

July 2, 1987

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Environment and Public Safety
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, just prior to the supper bread you indicated to us that you had personally called Mr. Paul Meagher regarding the developments at Redberry Lake, and you said to the Assembly that you phoned him and personally told him that an environmental impact statement was required before the development was to go ahead. I wonder if you could tell us when it was that you phoned Mr. Meagher.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't have the exact date, but I believe it would have been about February. I don't have the date here.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder if you could undertake to provide us with the date that you phoned Mr. Meagher.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — If the telephone bill that would register that call is available, I would try and do that because that would be the only exact source of the date. I tried a number of days, I know, and I didn't reach anyone. Finally I did get him. So I'll try and see if the telephone bill would give me that date. If it does, I'll give it to you.

While I'm on my feet, I'd like to provide the member with some of the answers to the questions you asked, that we promised to bring back for you. The first meeting we thought was January of '85. It was February 14. Those in attendance were Bob Walker, Saskatchewan Environment, Lloyd Talbot, Saskatchewan Rural Development, Lehman Walker, Saskatchewan Urban Affairs, Neil Tamlin, Saskatchewan advanced education and manpower, Dave McQuinn, Saskatchewan Economic Development and Trade, Roger Couturier, Saskatchewan Highways and Transportation, Karl Crosby, Tourism and Small Business, John Spicer, Tourism and Small Business, Dave Steward son, Tourism and Small Business, Alan Appleby, Saskatchewan Parks and Renewable Resources, Boris Mamchur, Paul Meagher, and Bill Tuer, a consultant from Winnipeg, representing the company proposing development.

The date of the letter that was sent to Boris Mamchur with regard to advising him of the need to do an environmental impact assessment was sent on August 2, 1985. The meeting that was referred to was held on August 8, 1985. Those in attendance: R. Walker, Saskatchewan Environment; B. McGregor, Saskatchewan Environment; S. Barber, Saskatchewan Parks, Recreation and Culture; J. Howard, Parks, Recreation and Culture; T. Good, Saskatchewan Rural Development; A. Dzubin, Canadian Wildlife Service, G. Bogden, Canadian Wildlife Service, A. White, Canadian Wildlife Service, R. Kerbes, Canadian Wildlife Service, B. Mamchur, Redberry Development Corporation, B. Robinson accompanied by

Mr. Mamchur and J. Slimmons, Saskatchewan natural history society.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could provide me with that information that you've just handed back to your officials. Instead of wasting time waiting for *Hansard* to come out tomorrow, if you could table it with us, table it with us here now. Is that acceptable?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I could provide you some of it, not all of it.

What I am providing to you is the lists of the names of those who were at the two meetings; and the other letter, I just gave you the date.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for providing that information. I just wanted to go back, if I may to some of the statements that you had answered to earlier on today. I just don't know whether it was the phrasing of the question or whether you hadn't heard the question correctly.

I notice here now that the attendance at the meeting held on February 13, 1985, that among those attending were Mr. Mamchur, Mr. Meagher, and Mr. Tuer. I just want to make it clear in my own mind. Is this meeting held on February 13, 1985, was this the only meeting held with officials of your department or in which officials of your department were involved, attended to by Paul Meagher? Was he at any other meeting to your knowledge or to the knowledge of your officials?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — This is the only meeting that he attended in 1985. He was at a meeting this year.

Mr. Lyons: — I'm sorry, I just missed the last part of your statement. You said, until this meeting this year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, that's what I said.

Mr. Lyons: — And the meeting this year was on what date?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I told you that I didn't want to get into the dates and the details of what happened this year because of the court case, and I think it's wise that we both observe that.

Mr. Lyons: — Am I to assume by your answer that this meeting took place — and without going into the details of the meeting — did this meeting take place after the bulldozers began to roll at Redberry Lake?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — You had a meeting with Mr. Meagher prior to the bulldozers happening at Redberry Lake. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I told the hon. member I wasn't going to make any comments with regards to the details of the case for this year.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I'm sorry, but that's not good

enough. The case before the court — and I want the hon. member on the other side to realise this as well — the case before the court involves a decision made by your department to halt the development at Redberry Lake.

There is now an appeal before the court due to an action taken — and now I take it from your words — after your meeting with Mr. Meagher. Your response, that you don't want to deal with events leading up to that, I would submit, sir, with all due respect, does not endanger or does not put in jeopardy any of the proceedings before the court.

The fact that you met with Mr. Meagher prior to the bulldozers going, I think, is quite well within the realm of questioning available to us here in the legislature. It's particularly within the realm of us questioning, given the fact that you stated here in the legislature this afternoon that you had no dealings with Redberry Lake project until the bulldozers began to roll.

You said the file was dormant. You said that the file was not active, that there was nothing happening at Redberry Lake until the bulldozers began to roll. You said that you had not talked with anybody, that Mr. Meagher had talked with everybody else except yourself. This is your words, Mr. Minister. You said that Paul Meagher had not talked with you prior to the bulldozers rolling at Redberry Lake.

Now you're telling us that you did talk with Paul Meagher prior to the bulldozers running at Redberry Lake. Was your meeting with Paul Meagher as a result of your telephone call to Mr. Meagher, or did your telephone call take place after the meeting with Mr. Meagher?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The member is misconstruing what I told him. What I did tell you . . .

An Hon. Member: — It's on the record.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, of course it's on the record, and I'm glad it is because that will prove what I'm saying is absolutely right. What I told you was that from 1985 until this year, that there had been a long period when nothing was happening. Then the department advised me that there had been a few phone calls where technical information was provided to Mr. Mamchur, and I told you that. And I told you that there was nothing else happened until this year and advised him that he must do an environmental impact assessment. So I gave you that kind of information prior to the supper hour.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I'll check back on the record because that's not my recollection of what you said. However, the question is: did you meet with Paul Meagher before you made the phone call to him to tell him that environmental impact statement was met, or did you meet with Mr. Meagher after the telephone call? Was the meeting the result of the telephone call made by yourself?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The hon. member is getting into detail that I think would be best left until the item is out of court, and it's not just a very narrow issue that we talk of. The appeal would be, but also we're advised that there is a

court case being registered that will deal with the whole case.

Mr. Lyons: — The appeal is on the point of law. As I understand it and as I am advised, the appeal is on a point of law in regards to the activities of your department, in terms of making the judgement.

Would you tell us what . . . Would you now tell us what other court case is now before the courts that doesn't deal with that narrow point of law?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — It's not before the courts at this point. We are advised that there will be a court case, and I don't feel that I should be providing anything that can be used on either side of a court case at this time. I believe because it's before the court on the appeal case that we should not be dealing with any more of the details of the issue for this year.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, now it's either before the court or it's not. Our discussion, our questioning here today has got nothing to do with the point of law that the appeal was based on. That's my information.

Are you trying to say now that I am to stop questioning you on this case because of something that may happen in the future? I mean, are you saying that there is not the other case before the court, and that there is the possibility of a case, and therefore I shouldn't ask you any questions because there is the possibility of something coming before the court?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Not entirely. That's part of it. The issue that's before the court, the appeal case that is being looked into now, will deal with partially just the legal part, but it will also bring in all the information of how the decision was arrived at, and so I think that it's better that we don't discuss it in the legislature.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, that is not, Mr. Minister, what is before the court. That is not what is before the court. I would respectfully submit that that is not what Mr. Meagher and Mr. Mamchur are at with your department right now. And as to the possibility of something else, some other court case arising at some time or another in the future, I don't think that that is relevant one little bit.

(1915)

You are before the court of the people of Saskatchewan. This is the . . . You don't agree? You don't agree.

Well, sir, I've got to say I'm just flabbergasted. You're saying that you've got no respect for the legislature. The people in this province have the right to know. They've got the right to know what's going on, particularly in regards to the Department of Environment and the controversy that surrounded your department since back before 1985.

This is the first opportunity we've had to begin to bring these items before the court of the people for a long time. You know that. You know that there hasn't been Environmental estimates like this for the last little while.

So this is our opportunity, and for you to try to sweep questions, or try to deny questions, or try to hide behind something that might happen in the future, I think is reprehensible. I think it's dishonest, quite frankly, in trying to deal with this.

We have here a situation, Mr. Minister, where a former member of the government, where a former legislative secretary to Executive Council is involved with business dealings with a department of the government, involved in business dealings prior to his defeat in the 1986 election.

we have some questions of conflict of interest which have been raised in this legislature before. This is the first time that we've had the opportunity to begin to examine, in fact, the precise nature upon which those conflict of interest allegations were based.

Your department was involved in dealing with Mr. Meagher and had a long relationship stretching back to February 13, 1985, when in fact Mr. Meagher was a member of the governing party at that time — party that you represent. I think it's only fair, and I think it's only right that we have the opportunity to address the concerns that people have raised around this issue. And for you to try to hide behind what doesn't exist legally is preposterous.

I have respected your right, if you like, or respected your wishes in regards to asking you the question: what occurred after the meeting. What occurred after making the decision which led to the court shutting down the Redberry Lake development? And if you notice that I haven't asked you any questions precisely because the events that took place in regards to you shutting down that development and subsequent events are before the court. And I've precisely left that area alone. But I think that people of this province have the right to find out what happened before, particularly in regards to something that was hanging fire in your department for over two years. I think that's only fair and I think that's only reasonable to expect some kind of answers.

My question is again: did your meeting with Mr. Meagher, which you said took place prior to the bulldozers working at Redberry Lake, did that meeting take place as a result of a phone call from yourself, or was it initiated by Mr. Meagher, or was it initiated by anybody else?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The member is making some pretty wide-sweeping statements in his comments. If you would like to go back and read Hansard during 1985 when this issue arose as a possible conflict of interest and the statements by the Premier at that time, when he said that there would be no development allowed because Mr. Meagher, could be thought to be in conflict of interest . . . And that's the reason that the item stopped in August and sat until after Mr. Meagher was no longer a member of the legislature.

So I believe that the proper things were done to avoid conflict of interest. Now that the man is no longer an elected member, we can't plead that it's conflict of interest. We're into a new year; he is no longer a member;

so different rules apply. And that is the course that he has decided to take evidently.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not questioning whether there's a conflict of interest between Mr. Meagher in the present day in his role as a private citizen and his role as a developer of Redberry Lake and the government, which is why I'm not asking you questions concerning your decision in terms of shutting down the development.

What I am asking you is precisely the fact that the Premier did, in this House, say that there was not going to be any development at Redberry Lake and he said that there will be nothing happening at Redberry Lake until the proper environmental steps took place. And we did see, we did see the marshalling of forces, and we did see the kind of preparations for the development begin to go ahead, and it wasn't until the public in this province raised the hue and cry at Redberry Lake that you finally stepped in.

