

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

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

Item 1 (continued)

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, prior to the supper break we were talking about the introduction of aluminum cans into the province and the effect that will have on jobs in our province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we've not finished that quite yet, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, by your remarks before supper I take it that you agree there will be a job loss in the brewing and bottling industries. I wonder if you have some figures, some predictions about exactly what that loss will be.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, I don't have any figures like that. A lot will depend on market share that cans may take, and it depends on whether or not the people in the industry put can lines in. And it's my understanding that we now have one can line operating or ready to operate in Regina, so that would make a difference. It depends on a number of things.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, just for our information, would you be willing to tell us where that can line is proposed to be in Regina?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the Coca-Cola company in Regina will have its own can line, and I believe it's in place now.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, you indicated before supper that in fact you expected there, with the new legislation that you're going to bring into this House some time, that there will be new jobs created. You indicated that there may even be more jobs in the long run, and yet tonight you tell me you don't have any idea how many jobs will be lost. I don't understand how your government can introduce this kind of legislation, this kind of new program that will indeed affect jobs, and not have at least an estimate of the effect on working people in this province. And I think that they deserve an answer to that. You must have some idea how many jobs will be affected. Could you give us that estimate.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — There are so many variables that can be looked at. The companies in the province could expand and create more jobs. They could contract and bring product in from other provinces or other areas. I can't really give you a figure. I think to make wild guesses in our business is not fair. I would anticipate when the complete change-over is made that likely you will see an increase in jobs as near as we can estimate.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, will your legislation ensure that the canned — and I'm talking about beer now — that canned beer will not sell for less than bottled beer in our province?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That would not come under our department, that would be under the Liquor Licensing Commission or the Liquor Board. We wouldn't have prices on beer.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, then is it your opinion that canned beer should not sell for less than bottled beer? Would that be your position or opinion?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I won't offer opinions on that. I don't believe that it's part of my department's mandate. That comes under the Liquor Licensing Commission and I would leave that information for them to give to the House.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, you are a member of the cabinet, I take it. I would assume you have a position on this issue and, as Minister of the Environment, I'm sure your cabinet colleagues would want to know your position. We who sit in this House with you would like to know your position. There are a large number of people in our province whose lives are going to be affected by this change. They would like to know your position. Mr. Minister, is it your position that canned beer should not sell for less than bottled beer?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well I think I gave the hon. member my answer. I don't believe that it's my job here to be giving you opinions, it's rather to give information from our department of the things that are happening under our department.

Though I sit in cabinet, I don't speak for every department of government. I do understand, and I know a lot more than I'm expected to answer for here. The questions here have to deal with the issues that are under the Department of Environment and Public Safety, and that is not one of them.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, in the legislation that we are waiting for, will this legislation contain a broad recycling policy for your government?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I think the hon. member will have to wait until he sees the legislation. I won't go into that kind of answers.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Then, Mr. Minister, do you, as the minister responsible for the environment in Saskatchewan, believe that this province should have a recycling policy?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — As a department we have shown that we have an interest in recycling and that we did go into the scrap vehicle recycling program and also the chemical can recycling. As a department we've always had an interest and continue to have.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I accept the fact that you've had an interest in this. I clearly recognize that and recognize it in your department, but your interest has not provided for Saskatchewan a comprehensive recycling program as of yet, and there are a goodly number of people in our province who are hopeful, hopeful that soon we will see such a comprehensive program.

Indeed, Mr. Minister, I note that as a jurisdiction, Saskatchewan is considerably behind other jurisdictions in this country in terms of recycling. To date in this province, we do not have a curb-side recycling program, nor a depot recycling program. I think beyond the recycling being done by Cosmos Industries in Saskatoon with newspapers, we've really had no long-term plan.

We do not have in this province a recycling council as do the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario. We do not have in this province a recycling co-ordinator as do the provinces I just mentioned.

So I'm asking you then tonight, Mr. Minister, is it your plan, either related to the issue of the aluminum cans, or at least in this session, to bring to this House and to the people a broader and long-range recycling program for Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I believe that I have answered your question several times on that issue and advised you that I won't second guess the legislation. When the legislation comes, you'll be able to read it yourself. I told you it should be here soon and you'll have to wait for that for that kind of answer.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, as my colleague from Saskatoon indicates, you have a responsibility to this House, but I think even a greater responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan. A number of people — a goodly number of people — are anxious to know if you at least are going to propose a recycling program for Saskatchewan, an expanded recycling program. Surely you can tell us tonight if it's in your upcoming agenda. Will you tell us that?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, I'll be bringing the legislation forward and we'll deal with it at that time. I can't second guess the legislation here.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, are you not writing the legislation? Are you not responsible for the environment in this province? Would you not be the minister responsible for a recycling program? You don't need to second guess the legislation, just tell me what you're thinking. Is it in your plans to establish a recycling program in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Policy issues, like the one the member is talking about, are not any one person's purview, but rather they are the purview of cabinet. That decision will be made by cabinet and brought here to this House in due time. And when it comes to the House, you'll have every opportunity to read it, to debate it, to have answers to your questions. We will be . . . When the legislation goes through in Committee of the Whole you'll have ample opportunity to ask questions about anything that you don't understand in the Bill when it comes. And so I would ask you to be patient for a few more days until that Bill comes in.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I read your government's throne speech at the beginning of this session with some care, looking for an indication in that throne speech that we might expect a recycling initiative

in this session. I could find no mention of it in the throne speech. Am I to take it from that that we're not to get one; or secondly, that it's really not a priority for your government?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well I think the throne speech debate was held and the things that were mentioned that would happen in the throne speech, you can look forward to. But everything that government does is not mentioned in the throne speech, so you can make your own deductions on that.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well frankly my deduction is, Mr. Minister, that it's not a priority for your government. And if it were a priority for you or your government, I'm sure you'd be willing to discuss the issue here in the House. That's what we're here for, is to discuss issues of concern to the people of Saskatchewan, and in this regard of particular concern to the environment of Saskatchewan. And so I'm frankly disappointed that you're unwilling to at least discuss the issue there in the House tonight.

Mr. Minister, we will be waiting for this legislation. The people of Saskatchewan are waiting for this legislation. Business people in this province are waiting for the legislation. For goodness sakes, the Saskatchewan Roughriders are waiting for this legislation, and so I encourage you to bring it into this House at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Minister, I will want to pursue a variety of other issues with you tonight, but I would like now to defer to my colleague from Regina Rosemont.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to address several issues that are of concern to not only members of this House but to all citizens of Saskatchewan, an issue which has become more and more an item for topic of conversation throughout the province — and that's the government's wasteful and mismanaged and mishandled and ill-thought-out, ill-conceived Rafferty-Alameda and Shand projects and the role played in those projects by the Minister of Environment.

I first of all would like to ask the minister: Mr. Minister, in your granting of approval for this project there were many concerns raised by people throughout Saskatchewan. At the public hearings, which were held only for the Rafferty and Alameda portions of the project, not for Shand, but held for the Rafferty-Alameda projects, many of those concerns raised centred around a number of issues.

First and foremost was the issue of the quantity of water which would be available in the south-eastern part of the province, which would be trapped by the proposed structures and which would be available for use by residents in Saskatchewan, and also by the impact of those structures on the use in North Dakota, water use in North Dakota, and further on in the province of Manitoba. Many of those concerns were raised; very, very few were answered.

So my first question to you, Mr. Minister, is in regard to the quantity of water that's available. Opponents of the project have said that there will not be water available to

cool the Shand power plant, to provide the irrigation as originally proposed and approved by yourself, and to undertake all those multi-uses. In reviewing the environmental impact statement, Mr. Minister, were you totally satisfied that all necessary work had been completed to ensure that, in fact, there would be the water there to provide for the purposes as outlined?

