or meet with them or whatever, I'd certainly do it.

Through the only way I know, other than going one-on-one is to use newspaper ads and TV and whatever that they may listen to. It may be that the northern radio station that broadcasts in the North that we use. Whatever is necessary, we should use.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I suggested to you that the way to have meaningful involvement of people at the local level is to establish specific environmental advisory committees or monitoring committees with specific mandates that will carry out the community's concerns and aspirations, not your government's policies and philosophy. That is why I left the remarks that I did just a brief moment ago. I wanted to get your reaction on that very specific subject.

The minister suggested that he has met with several groups, and I agree. In fact, I initiated some of those discussions, along with the Minister for Environment and the Minister of Labour. Our groups were concerned that our land was being flooded, that our livelihood was being destroyed, that our communities are served only by an unsafe ice bridge all winter in areas like Cumberland House. We didn't get free water to generate power, certainly, and we didn't get any economic spin-offs from any construction, Mr. Minister.

We do get the freedom of choice to seek compensation in the courts, and I can only speculate, Mr. Minister. I want to ask you: does the fat compensation package for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting have anything to do with the \$5,000 contribution that that company gave to the Saskatchewan PC Party in 1982?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, we're sort of getting into the drawls of politics here instead of environment. But my comment is: first of all, we did not do the purchasing of Island Falls. It was done by your administration. I don't know if you got \$5,000 or not. I couldn't tell you what was paid to your party. I do know that we inherited a property or a plant that we had to finish paying for, that was originally purchased under the former administration. So, in regards to that, that's about all I can say there.

One other thing I want to make comment on. You said there's been no consultation up in the area, and I was just talking to the Minister of Highways. I understand the first time — by the way, a good minister. He tells me that that's the first time ever that they went up there and there was an ice bridge put across the river for the people, (two people were hired to put it in) and paid for by the Department of Highways. That's the first time ever that anybody's even come in to take a look at it. So it's the first year there, first time ever done. I think that's pretty commendable.

And I also know that just about every minister in this here government has been in the North

quite a few times talking to the people up there. So I think that, as a government, we have been doing consultations in the North — maybe not enough. You never do enough. But certainly we've been there, and certainly we are trying to be aware of all the situations.

I'm sure the member from Athabasca knows, too, some of the problems up there, as well as I do, and it takes more than consultation to resolve it.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that certainly you have been in the North, and certainly the Minister of Highways has been in the North, but certainly, as well, the majority of your cabinet members and legislative secretaries haven't been in northern Saskatchewan. And you can talk and you can consult in your own terms, Mr. Minister, but if you don't have specific policy, specific programs geared to alleviate, to help, that high unemployment rate that we have in northern Saskatchewan, to help alleviate the high welfare rates that are ever increasing in northern Saskatchewan, rates as up as 62 per cent in welfare. Rates in unemployment as high as 95 per cent.

If you don't have specific policies and specific programs, Mr. Minister, your dialogue or your discussions and your visits will be absolutely useless.

I want to go on, Mr. Minister, and talk about the delegation that was here earlier this spring. We had a discussion with the delegation in from Pelican Narrows and Sandy Bay, and they talked about the environmental impact and damages that occurred in their community and in their area.

They talked about the wild rice resource, the wild rice industry. They talked about tourism. They talked about the fisheries resource. They talked about their trapping and hunting areas. And they wanted, as well, to talk about and study the economic impact and damages done by the Island Falls project, which was initiated, again I repeat, in 1927.

But, nevertheless, you are the government in power. You are the government with the responsibility, the authority, and the jurisdiction to do something about this at this point in time.

They gave you several issues, several recommendations. In fact, they gave you a proposal to assist them in carrying out environmental, social, and economic impact and damages studies that they hoped to initiate on their own accord.

I want to ask the minister: those issues that that delegation brought to your attention were very serious and were very important to the people in the area. I want to ask the minister: what have you done to date, to this point in time? What are you prepared to do in terms of co-ordinating further developments on behalf of the community of Sandy Bay and Pelican Narrows?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, I think you're getting quite a ways away from economic . . . That's over in Economic Development, or some aspects of that, or maybe even with Parks and Renewable Resources.

I just talked to the minister sitting beside me here, in regards to the North, and the fish enhancement fund. I understand that they're setting up rearing ponds in the North, that they're going to be doing thinning of trees in the North, and it's all going to be basically all native employment. I think that will create some employment.