That's the interpretation I'll put on events; that's the interpretation I want to put on events. I want to put it on the events because I think from your own mouth the words that you have spoken here today in regards to your role as Environment minister speaks pretty loudly. When you say today in the House that the proponents of a development should decide whether they or not will submit an environmental impact statement — and that's what you said. In other words when Peter Pocklington . . . He's the one that's going to decide whether to put forward an environmental impact statement. And we see a length of time in terms of Redberry Lake go from January of — pardon me — February of 1985 up until the spring of 1987, then Paul Meagher obviously thought that the same rules apply to him, and Boris Mamchur thought the same rules applied to him, that they were the ones who are going to decide that an environmental impact statement was necessary, then I think we've got some fairly valid grounds to put that interpretation on events. And you yourself said it, that it's the proponents who should decide whether an EIS (environmental impact statement) should be submitted or not.

An Hon. Member: — EIA

Mr. Lyons: — Pardon me, the member says EIA. It's called an environmental statement. Get your terms right.

So we have a situation here where the minister is saying that the proponents of development should be the ones who decide whether or not that development go ahead. On the one hand we see Peter Pocklington let entirely off the hook because his isn't a development, and on the other hand we see in the spring of 1987 all of a sudden Paul Meagher is coming down on, and I don't hold any brief for Paul Meagher, as the members opposite know, but it seems to me that there's a problem in determining within — from the ministers of Environment in this province — the kind of interventionist role . . . and I say that deliberately because I think the people of this province want their Environment minister to be an interventionist and to be a proponent for the environment and to be pro-active on environment.

When I see the kind of history of events leading up to

Redberry Lake, particularly given what's happened at North Battleford in the Gainers plant, and also what's happened at places like Waden Bay . . . Waden Bay on Lac La Ronge, where the proponents of a development which uses Crown land, which alters the shore line, which changes the ecology of the sites upon which they are developing for that area . . . And I would submit that that's a development — and here I'm speaking about the houseboats — the houseboats that have somehow appeared to be in the hands of Mr. Dave Longpré, who I'm quite sure the people of the province want to recognise will be the proponent in this development. We see Mr. Longpré who's taken over from Canadian Wilderness Adventures, move houseboats out of McGibbon Bay into an entirely different part of Lac La Ronge, will have an impact on the lake. And when we see your decision not to go ahead and demand from Mr. Longpré's operation an environmental impact statement, we see that you have not in fact responded to the general hue and cry raised by the cottagers on Waden Bay.

And I want to bring you back to something you said in regards to why you raised, why it was you who raised the issue of Redberry Lake. And one of the reasons that you raised the issue of Redberry Lake and demanded an environmental impact statement was section 2(d)(iv) of the Act. And you said one of the reasons why you were going to demand an environmental impact statement from Redberry Lake was the fact that it raised . . . caused widespread public concern because of potential environmental changes.

Those are the reasons, Mr. Minister, you gave for demanding an environmental impact statement at Redberry Lake. You yourself know that there was a widespread public interest and widespread public concern about the potential impact the environment of the development at Waden Bay. Why is that you did not demand an environmental impact statement and assessment from Mr. Dave Longpré in his operation in Waden Bay?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — When you go over three different issues in order to ask a question, it gets a little difficult to give you an answer to anything.

To begin with you talk about North Battleford, and I've outlined to you the reasons that it was not a development, so the same rules then do not apply. If it's not a development an environmental impact assessment is not required, and therefore the project goes through the municipal bodies for its licensing and its clearances.

When you talk of Redberry Lake, it was ruled that it was a development, and I gave you the exact sections of the legislation that indicated that it was a development and why it needed an assessment. so the member refers to two entirely different things, but evidently is not able to see the difference.

Waden Bay. I've responded to you by letter, and I believe that the letter spelled out very clearly why Waden Bay was not required to do an environmental impact assessment. And I can read some of the background if you like:

In 1985, the Department reviewed a proposal by Canadian Wilderness Adventurers for operation of houseboats on Lac La Ronge.

Aspects of the review included impacts on fish resources and wastewater management.

The Department determined that an environmental impact assessment was not required because environmental (impacts could be considered) adequately (and) controlled by conditions of the annual Outfitter's Licence issued by Parks, Recreation and Culture.

Operation of the houseboats at Waden Bay which was proposed this year will continue to require an Outfitter's Licence.

Proposed onshore facilities such as the new 14 stall parking lot and store on the new dock will be approved by Parks, Recreation and Culture. Conditions of leases will address concerns expressed by Waden Bay Cottage Owner's Association.

So those are the reasons. The issues concerned are addressed and handled by the licensing through the Parks department.

Mr. Lyons: — I'm afraid that doesn't answer, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I'm afraid it doesn't answer the question. The question is that you, in your department, in making the determination that the development on Redberry Lake constitutes a development, and you quoted from the areas of The Environmental Assessment Act upon which you made that basis, one of which was to "cause widespread public concern because of potential environmental changes." And you, yourself, have just admitted that there was widespread public concern, particularly by the residents of Waden Bay.

(1930)

And as you very well know, there was widespread public concern by the residents of Waden Bay. And the fact is that you received many letters from residents from Waden Bay, some copies of which were sent to myself, some to the members of the Legislative Assembly. You used the fact in The Environmental Assessment Act, section 2(d)(iii) — pardon me, section 2(d)(iv) — that was one of the bases for demanding environmental impact statements from the proponents of fl. The same rules for assessment do not apply in this case with Dave Longpré. Is it because, is it because Dave Longpré was the campaign manager for the PC candidate in the last provincial election, Mr. Larry Wolkowski? Isn't that the real reason why you didn't demand from Dave Longpré that he in fact submit an environmental impact statement despite the widespread public concern up in the La Ronge area? Or has that ever crossed your mind?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — To begin with, I didn't know who the campaign manager was, and thanks for the information.

I might tell you that we had some public concern, but I

wouldn't say great public concern, registered — a few letters before the decision was made, and two or three or four afterwards — but I wouldn't say it was wide public concern. There was some public concern by the cottage owners at Waden Bay, but it was not a big hue and cry. There were a few. And we did write to any who wrote to us, and I think with the explanations that were given we've heard very little since.

I believe that the development itself, as it goes ahead, and as the houseboats begin to operate there — they likely are by now — that people will see that the sewage is handled properly and that they are anchoring their houseboats away from the regular cottage owners and things, and I think the people will not find it the problem they at first expected.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I beg to differ with you on that as a former resident of La Ronge and somebody who was resident of the great town of La Ronge when the houseboats were first put in. Far from the public in La Ronge being assured that the houseboat operation, even out of McGibbon Bay, was going to cause less concern, far from having their fears assuaged in that matter, as the houseboat operations proceeded day by day, as they proceeded day by day, public opposition to the houseboat operation by residents of La Ronge increased. And one of the places where that opposition was highest was in Waden Bay, because they found that the houseboat operation did, in fact, did, in fact, pre-empt their utilisation of the public resource which is Lac La Ronge.

Which brings me to not one reason why you should have had a public environmental impact statement from Mr. Longpré. Section 2(d) of The Environmental Assessment Act, the second part, 2(d)(ii) says:

“development” means any project, operation or activity or any alteration or expansion of any project, operation or activity which is likely to . . . substantially utilise any provincial resource and in doing pre-empt the use, or potential use, of that resource for any other purpose . . .

And the facts of the matter are that in Waden Bay, Mr. Longpré's operation does, in fact, pre-empt the use of part of the provincial park in La Ronge — has in fact made, had in fact pre-empted the use because of the tree cutting that's gone to create the parking lot; has pre-empted the use of part of the shore line; and for the residents of Waden Bay, have pre-empted the use of the lake because of the kind of ignoring of the regulations under which the first houseboat operation was first licensed. The houseboats don't care. The people who drive the houseboats don't care what the outfitting licence says. they utilise and put those boats anywhere they want to. And that includes running them up around the rocks around Waden Bay, and they're parking them in Waden Bay despite the fact that they're prohibited.

What is the impact on the environment up there? You have two portions of the Act, one which says there's public concern, the second which says it pre-empts the use. And yet you refuse to demand that the former campaign manager for the PC candidate in La Ronge and

in the Cumberland constituency — you and your department — have failed to make him provide the adequate documentation and undergo the necessary assessment of their impact on the environment. You rushed it through and you did it holus-bolus.

The question is: why is it that there's one law for Paul Meagher, and why is it that there's another law for Peter Pocklington, and why is it that there's another law for Dave Longpré and his friend Larry Wolkowski in this? Why are there three laws for three different people in the province? Why haven't you been applying this law even-handedly? And why has your department not taken an active role in protecting the environment but are sitting there and allowing these developments to proceed apace except when you own political purposes don't suit you?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'd like to thank the member for clapping for me. I didn't know I'd said anything.

the hon. member's made quite a speech — not very much of it factual, but quite a speech. We've been over the ground quite a number of times with regard to the reasons that the different decisions have been made. I think each of the decisions have been made quite clearly and separately. Each one has to apply the text of the Act, and if the Act says they're development, then they are. If it says they aren't, they clearly aren't.

And that's the way the Act is applied. It has nothing to do with political background. If I were going to rule in favour of a politician, then I suppose I should have let Paul Meagher go ahead. Clearly we didn't do that. Clearly we put a stop to that. So the member is making wild accusations that have very little background to them.

There were meetings held in Waden Bay with the people, by the Parks department. All of the background information was applied and the people were given the evidence. They were able to ask questions and they were given the answers. Our department has looked very carefully at the issues at Waden Bay and the decision was made. it was made because we felt that the operation of houseboats, the installation of anchorage for those houseboats and the parking lot could not really be considered a development.

Along Lac La Ronge there are a number of places that have built cottages and have put in roads and things, and they haven't all been ruled to be developments and required environmental impact assessments. As far as the few houseboats that are there — obstructing the use of the lake — I find that very hard to accept. La Ronge is a very large lake. You could likely lose those houseboats out on that lake and most people would have difficulty even finding them. So there's still room. If you have a boat there and would like to go fishing, you can likely fish for a good part of a day and not encounter any houseboats.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm glad you now finally conceding that, in fact, there was a great deal of public concern. You are now conceding that there was public concern. A little while ago, a few minutes ago, you said we've got a few letters before and a few letters after.

Now you're talking about meetings with residents held between officials of the Parks department.

Now isn't it true that the reasons that those meetings went ahead was because of the kind of public outcry, not from a few people, not from a few cottage owners up in La Ronge, but dozens and dozens of cottage owners on Lac La Ronge, on Waden Bay, and also from residents, long-term residents, of Lac La Ronge itself? Isn't that the real reason that you began to do it? Isn't that the real reason that the park officials went up there to try to mollify, so that you wouldn't have to do the environmental impact statement, so that you would cover for Mr. Longpré, and so that Mr. Longpré could rush into this operation and get it started this year? Isn't that the real reason?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The statement that I made to you, that there were a few letters, still applies. There were a few letters, but very few.

The decision was made that we would not require an environmental impact assessment long before the Parks department went in to hold its meetings with the cottage owners. I don't have the exact dates; I'm just advised it was long ahead of that time. The meeting was held on April 1, so it would have been some time prior to that that our decision was made.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I can report to you, Mr. Minister, that I had a constituent come into my office, and they have had a cabin at Waden Bay for many years, and this was before April 1. And I have no reason whatsoever to doubt this person's word. And this person was very concerned about what was happening at Waden Bay.