(1915)

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Chairman, the quantity of water that will come into the Rafferty or Alameda reservoirs would depend to a great extent on the amount of rain and snow, and naturally, the department or the water corporation would have no control over that. But over the long term, as we have looked at flows over the longer period, I believe that, yes, the quantity would be enough.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, my question — I'll repeat it again — are you satisfied and were you, when you, as the Minister of Environment, gave approval to this project, that all necessary work had been done and completed which would guarantee the supply of water for the project? Are you satisfied that all necessary work had been done?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the hon. member that as far as the environmental impact statement was concerned and the work that my department did with that impact statement, yes, we believe there was enough.

**Mr. Lyons:** — If that being the case, Mr. Minister, and you were satisfied and you were the minister who gave approval, why was it that on March 3 — a great length of time after you gave approval to the project and a great deal of time after the objections have been raised throughout the province — that the Saskatchewan Water Corporation issued a document, issued a document which showed, and I quote:

... that the minimum flows in the rivers leading up to Rafferty and Alameda can only be met about 85 per cent of this time because the reservoirs are forced to go completely dry in a number of years.

This was a document which was presented to water corporation March 3, long after you gave approval. You say in this House that you did all the homework necessary to prove that there would be water, yet here is a document, here is a document from Sask Water Corporation which says that 85 per cent of the time, 85 per cent of the time we're looking at minimum flows and that the reservoirs will be completely dry in a number of years. How can you make the statement that you, in fact, did the necessary homework when the Sask Water Corporation doesn't agree with you?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I don't know what document the hon. member is quoting from. I haven't read any document like that. My department, in its review of the environmental impact study, would take a look at all of the long-term flows that were predicted in that environmental study, and from that information we're satisfied.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, the document I have here from the Sask Water Corporation, document number 694-3952, entitled *Instream Flow Requirements in the Souris River*, as requested . . . I want to read this into the record, Mr. Minister. It says:

As requested, we have made the water balance computer runs that test the viability of the monthly minimum instream flows suggested by you for the three locations shown in Table 1. This is to support the work you are undertaking under contract to the Souris Basin Development Authority to develop estimates of instream flow requirements for fish.

Now here you have approved a major megaproject in this province, and says you're still doing your homework. That's what the first paragraph of this says.

It then goes on to talk about the results of that, and I've already quoted the fact that it says in black and white that the reservoirs will be going dry over a number of years. But not only that — not only that; it goes on to talk about how much water will be available with and without the dams in place and the minimum flow requirements thereto.

And the table 2 of this document, saying, per cent of time equalling or exceeding minimum desired flows — that's the per cent of time meeting or exceeding minimum required flows — it says that without the project, in the months of January, minimum required and desired flows will be met 55 per cent of the time without the project. But in the month of January, with the project, it would only be met 50 per cent of the time.

In February, the minimum required flows will be met 55 per cent of the time without the project, and with the dam only 50 per cent of the time. In March — and here we're getting near seeding and here we're getting near high demand periods for water as irrigation pumps up — without the project, the minimum required flows in the Souris River will be met or exceeded 70 per cent of the time. With the project, under the environmental impact statement, 55 per cent of the time, which means 45 per cent of the time it won't even meet the minimum flows. And we get to April, and we're getting near seeding — 60 per cent of the time without the project; 50 per cent of the time with the project. Here we're getting into May — May, well farmers are on the land — without the project, 50 per cent of the time the minimum flows will be met in the Souris River; with the project, 35 per cent of the time, 35 per cent of the time. June, and we're on the land and the seed is in — what have we got for water? What have we got for water? Without the project, 55 per cent of the flows will be met; with the project, 45 per cent. July, 55, 40 per cent.

August — and here's where things change a bit — in August, 15 per cent without the project; 30 per cent with the project. Now August will be real good months to start seeding and start irrigation on the land for most farmers in that area, let me tell you, Mr. Minister. Right? September, 15-55. We're going to do lots of irrigation in September down in that valley. October, 15 per cent and 60 per cent — much, much, much greater need for water in October.

November, 50-50. December, 50-50.

Now what's interesting is not only that the desired flows will be met earlier on in the spring and in the early summer without the project, is the fact that throughout this whole project the minimum flows are going to be met 50 and 55 or 45 per cent of the time, which means the rest of the time you're not going to even reach the minimum flows. That's what this document from your own water corporation says. That's what the opponents of this project say.

This document says that those reservoirs will go completely dry — and that's the words of the document, completely dry — over several years. The opponents have been saying that. But you, you and the rest of the people who in this politically motivated project have been saying, no, no, don't worry — no, no, don't worry, there will be lots of water available.

Well, Mr. Minister, we have here a document which proves March 3, after you gave approval, that the water isn't going to be there. But what do we find? What do we find, Mr. Minister? We find all of a sudden that the Department of the Environment had been engaged in a project since 1986 to divert water from the South Saskatchewan River and from the Qu'Appelle River system down South. That was the diversion. When I asked you about that diversion last year, Mr. Minister, you denied your department was involved in any kind of discussions about diversions, any planning about diversions. You denied time after time in this House, and you can look back to pages 1215 and there on, when those questions were raised in last year's estimates. You denied that that diversion was there.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is simply this: given the fact that your own water corporation says that there's not going to be water here; given the fact that the federal Department of the Environment says that the only way you'll ever get enough water for to cool the Shand or to do the irrigation or to half-ways fill those dams, the Rafferty-Alameda dam, will be diverting the South Saskatchewan River; won't you now admit that what you did in approving the project was nothing more than a politically motivated and crafted decision, that it was forced upon you by the Premier of this province, and that it has absolutely no basis in reality, has absolutely no basis in the real facts and the real needs for water management in this province?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — To begin with, I haven't read the article that the member is reading, so I don't take all that he's saying as fact. If he'd like to send me a copy, I'd appreciate that. We would probably be better advised to be discussing this when the water corporation is in — and the staff are in the hallway and will be next in line.

I made the decision based on the facts that were there, through the environmental impact study and the board of inquiry study and the public hearings that were held. We made what we consider is a very valid decision, and I can assure you now that there has been no decision by any department of government to divert water from the South Saskatchewan River system to the Souris. There had been a statement made by a university professor, but that's as

far as it goes.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, are you denying before this House that the provincial Department of the Environment and the federal Department of the Environment have been involved in a four-year study of water diversions of the South Saskatchewan River? Are you denying that now?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The studies that have been done are not water diversion studies. They're studies of the South Saskatchewan River system. They're ongoing studies. One of the people that was involved in that study made a very wild statement the other day, from the University of Saskatchewan. I can advise you that we will be challenging that statement with the member who is in the employ of the university, and I believe that the member will likely retract some of his thoughts there.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, we have been saying for two years in this House that there's no water for Rafferty-Alameda; that the only way there's going to be water for Rafferty-Alameda is if you divert the South Saskatchewan and the Qu'Appelle and take it down into the south-east area of the province. Your own water corporation says that's true, and you still stand here in this House and try to deny the fact that your department is involved in studies, including water diversion in the province of Saskatchewan and inter-basinal transfers of water in the province of Saskatchewan. I would ask you, sir, if you're so sure of your position, why don't you make those comments with Professor Henry outside the House and let's see who challenges whom?

However, Mr. Minister, I make the allegation here — I'll make it outside the House — you people are involved in diverting inter-basinal transfers of water and diverting the South Saskatchewan River. I will repeat that outside, and if you want to challenge me in the court, you go right ahead.