In going back to what that group of people come in to see me about from island Falls, really they weren't concerned as much about the economic development. They were going to go back and talk about what they could do there. They were concerned about some of the environmental aspects in regard to some dams being put in many, many years ago. Some had washed out, and they were concerned about their beaver, especially their beaver, and their muskrat area up there, that it may be not enough water for them. Some areas got too much and some not enough, because of these . . . because the man-made dams had washed out and it was changing, again

changing the environmental aspects in the North.

That's what they were about. They were going to go back. They were going to do their own . . . look at it again this year. We were going to send somebody up to help them take a look at it, and then this fall we were going to discuss it again to see where it would take us or what we could do to help them. So I think that answers your two questions.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to reiterate some of my points earlier, Mr. Minister. Yes, I agree, they were concerned about the environmental impact and damages done to the area in terms of their wildlife resource. Certainly that has been expressed as well by the people in Cumberland House.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that when they talk about environmental damages, they are also concerned about the economic impact of the area. Certainly that has to enter the issue. The fact is, people still have to maintain their livelihood out of their resource base. The delegation that you mentioned, the people that we met with, wanted to investigate further the economic potential after the developments, the damages that had occurred in respective areas.

That is why it is important, Mr. Minister, to acknowledge, not only to acknowledge the fact that we met with the delegations from the east side, north-east side of Saskatchewan, but also to consider very seriously the need for them to initiate further study, further reviews of the major projects that have affected them and their livelihood. I would like to hear your comment on that.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, which one he's talking about. If he's talking about the Sandy Bay group of people, I was in talking about the Island Falls project. He sat there with me at the whole meeting. I think the decision was reached at that time that they would go back and they would look at what they could see they could do for themselves in regards to economic development in co-ordination with what the government has in place now. There were some things he made them aware of.

We also discussed at that time a couple of dams that had washed out, that were man-made, had changed the environment then but they wanted it left the way it had changed to, and now it was going back, I assume, to the old pattern. They were concerned about that. We said we'd send somebody in this summer to look at it, to discuss it, when the water went down where they could see what it was all about.

If he's talking in regards to the Cumberland area, as you well know, the Nipawin dam hasn't come on-stream yet. There's been really no effect from the Nipawin dam. Any effect would have been from the Squaw Rapids dam, which has been in there for over 20 years now, so I'm not too sure that there would be any effect in the Cumberland area to date, other than what has been going on over the last 20 years. And as I said, the Sandy Bay people — you sat at the meeting as well as I did. You know exactly what was said, and I think what I've stated now is exactly what we said there.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I had thought that one of the understandings for a consensus reached were for you to talk with other cabinet colleagues in terms of the specific submission that was given to you by a Mr. Norman Nodaways who was part of this delegation.

And further on, one consensus or agreement that I understood was reached was that you and the Minister of Labour would come into the communities and hold discussions and study meetings with the communities and do this at the earliest opportunity after the House adjourns. I want to know if that's the accurate assessment of what I think it was, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's fairly accurate. What we said is that if they made a proposal to us after the House had sit, that we'd look at the possibility of going in, sitting down, if they could set up a group of people to meet with, and discuss problems in the area in regards to the Island Falls project and also in regard to environmental concerns up there and

anything else that we could be of assistance to them.

That proposition still stands, as far as I'm concerned. I'm sure the Minister of Labour agrees with it.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I want to go on with your estimates then and come back to other areas later with respect to acid rain and Key Lake.

Under your estimates, on page 34 . . . I want to refer to a government kit here that I have, Mr. Minister. It says, "Developing Saskatchewan Business." It's a brochure put out by your department, or by your government anyway, showing how the Department of the Environment is now more responsive to developers.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: whose interests are you and your department and your government serving — the people of Saskatchewan or outside developers?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we're certainly . . . The Department of the Environment's concern is with the province of Saskatchewan — the people that live in it. Whether they be outside developers, whoever, come in, we're concerned that the environmental aspects of this province are protected. And not only protected — managed.

As you noticed today, I introduced first reading of a bill to change The Department of the Environment Act to a management and protection act. And that's how strongly we feel about it, that it has to be a management as well as the protection part of the environment, has to be both managed and protected.

So I would say that we are concerned with whoever is in the province and whoever can in any way damage or hurt our environment. We're certainly going to be there to put regulations or whatever necessary in place to protect it.