And the thing that concerned the person the most — and I don't know whether it's your department or the other department — but the thing that was concerning my constituent the most was the total lack of consultation that had been held with the residents of Waden Bay. And it seemed to me on the surface that this person had a very good case. And I was concerned that this person appeared to be very reasonable. They said, I have no objection to houseboats on Lac La Ronge, but why are they putting them right on top of Waden Bay? And why does this person appear to have a special entry into what the government . . . what is being done here? How does this person get special consideration and we're not even consulted about construction of pump houses? And he mentioned a number of other things as well.

So I want to add to what the member from Regina Rosemont says, that there was concern. There was a concern from one of my constituents. He came to my office and was . . . He had been in Waden Bay for 10 to a dozen years and was really quite concerned about the total lack of consultation on this issue.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — As I indicated to you, the decision was made by my department that an environmental impact assessment was not required. then it went to Parks and Recreation. They did hold public meetings. The first of them was on April 1. So that would be long before any houseboat activity really occurred. You know, that's

before spring arrived. If you were to go up there to hold meetings in the middle of the winter, there likely would be very few people at a cottage site like Waden Bay. So I believe April was probably as early as you could anticipate there was any need.

The discussion and so on, you would have to talk to somebody in Parks and Recreation when that estimate comes up because they were at the meeting, we weren't.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well perhaps, Mr. Minister, my question should arise when I'm talking to the other minister on this particular matter, but I know that my constituent was concerned about this matter. Not that his concerns were primarily environmental, but they were about lack of insensitivity of the government with regard to allowing this project to appear to move ahead when nobody had been consulted at Waden Bay. And this was not too much ahead of April, beginning of April.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I suppose people always felt there is no consultation. Any department moving with an issue like the Waden Bay issue is bound to go out and talk to the people. The Parks and Recreation department did that. But to go up there in March or February would not be a reasonable time to expect to find cottage owners there. So I think it was wiser to go at a time when there was more liable to be opportunity to meet with the people who would be concerned, and that's what they did.

(1945)

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, just again somewhat on the same topic as that being pursued by the member from Saskatoon Westmount. I want to read to you a letter that was sent to our office from a constituent in Saskatoon. the constituent of, I believe, the member from Saskatoon Nutana. It says:

Dear Sir: The enclosed letter regarding the operation of houseboats at Waden Bay . . . has been forwarded to the Ministers of the Environment and Parks, Recreation and Culture.

And your department obviously received this letter.

I am concerned with the present Government's disregard of established rules and regulations as well as the ominous secrecy involving decisions which favour a selected individual or Company in preference to the wishes and well-being of the public at large.

I am at a loss to know how to assemble all the pertinent facts relative to this case, but certainly I suspect gross patronage and perhaps government money or promise of same.

I apologise for imposing on your busy schedule but I believe this is an important issue, and one in which you and your party are genuinely interested in.

And then it says:

Re: Proposed Operations . . . at Waden Bay. Dear

Sir: (And this is your letter to the minister) As a private citizen who has used the Lac La Ronge Waden Bay facilities for the past 10 years or so several times each summer for various periods, I voice my . . . concerns regarding proposed transfer of the houseboats now located at English Bay and previously managed by Apex Award nominee (now bankrupt) Wilderness Adventures Company.

I do not believe the original houseboat charter considered all the environmental factors adequately to begin with. Additionally, to the best of my knowledge, no follow-up studies on environmental effects have been made. As an example, Mooney Beach was a clean, quiet, respected picnic spot enjoyed by many cottagers, visitors, and tourists. Three and four years ago, I never saw any litter . . . beer bottles, cans, etc., in that vicinity. Since the houseboats appeared, litter is evident . . . and this is probably only one of the places so affected. In the interests of preservation, a follow-up environmental study on the effects of the houseboats to-date is imperative.

Apparently, a Mr. D. Longpré of La Ronge has been given permission to move the houseboats from English Bay to Waden Bay without any further environmental study or canvassing of Waden Bay cottage owners.

This was after permission was given for Mr. Longpré to take over the operation and move it to Waden Bay. And this cottage owner, who is a prominent member of the cottage owners at Waden Bay says, "without any further environmental study or canvassing of Waden Bay cottage owners."

If true, this is to my mind an inexcusable and irresponsible act. If a study has indeed been done, I would appreciate information relative to obtaining a copy.

I am sure a site to handle, dock, and repair the houseboats as well as parking space had to be prepared at English Bay. This undoubtedly meant clearing of trees, etc. Additionally, it is likely Government funds were used to at least some degree in the site preparation. Does it really make sense to abandon a recently prepared site and devastate the environment again a few miles further north to accommodate the desires of one individual? As a tax-payer and concerned citizen, I emphatically say it is not! Apparently more people's money is to be spent to accommodate the houseboats at Waden Bay. The current concerns regarding judicious expenditure and curtailing the deficit reaffirms this Government's credibility.

It is very likely sound judgement brought in the very restrictive fishing limits on all species in the past five years. Cottagers and visitors using normal dock facilities can be readily checked regarding catches. What ensures limit adherence in the case of houseboats anchored in out-of-the-way locations for several days in a row and equipped with modern cooking facilities?

Mr. Minister, this letter goes on and on, raising valid concerns. Now those aren't concerns of just one individual, those are the type of concerns raised by both cottage owners at Waden Bay and also by long-time residents of La Ronge, many of whom originally were in favour of the houseboat idea and the houseboat initiative and who, because of their experience with the houseboats, have turned against it precisely because they are not being controlled by any of the present regulations.

I go back again to The Environmental Assessment Act, and that part that says The Environmental Assessment Act shall have supremacy over all other Acts, regulations, or by-laws, in determining what kind of development should go forward and what kind of development should be controlled in order to protect the environment. That's what The Environmental Assessment Act says.

I submit that in the case of Waden Bay, and I submit that the cottage owners and the other residents in La Ronge will agree with me in this, that you in fact are derelict in your duties in regards to the Waden Bay development, that you have not listened to the concerns of the residents of La Ronge, you have not listened to the concerns of the cottage owners at La Ronge, and that you allowed this development to proceed in much the same way and with much the same kind of reasoning that allowed the Peter Pocklington development to proceed in North Battleford.

Again, I ask you, why? Is there one law for Peter Pocklington, who's a Tory in favour? Is there one law for Dave Longpré and Larry Wolkowski, who are Tories in favour in La Ronge? And another law for Paul Meagher, who's a Tory out of favour with this government. Isn't that the real reason that there is not an even application of this law? Isn't that the real reason that you're not exercising your authority as minister in a pro-active way? Isn't that the real reason that we have one after another, after another fiasco in environment in this province, is because you're using the department for narrow political and partisan purposes?

I submit, sir, that that's right, and I submit that your actions around this, in fact, are adding up bit by bit to the case to prove that to be the case.

I want to go back to one of those Tories who are out of favour with your government, go back to the Redberry Lake development. I want to ask you: you've had, and you've admitted as much in these estimates, and you've said as much in these estimates, that you've had meetings with Mr. Meagher, that your officials have been in contact with Mr. Meagher in regards to up until . . . and I won't ask you anything past from the time the bulldozer started rolling there, because of respect to the court case. Prior to that, did you have any conversations with the Premier as to the developments which were taking place at Redberry Lake?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well the member again gets up with a long diatribe of nothing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think it's time that we call it for what it is because he's making wild statements with no background at all. I don't mind him making statements if he has some background and he can prove it. But he's making statements that have

absolutely no substance. He makes the statement about the North Battleford, Gainers plant, then he makes the same statements about the Redberry development, which I think was a very serious error on the part of the developer and that was the reason that everything was stopped.

Then again, after I advise you of the reasons that there was no environmental impact assessment needed for Waden Bay, that the licensing would be handled under Parks and Recreation, then you go on again to make a bunch of wild statements. They really have very little purpose. If the member wants to make long speeches, I've got all kinds of time, but I don't believe that they're proving anything to anyone except that perhaps we're putting in the evening.

Mr. Lyons: — Now, Mr. Minister, it's an interesting response to a long diatribe, interesting response to a long diatribe.

The question was, and I'll refer . . . You say that you were dealing with individual cases here and that you have dealt with things on an individual case. And I submit, sir, that what we are seeing is a pattern, a pattern of action by your government. And I've said this before, I said this in my opening remarks, that there is a pattern of action by this government where environment is on the bottom of the totem-pole in terms of priority, and that you and your predecessors have in fact put environment way down there and have not acted in the best interests of the people of this province.

We're building the case bit by bit here. And the fact that it may cause some political embarrassment, the fact that this causes you some political embarrassment shouldn't worry you too much because it reflects not just on yourself, but it reflects on your predecessor and reflects particularly on the Premier.

My question is in regards to the Premier, in which you dodge very neatly, or tried to dodge. When did you tell the Premier, when did you tell the Premier that in fact Redberry Lake, Meagher and Mamchur, were going to go ahead with Redberry Lake. When did you tell the Premier that they planned to go ahead despite the fact that they'd been told they needed an EIS? When did you tell the Premier that?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I never told the Premier that because there was no need of telling the Premier that. When the bulldozer came on site, we put a stop to the issue immediately. We have always told that development group at Redberry, Mamchur and Meagher, that the environmental impact assessment was required and there was no authorisation for them to proceed.

The Premier knew that because it had been in the news it had been talked about for a long time. So there's no need of me running to the Premier with information about things that he already knows about. And when the injunction was placed to stop that project going ahead . . . I don't have to run over and tell the Premier that there's an injunction. He reads quite well, thank you, and he can understand.

And when you start talking about what a terrible job the

former minister was doing of the environment, and I bring you back to the nice report card that we get. Sure we got a C minus, but we're still second among all the provinces in Canada, and we rose on the scale from third up to second.

Your counterparts in Manitoba have been holding a good 10th for a long time, and they get a D minus. So don't criticise the emphasis that we place on environment. I think we place a lot of emphasis on environment and the results are the proof that we're doing a good job.

Mr. Lyons: Talk about . . . if you want to talk about the results, Mr. Minister, that's fine, but first of all we have here three instances of your fumbling. We have three instances of your fumbling. We've got Peter Pocklington let off the hook; we've got Dave Longpré let off the hook, and we've got Paul Meagher put on the hook. We got Dave . . . Mr. Meagher put on the hook. And rightly so, and Mr. Meagher quite rightly so, and we've admitted that. We've admitted that.

But there is something wrong with the process. There is something wrong with the process. And you've admitted, sir, you admitted in your opening remarks that you intended to fix the environmental assessment process. And you recognise . . . I think you've got to recognise because every blind person in this province recognises that there is something wrong with the environmental assessment process.

You know, there's the old saying — if it happens once, it's coincidence; if it happens twice, it's happenstance; and if it happens three times, it's enemy action. And when I look at the record of your department, we see not three or four or five things, we see a long list of actions which are detrimental to the environment in this province.