But I want to get back to the point about the political motivation of this project and how it was a politically crafted exercise. Mr. Minister, and you have a copy of this because it was sent to Mr. Bob Walker — and you know who Bob Walker is in the Department of the Environment — and it's from Mr. R.L. Kellow. Mr. R.L. Kellow is the chief of the planning branch of resource management for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, and he sent a copy of this letter, a letter to George Hood, he sent a copy to your department. It's called *The Environmental Impact Statement for Rafferty and Alameda Projects*. And I want to read this, Mr. Chairman, if I may, read this into the record. It will take some time; it will take a few minutes, but I think it's worth it for all the people in this province to hear the kind of political conniving and political craftsmanship that went into this project.

I have reviewed the draft antedated outline for environmental impact statements (says Mr. Kellow), as requested in your letter of September 26, 1986. In general, I find the outline satisfactory. My specific comments are as follows.

- (1) The first part of Volume 2 is entitled "Environmental Setting." The purpose of this

section should be to provide the reader with a broad understanding of the socio-economic, as well as physical and biological characteristics of the area which could be impacted by the project. I assume the subpoints under this heading are just examples and not a definitive listing of topics. Because the project is a multi-use water storage proposal, a separate section describing the water surface system should be considered.

(1930)

And that's what happened. That's the way that the EIS (environmental impact statement) was developed by the department and by the Souris Basin Development Authority and approved by your department. And listen to this:

- (2) I would prefer not having a section entitled "Alternatives" for this particular project.

Despite every known and every accepted environmental assessment method in which alternatives are demanded as part of the environmental assessment process, here is the chief for the water corporation writing to the Environment, saying:

I would prefer not having this section entitled "Alternative" for this particular project. Instead I would recommended a section entitled "Project Need."

So, instead of saying that there are alternatives to be chosen among, what we'll do is we'll write the environmental impact statement to prove environmental need. Project need.

It is critical that the project be presented as a multi-purpose undertaking where individual components are not justified on their own.

Did you get that. Individual components of the project are not justified on their own. That's what this Mr. Kellow says, that they're not justified on their own because you know, and I know, that they can't be justified on their own.

But, as part of an overall project, the main focus of any discussion about alternative should be with the alternative of no project. (Should be with the alternative, no project). However, if necessary, a limited discussion of accomplishing each project function could also be presented.

Why, Mr. Minister, why did the chief of operations write to your department and say: don't present alternatives, say it's either this project or no project? Why did he do that? Won't you now stand here and admit that the only reason that he's crafting the environmental impact statement the way he did is because he had to sell it? Because you told him, because Grant . . . excuse me, the Premier told you to make sure that this project went through and that's why, that's why you're involved in this kind of crafting, not presenting alternatives to the people of this province.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I don't know the date of the document that the hon. member is reading from, if there is a date on it. To say that Mr. Kellow was a chief in the water corporation would be stretching the imagination a ways. He's no longer with the corporation. He's working for a different organization entirely. He left us about a year and a bit ago. And what you're using is inflating what is written on paper into your own magical language and I don't buy a lot of it.

If you would like to raise that when the water corporation staff are here they may be more familiar with it than I am. I haven't seen that particular piece of paper but I don't put a lot of weight in what you're saying.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well excuse me, Mr. Minister. Mr. R.L. Kellow, the chief planning branch resource management, at the time the letter was written to Mr. George Hood, October 7, 1986, in the preparation of the Rafferty-Alameda project.

And it's no wonder, Mr. Minister, that you would prefer this be discussed somewhere else because you know very well that the water corporation has to deal within . . . and corporation estimates has to deal with things in a very limited terms of reference, and it's no wonder you don't want to deal with it here. You are the Minister of the Environment, sir. You, sir, are the Minister of the Environment and you gave your stamp of approval on this despite the fact that I know, deep in your heart, you didn't want to do it and the Premier made you do it. I know that. I know that, sir, and I'll take that.

But let's go on. Let's go on to see some more political craftsmanship of this operation. Point number four in the letter:

The key to the last chapter, cost benefit summary . . .

And this should interest everybody in Saskatchewan because it's going to cost them \$1,200 for every man, woman, and child in this province, your shafferty boondoggle.

The key to the last chapter, cost benefit summary, is allowing the reader to see what trade-offs are being made if the project proceeds. I would avoid the use (and I want, Mr. Chairman, I want the people of the province to hear what kind of political craftsmanship went into this) of cost-benefit in the title as it may allow the reader to expect a traditional cost-benefit analysis (a traditional — one which is correct, one which lays out the facts) which I do not believe is part of the environmental impact assessment process.

So here we have the chief of planning resource management for the water corporation writing to the Department of the Environment of which he's the minister, saying we can't do a traditional cost-benefit analysis because it would allow the people of Saskatchewan to see what a total political boondoggle this is and what a total economical nightmare it is. What does he say? We can't use traditional cost-benefit

analysis. My, my.

He goes on to say, Mr. Minister:

I would minimize reference to the United States aspect of the project. The purpose of the EIS should be to discuss implications in Saskatchewan. There should be mention of the flood control benefits to the United States, but the degree of those benefits and alternatives (and the alternatives) to achieving those benefits, are not a concern to the environment approval process in Saskatchewan.

That goes again to the nub of it.

Why is it, Mr. Minister, why is it that when you politically crafted this project, when you tried to hide from the people of Saskatchewan the true costs and the true benefits, of which there are none, and the true cost, of which there are many, why was it that you tried to, as Minister of the Environment, try to hide this kind of thing?

Why is it, Mr. Minister, that you, as the Minister of the Environment, rolled over and played dead for the Premier when he wanted this politically motivated project to go ahead? Why didn't you do the honourable thing: stand up to him and say, no, we're going to a traditional cost-benefit analysis; no, we're not going to do this thing on the basis of political boondoggle, we're going to do it on the basis of its merits and its benefits for the people of Saskatchewan, which there are none? Why didn't you have the courage, sir, to stand up and say, I won't proceed with this approval; I won't give my approval to this project; I won't go ahead and try to deceive the people of the, as is so clearly outlined by this letter?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well the member makes an awful lot of wild statements. Number one, I can assure you that I made my own decisions on this particular one with the help of the department and the public hearings and the board of inquiry hearings. And if you look at what the board of inquiry recommended and what was put in the final approval, you will find they are almost identically the same thing. For you to say then that it was politically motivated, has very little substance or fact.

You talk about the cost of the project and you say that it's \$1,200 for every man, woman, and child. Well check your mathematics, my friend. This project is to cost 126 million and with a million people that is no \$1,200 per person. It ends up something like \$126, and if you back away from that figure again and take the amount of money that the Americans will put into the project, it will back it down by another 51 million. So it doesn't become such a big dollar figure for every man, woman, and child. It's only \$126 million — total project — and that's the figure that you should be using.

You talk about factual. You haven't been factual once when you've given figures of what that project would cost. You have been throwing out something like 1.2 billion for a long time, though you knew far different than that. But figures don't seem to have any meaning in your line of speech. You like to get up and just throw out some

wild ideas and expect the world to believe. Well the world has seen through you long ago and they don't believe it.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Chairman, if there is a lack of credibility on this project, in this province, the lack of credibility is not here. The lack of credibility rests over there.

Let the minister do his little bit of arithmetic — very simple. Rafferty-Alameda and Shand, all three are tied together. As your initial environmental impact assessment process and proposal laid out, all three were an integrated project. Total cost is \$1.2 billion — 1.64 billion, including the transmission lines for Shand; \$146 million now, given the raise in the mitigation figures for oil and for wildlife. You'd better go back and do your own homework, Mr. Minister, because if you're allowing your officials to do it for you, you're getting in deeper and deeper. You're getting so deep in the mud that we'll find behind the Rafferty dam that they'll never be able to pull you out. So I'd advise, if you're going to talk about homework and go doing your homework, I think I've done some homework, and I think the people of this province realize that I've done that kind of homework.