So my answer would be: protect the people and the province.

**MR. YEW:** — I had raised, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I raised that specific question because on the second page of your pamphlet, about the seventh paragraph it states that:

Reorientation of the Department of Environment is designed to make it more responsive to the needs of project developers seeking environmental approvals and permits for major developments.

That in itself, Mr. Minister, tells me that you would sooner favour the major companies' business and major developers to help eliminate red tape and what have you, so that they can go ahead with those major developments. And it certainly, Mr. Minister, doesn't specify benefits here for the community; it specifies here favouritism to the major developers. And I'd like to have a comment on that.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think this is the first time that Department of Environment in the last two years have started to set out guide-lines for just about every type of industry there is in the province we anticipate coming.

We have set out guide-lines for potash emissions; we have set out guide-lines for coal reclamation; we have set out guide-lines for air emissions; we've set out guide-lines for water quality. We're now in the process of setting out guide-lines for operators of thermopants. Those type of guide-lines are set out.

If you're mining in exploration in the North, in your part of the country, there's guide-lines set out that's to be adhered to. We set out guide-lines for gravel pits. I could go on and on. Those guide-lines were set out and established over the last two years. Those type of guide-lines are



protective. We are there first, and this is what they have to adhere to if you want to come into this province.

An industry is welcome, but here is your guide-lines that you have to go by. And industry doesn't mind that as long as it's known ahead. And we make sure it's known ahead. And so we do know that the environment is protected before they start to build and before they come, not after the fact. And you know, in a few cases here where it wasn't done and you can look after the fact, it'd be darn hard to clean up.

**MR. YEW:** — I wondered, Mr. Minister, if that clause, the clause that I read to you, wasn't applied with that spraying project that was carried out a while earlier.

Very bluntly and very logically put, if you read that paragraph, it favours major developers. That is what the clause tells me, Mr. Minister. And I go on to talk about another area that's irrelevant to your department, but certainly relevant to this government, and that's The Planning and Development Act. But I won't get into that, because The Planning and Development Act was argued by people in this province that it favoured the developers rather than the local governments and the people at the community level. But anyway, as I mentioned, that's not in your department.

However, I'd like to get on to the area of the water resource, and again I know that we have a new corporation, a new department initiated here. But nevertheless, under estimates for Environment, you have under items 4 and 7 on page 33, items that deal with water issues and programs. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: what precisely is the Department of the Environment's responsibility re the water, and how is that responsibility to be changed with introduction of the new water corporation?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the role of the new Crown will be water management and financing of whatever is necessary to be built for municipalities, or however it's worked out. The role of the water Crown is management of our water resources in the province of Saskatchewan. The role of the Department of the Environment, which is clearly defined now, is responsible for the management of water resources in the province of Saskatchewan.

You well know in the South we've got none, and in the North we've got way too much, at the present time, anyway. And certainly it's something that should have been there before. It'll give us an overall way of letting . . . Those that need to drain will be able to drain, and those that maybe need water, like cities or towns, or irrigation, will be able to put in . . . they'll be able to maybe put in dams, whatever's necessary to hold it, so it can be used. So we'd get full utilization of the meagre amount of water, especially that we have in the southern part of the province where water has been in demand for the last few years.

**MR. YEW:** — So I gather, Mr. Minister, that those two items I mentioned — number four, the water pollution control and number seven, item seven, the drainage control — will remain with your department.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — The water pollution control branch will remain entirely with the Department of the Environment. The drainage control, as it is necessary, will be phased into the water Crown. Now, I don't know how that will work out, whether it will be this year or some other year, because drainage relates directly to water management, to water basins. So it may be, in fact, phased into the water Crown in the next year or two or whatever's necessary. But at the present time, it's in the Department of the Environment.

You know, the water pollution which, as you notice, has been increased by 10 employees, and I

think that says in itself that we will be upgrading and updating and doing whatever's necessary to, in fact, monitor water quality in this province.