Going back to the question, going back to the question: when did you or any official in your department inform the Premier — and this is prior to putting in the injunction — when did you inform the Premier that in fact that the Redberry Lake development, Meagher, Mamchur, intended to go ahead with the Redberry Lake development? Are you saying that the Premier didn't know about this?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm not saying that at all. What I am saying to you is that I did not advise him because we had no indication that they were going ahead. They were doing a lot of talking, they were doing looking, they were trying to see what they could do to dodge an environmental impact assessment. He was advised on every turn that he must do the environmental impact assessment. He didn't follow that. Eventually he took a bulldozer on site, and that caused the court injunction, and the development stopped.

So at no time was he ever given authority by the department to go ahead. He knew at all times that he must do that environmental impact assessment. He chose not to do it. He tried to bulldoze his way in and start that way. It didn't work.

(2000)

Mr. Lyons: — Well I recognise he tried to bulldoze it over

the department, and you did the right thing in stopping him. That's not the question. I'm asking you because the Premier had a particular interest in this. And you've already referred to the fact, you've already referred to the fact that the Premier spoke in the House on this issue, so he obviously had a particular interest. And let's not kid ourselves, he had a particular interest in it because Paul Meagher was involved and he and everybody in this province knows that the Premier and Paul Meagher weren't exactly bosom buddies when it came to things that went on in caucus and came to the direction of the government. And again, particularly in the light of Mr. Meagher's statements around Redberry Lake and his estimation of your government — an estimation that I don't particularly agree with — but given the fact that this is a political issue, and given the fact that the Premier stood up not very long ago and talked about how he was politically competitive and he was out there to win, isn't it true that he was out there to win and beat Paul Meagher and this thing into the ground, and that you had instructions to keep him informed on Redberry Lake development?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, that's not the case at all. The member makes a lot of wild assumptions but unfortunately is a long way from the truth. The case with Paul Meagher, if there had been such animosity as you're trying to describe, then Paul Meagher would not have sought re-election last October. But he did seek re-election as a member of the Conservative Party. He was not successful, unfortunately, but he nevertheless was signed in as a nominated candidate by the Premier, supported whole-heartedly by the Premier, and he ran, and if he had been elected would be part of this government. But he wasn't. So when he went ahead this year and tried to start a development at Redberry without clearing the environmental impact assessment process. He was simply stopped.

If I recall properly, I think the Premier was in Japan at the time that occurred.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, the Premier has been in Japan for a lot of the events that are taking place in this province, and perhaps the people of Saskatchewan will be fortunate to have him move there permanently. Bad luck to the Japanese.

You say, sir, that Paul Meagher was on good terms with the Premier. You try to deny the fact that there was a falling out and there had been a falling out between the Premier and Paul Meagher previous to the election.

Is it not true that Paul Meagher was contested for the nomination in Prince Albert? And is it also not true that the person that ran against Paul Meagher had the backing of members of Executive Council? And is it not also true that the Premier tried to bump Paul Meagher off but was unsuccessful in the attempt because Mr. Meagher had support from other former members of this Assembly like Gay Caswell and other sterling lights of the back bench? Isn't that the real truth? Mr. Minister, how can you stand here and try to defend the relationship between Paul Meagher and this government?

Look at this, Mr. Chairman. "Meagher raps province,

promises major scandal." There it is. Meagher ... from the *Prince Albert Daily Herald*, April 10th, Friday, 1987, page 3. That's real good terms, Mr. Minister. Don't you think those are real good terms? Here he is rapping the province, promises major scandal. And "the words 'major scandal' and 'vendetta' rolled off the tongue of Paul Meagher today in the wake of an injunction to halt the Redberry Lake project." And isn't that just the culmination of a long and bitter relationship between the Premier and Mr. Meagher?

Again the question is, which you dodged: when did you and the Premier talk about the Redberry Lake development prior to you applying for the court injunction? What date did you speak to him about it?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I advised the hon. member that the Premier had not been involved. The Premier was out of the province at the time that that Redberry problem occurred. The decision to place a court injunction was made because you can't allow someone to disregard the legislation that we all must live by.

The department has the right to see that that legislation is followed, and when it was not being followed an injunction was placed. I believe that's the legal process that's proper — it was taken, the project was stopped. You hold up a sheet of paper and major scandal is going to be revealed. I haven't heard of any scandal, but there was a man under a fair amount of pressure right at that time and probably made irrational statements.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I'm glad to see that the minister admits that Mr. Meagher was irrational at the time he made the statements. I think that irrationality may, or may not, extend to other members of the government opposite. I hope you're not trying to imply that, sir. Because we're certainly not doing it here, yet.

As to the major scandal, Mr. Meagher says: "I actually welcome now the opportunity to get this into the judicial system. I promise a major scandal will develop when this reaches the court." So I'm sure all members on the other side are waiting for the other shoe to drop in this matter, waiting for that major scandal to occur.

Again because you did not deny, you did not deny, sir — and I submit that you did; I submit that this is the following series of events because your own words have in fact put this link of events together. Prior to the Department of Environment putting a court injunction on the Redberry Lake development, from your own words you said you had phoned Paul Meagher. You said you had met with Paul Meagher. Now which is first and which is second is something that you've refused to answer, is something that you've refused to answer. And it's very interesting why you're refusing to answer.

But after having telephoned Paul Meagher and met with Paul Meagher, I submit that you went, or one of your officials went and met. with either the Premier or one of the Premier's advisers, told him about that conversation, told him what was going to happen, told him what Paul Meagher's response was, told him that that was what really happened because the Premier himself, as you've admitted, had a special interest in this — had a special

interest in this matter. You said it. You said it here, that he had a special interest.

Are you asking us to believe now that all of a sudden, after the Premier's taken the time to stand up in the House and assure the House that his project would never go ahead until the proper environmental impact studies were done, and that putting his reputation and his credibility on the line in that regard, that all of a sudden he was going to forget about this? That he was going to forget about it despite the fact that he had the political falling out with Paul Meagher; that Paul Meagher took on his designate in a nomination race for the Conservative Party in Prince Albert; that Paul Meagher had beat it and Grant Devine wasn't necessarily unhappy to see . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order. I've asked members many times not to use other members' names, and I would appreciate if you'd . . . Order. I've asked members not to refer to the members of this House by name, and I would like them to keep that in mind.

Mr. Lyons: — Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, excuse me. Which name did I use?

Mr. Chairman: — You used the Premier's name.

An Hon. Member: — That is a profanity.

Mr. Lyons: — Yes, I don't want to repeat that name too often. I don't want to repeat that name too often when I refer to the Premier.

And it was true. Isn't it true that this is what really happened? — that the Premier was informed by either yourself or someone in your department and the Premier was informed by one of his officials and that he was keeping a constant day-to-day watch on what was going on in the Redberry Lake development.

Are you going to deny that the Premier was completely left out in the cold — that you did this all yourself, the preliminary stuff? Are you going to deny that you didn't advise anybody in the Premier's office?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't know. The hon. member mustn't sleep well at night. He seems to have a lot of very bad dreams.

The things that you're starting and assuming really are not factual, and I don't see any answer that I can give you other than what I did give you. The decision was made by me.

We went ahead with the court injunction because the hon. member had not followed the legislation that's in place. He had been advised a number of times that he must do an environmental impact assessment; he went ahead to develop with it; and the court injunction followed.

No, I didn't run to the Premier's office and say: what do I do now? You know, we're put in position as ministers to carry out the duties that fall to a minister of a department. The Premier has plenty to do without me running to him with small issues like that.

Mr. Lyons: — Well that's very interesting, Mr. Minister. That's very interesting. When you see the kind of development going on at Redberry Lake and the kind of controversy that surrounds it, and you think that that's a minor development, when you see environmental groups across the province banding together to oppose Redberry Lake, you say it's a minor development, and that you don't keep the Premier involved, I say you're not doing your job.

But that's not the question. The question isn't whether or not you put the injunction in. You did. The question is: did you report any proceedings of the meeting between Paul Meagher and yourself or a telephone conversation between Paul Meagher and yourself? Did you report that to the Premier or anybody in the Premier's office?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I told the hon. member that the issues that were surfacing in the paper, the Premier was well aware of, because he reads and his staff reads, and they read well and they keep up to what's happening. But at the time that the Caterpillar was on sight at Redberry and the injunction was issued, the Premier was not even in the province. The decision was made by me, and the issue was brought to a complete stop. And I think the decision was the right decision.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, you're not denying the fact that you informed the Premier's office or the Premier. I take it then that you reported to somebody in the Premier's office, whether it was the Premier or somebody else, that you had had a meeting and a telephone conversation, or both, with Paul Meagher, and that you reported the contents of that meeting to the Premier. And I respectfully submit, sir, that, in fact, was how the Premier was kept informed. Again I repeat: we're not talking about making the injunction, we're not talking about making the injunction, we're not talking about putting the injunction in. We're talking about those things that led up to making the injunction, because we had a former member of the legislature challenging the authority of the environmental department, challenging the authority of yourself, challenging the authority of the Premier. And are you trying to tell me that that's just a little matter, and that the Premier wasn't kept informed of that supposed little matter?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm sure after the injunction was filed that the Premier's staff would've read it in the paper and advised the Premier regardless of where he was. But I didn't go and advise the Premier because I don't see the need of that in something of this type. You deal with it as an issue — a person goes beyond the authority provided under the legislation. When that happens, the department must act, did act, and, I believe, made the right decision.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, once again, you're dodging the question. Once again, you're just dissimulating — disinformation. That's not the question. We're not talking when you put the injunction in place, or when you asked the courts to put the injunction in place; we're talking about before that time. We're talking about the time at which reports were circulating that Paul Meagher and Boris Mamchur were going to go ahead with the development. We're talking about the time when Paul Meagher said, they're not; I'll never do an environmental

impact statement; I'll new present one; because I'm going to go ahead because the government doesn't have the authority. We're talking about the time when Paul Meagher was saying to the government, I've got the approval from the department of rural affairs. We're talking about that time.

We're talking about the time that you called Paul Meagher. We're talking about the time that you called him and arranged a meeting. We're talking about the time that you met with Paul Meagher. And we're talking about the time that from that meeting you went and reported the contents of that meeting with Mr. Meagher to the Premier or somebody in the Premier's office. I want to know: when did you report the results of that conversation? And I also would like to ask you, what, in fact, was the content of that conversation with the Premier?

(2015)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't know. The member must be hard of hearing as well. I've advised you a number of times that I did not go to the Premier with that kind of an issue. The Premier has many things on his mind; he has lots of work to do. Things that the minister can handle should be handled at that level. The minister should not run to the Premier with every bit of trivia. So I didn't go to the Premier. I dealt with the issue; other members within the cabinet dealt with the issue as it applied to their departments. That's the way the work is done.