But I'm glad you raised the question of the public hearings and the report of the public hearings, the Souris basin board of inquiry, because, Mr. Minister, as you know, as you very well know, one of the central — the, in fact, central — prediction of the board was that this project should not go ahead unless there was . . . This project, including Rafferty and Alameda, should not go ahead until the funding had come through from the Americans and that the only — the only — cover, economic cover, you would have for this project was based on the fact that you were going to get American money.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, given that your own board of inquiry said that this project should not proceed until the money was forthcoming and that it was predicated on that money being forthcoming from the Americans, I wonder if you would tell us now how much money has come in, and if none has come, when can you expect it so that the conditions laid down by the board, or the outline by the board, will be met.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The actual ongoing negotiations and construction and the money that would come in, you would have to deal with the Souris Basin Development Authority, not with me. The approval that was given by my department was very much the same as the board of inquiry had put down, and that was that the Alameda project should not go through until the money was available, and that's exactly the way the approval was given. Alameda has no approval until the American funding comes.

**Mr. Lyons:** — That is a little bit of sleight of tongue, if I may use that expression. Mr. Minister, the board of inquiry . . . Okay, let's put it in this way: are you saying that the board of inquiry did not require the U.S. funding for the Rafferty dam? Is that what you're saying?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The recommendation by the board was that the Alameda dam not be built unless the

American funding was in place, and that is exactly the way the approval was put.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well I beg to differ, Mr. Minister. I suggest you go back and read that because it said that the project as a whole, the two dams, was predicated on the fact that there would be American funding, which is a very interesting proposition, Mr. Minister, because I'm sure that the farmers downstream of Rafferty will be really pleasantly surprised at the fact, when they lose all their water because there'll be no downstream water from Rafferty, but it'll be dependent upon the Moose Mountain Creek and its limited and brief duration in the springtime for its water supplies and all the communities downstream of that, I'm sure they're going to be surprised.

But I want to read to you, Mr. Minister, since we're talking about the question of funding, another letter, a letter which was written to Cochrane Lavalin, the project engineer, to a Mr. R.D. Farrell, regarding the Rafferty dam, file no. A435-1M-100. Mr. Farrell goes on to say, or starts:

In view of the uncertainty regarding the availability of U.S. funding, there is some doubt as to how much work, if any, would be done on the Rafferty dam during the 1988 construction season.

Now that's very interesting. It's in direct contradiction to what you said, Mr. Minister. It's in direct contradiction to what you said. This letter, by the way, is from Mr. G. Phillips, the project manager from SaskPower. You have a copy of this letter on file. This person understands that unless there's American money available, that the Rafferty shouldn't go ahead. And he talks about the uncertainty and the availability of American funding.

Now, as the minister who gave an approval to a project which was dependent upon American funding, will you tell this House how much American funding has come through, if any? If it hasn't, when do you expect it? And why was it that a Mr. G. Phillips from SaskPower would talk about the uncertainty of American funding for the Rafferty dam?

(1945)

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I think the member is almost answering his own question. You read from a letter; it's written from SaskPower. And SaskPower and the Souris Basin Development Authority are the ones that will deliver the project, not the Department of Environment. The approvals that we gave were very firm approvals that they could build the Rafferty but they couldn't build the Alameda until they had the American money. And we're still waiting for that part before that final approval is given. And until the money is available, we will not give approval for the construction of the Alameda dam. That's the way it stands.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, once again, once again as part of the conditions as laid out by the board of inquiry and as part of your own conditions, it's your responsibility of Minister of Environment to monitor the progress of funding from the U.S., particularly in the light of the fact

that the Governor of North Dakota, at a recent meeting in Minot, which is a well-attended meeting and was attended and included by officials of your department as well as from the Sask Water Corporation, the Souris Basin Development Authority, and others; in light of the fact that the Governor of North Dakota says, well, if we can't buy this project as a flood control project, maybe we can buy it as water storage, as a water storage project, and that we'll take the money and buy it as a water storage project.

In light of the fact that your department is involved in a water diversion study which would take the South Saskatchewan River and empty it into the south-east part of the province, in light of the fact that you, as the Minister of the Environment said, there shouldn't be any work and your board of inquiry said there shouldn't be any work and your board of inquiry said there shouldn't be any work on Rafferty, and in light of the fact that SaskPower recognizes that the Rafferty project should not probably go ahead without the availability of American funding, are you, as the Minister of Environment in charge, are you watching the progress of American money? How are you monitoring the situation? And if you are in fact monitoring the situation, which by your own admission is a prerequisite for this project, will you tell this House how much money has come from the United States for this project, if any? And if none has been forthcoming, when can you, as the Minister of the Environment, expect that money so that you can go ahead and give your rubber stamp to Alameda?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I guess the hon. member and I are getting the same kind of information, and that is what we read in the news media of the American negotiations on this project.

The approval that was given gave approval for the Rafferty dam and denied approval for the Alameda dam until the American money is in place. Rafferty can go ahead whether or not the American money comes as far as our approval is concerned. And until somebody from Souris Basin Development Authority, or SaskPower, or other sources, can advise us that they have the American money, the approval for Alameda will not be forthcoming and it's that simple and it's going to stay that way.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, I appreciate your honesty on this point. Now the people of Saskatchewan know that you're going to go ahead, and your government's going to go ahead, and the Premier of the province is going to push through this project in his constituency whether or not American money comes, the Rafferty dam will be built with or without American money.

And I appreciate and I thank you very much for your honesty on that point because it's something, Mr. Minister, in light of that though, in light of that statement, what this does is throw the economics of the project out the window. And it throws out the window, your approval, which you gave to the initial proposal contained in the environmental impact statement which developed an economic cost-benefit scenario, not a traditional one, as we've heard, but some kind of scenario to try to justify this project in voodoo economic terms. Even within the voodoo economic terms that was used to draw up the environmental impact statement, that's gone out the window because you said now that there is no

American money forthcoming or that a Rafferty will be built with or without American money.

I appreciate your honesty on that point, Mr. Minister, but doesn't it appear to you that perhaps the Department of the Environment of the province of Saskatchewan now call for a review of the environmental impact statement, put forward to your department, on the basis that American money may not be forthcoming and that the cost-benefit scenario, as laid out in that process, are totally gone out the window. Doesn't it seem sense to you that if they throw out the cost-benefit scenario that you are under a certain obligation to now go ahead and to review the project and the economics of the project and perhaps to modify the approval given to this project?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The member is putting words in my mouth and many of the things that you're saying that I said were not said, and if you read *Hansard* tomorrow, you'll see that. So I'm going to simply say to you that the approval was given for the Rafferty dam, but the approval was denied for the Alameda dam until the American money was made available. Whether or not SaskPower goes ahead or the Souris Basin Development Authority goes ahead to build the Rafferty project, that's a different matter, and that's a choice they make.

We don't build dams from the Department of Environment; we simply have given an approval based on the best information that we could gather through the environmental impact assessment stage, the public hearings and the board of enquiry hearings. And those are the three areas that we used to make our decision. I believe we made the right decision; history is the one that will prove whether or not that decision was right.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well you know, Mr. Minister, part of the problems, I guess, of being a politician and being in the position of having to make judgements is whether or not you're going to be second-guessed and whether or not you're going to have to make the wrong judgement and have to pay for it. Well in your particular case, Mr. Minister, it's not a question of second-guessing.

The issues that I'm raising here tonight are the issues that people throughout this province have been raising with you and your department for the last two years, ever since this lunatic idea was floated — right? — ever since this idea was floated. And what is interesting, what is interesting is that each and every independent study of this project — studies not done by one or another of your departments, but independent studies — each of those studies says this thing does not work. Environment Canada says it does not work, and that the water flows for the Rafferty-Alameda project are not correct, have not proven to be correct, and will not be proven to be correct.