And certainly water quality as well as water quantity is a problem, and anybody living in Regina, Moose Jaw, Melville, Rosetown, well know that. So we'll be responsible for the water quality to see that the water quality . . . what it is, and to do all the necessary work in that avenue, and the water Crown will do the managing of it.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I go now to item no. 10 on page 34, and I notice that under grants to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation you have identified here a budget of \$3,650,370. I want to ask the minister: how was this very precise figure arrived at and for what purpose is this grant being made from this particular department?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, that portion of the Department of the Environment has gone over to the water Crown. That's the hydrology branch, the water rights branch, which is water management — it's over there. When the blue book was drafted up, we didn't have the water Crown. As you know, we just introduced legislation a few days ago here, into the legislature here, under the auditor I would guess, or under requirements to properly do it, it has to be put, so was shown in there, and it was there from before. And that's the amount that would be taken . . . would have been used by water frights and the hydrology branch in the department, which has now gone over to the water Crown.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to go on, Mr. Minister. I know my colleagues will have several other items to discuss, and several of the various I've raised questions on.

I want to go on to the mines pollution control board, Mr. Minister, as it relates to environment. I note from some of our research that our budgets have . . . and the labour force have certainly declined in a lot of areas with respect to the mines pollution control program.

I note that in 1982-83 budget we had an 11.9 per cent positions in a budget of 667,590. In '83 and '84, that went down to seven positions, and the budget decreased down to 517,140. And I noted, as well, that you have beefed up that portion of the budget after the incident of January 5th, the Key Lake spills of January 5th. And I note that now you have a staff of 10 and a budget of 609,408.

But, Mr. Minister, this is certainly not even back to the level that it was back in 1982-83. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, just what is your objective in this respect?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, back in '82-83 I understand there were somewhere between two and five vacant positions there at different times that wasn't being used anyway. That's the reason they were taken out in '83-84.

The reason that we've increased it in '84-85 is we anticipate considerable amount more mining in the North. We basically do to our royalty free structure that allow some gold mining and whatever else, any other kind of mining that would like to go on in the North with a royalty free structure. We anticipate, and I was at La Ronge not too long ago, and they feel very good about it, too, that there could be a considerable amount of mining come in in the next few years up there. We feel we should have some people, extra people, in case the need is there and to identify, again, the guide-lines, and make sure people are aware of the guide-lines, and to enforce whatever guide-lines were necessary. So we brought people on feeling that, specifically in the North, there is going to be a need for more people because we anticipate more mining up there.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to turn again to the related issue here, Mr. Minister, and it more specifically relates to the surface lease agreement and the monitoring committee. I, and the people of northern Saskatchewan, and the people of this province had understood that we had a very

comprehensive, binding agreement between the province and Key Lake Mining Corporation. And more specifically, Mr. Minister, in terms of public involvement, I refer to section 36 of the surface lease agreement which states that:

A monitoring committee shall be established. The lessee, which is Key Lake Mining Corporation, and the minister agree to establish a monitoring committee to review and evaluate the matters referred to in section 36.5.

I won't read the entire agreement, Mr. Minister, but I just want to inform the public and yourself. I'm sure that you are aware of this but regardless, this monitoring committee was supposed to consist of six members, one appointed by yourselves, the government, and also a member of the Key Lake Mining Corporation, and representatives of the workers on the site, and also three representatives of the northern communities affected. The monitoring committee, it states as well, Mr. Minister, under section 3:

That the monitoring committee shall meet on site at least quarterly (that's every three months), and that further (Mr. Minister), that the monitoring committee shall conduct a review of the recruitment and the employment of programs for northern residents. They shall conduct and review training courses, commuter transportation services, affirmative action programs, utilization of scholarship funds, and also conduct reviews of the social and economic impact of the operations of the lessee, Key Lake Mining Corporation, on northern residents.

And finally, the area that pertains to your department, Mr. Minister, the agreement was:

That the monitoring committee shall conduct a review of inspection reports by the Department of Environment.

And what my concern is, Mr. Minister, is that the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan, the member for Meadow Lake, when asked about the monitoring committee in late 1982 by a member of his staff who was the director of the manpower secretariat at the time, Mr. George Mercredi, said that this committee, with a shrug of his shoulders, "Let it die."

You know, he had no regard and no interest at all to help assist or support or try to initiate a meeting of the monitoring committee. He refused to recognize this binding agreement. He failed and refused to support and to recognize northern community involvement, worker involvement, in terms of the monitoring committee and the operations carried out by the Key Lake Mining Corporation. And I . . . You know you are very well familiar, and the people of this province are very well familiar, with the happenings of January the 5th of this year, where we had major spills of contaminated radium water.