Mr. Lyons: — Once again, you're trivialising. Here we had a former member — here we had a former member . . . You know, Mr. Chairman, the minister says I must have trouble sleeping at night because I have these bad dreams. Well I can tell you right now, I've got nightmares. I have nightmares, thinking it's people like you in charge of the environment in this province. I have nightmares and so do the rest of the province have nightmares.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — When we see you allowing Peter Pocklington off the hook in North Battleford; we see you allowing Dave Longpré off the hook up in Waden Bay; and when we see you using the Department of Environment to put the screws to Mamchur and Meagher, you darned right we've got concerns. Your darn right we've not nightmares.

But once again, and I'm not hard of hearing — I'm not hard of hearing — did you talk about . . . Let's put it this way; did you talk about . . . Let's put it this way; did you relay the contents of any meeting that you had with Paul Meagher to any member of Executive Council, including the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The only time that I met with Paul Meagher was at a meeting instigated by him, and other members of the Executive Council were at the same meeting.

Mr. Lyons: — And I assume from that statement, Mr. Minister, that the meeting took place prior to the bulldozer going into action at Redberry Lake. Is that the correct assumption?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I told the member the answer to that before, and the answer is yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Now we're getting somewhere. Now, you admit you met with Paul Meagher, after phoning him. There were other members of the Executive Council present. Will you tell me who the other members of Executive Council were?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The members that were there were the members from, I believe, Turtle ford . . . Were you there? You were away. Okay, it was the member for . . . The minister of rural affairs was the other member.

Mr. Lyons: — The only other member there was the minister of rural affairs, is that correct? There were no other members there?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, that's right.

Mr. Lyons: — Were there officials from your department present at that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm sorry. There was one other member. The member for Redberry was there, and the officials from the Rural Development, the officials from Environment, and officials, I believe, from parks and recreation were also there. There were quite a number of people.

Mr. Lyons: — Would I be way off base in assuming that the topic of conversation at this meeting was the Redberry Lake development? And at this meeting, in terms of Redberry Lake, did you at this meeting at Redberry Lake, meeting with the other members, with Mr. Meagher, did you put forward the proposition to Mr. Meagher that an environmental impact statement was required?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I told the hon. member that that statement was put forward in August of 1985. It was put forward at the meeting that we had here in Regina, and he was again advised by telephone later on. So he had plenty of advice that the environmental impact statement was required.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, I'm not denying that fact. I think it's obvious from your words here that in fact he was told of that, and that at this meeting the screws were put to Mr. Meagher in terms of saying, you got to do the environmental impact statement. I hope that's what took place. I hope that's what took place.

At this meeting that we refer to, was it the position of Mr. Meagher at that time that he did not need to do an environmental assessment of any kind because he had a permit, and he had ministerial approval from the minister of rural affairs?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The member is getting into detail that I don't believe I should provide because of the court case, and I'm going to leave it there.

Mr. Lyons: — Are you talking about the court case in terms of the appeal, Mr. Minister, or the supposed court case, or the alleged court case which may at some time arise in the future?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm talking about the appeal that's before the court.

Mr. Lyons: — Would you care to expand then on how the conversation with Mr. Meagher would affect that court case?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, I would not.

Mr. Lyons: — ... (inaudible interjections) ... The follow-up question, as the member from Weyburn point out, I think is fairly obvious. Did Mr. Meagher, at that meeting between yourself and the minister of rural affairs and the member from Redberry and the other department officials, did Mr. Meagher at that time say to you, or to any of the officials, that he had leave to go ahead with the development, leave provided him by the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I indicated to the hon. member that I don't want to get into that kind of detail. I would not be privilege to any conversations he may or may not have had with the Premier. I don't think he had any conversations with the Premier, but I wouldn't be privilege to them if he had.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, that's not what I asked, sir. I said, at this meeting that you attended along with the minister of rural affairs and the member for Redberry and other officials from the various departments, was it the statement, or was it the position of the Redberry Lake development group that they did not indeed need an environmental impact statement because they had had previous leave by the Premier, given to them by the Premier, that they in fact did not need to do an environmental impact study because they had ministerial approval from the department of rural affairs?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The hon. member is again making very wild assumptions. Let me advise you that the Premier does not have that kind of authority. The legislation is in place. The legislation applies to everyone. So the Premier would not have that kind of authority, in our government, to make that kind of a decision.

Mr. Lyons: — It's interesting you say the legislation applies to everyone. We've just gone through an exercise here today where we proved that it doesn't apply to Peter Pocklington, and where we proved that it doesn't apply to Dave Longpré, but in fact it seems to apply to Paul Meagher.

Again, the question is ... I didn't ask you whether or not the Premier had the authority to give leave. I'm asking you whether or not it was the position of the Redberry Lake development group. Meagher, Mamchur, that in fact they did not need to do an environmental impact statement because they had previous commitment from the Premier of this province that they could go ahead, provided that the ... because of ministerial approval from the department of rural affairs. Was that the position of the developers at Redberry Lake?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I can't advise you on whether or not they ever talked to the Premier, as I told you. You indicated earlier that you weren't going to get into

questions that dealt with this issue as it came close to the time of the injunction, because that issue is before the court. So I believe for the benefit of your side of the House, and this side, as members of this legislature, that we would be wise not to get into details that close to the court case. I think it's not proper. So I would ask the member to ask other kinds of questions, but those questions I can't get into.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what I agreed to — and I want to make this clear to the minister — I agreed that I would not ask you questions concerning events which took place after the bulldozers began to roll at Redberry Lake. And I've said that three times. But I am going to ask you questions concerning events which took place prior to the bulldozers rolling at Redberry Lake.

The question I asked you was this: at the meeting attended by yourself, attended by the minister for rural affairs and the minister for Redberry, was it the position of Mr. Meagher, on behalf of the Redberry Lake group, that he did not, and their group did not, have to go through an environmental assessment process because the Premier had told him that he didn't need to do it, and he didn't need to do it because he'd gotten ministerial approval from the minister of rural affairs? Isn't that the position of the Redberry Lake group at this meeting?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Those decisions of whether or not an environmental impact assessment is required are made by the department and the Minister of Environment. They're not made by the Premier. That decision was made in 1985. It has never changed from that time to this. So the requirement was there in 1985; the requirement was still there this year. It's still there today. The decision has not changed over all that period.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I can appreciate that fact. Again, you didn't answer the question. You didn't answer the question. I'm not asking you what the Premier ... whether he was in Japan, or whether I sleep well at night, or whatever other red herring you want to throw up, or in your case a blue herring.

What I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is this: was it the position at the meeting attended by yourself and the other ... the minister for rural affairs, and the member for Redberry, was it the position of the Redberry development group, Mr. Paul Meagher, that he and his group did not have to submit an environmental impact statement because the Premier had told him that he didn't? Isn't that right? Aren't I correct? Wasn't that the position of the people from Redberry Lake? The Premier told him he didn't have to do it, so he wasn't going to do it. Isn't that his position?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay. Now you've agreed to talk about this, what went on at this meeting, finally. What was the position, then? You say no. What was the position of the Redberry Lake group at this meeting? What was the position of Mr. Meagher at this meeting? And what did he put forward as the position of the group in regards to their actions?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I haven't agreed to talk about what happened at the meeting. I simply gave you an answer to your question which had nothing to do with any meeting that I was at. And I simply told you that your statements were wrong. I said no.

Mr. Lyons: — Well obviously, Mr. Minister, you're not very anxious to talk about this meeting between yourself and Paul Meagher and the minister for rural affairs at which the decisions in regards to Redberry Lake were taken. So we'll come back at this another time and another place.

I've got a few questions I'd like to ask you regarding some information that I think would be of interest to the people of this province. Mr. Minister, you've got the . . . stood here for the last several days ink these environmental estimates, and through an explanation of various actions undertaken by your department, put forward what you believe is . . . or what I believe is your philosophy in dealing with the department. And I would label that a non-interventionist, reactive as opposed to a pro-active approach, not getting involved in things unless the political heat's turned on you.

(2030)

I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, can you state for us whether or not you have any background in environment, academic or otherwise, that makes you a logical choice for your position as Environment minister.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I suppose I would say to you that I have no formal training that would equip me to be an Environment minister. I would suppose that I could also say the hon. member likely has no formal training to be Environment critic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I've been working for a number of years in this province. I've been involved in the agricultural sphere and have been probably closer to nature than most people in that capacity and have an understanding of the environment and the needs of the soil, the needs of wildlife that live in the environment, and the needs of the people that live in environment. So in that respect, I suppose I have some background.

But the actual expertise in Environment comes from people that are hired and work within the department. And I believe that the people in the Environment department are well qualified, do a good job for the Government of Saskatchewan, and provide that kind of background to any minister of Environment that comes to take the job.

Mr. Lyons: — But, Mr. Minister, in response to that, I certainly respect the expertise of people in your department, and it's obvious that your role as Minister of Environment is a political role. And that's one we have shown time and time again in this House, that in fact your role is to make political decisions regarding the environment, not to make decisions which don't fall within the political realm, and that you've made a number of political decisions in your capacity. Those

decisions include getting Peter Pocklington off the hook. And I don't refer to you specifically in this, but that's the way your government sees that role, as a political role. So get Peter Pocklington off the hook. Make sure Dave Longpré gets his houseboats in La Ronge, and make sure you put the screws to Mamchur, Meagher up in there.

As a matter of fact, in response to what you say, I've had some training in the environment, but I'm not in your position right now. And I'm sure that some day if I happen to be sitting in your chair on the front benches, you will have an opportunity after 1990 to ask myself or one of my other colleagues our qualifications. You may not, you may not have that opportunity. You may not have that opportunity, given what's going on up in your area, but one of your decimated crew will have.

I note, Mr. Minister, though that you're assigned a Legislative Secretary, with some sort of responsibility for the water corporation — Mr. Martens . . . excuse me, the member for Morse. Now I have no doubt whatsoever that the member from Morse is of immense value to you in that capacity. But I want to ask you: has your Legislative Secretary any duties that involve the Department of Environment? Is he paid any allowances or expenses or other payments out of the Department of Environment?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — He has represented me at functions when I've not been able to be available. The majority of his expenses would be paid for from the water corporation. I believe there's been one or two expense statements for meetings where he has gone to represent the minister and brought greetings or spoke at given meetings. But for the most part, he works strictly on the water corporation side.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, will you then, given that in fact he has drawn moneys from the Department of Environment, will you submit to this House a statement of the amount of moneys drawn from the department up to July 1, let's say, by the member from Morse in his capacity as representing you through the Department of Environment? How much has he been talking out of the department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The department will bring that information for you. We don't have it here tonight. It wouldn't be very much money, but we'll provide that information.

Mr. Lyons: — Well we'll see whether it's a big bit or a little bit when you provide the information.

Speaking of money and things of that matter drawing form the department, I wonder, Mr. Minister, can I have a complete list of your personal staff, their names, and their present salary levels.