And it's not just me talking. I'm not an engineer; I don't claim to be, but I can read and I can listen, and I hear what people around the province — people who are technical experts as well as people who are not but who have other concerns — are raising. Why is it that you don't listen? Why is it that you don't recognize that there are legitimate concerns being raised by highly qualified technical experts, and that your department has time and time again been shown to be wrong in terms of dealing with

environmental assessments on this project. One can only be led to the conclusion that, over a period of time, you're not dealing with facts as they are, you're not dealing with the reality, but that you're dealing from another agenda, from a hidden agenda which is not so well hidden because it's in the hip pocket of the Premier, because it represents a \$1.2 billion investment in his constituency.

Mr. Minister, I beg to differ with your last statement regarding the Rafferty-Alameda and the question of funding from the United States. And I beg to differ based on a document I have here, a letter to Mr. George N. Hood, director of planning operations, Souris Basin Development Authority, dated March 3, 1988 — not very long ago, well after you gave approval to this boondoggle — regarding the draft Canada-United States agreement for the Rafferty-Alameda project.

Point number four of this letter, on page 2, says:

The amount of any such contribution by the United States at any time shall be determined by an allocation of the 41.1 million U.S. based on the proportion of construction costs incurred to that time to the projected total cost of construction of the Canada works.

Not a Rafferty, not Alameda, but all the works done, and based on a proportional basis, that when you complete the Rafferty project, you will get a certain amount of American funding; when you complete the Alameda project, you'll get a certain amount of American funding; when you complete the diversion, you'll get a certain amount of American funding — the diversion canal which is contained in the EIS (environmental impact statement), not the other water diversion project which you're studying.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, on the basis of the inaccuracies of your statements here tonight, on the inaccuracies of the statements that your department and that those of the minister in charge of SaskPower have been making — inaccuracies on the one hand which say, we have a little disagreement here, because the minister to the Deputy Premier says that there is no such agreement in place, that there is no Canada-U.S. draft agreement. And it's a matter of record in *Hansard*, and he has said it time and time again that there is nothing reduced to paper, contrary to what it says here.

But be that as it may, will you, sir, table — from your department, because I know you have a copy of it — a copy of the draft U.S.-Canada agreement dealing with the Rafferty-Alameda project so that the people of the province will know the true costs of Rafferty and what you've given away to the Americans in order to sell them long-term water supply?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The Department of Environment would not be involved in the drafting of agreements. The Souris Basin Development Authority and SaskPower have been very closely working together on that project. When and if they wish to table documents, they would be the ones that you should ask to table. It would not be this department.

The member is making statements about Environment Canada and them not being in agreement. I think the only way we'll know whether Environment Canada is in agreement or not is when they issue approval. And the Deputy Premier stood in this House not long ago and said that he expected that that approval would be here sooner rather than later and I think we just have to wait and see. That's sort of the proof of the pudding is if they believe in the project after all of their studies of the EIS and other things, then they will grant an approval. And we'll watch with interest to see when that approval is forthcoming and I expect it soon.

**Mr. Lyons:** — What's interesting, Mr. Minister, is that you fail to answer the question. Do you have a copy of the draft U.S.-Canada agreement, or the final U.S.-Canada agreement, regarding Rafferty-Alameda — either one — and will you provide that to me and to the House tonight?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I advised the hon. member that the negotiations would be done by the Souris Basin Development Authority and SaskPower, and if anyone has that agreement it would likely be them, not us. We have not been involved in the negotiations. We do not have copies of any agreements and I don't expect that we should have. So the member should ask the proper authority when they come before the House here in their estimates.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not asking you who drafted the agreement. I'm not asking you who's involved in the discussions of the agreement. I'm asking you as a minister responsible for approving this project, an important component of which was a 41.1 million commitment or expected commitment from the United States, which would be signed and contained in an agreement of one sort or another — reduced to paper and signed by various parties. And I know because of the past history that you, as the minister, have to put your signature to it. I'm asking you, sir, whether or not you have in your possession, as the minister, a draft agreement with the United States or a final agreement. Do you have it? Not whether you negotiated, not whether officials of your department negotiated, not whether somebody else negotiated it, but do you have that? Stop trying to slippery and slide around the question. Answer yes or no. Do you have it and will you provide it?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I have advised you on a couple of occasions now that, no, I don't have a copy of the agreement, and even if I did, I wouldn't table it.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not surprised at that answer, particularly the second part. I'm surprised at the first, because quite frankly, sir, you may not have it in your possession here, but it's in a filing cabinet in your department somewhere.

(2000)

I'm not surprised at the second part. I'm not surprised at the second part, that you wouldn't table the agreement, because this agreement would not want to see the light of day in Saskatchewan by your government because of what it contains, because of the long-term commitments it makes to the Americans to provide them with a

guaranteed flow of water. You are guaranteeing to the Americans a certain amount of water over the life of the Rafferty-Alameda project — you are guaranteeing them, despite what happens to the environment and the ecology of Saskatchewan. And as part of that guarantee and in order to meet that guarantee you are involved in a water diversion project, something we have been saying for the last two years, something which you have denied, and now something which has been affirmed by people even within your own department. So let's not play footsy.

Why won't you show the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister? Why won't you show them what you are doing to our water resources in this province by committing them for an extended period of time to the Americans? What is it that you've got to be afraid of in that document and why are you trying to hide this project which will affect the whole use of water throughout southern Saskatchewan? And I may say, if we're now to understand the implications it has or communities like Saskatoon and up river of Lake Diefenbaker, why are you choking off the water to the North through the South Saskatchewan River, potentially choking it off, in order to try to make viable this politically motivated project in south-eastern Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I've advised the member a number of times that we are not in the dam building business, but rather we were here only to approve or disapprove an environmental impact study for a project. It's the same with any project that goes through the department. We simply review the pros and cons of environmental impact study, make recommendations where necessary, and provide an approval or a disapproval, and we've done that. We do not get into the negotiations of a contract or water flows or any of those things. That's not part of the mandate of this department.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, we have heard time and time again tonight, and actually since the 1986 election and your appointment as Minister of the Environment, that it's not your fault, that it's not your responsibility, that it's not your duty, that it's not your department. It's always somebody else, and there's always another appropriate time to ask. Well I tell you, sir, we're sick and tired of that approach. You're the minister responsible for the water in this province and for looking after the environment in this province and for looking after public safety to a great extent in this province and you've got a responsibility to the people of this province — and we're going to question you on that responsibility. And no amount of trying to shoot the messenger, no amount of trying to slip and slide out of answering questions will do you, because the time of reckoning for this project and for your role in this project and for the role of your government in this kind of project is at hand, as it is for your federal counterpart.

And I want to read to you a letter, Mr. Minister, written to Mr. Tom McMillan, the federal Minister of the Environment. Now you stood here a little while ago . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Who wrote it?

**Mr. Lyons:** — I'll tell you who wrote it in a minute. It's the head of the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Mr. Ken

Brynaert, and I'll tell you about the letter. But I want to tell you, just remind the people of this province that you stood here a few minutes ago, saying that the federal Minister of the Environment is going to grant sooner rather than later, I believe were the words you used, approval . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry, sir, I don't attribute the words to you; that you attributed them to the Deputy Premier, and I heard them myself — that the Deputy Premier stood in this House and said that Tom McMillan, the federal Minister of the Environment, will sooner, rather than later, grant federal approval.

Well, I want to read, first of all, a little excerpt from the Commons debates at the House of Commons in Ottawa. In regards to the question of — it's entitled, "Environmental Affairs, Saskatchewan Construction of Dam on Souris River." The question was asked by Mr. Simon De Jong, member for Regina East, and he said, "Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment." It goes on to talk about how he is aware of this project and so on and so forth. The minister said that he's been following it with a keen interest and so on.