And I just picked up a paper here just a few days ago, Mr. Minister, and it tells me again here that the mine at Key Lake has another spill. And we are continuously confronted with this type of news pertaining to that development.

And I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: we've had spills of various sizes — some small spills, some major ones, some that were disastrous, or less than disastrous — but certainly spills that will affect the North on the long term.

And my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: will you agree that the monitoring committee was a sound idea, in that it ought to be . . . in that it should never have been abolished, and that it ought to be re-enacted so as to allow the people in northern Saskatchewan input involvement in terms of that major operation?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, to make it very clear that the surface lease agreement is under the department of northern Saskatchewan, which is now northern

secretariat, so we really don't have any control over . . . or I don't, as a department, have over who's be on it or if it had meetings.

If they had had the meetings, I do not believe, and I'm sure the public does not believe, that they could have prevented a spill that run . . . the major spill that happened up there.

You fully realize that they ran over the top of the holding reservoir, with visual surveillance of it under the ice, and run out and spilled over. Nobody . . . A monitoring committee wasn't going to sit there day and night, so they couldn't have, in any way prevented that spill.

Second or third, that it wouldn't even have reviewed our reports until into '84, which is the '83 reports. So again, they would have no way of knowing.

Third, or fourth, or fifth, or whatever you want to call it, when they designed that plant, the former administration allowed the company to cut it back, the size of the holding bonds, by 125,000 cubic metres, which in effect, maybe would have been a preventative measure taken, because of the new types of a new plant and it's supposed to be better ways of treating it, they felt it wasn't necessary. That may be right. It may have been a fault of the company. It may have been a fault of whoever that happened.

But all those things put together there's no way a Department of Environment, or a monitoring committee could have prevented any such spill such as that. Or as . . . There was two by the way, not one at the end. Both of those, one, a pipe was not hooked up by a worker or whatever, and the second one, one of the outside ponds, they allowed it to overflow.

Those kinds of things, no matter how many monitoring committees you've got, or who is looking after it, can't be prevented. It does need, and I believe it does need some co-ordination up there between the workers and management to see that these things do not happen. Because if they continue to happen, it is creating a problem, and it's creating a problem for the people on site, for the people who work there, for northern residents.

So I think it's time, and I've told the company so, that it's time that they straightened up the act, they got co-ordination between management, between workers and management, and to see that the environment is protected up there.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: how many spills have occurred at the Key Lake mine since July 1st, 1983, and what was the volume of each? Because to this point in time, Mr. Minister, we understand that there was a total of nine or 10 spills at Key Lake, and I'll give you the information that I have, and you may want to add on to the information that we have in front of us.

I understand that on July the 22nd and August the 3rd, we had a spill of 400,000 litres. On August the 25th to September the 6th, 57,000 or as much as 684,000 litres. December 6th, 4,500 litres; December 23rd, 1,125; December 24th, 1,350; December 31st, 100,000 litres; January 3rd, 450; January 5th, 100 million litres; January 12th, 50 to 100 gallons; May 12th, 28,000 litres, Mr. Minister.

I want to ask you: how many more spills did we have since July 1 of 1983? And, Mr. Minister, with respect to each spill, when was the Department of the Environment first notified? I'll leave it at that for now. There's three questions there for you.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think all the spills have been made public. We gave it to the news media and it's been available over in the Department of the Environment. Each time it happens, we notify them. We tell them if anybody wants any further information, it's there. I'm sure you've taken that from some of the news media information we've handed out. It's all there. It's all been made available — each and every one.

So, if that's the question: is there any more? I would assume that you've got them all there as far as I can tell. If not, certainly we'll send you over a list. There's no problem. The news media all have it and everybody else has it in the province. I assume you have it, too.

**MR. YEW:** — I want to ask the hon. member, the Minister for Environment, if you run your department through the news media. You advised me that I ought to get my information from the news media. Certainly, Mr. Minister, you have a budget, you have a staff, you have the technical expertise, and you have the people to have this necessary information.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, order! I understand the minister has offered to send you the information, if you wish. Is that correct?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's correct, yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — The question is: do you wish him to send you the information?

**MR. YEW:** — For the record, Mr. Speaker, I didn't . . . For the record, I didn't get the message that the minister was volunteering to provide this information. And again, for the record, I wanted the minister to state to this Assembly and to the people of this province just how many more spills did we have aside from the ones that I just quoted to you.