Okay, Mr. Minister, I notice that we have here ministerial assistants' salaries. First of all is Mr. Conrad Hild, his position classification is a ministerial assistant 4, his present salary is \$3,392 a month. Is that his present salary, as shown here?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That was the information that the

member asked for. It was the present salary. That is his salary.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Has Mr. Conrad Hild, in his capacity as a ministerial assistant 4, within the last 24 months received any increase in pay or any other benefits?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — In July of 1986 he got a 3 per cent change, which was the economic increase that was provided to staff across the government.

Mr. Lyons: — When was it, Mr. Minister? When in 1986 did he receive that increase?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I indicated to the member, in July of 1986.

Mr. Lyons: — Sorry, I didn't hear the July part. Another name I see here is Lorraine Moffitt, a ministerial assistant class D, and she makes \$2,518 per month. Did she receive any increase, and if so, how much within the last 24 months?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — She also received the same 3 per cent increase in July.

Mr. Lyons: — Did Ms. Moffitt or Mr. Hild receive an increase in the 12-month period prior to the July increase of 1986?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Neither one of them would have worked for the Department of Environment prior to that time.

Mr. Lyons: — Would it be fair to say they were working for the Department of Social Services prior to that time?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I really couldn't tell you which department Lorraine Moffitt was in, but Conrad Hild was probably with Social Services at that time, yes.

Mr. Lyons: — Given that Mr. Hild was working in the Department of Social Services at that time, what qualifications does Mr. Hild have to go to work at a salary of \$3,392 a month for the Department of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Hild has considerable education background, but the department advise me that they don't get that information for ministerial assistant. I know he has a degree and he's working on a masters. I think he has one subject to finalise his masters. But the total background of his degrees, I couldn't give you.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, I know that the department doesn't hire ministerial assistants. In fact, the responsibility for hiring ministerial assistants is in fact the responsibility of the minister. You're their boss, and we all know that they come and go as the winds of political fortune dictate. Did you check Mr. Hild's qualifications? If you don't know . . . If the department doesn't know, did you check to his qualifications to earn that much?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Hild was hired on before I became minister. He was transferred from Social Services

to Environment by the Premier and so was Ms. Moffitt. So I didn't hire either one. Ms. Moffitt, I believe, has about 25 years of experience here with government and has worked with ministers in a variety of different governments, going back into the '60s. So no, I didn't check because these were people who were on staff and transferred to me, and my instructions were to use those people for a six-month period, and if I wasn't satisfied, then to make change. And that's exactly the process that we've been through, and they've both been very satisfactory.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, Mr. Minister, I see that you have another ministerial assistant Class C, Brenda Kostiuk, at a salary of \$1,795 per month. Was Miss Kostiuk a member of your department when you took over as minister.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, she was.

Mr. Lyons: — You mention, Mr. Minister, that you received orders to keep these people on for six months and then evaluate them. Who gave you those orders?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That was the instructions to all ministers. The staff were assigned; these were people who had been working for government for some time, and we take them on. If they fill the needs of the minister within the department, fine, you keep them. If there's some reason that you're not compatible, don't work well together, whatever, then you could make change.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I notice in your classification these are ministerial assistants' salaries. Do you have any people on staff in your department classified as special assistants?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — These are the only people that I have working for the Department of Environment within my office.

Mr. Lyons: — Good. Mr. Minister, do you have . . . I know the members of your office staff have access . . . Do the members of your office staff have access to government vehicles either on a permanent or intermittent basis?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, they drive their own vehicles.

Mr. Lyons: — They never, never use government vehicles even on government business?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — They haven't up to this time since I've been minister.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, do you or any members of your staff travel by government aircraft?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes. I think that's customary for any minister to use the aircraft where it's needed, and if I travel by aircraft, I take the staff members that would be needed for the particular event that I'm travelling to.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder if you would mind providing us with a list of the, within the last 12 months, of a list of places travelled to by the Minister of Environment — and I realise that we're going to deal with two different ministers here — the destinations, the cost of the flight,

and the purpose of the flight.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that they don't have that information here tonight, but we'll provide it.

Mr. Lyons: — Will you make a commitment that I receive it within the next day?

(2045)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — They'll do the best that ... (inaudible interjections) ... Order, please. It's very hard to be able to respond back and forth here. Tomorrow being Friday, we are in the House at 10-. The staff will do what they can, but I couldn't guarantee that they could provide it tomorrow. It takes some time to go back and pick those figures out of the records, and because we will be in House by 10, it would be most difficult to make that commitment. We'll try, but I wouldn't want to promise for tomorrow.

Mr. Lyons: — Well if it is at all available, Mr. Minister, I'll be in my office after the legislature sits, till after 5 o'clock. So if they are able to provide the material to the office, that will be fine.

I wonder while at the same time that they are preparing that list, Mr. Minister, in your capacity, and also within the past 12 months the former ministers of Environment, in your capacities as ministers of Environment, did you or your predecessor travel outside the province? If so, I'd like to know where. I'd like to know the purpose of that travelling, the cost of the travel, and who went along.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that there has been no out-of-province travel by either the former minister or this Minister for the 12 months.

Mr. Lyons: — I'm surprised by the answer, Mr. Minister, for two reasons. First of all, given the government's record of job-riding around the world at taxpayers' expense, but particularly surprised given your role as the Minister of the Environment. We had recently a national consultative conference on the environment down in Ottawa at which the Environmental Protection Act — the proposed Environmental Protection Act proposed by Mr. Tom McMillan, the Minister of the Environment ... I'm surprised that neither you nor any members of your department, if I'm to listen to what you're saying, that neither you nor any members of your department went along to at least that conference, given its importance for the environmental future of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The hon. member is adding to his original question. What I indicated was that neither the former minister or I made any out-of-province trips as Minister of Environment. The staff have been out of the province. There's many meetings that staff are involved with, and so they have travelled. But the ministers didn't.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, will you provide us with the following: the destinations of the meetings that your officials went out of province; the reason for the meeting out of province; the cost of travelling there and return; who went to those meetings; the cost of staying there; the length of stay at the places where those meetings were held; and the lodgings at which those officials stayed.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that normally the travel for ministers has been provided, but it's not normal to provide that kind of information for department staff. As you can appreciate, there are a number of trips that department staff must make in order to do the job within the department. It would take a considerable amount of time. Our staff are busy, and I don't see that you would gain a lot by that kind of information. The total amount of travel, of course, is in the annual reports and also in the *Estimates*. I think you'd have no trouble picking it out, but it would take a lot of work and I really don't see the purpose. It traditionally is not provided.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, given the fact that neither you nor your predecessor left the province, and given the fact that there were very many important environmental meetings taking place in Canada throughout the last year — and I mentioned one of those which was the whole series and consultative meetings regarding the new Environmental Protection act, not to mention things like meetings in regards to the joint use of waters, or meetings in regards to the councils of ministers in the environment — would you not submit those expense requests, given the fact that you yourself or your predecessor didn't go, but that in fact that there were important environmental meetings taking place, and it was important for Saskatchewan to be represented there. I think that the people of the province have the right to know if, in fact, they were represented at these meetings.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I believe the meeting that the hon. member is referring to that took place in Ottawa was a meeting where the federal government invited non-government organisations to participate in a meeting dealing with the new legislation that was getting put forward by Ottawa.

Under other circumstances and meetings in different places, some of my staff were involved, and there has been a lot of correspondence and a lot of discussion on the new environment Act that Canada is introducing, or has introduced. So we have been very much involved in the time frame leading up to that legislation being introduced. But the meeting you refer to, I don't think department staff or ministers were really invited to that particular meeting.

I might tell you it's been a very busy winter. If they'd give me an opportunity to go somewhere, I'd love to go.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm quite sure, given what's on the plate and the agenda of the environment for Saskatchewan for the people in terms of their concerns of the environment in this province over the next 24 to 36 months, that you will have plenty of opportunity to go. One of those places you'll have an opportunity to go, I suspect will be Washington — and given the concerns now being raised by the Americans in regards to Rafferty — and we'll deal with that one a little later on.

You still didn't answer the question, because those groups that you mentioned, those non-governmental organisations, members of those organisations have told me that Saskatchewan, in fact, has played a fairly low-key role in both the setting up of the environment protection

Act, the proposed new federal environmental protection act. and I didn't believe it. I thought Saskatchewan, knowing the officials of your department, would be interested in it. I thought that, in fact, that Saskatchewan would be playing a much higher, higher role. And it would be my estimation that they would be playing a higher role.

Will you, to confirm that, tell me and give to us those questions that I asked you — the places where your officials went, where they went, what meetings they went to, how long they stayed, and the cost, as I had outlined earlier — in order to assure the pole of this province that Saskatchewan was indeed represented at those meetings which you yourself have said were important to the people of the province.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that the department's opportunity to work, to develop the new environmental Act for Canada would normally be done through the Canadian Council for Resource and Environment Ministers. And probably your non-government officials that you speak of would be likely unaware of those meetings when they take place. My officials did attend that meetings and did have input at that time along with the correspondence and the opportunity to input through that method. I was pleased that Canada gave us as much opportunity as they did to be involved in the development of that legislation.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Minister, did your department pay for any public opinion polls or surveys during the course of the last year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that we did not.

Mr. Koenker: — No polls or surveys of any description conducted by your department and paid for by your department, or paid for in part by your department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, there were no public surveys paid for by my department within the last year.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, as a follow-up to the question from my colleague: did any department of government do any poll or ask any questions in its poll related to the Department of Environment or any of its activities?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I really wouldn't have access to that information. I can only speak for what the Department of Environment did. If others did, I'm not aware of it, but I couldn't speak for them, at any rate.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Let me ask another way. Did your department receive any information from polling done by any agency or department of the government, whether the department . . . Was there any information from a polling provided to your department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised, no.

Mr. Koenker: — Did your department survey the residents or the cottage owners at Waden Bay about developments taking place there?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, we did not.

Mr. Koenker: — You conducted no surveys of residents in North Battleford with respect to the Gainers plant?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, we did not.

Mr. Koenker: — A little bit of a change of pace. How much did your department spend on advertising this past year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The total for the year: \$104,098.

Mr. Koenker: — What does your department have budgeted for advertising this year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The budget this year is 210,000.

Mr. Koenker: — Can the minister explain how it is that advertising more than doubles over the course of a year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — A lot would depend on the issues that you're dealing with. We have quite a number of environmental impact assessments that we must advertise. We've given out quite a bit of advertising related to the program for collection of chemical cans and the collection of the chemicals from different laboratories.

I'll just run down the list of the different areas the advertising covers: it's the reproduction of publications; the spill control program — they advertise in newspapers and provide kits that go out for people in industry; the department program brochures; advertising dealing with Environment Week; the annual report; and newspaper clipping service.

(2100)

An Hon. Member: — What are you doing this year you didn't do last year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We're just doing everything better.

Mr. Koenker: — You're certainly spending the public money at a much faster pace on advertising than you were last year. I'm wondering if the minister would table that documentation that he just referred to.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I might advise the hon. member that last year's budget was 218,000, and we spent 104,000. This year we are looking at the reproduction of a number of publications. They are printed, and when they expire then you have new. Where we spent something like 3,500 last year, we are going to spend 35,000 this year because of the need to replace a bunch of those that are used up. So things of that nature, I suppose, occur. We budgeted actually less than last year, and what we'll actually spend depends on how the year goes and the needs. But they are all spent on fairly straightforward kinds of advertising dealing with departmental issues. And . . .