But the interesting part, the part that interests us in relation to whether or not it's going to get federal approval sooner or later, is the following. The Hon. Tom McMillan says:

Mr. Speaker, I said in my first answer that an application had been made. The permit is yet to be issued. I will not pronounce now, since it would be premature to do so, whether a permit will be issued. The building of the coffer-dams is not in contravention of the relevant Act, because it does not yet have an effect on the inner basin flows as far as international and national jurisdictions are concerned. I can tell the hon. member, in response to his question, that the federal environmental assessment and review process is now being followed.

Is now being followed. Now, Mr. Minister, as part of the federal assessment and review project or process, public hearings will need to be held. Are you supporting, sir, the position held by Mr. McMillan, that public hearings on Rafferty-Alameda are necessary, should be held? And will you support, will you support by way of granting or demanding a temporary halt to the construction of the project until those public hearings are held and more relevant material is presented, so in order to complete the requirements as laid out by federal law?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — From the point of view of our department, we have done our review of the environmental impact study and have given our decision. The federal government will have to do its review and give its decision, and how it does that is entirely their decision, it isn't ours, and we have not contracted or pressured or done anything of that nature. We've let the federal government do its own review process, and when they're ready to give approval, they'll give it.

So I can't give the member any other answer about whether or not they'll hold hearings. That's entirely their choice. And if they choose, then the hearings will be held; if they decide that the hearings that we have held are sufficient, then that's the way it will go.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, have you had recent contact with the Department of Environment, you or any of your officials, to discuss the question of granting, the federal government granting, a short-term interim licence for the project?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, we have not.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Have any federal government officials contacted you or any other official in your department regarding the questions of Rafferty-Alameda and the need for either a federal environmental review process, the need for public hearings, and/or the question of a licence which is — and the wording of a licence — which is temporary in nature?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the federal government has not made contact with our department on this issue.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, have any of the other departments such as the Souris Basin Development Authority or Sask Water made contact, and have you had discussions with other agencies of the Saskatchewan government regarding representations made to them by the federal government on this issue?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm sorry, but I can't speak for other departments of government. I have to stay with the Department of Environment when I'm here tonight, and the department and the officials here advise me that they've had no contact.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well now, Mr. Minister, the officials advised you that you, as the Minister of Environment, or the Department of Environment, has had no direct contact with the federal government on this matter. What I'm asking you is — and it is your responsibility — you, as the Minister of Environment, should know whether or not your officials have had contact by any agency of the Government of Saskatchewan in regards to conversations or approaches or discussions that they've had with the federal government regarding a short-term licence to be granted to the Rafferty-Alameda project. Are you saying that there has been no discussions either from Sask Water or SBDA (Souris Basin Development Authority) or SaskPower or any other government agency? Is that your position, sir? Because I hope it's not. I hope you won't say that publicly.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — To the best information that we have tonight, we are not aware of any contacts by any of the other Saskatchewan agencies with our department that would deal with that kind of a licence.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, from that answer I take it you're not denying it. However I'll leave that alone. I'm pretty confident of the answer myself.

I want to deal with one more issue before I turn it back to my colleague from Moose jaw South. That's the question of the Shand power plant, the question of acid rain, the position of the Saskatchewan government, vis-a-vis the federal government's attempt to develop a limit to acid rain through an agreement with the United States.

It's my understanding, Mr. Minister, from a document I've received from Environment Canada, that your department was advised, prior to your approval of the Shand power plant project, by way of letter to Mr. H. Epp, from the environmental protection branch, conservation and protection, on September 28, '87, that Environment Canada said that your environmental impact statement, and the studies done, were wrong, that there would be a much higher sulphur content released into the atmosphere than the numbers used. And I just want to quote, and you'll please excuse me because of the technical nature of the language. I'll try to interpret it into regular English.

It goes on, on page 1 of this general introductory comments: that the Grawnhood U.S. Bureau of Mines equation for sulphur retention on lignite ash, which was remarkably accurate in predicting Poplar River's coals ash retention of sulphur in extremely meticulous testing, that combustion and carbonization research laboratories, in 1977, predicts a sulphur retention of 7.1 using the data above for Shand coal ash.

The EIS evidently claims 35 per cent capture for alkali ash. That's a fair difference — 7 per cent to 35 per cent capture rate by the experimental method that you're attempting to use at Shand. This sounds, and, Mr. Minister, I want to, so that everybody understands that this is not a partisan shot, because the letter goes on to say — this sounds familiar — 35 per cent, plus, was being claimed for Poplar River in 1976 against a Grawnhood prediction of less than 10 per cent. Many years later it was agreed by SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) that less than 10 per cent of initial SO<sub>2</sub> (sulphur dioxide) was being retained at Poplar. Right? And that's nothing to be proud of. That is certainly nothing to be proud of.

But here you are, Mr. Minister, accused by Environment Canada of using unsound methodology, unscientific research, in an unproven method of trying to cut down the emissions from the Shand power plant that will lead to the pouring out of acid rain on our neighbours to the South.

Tell me, Mr. Minister, is one of the reasons why you wouldn't hold public hearings on the construction of the Shand power plant due to the fact that you knew people across Saskatchewan, as well as in North Dakota and Montana and Minnesota and Manitoba, would raise objections because of the experimental nature of your pollution control measures and because of the inaccuracy and total scientific unsoundness of the methods that you're using to predict acid rain?

(2015)

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Now the member is kind of shooting broad and wide at everything that SaskPower has done. I might inform the hon. member that the project that was built in 1976 was built when the New Democratic Party were in government, and if they made mistakes, then perhaps he should criticize a few of his cohorts on that side of the House.

The letter that you're reading from as it deals with Shand,

that particular letter was withdrawn about a month after it was written because the federal government writer of that particular paper found that he had used wrong information and he apologized to SaskPower for the letter that he had written. So I believe that you can rest a bit more comfortable tonight knowing that that letter didn't have as much fact in it and has been withdrawn.

The assurance that we have from SaskPower that when the Shand station is completed that its emissions will meet the federal requirements, that's the best information that we could give you tonight.

**Mr. Lyons:** — The final question, Mr. Minister: you've said several times that things put forward by Environment Canada have been modified or have been withdrawn in regards to Shand and Rafferty and Alameda; each time that hasn't proven to be the case. I wonder, will you table for the House tonight the letter of apology supposedly written by the people from Environment Canada. Will you table then the real comments, since you're saying that these aren't the real comments — would you table then the real comments put forward by Environment Canada, and would you also supply us with the data that was wrong or that part of this data that was wrong? It's my understanding from Environment Canada that in fact they will stand by every word which is written here that the laboratory testing done on Shand proves that the kind of experimental acid rain control that you're engaged in down there doesn't hold the sulphur ash that's coming out that big, high smoke-stack to dump it on our southern neighbours, and that it doesn't hold it.

If you make any allegations against Environment Canada, why don't you put the papers where those allegations are and table them before the House?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I don't have the letter here tonight, but we will mail you that letter tomorrow, a copy of that letter, and I believe then that the hon. member will be able to look at it in a better light.

**An Hon. Member:** — Take your time, Herb, you know you've got three weeks in these estimates.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — It could be three or four.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, when you're providing us with that letter, would you also provide us with the new technical data that is somehow different than what is in this report? Will you also provide us that?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — We can provide you with the letter and the data that is in their letter that shows that they are of a different opinion now. But I believe the report that we have from SaskPower that they will more than meet the federal guide-lines, are a very important part of that whole issue.

If we're going to get our acid rain down and within reason, we have to come under the federal guide-lines, and they're very stringent guide-lines. SaskPower are prepared to more than meet those guide-lines, and I'm pleased to hear that.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I'd like to turn our attention

now to something that we mentioned in passing this afternoon, that's the matter of hazardous waste disposal in our province. We mentioned that issue in regard to the dioxins and the sludge at Weyerhaeuser, and you indicated this afternoon that there really is not a long-term plan other than to hold the waste in landfill in our province.