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Chairman, I said I would get them together and send them over. I don't know what spills . . . I wasn't paying that much attention. You read them off and I couldn't tell you. I did say there's been quite a few up there. They were initially start-up spills. We thought they were. But at the same time we had a concern that they were . . . Whether it's management co-ordination or whatever in regards to the overall spills, we will send you a list of the spills. They've been made available to the public. There's no problem. And I told you any other spills that you don't have on the list, I think last week I told you there was two more. I just mentioned a minute ago you'd missed one, that small one, I understand. I heard you reading it off since. I don't know what else I can tell you. I'll send you the information.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only conclusion I can arrive at is that we have a minister here that is irresponsible, that is not interested in providing this information, and is not on top of this information. And I can only arrive at that conclusion that we have a department here that is — and a government for that matter — that is certainly not interested in seeing that our environment is protected.

I want to ask the minister: is he satisfied that each spill, in fact, was reported to the Department of the Environment as quickly as possible, and that appropriate clean-up was initiated as quickly as possible after each spill?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that they're reporting them very promptly and that the clean-ups, especially in the last while, has been very prompt and they're keeping us really well informed. I understand in the early stages they weren't reporting them as fast as they should have been, to our satisfaction. That has been clarified and straightened out. Yes, they are reporting them; and yes, they're being cleaned up properly.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Speaker, I have with me here a report that was submitted by a Mr. Ken Santo, by the Key Lake Mining Corporation. And it is a report dated December the 9th, re the December 6th spill.

The report indicates that there was a three-day delay in the reporting of the spill, and that the Key Lake Mining Corporation could not explain the delay in reporting. Further, they could not explain the delay in excavating contaminated material, and not having done a gamma ray survey. Have you got any comments with respect to that, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Chairman, that's what I just said. There were some things we weren't very happy with. We've been up there trying to get them straightened out, so they do report them properly, and for the last while they have been reporting to the department's satisfaction.

Some of those things were drawn to my attention about the time of the Key lake spill. Because of that, it probably had to draw it to everybody's attention. The department had been doing some serious checking in. They have been working with Key Lake Mining to see that these discrepancies, as we would call them, do not continue. And my understanding is that now they're doing it to the department's satisfaction.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, the North, and many other organizations: environmental groups, church groups, labour groups, native organizations, and even the media, Mr. Minister, called for a public inquiry into the spills that are being discussed here in estimates. In fact, you know, we had, and I have the excerpts of some newspapers that requested the need for a public inquiry, papers like the *P.A. Herald*, the *Leader-Post*, and the *Star-Phoenix*, and various other local papers. And if you want I can send that information over to you.

It is my contention that your government is not responsive at all to the concerns of the public, the people of this province, and particularly, the concerns expressed to you by various northern groups — the people that will feel in the long run the effects of those spills, major spills that have occurred earlier this year.

Those are very important issues, Mr. Minister. You and your government should not just shrug them off and tell me, on this side of the House, that you will forward this information later on. Now is the time to discuss those very specific issues. Now is the time to weigh the consequences of your actions. Now is the time to judge whether your actions were — whether your government's policy was accurately — or whether those decisions were made in the public's interest. Don't you agree that we ought to have had a full public inquiry, Mr. Minister, instead of just a token, receiving, putting out some public propaganda to the public, to the people of this province, to the people of northern Saskatchewan — people that were directly affected or will be directly affected; people that were concerned about those spills. Don't you find it logical that we ought to have had full public inquiries?

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been sort of waiting for him to ask me that question ever since I sat down here. I'd like to go back to a Key Lake board inquiry report done by Bob Mitchell who was a former deputy minister of labour in here, and a former NDP candidate. I would like to read from his inquiry the report that he put out. And it says here, just a portion of it:

Whether there will be another inquiry in the future into the appropriateness of further uranium mining and milling in Saskatchewan is a question that can only be answered by the government.

It is a political question. Pressures from anti-nuclear and environment organizations that there should be another inquiry will, of course, be political in nature.

If the government decides at any time in the future to examine this question again, we recommend that it should appoint a board of inquiry specifically for that purpose.

That is the reason why I believe, Mr. Chairman, why we should not have a public inquiry. The last public inquiry stated, if there should be another one, it should be political in nature. I do not believe in that. I believe that we need to be responsive to the environmental needs of the North, and the environmental needs of the people, but we do not need to make it political.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.