An Hon. Member: — Can you pass that over?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No, no, I can't pass that over.

An Hon. Member: — Why not?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — It has personal comments on it, just for me.

Mr. Koenker: — With all respect, Mr. Minister, that was not the question I asked whether you would supply that information and pass that over?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well I advised the member that, no, I wouldn't pass that information over. You have the estimate book which also lists the same. It doesn't list the detail that I was using, but it lists the amount for advertising. Those were my own lists prepared for me for estimates and they have personal comments, and no, I won't pass it.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, you talk about the fact that that sum 30 or \$35,000 is to be spent this coming year on replacing brochures and other literature that needs to be redone. That still would only account for approximately a third of the increase in spending over this present year. And I'm wondering how you can justify another 60 or \$70,000 expenditure for advertising.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I think the member missed what I said. I told you that last year's budget had been \$218,000. Of that we spent 104. We're not talking here about money that's spent. We are talking about budget, and it's 8,000 less than last year. How much we'll spend, we'll have to wait for the end of the year to find out. We may not spend as much as last year; I don't know at this point.

I could tell the hon. member that the kind of figure that I gave you, that 35,000, that was exactly what was in last year's budget. We spent \$3,488 out of the 35,000. So it depends on the needs of the department whether or not the brochures are all used and you have to reprint. So the money is there if it's needed. If it's not needed, of course, it goes back into the general treasury.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, in a time of restraint, how is it that you don't restrain advertising budgets but you budget the very same figure, apparently, that you had last year? When the public is being asked to bear the brunt of government restraint programs, how is it that you refuse to curtail advertising expenditures in your department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I suppose you can say, hon. member, that we did curtail it. We budgeted 218,000 last year and we budgeted 210 this year, so that is a reduction.

Mr. Koenker: — Why is it that you would not budget what you spent, or approximately what you spent last year? Why would you want to possibly double your budget for advertising in a year in which you are asking the public to bear a restraint?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We will be practising as much restraint as possible. But I want the hon. members to realise the Department of Environment has many environmental impact statements being reviewed this year. That demands public advertising. And when we go into that process, it does cost money. Some years you have more of those statements than others. This time it's a

very heavy work year in that division of the department, and they will do a lot of advertising.

Some of the other programs you must advertise, otherwise people are not able to access the program. So you must do some printing and some advertising. I think that all of the advertising the department has been doing is very essential advertising to the environment of the province — it's not waste money at all; it's very well spent, and I make no apologies for the amount of money that we've spent up to now in advertising.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, I am asking you more specifically about the advertising that you propose for this coming year and the doubling of the budget. You talk about the expenditure of public funds for advertising the chemical cans program. That was advertising that you would have conducted last year and would be approximately the same this year.

I'm wondering where the increases in advertising occur this year? Have there been reallocations within the budgetary figures for advertising — shiftings of priorities within the advertising budget?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — If you go to the 1985-86 actual expenditure, the budget in that year was 219,000. When the budget was struck for 1986-87, it was set at 218,000. The actual for '86-87 ended up at 104,000-and-a-few dollars. The budget this year is 210,000.

There are no great escalations; they're estimates of what you may spend. If you don't need it, you may well find that next year we've spent 100,000 or 110,000 or something again. It depends on the costs of the necessary advertising within the department and the number of brochures and things that are requiring reprinting.

Mr. Koenker: — You strain credulity, Mr. Minister. I'm wondering now if you can tell me how many environmental assessments you conducted this past year.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — There were 65 active projects in '86-87. Projects that did not require an EIA turned out 37; projects that were withdrawn, two; projects still being screened, eight; projects requiring an EIA, 18; EIAs completed, three.

Mr. Koenker: — And how many assessments do you anticipate conducting this year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That's almost impossible to estimate, but we do have on hand and working within the department some very major environmental impact statements right now, as you are aware.

We have the Shand power development, and the Rafferty-Alameda, which just those two, will require considerable advertising, but they're very heavy projects. And there likely will be many others, depending on how many developments go ahead that require them.

Mr. Koenker: — And you anticipate a substantial difference this year in advertising for these assessments as opposed to last year.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, we do. We've done quite a number already this year, and we do anticipate that the cost for the advertising will be higher than last year.

Mr. Koenker: — Which companies handle advertising for your department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The advertising is done through the central government agency, and they in turn use Dome Advertising.

Mr. Koenker: — How much money was Dome Advertising then paid for advertising on behalf of your department last year?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Approximately 81,000; approximately 81,000.

Mr. Koenker: — Then how would the minister account for the other, it'll be about 25,000, that was spent on advertising?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That would mostly be printing and newspaper kind of advertising. The other would be the preparation of the annual report, the preparation of brochures, and the actual producing of that material for the department.

Mr. Koenker: — And which firms would have handled those contracts?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That was what I advised you, Dome Advertising.

Mr. Koenker: — Somehow I'm not understanding. I understand that Dome Advertising was paid \$81,000 last year, and there was still other placements of newspaper advertising for the department, preparation of the annual report, and those kinds of things. Was that work done by Dome, or was that work done by another firm?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — What I'm telling you is that Dome did the preparation of the annual report, the lay-out, that sort of thing, and then the actual printing would also be done.

The balance over the 81, there would be approximately 4,000 . . . Sorry, approximately 2,600 would be for the newspaper clipping service, and the balance of it would be for the actual printing.

(2115)

Mr. Koenker: — Who does the newspaper clipping service for the department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Prairie Print Clipping services.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you. And then the remainder would be for the printing of the newspaper ads themselves?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The printing of the annual report, the printing of all of the brochures that the department uses — all of that type of printing would be included in that.

Mr. Koenker: — Who does that work for the department?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Dome Advertising does the layout, and then it's contracted by tender.

Mr. Koenker: — In other words, all of the rest of the expenses above the 81,000 we've established for Dome and the 2,600 we've established for the prairie clipping service, all of the rest of that would go to Dome Advertising?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — No. That goes to the company that gets the bid to do the printing. It's tendered, and whoever gets the tender would get that amount of money.

Mr. Koenker: — Could you, then, tell me which companies got the contracts, won the bids for the printing jobs, the tendering there?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — There are a number of small jobs, but the annual report was done this year, or last year, like for '86-87, by Saskatchewan government printers.

Mr. Koenker: — And what was Saskatchewan government printers paid for the annual report, then?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That one would be in the neighbourhood of 12,000.

Mr. Koenker: — And the remainder, then, would have been paid to which printing firms?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The tenders are handled through a joint government format, and so basically we don't get the answer of which particular person does the printing always. They handle the tendering and the awarding of the contract, so we don't always have those names. That's what my officials advise me; they don't have it for the small ones.

Mr. Koenker: — Well these are for the small ones, but is it not possible — you can say it's for the small ones — is not possible, however, that inasmuch as the central government agency that contracts for the advertising, and that allegedly contracts for these small jobs, could in fact have given some of the printing contracts to Dome Advertising themselves?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I don't believe that they do the printing, but my staff advise me that they could get the information. They don't have it, but they could get it and provide it to you.

Mr. Koenker: — Could that information be provided for tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I would doubt it because we start at 10 o'clock. I don't see that there would be an opportunity for the staff to gather the information. We would have to provide it later.

Mr. Koenker: — Could we expect the information before we finish these estimates — by 5 o'clock tomorrow or by Monday morning?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I believe we could do it by Monday, but as you realise, the staff will be here tomorrow for

estimates, and the House closes at 1, so they wouldn't have the opportunity to do very much until after that time.

Mr. Koenker: — I appreciate your commitment for Monday. I think that would be adequate. What we're looking for, then, is the remainder of the expenditure. That concludes my questioning of the minister.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you a few questions about some concerns that have been expressed to me by constituents in the Regina North East who reflect some concerns, I think, of people in the city in general.

There are a number of chemical plants located in north east Regina, in the industrial park area. Some of them are very close to schools, as my colleague, the critic for Environment, has pointed out previously. I have written to you at one occasion, a letter, in which I brought to your attention concerns expressed by a certain person who had written to me, and you were good enough to respond. And I appreciate that.

My question to you is, that in light of the fact that these chemical plants are a potential hazard — and I'm not imputing anything on their operations at this time, but any chemical plant is a potential hazard situation — could you tell this House, and me, what kind of criteria, or what kind of requirements do you have in the department to ensure that all possible safety precautions are taken to make sure that a dangerous situation does not arise?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that for the most part the chemical companies go through the city process when they go into an industrial park, and they are given licensing authority in that manner. If there are any complaints that arise, then my department deals with those and addresses the concerns that are raised. But initially, we don't always get involved in those decisions.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm sorry, that doesn't quite, that doesn't quite come across very well, Mr. Minister. Are you saying that your department, which is the Department of Environment for this province, has no jurisdiction, has no requirements that have to be met in order to ensure that health and life are protected when it comes to situations where there could be dangers created by chemical spills or chemical leaks or inadequate disposal of waste from chemical plants? Are you saying that your department has no role to play in this?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, we do have a role to play in that area. What I was saying was that the initial construction of a chemical plant in an industrial park of a major city is normally dealt with by the city. If there are concerns and they do not meet the requirements of the department, then of course we step in and we do deal with the issues.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Do you not, Mr. Minister, have any type of inspections that you do from time to time in order to ensure that the requirements and regulations are being adhered to?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm sorry, I was getting information. I missed your question. Would you mind repeating it?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, my question was, while you were getting the information, is: does not your department carry out inspections in chemical plants or similar type of installations from time to time to ensure that all of the safety requirements are being met?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Much of the type of inspection that you speak of would be done by the public safety side, if that's what you're referring to. And yes, those inspections of boilers, and electrical hook-ups, and all of the different inspection areas would be involved during the construction phase, but strictly as an environment department. They would not have, prior, been involved to the same extent.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But I ask: why not? Do you not appreciate the fact that in order for the health and safety of the public to be protected, your department ought to have some role in ensuring that all the safety requirements are being carried out.

I know the role of the city. I made my enquiries there. I'm asking; Mr. Minister, what role do you play? And I don't believe it's adequate if the only role you play is follow-up when somebody complains because somebody has died because of something that has gone wrong. do you not have a role where you inspect these plants to ensure that they are safe?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well, there are permits issued with regards to the methods that they can operate, and there are some monitorings of emissions from chemical plants to be sure that they're within the requirements.

The sewage requirements for a chemical plant are spelled out, and any spills have to be reported to the department. That's a requirement. So yes, there is that type of monitoring.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — How often do you have your people and your officials inspect these facilities to ensure that all the requirements are met?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that different types of plants have different requirements. The anhydrous ammonia is a pressure vessel that it's stored in, and they're only allowed to be established outside of the city limits, and they are inspected on a regular basis, depending on the installation. Sometimes it's annual, sometimes it's once in three years. It varies with the type of vessel. If it comes to fertiliser type of plants, they're still classified as a chemical plant, but those would be licensed by the city.