Mr. Minister, you will be aware of a resolution passed by SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), the urban municipalities association, at this year's convention. I will read you that resolution, although . . . I hope you're aware of it.

Be it resolved that SUMA urge the Minister of the Environment and Public Safety to proceed immediately with the planning and development of a provincial hazardous waste disposal site; and if a hazardous waste disposal site is developed that it not be located in northern Saskatchewan.

SUMA is calling upon yourself and your government to proceed immediately with the plans and developments for a hazardous waste facility in our province. In January of this year you will be aware that Regina city officials were calling upon you and your government to build . . . plan to build a hazardous waste facility in the province. You will be aware that right now the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon is planning to build its own incinerator for low-level, radio-active waste and other toxic wastes. They are going ahead with this project, I believe, out of a frustration that there is no hazardous waste facility in this province.

Given the need, Mr. Minister, and given the requests and the urgings from a variety of people in our province: are you, at this time, in the process of planning a hazardous waste disposal facility for Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I was aware of the communications from the city and from the convention. Hazardous waste has been an issue in our province for a considerable period of time, and we've had a fairly major study done and will be continuing to work on plans to handle hazardous waste. But as far as the actual building of a facility in our province, a major hazardous waste facility, we really, as a small populated province, a small population base of a million people, it would be very hard to justify the kind of expenditures that would be required to build a major hazardous waste facility.

The request that many have, to go ahead with a hazardous waste facility, is fine. But when you start looking for a place to put it, even if you had the 58 million or more that it would cost to build it, everybody comes up with the same idea — don't put it in northern Saskatchewan and don't put it in my back yard. So just to find a site for a hazardous waste disposal facility would be a major accomplishment.

Governments have spent a lot of dollars in the past. I think just to look for an ordinary dump for garbage here in Regina, they've spent about \$600,000 and still haven't come up with a new garbage dump. So what are we going to find, and what kind of expenditure do you expect we would have to have in order to find a hazardous waste

site? It's something that we're going to work on. I don't expect it will happen overnight.

At this point we are able to take some of our hazardous waste to dispose of in Ontario. There may be a possibility in the future of accessing Alberta's, but we haven't got that guarantee at this time. We did at one time try to work out an arrangement whereby Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta might have built one disposal system jointly. That didn't happen because the province of Alberta wanted to go it alone and Manitoba indicates that it wants to go it alone. But I haven't seen any paper yet that says that Manitoba is going to be able to immediately go ahead and build a hazardous waste disposal system.

So we are looking at it. We have been doing some work on regulations to control the handling of hazardous wastes. I don't believe that we have a major problem. The things that we need to dispose of, we are able to move at this point and we hope to be able to continue to handle the waste in that manner.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it seems that the Government of Alberta was able to overcome whatever problems there are in locating funding and building a hazardous waste facility. It seems that that government understood the need and the environmental protection that's offered by such a facility.

And I know it's not an easy job, but not all jobs that governments have are easy. And the people of this province expect you to tackle some of these tough questions, not to just suggest that, well we're going to study it, we're going to look at it, we're going to study it, and we're going to look at it.

Mr. Minister, you've indicated just a few moments ago that some of the chemical waste in this province is trucked to Ontario. Would you tell this House how much it costs each truck load to deliver that chemical to Ontario and have it disposed in Ontario.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — We haven't broken out the exact transportation cost, but it would depend where the load originated; but the staff feel it would be in the neighbourhood of about \$2,000 a truck load.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not clear — \$2,000 a truck load, does that cover the transportation and whatever it costs in Ontario to have the waste disposed? What is the total cost to send a truck load of waste from Saskatchewan to Ontario and have it disposed — the total cost?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That's a difficult figure to give because it would vary; the cost of disposal depends on the product that's shipped.

Just to give you an idea of cost for one type of material from our chemical collection system: a semi-load going to Ontario and being disposed of was about \$40,000, but on other chemicals it would be different costs . . . other products.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well the figure reported publicly through

the press, Mr. Minister, was \$40,000 a truck load. How many truck loads do you estimate leave Saskatchewan for Ontario in the course of a year?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — From our own department there were only two truck loads, but companies that have hazardous goods to dispose of, they make their own arrangements under the hazardous goods Act, and they transport and dispose of at their own cost. So that's the only ones that we pay for are those two.

**Mr. Calvert:** — But if 10 trucks, Mr. Minister, if 10 trucks, let's just say, left this province a year, that's \$400,000 a year leaving our province. That would go a long way, it seems to me, to funding the operation, perhaps not the construction, but the operation of hazardous waste facility in our own province.

Mr. Minister, do you have some estimates on what it would cost to put a hazardous waste facility, disposal facility into place in Saskatchewan? Do you have some estimate of the cost?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — About the best I could do for the hon. member is give him the costs that Alberta incurred to put theirs in place. They had a five-year search for a location at a cost of about \$8 million — just to find a location. and then to build the plant itself, they spent an additional \$58 million. I was at the opening of that particular plant. They estimate something like 52 people working full time at that plant. So when you talk about 400,000 going a long ways, it would go nowhere.

(2030)

When you put 52 people to work at an average of say 40,000 or in that neighbourhood, or 30,000, you soon eat up \$400,000

So, no, the amount of money that we as a government are spending would be minimal compared to the cost of putting a plant in place and operating it. If you just looked at the interest on the investment, we could ship our goods out for a number of years and still have the original investment. So I think that what we're doing at this point is probably best for the amount of hazardous waste we have and the numbers of people that we serve.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, I tell you, Mr. Minister, this afternoon you told us that we can't dispose of some hazardous waste because it's simply uneconomic to take it from the province. So we're in one case piling up sludge full of dioxins that will stand there for years and years and years and years — in anybody's books an environmental time bomb. You told us this afternoon we couldn't afford to get rid of it, and we can't get rid of it because we don't have our own hazardous waste disposal.

Mr. Minister, I'm not sure you can put an economic figure on our environment and on public safety. Mr. Minister, I suggest you could take half, half of what you're going for the Rafferty dam that we don't need, put it into a hazardous waste facility that we do need, and we'd have a facility in our own province to meet our own needs.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I guess every government sets its priorities. If we were to spend something, 65 million or better, to establish a hazardous waste site, the hon. member would likely be one of the first ones to criticize us for running the deficit higher. You know, so you have to put your priorities straight sometimes and this is one that I don't think you have straight.

When you speak of the sludge at the Weyerhaeuser pulp mill, that sludge is on their property and it's their responsibility to dispose of it. It's not government responsibility. I would like to see them move it out regularly and have it burned or whatever. That's part of their operation. As long as the product is not causing trouble in our environment, and it's not at this point, then I don't believe that we have a serious problem to deal with. But Weyerhaeuser eventually will have to do something with that sludge. And they're a company that has been in the business for a long time; they likely have the contacts to find ways of handling it. And we will, over the long haul, work with them to have that happen, but it won't likely happen in the near future.

**Mr. Calvert:** — So, Mr. Minister, again, if we can move into just another area of what I would consider to be your responsibility. And it's commonly said in environmental circles, and you'll know this, that we, when dealing with the environment, we need to think globally, act locally.

And there's a responsibility, I think both you and I will agree, that we have a responsibility, not only for the environment that is determined by the borders of our province, but for the global environment that really isn't affected by national or provincial boundaries or political differences — that environment which sustains all of us.

So we do have a responsibility, I would submit, in the global context. And as you will know, perhaps the two largest crises facing the global environment are the combination of the deterioration of the ozone area and the greenhouse effect.