So there's a different requirement there, and there's not a continuous ongoing inspection, the same as there is in the more dangerous type. If it comes to the chlorine type of plant again,, it's a pressure vessel, falls under The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act, and is required to be inspected on a regular basis. So it varies considerably. When you say chemical plant, it can cover so many things. It's very difficult to give you a definite answer.

(2130)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Without in any way reflecting on the activities of any plant, let me give you one example, and then you can give me an example in response. It might satisfy my needs to have the answer.

Let's take Hoechst chemicals. Do you do a regular inspection on that kind of an industry, which is located in the city, and if so, how regular? And if not regular, what does it take in order for your department to do a check on it?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that Hoechst Chemicals has an air pollution permit, and we try to inspect that one on an annual basis.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, from time to time people will bring to your attention concerns about what they think may not be a good situation. Will you follow up on each one of those and provide, then, a response and a report on what your findings are? Is that the procedure that you follow?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, that's the process that's used.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — And when you do the follow-up, Mr. Minister, what are the arrangements? Do you notify the chemical plant that your people are going to go and do the inspection ahead of time, or do you just show up and do the inspection?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — That varies on the nature of the complaint, but quite often we would just show up and do the inspection. I think that's the best way to catch a company that's not obeying the regulations.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Chairperson, to the Minister. Mr. Minister, can you tell me what you know about PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyl)?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Let me advise the hon. member that I'm aware of the contamination that PCBs cause.

We do have a company in the province who handles the low level of PCB-contaminated oils, and they process it and make it available back to Sask. Power and other companies who use it for reuse. So I'm not just sure what area the hon. member is looking at.

I am just advised that we have recently printed a major pamphlet dealing with PCBs and the method of handling it. If the hon. member would like one of those brochures, we would be pleased to provide that. We don't have it tonight, I don't think, but we'll send it across.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, can you tell me what the possible consequences or health hazards there are associated with PCBs?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We do know that it is a chemical that provides difficulty with toxicity, but when it comes to just the effect that PCBs have on individuals, I think it would depend to a large extent on the level of PCBs present, and whether it was external or internal that a person was involved with them, so it would be very difficult for me. I think you'd have to have a medical doctor really to give you that kind of background. My department wouldn't

have that.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, do you know where PCBs are used in Saskatchewan, in what sort of industries? Where, in Saskatchewan, would PCBs be used?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The biggest part of it is used by Sask. Power in its transformers and capacitors. Smaller amounts of it are used in other areas, in motors for submersible pumps and things like that. And a recent study from Ontario sort of gave background information on that, but it's a fairly new report.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, how many PCB spills were reported in the last calendar, or not calendar year, fiscal year? Does your department have that information?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We don't have that information here, but it would be available on our spill reports listings. If the member is really anxious for it, we could probably go back and get it, but it would take some time.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, if I could have that information by tomorrow, if it's easily available, I'd appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I might advise the hon. member that the spill report is a very detailed report and it's ongoing day after day. I don't think it would be possible to pull that out in a day; that would take a considerable amount of work. So I couldn't provide it by tomorrow, but we could provide it in, I don't know, in a couple of weeks probably would be more . . . Yes, they think probably by the end of next week but not, definitely not tomorrow or in a day; that would be impossible.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I would appreciate it if I could have it by mid week because we'll still be in budget estimates for the Department of Health, and it would be useful in terms of pursuing some of my concerns with regard to PCBs. I'm wondering if it would be possible to have the information available by Wednesday of next week?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — We'll do the best we can. I would hesitate to guarantee you'd have it by Wednesday. We'll do the very best we can. If it can be by Wednesday, we'll put it across to you by then.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you outline in detail the kind of procedure that your department uses once they've been notified of a PCB spill?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Immediately that we hear of a spill, someone goes to the site. We try to contain the spill in as small an area as possible. Then we try to, at that point ascertain the level of PCBs in the commodity that was spilled. Then we gather it up, put it in barrels, including the earth that is saturated with the PCBs, and try in that manner to gather it and store it until it can be processed.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I am wondering if you

could tell me how many storage sites there are in Saskatchewan for PCB spills that the Department of the Environment has supervised the process whereby PCBs have been picked up and put in barrels.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — My department wouldn't have the information of the number of sites. Saskatchewan Power Corporation, because they are the company that uses the bulk of that type of oil, would likely be more capable of advising you of how many sites. Now there are a couple of sites in Saskatoon that we're aware of, but I really couldn't give you the information because we basically don't have it.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, are you telling me that the Department of the Environment, the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment does not know the exact location of PCB storage sites around this province, and you don't know how many sites there are? Is that what you're telling me?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, that's exactly what I'm telling you. And if the hon. member will realise what she's asking, if you go into rural Saskatchewan and every farm yard that has a transformer from the early '50s will be a PCB site, because these transformers were all filled with PCBs, Sask. Power has sites all over this province. It would run into thousands of locations. So yes, I'm telling you that we, as a Department of Environment, do not have that kind of information readily available.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I'm not talking about where various transformers are located or various light ballasts are located, I'm talking about storage sites that have come about as a result of the Department of the Environment's supervision of spills, the collection of the earth and the PCB chemical, and then consequently those barrels being stored in various places around Saskatchewan. And I'm wondering if you know where those sites are.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that traditionally Sask Power would be the company that has the responsibility to look after the product that is spilled, because normally it's their product. And they have sites that they have prepared that have concrete, and they're enclosed so you don't have the PCBs escaping into the environment. So traditionally when the clean-up occurs, we're there and see that it's done properly and that the site is clean. But the actual storage of the product then goes back to the company.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, if you're not aware of all the storage sites around the province, I'm wondering what sort of process your department goes through to monitor the storage of PCBs.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that our department does not monitor the storage sites. If there is any complaint raised about a storage site that's not proper, then of course we will have it checked. But Sask Power traditionally is the company that we deal with. Sometimes there have been others, but traditionally that's the main company that would be storing the product.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I think that I heard you

acknowledge that PCBs are highly toxic. I think that in your own roundabout way you have acknowledged that there are health hazards associated with PCBs and contamination. As the Minister of the Environment, I wonder why you hold the view that the Department of the Environment has no responsibility to monitor those storage sites?

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I'm advised that many of the storage sites are temporary sites. The product is taken to a site, and then it's transported to be processed and the problem eliminated. So we don't monitor all of those sites. We have inspected the major sites that Sask. Power has developed, have approved the type of storage that they are using, and we don't really go back and monitor every year or anything, each of those sites. If there is a problem shown to be developing, of course we'll go back and review and see that it's cleaned up. But it would be a major job for any department to try and monitor each and every site where there has been a product cleaned up and stored for a brief time.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in knowing your definition of "temporary" or "brief." What is your definition?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Temporary can mean different things at different times, and I'm sure you're aware of that. Sometimes a temporary site would only be for a matter of days. Other times, it could be a matter of several months. But the permanent sites where PCBs normally are gathered, they're ongoing sites that are used year after year.

So I suppose the difference between the two: one would be the permanent type of site that's developed and used year after year; the other is qualified as a temporary site, and it could be anything from days to many months, like most of the year.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, could you give me a list of the permanent sites that you refer to. You seem to have some knowledge of permanent sites. Can I get that list from you, and can I have the list from you by next Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, we could give you the listing of those permanent sites. There aren't many, but I don't have the exact locations here tonight. We'll provide it to you.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I'd be interested in your view of PCB storage sites in residential areas. Do you know of any PCB storage sites in residential areas in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I couldn't indicate to you whether they're in residential areas or not. I'm not that familiar with the sites. We will provide you with the information of where the sites are, and then I guess you'd have to know the city well enough to know whether or not they are in a residential area.

Sometimes, you may classify a site in downtown Saskatoon as being residential. Maybe it's commercial,

you know, so it's a fairly fine line. It's residential because there are apartment buildings; it's commercial because it's city zoning that says its commercial. So I have some difficulty with that, but we will provide you the locations of those sites.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take it from the Minister's statement in response to the question from the member from Saskatoon Nutana that you'll provide that information within the next seven days, let's say?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Yes, we indicated to the hon. member that we'd provide it within the next week.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I was following the questioning back and forth here regarding the spills. Earlier on, in fact the first day of estimates, I had presented to you a list that I'd read into the record, but I'd also provided to you via way of letter dated June 26 of a number of things that we would like you to supply us for the estimates and during the estimate process. I want to see if I can get, now, a response from you to each of these items.

The first item we asked for were that two copies of each of the environmental impact assessment statements that have been filed with the Department of Environment in the past 3 years, since July 1, 1984. Will you provide that information to our office and to myself within the next 5 days please?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Let me advise the hon. member that the request you make would be a major undertaking for the department. All of the environmental impact statements are in the Legislative Library, straight across the hall from your office. I believe that they're readily accessible to the hon. member, and I don't feel that it would be proper to take the time of the staff of the department to provide all of those statements at considerable cost to the government in both material and time. They're readily available to you in the Legislative Library, and I would ask the member to access them in that manner.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, just a . . . and I'm going to get back to this question. I guess, depending on your answer to this question. Other than the environmental impact assessment statement, there were one, two, three, four, five, six, seven other requests made in the letter. Will you provide myself, and our office, and this side of House with the information requested on the other seven requests, or are you going to have the same "try to find it yourself" attitude in regards to that information?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — The department comments would be with the statement in the library. They're provided there for the purposes of the public and certainly are easily accessible. And I'm not asking the hon. member to find it himself; if you ask the librarian, she'll help you.

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, there has been in recent months certain concern and publicity in this country and in North America concerning the problems with radon gas and other gases and substances seeping into homes and polluting the living environment and so forth. I wonder if you can

report to us if there have been any such complaints from residents in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I am advised by the department staff that a major study was done dealing with radon gas back in 1975-76 period. That information was made available, and a number of ads were put out to the public. Individuals would not be able to really recognise that they had radon gas unless they had very technical equipment to measure it.

If we had request, we would go out and check, but we don't get regular calls or anything of that nature saying that we have a problem. There really is not a significant problem in most homes. And if you feel that you have a problem, then ventilate your basement or whatever with a fan or two and you likely would clear it anyway.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Minister, I have received one very specific inquiry about what appears to be a rather severe problem with some kind of polluting substance which seems to be unidentified in a particular home in the community of Willow Bunch, where a rather elderly lady is having great difficulty in getting help in determining what the problem is. And I wonder, just as a matter of information, if her circumstance were to be described in detail to you and your officials, if you would be in a position to take action to answer her questions and relieve her anxiety, because at the moment, for health reasons, because of this pollutant, her home is virtually uninhabitable.

Hon. Mr. Swan: — I would ask the hon. member if he has made the department aware of that concern. If you haven't, then I suppose we couldn't correct it. But if you would like to provide us with an address and phone number, or whatever, and the name, we would be pleased to address the problem

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.