Mr. Minister, I have a simple question: do you have people in your department actively today giving thought to what we might be doing in Saskatchewan, first of all, in terms of the ozone layer and the deterioration of the ozone layer? Do you have people in the department at work right now suggesting possibilities of actions we may take locally to help restore and repair the ozone layer?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I believe that this ozone layer problem has been around for a while and it's been one that has been looked at by the community, the university community, the people that monitor that type of weather picture.

What we have done within our government is to begin to move towards the unleaded gasoline to be used in Saskatchewan and have offered tax incentives to people who would produce ethanol as a gasoline additive to get away from leaded gasoline entirely. The CCREM, which is the Council of Resource and Environment Ministers, have done a considerable amount of work and are making recommendations that hopefully will be of some use. My deputy minister has been involved in a number of

those meetings, so he is one of the people from our department that is very much involved.

The policy and evaluation unit that is being established in our department will on an ongoing basis be keeping track and working on directions that we may use in this province to be of assistance. Now I imagine that the heavier populated provinces and countries have more contribution to that problem than we do, but each one of us has some need to be involved ourselves in things that we might do to be of assistance. Perhaps you as an individual when you shave tomorrow morning don't use a pressurized can, use a bar of soap, and you'll help the system quite a bit yourself.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I am trying to do my bit and I'm hoping that you're going to try and do your bit. And you have considerably more influence and power in this province than I do or many, many other citizens. You are the Minister of the Environment. You have some, I hope, authority and influence within your government.

Mr. Minister, I couldn't take from your remarks whether you have some very specific proposals coming out of your department just now. And I see you shaking your head — no, you've not. Then I would ask you to consider some very specific proposals. In terms of the ozone layer, it's widely accepted that the damage to the ozone layer is occurring through the use of the chlorofluorocarbons, CFCs. It is widely known that this chemical is present in many of the products we see in our daily lives.

It is my understanding that the McDonald's chain of restaurants, now using the containers for their food and so on, have agreed, in Canada, by August, to be using a product that doesn't contain the CFCs.

Would you be willing, through your department, to encourage — perhaps first of all encourage and if that doesn't work then to legislate — other retailers and businesses who are using products which contain CFCs to eliminate their use and to do so as quickly as possible?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — There are still many unknowns in the solution to the ozone problem. I don't believe that any country in the world is really at the stage where they can make concrete proposals on remedies that would be effective. I believe that it's going to take a wide variety of things changing in order to change the ozone problem. And I don't know whether it ever rebuilds and I don't believe most scientists know. They're looking at it but they haven't all of the answers at this point.

So our department doesn't have specific proposals. Our government has been monitoring the same as other governments across Canada. And I indicated to you the direction that we're heading with gasoline, to get to the unleaded stage, and that is one of the major contributors from our province to the problem.

Now there will be a number of other things coming down the pike, and I think there are new inventions each year and each month that will be of benefit. The change for McDonald's is one of those benefits. probably the change away from plastic bags that Safeway is using to the ecolyte plastic is probably another one that will be of

benefit. There are a number of things, but we don't have any specific ones, and no, we're not prepared to start to legislate until we have much more information so that we know that when we legislate we're doing the right thing.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I tell you, I think this province is in trouble. When the McDonald's chain of restaurants have a better understanding of the environment and the problems facing the environment and are more willing to take concrete steps to deal with those problems than is the PC Government of Saskatchewan . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, it is widely accepted that the CFCs used in a variety of commercial products are causing the problem in the ozone layer. I mean, you can find all sorts of technical studies that will show that; you can find all sorts of popular articles in publications like the *Reader's Digest*, in publications like the *Sports Illustrated*, articles talking about the damage to the ozone layer and what drastic consequences we face if we do not take immediate action.

We have a variety of products in use in our province, and I suggest . . . I'm not saying you need to legislate immediately, I'm suggesting that your government undertake first of all, at minimum, an educational campaign. Try and get our eggs back into cardboard cartons, biodegradable cartons. Try and get the food chains in this province to use packaging that doesn't contain CFCs. Try to get other manufacturers to use materials other than the foam that contains CFCs. Mr. Minister, will you at least undertake that much, not just for the sake of Saskatchewan, but for the sake of the globe?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — It was interesting when the hon. member was speaking that he didn't say that they were scientific articles, they were popular articles, and I believe that's the right term. The articles that have been written, for the most part, are just popular articles and don't have very much scientific base. There are some that are scientific.

And we are looking at areas that we could advertise and assist but we haven't really reached that stage as a department. The Council of Resource and Environment Ministers have been looking at this issue and as we develop a program that might be universal across Canada it would likely have more impact. That's the direction that our department has been going, and I think will continue to go, because there is a lot more money to be spent to be sure that what we do is going to be beneficial. I don't want to jump first and then think later; we want to think first and then jump, and that's what we intend to do.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I didn't bring them because I didn't think it was necessary — some of the technical studies by eminent and qualified people, not only in Canada, the United States and elsewhere, who have concluded that CFCs are creating the problem in the ozone layer. I did not come here expecting that this

would be a matter of debate. I did not expect the Minister of the Environment in Saskatchewan to stand up and suggest, well, we're not sure that there's a problem; we're not sure what's causing the problem.

(2045)

This is just like, as I said this afternoon, a Ronald Reagan, who wants to excuse inaction by saying, well we need to study the issue. We don't know what the problem is, we don't know the damage is.

Mr. Minister, it's my understanding there's international agreements in place calling for a 50 per cent reduction of the CFCs. I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, if . . . Now I'm not sure how you're going to respond because I'm not sure you accept the fact that CFCs are a problem. But I came here wanting to ask you tonight, so I will. Would you be willing to lobby your federal counterparts to strive for an agreement that would call for an 85 per cent reduction in the use of CFCs in Canada? The scientific and technical communities say that with that kind of reduction then we can expect a regeneration of the ozone layer — but a 50 per cent reduction won't do it.

So I wanted to ask you tonight, and I will ask you: will you lobby your federal counterparts for an agreement which calls for an 85 per cent reduction rather than the agreement which calls for a 50 per cent reduction?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — You know, the member now says he has scientific studies and that's a different matter. But when you spoke first, you said "popular articles." And that's all I quoted, is what you said.

I might advise the hon. member that there is an international meeting proposed for Canada on the June 26, and if the legislature isn't in session, I fully to expect to attend that meeting and be involved in it. But the department likely will be represented whether or not I go.

The decision to change the products that we use, if it were a great decision, they shouldn't say 50 per cent, they should say that we should have a time frame and work right out of using that project. And I believe that's the direction that environment ministers across Canada and across the world are looking at it.

There are many products that are causing trouble — the ones that you quote are one product. They still tell me that the biggest polluter that we have is the combustion engine and the types of fuel that we have used; that it's doing far more damage to the environment than any other one single factor. That's the one that I believe Canada should move to adjust first because we are a very industrialized nation and we have many combustion engines.

So we will be looking at the issue and I'm sure, in the very near future, you'll see more action across Canada and across Saskatchewan on this issue.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Minister, last year during your estimates we spent some time discussing the fire commission's office and its role. You will recall that last year you advised me that the fire commission's office was

spending approximately 1.024 million and that was taken from a series of premiums on fire insurance, home fire insurance that was collected at a total 1.8 million. I'd like to know how much you're dedicating towards the fire commission this year, please, Mr. Minister. And also, in view of the fact that there aren't any public accounts, could you advise me whether the amount collected in premiums are approximately the same as last year.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The budgeted figure you have, which is 989 million, and the figure that you said that was collected out of insurance fees was estimated by Finance. It goes into general revenue, and I imagine that the estimate would be very much the same this year, although I haven't seen that estimate.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Could you give me the figure for the fire commission's office again — 989,000?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes, 989,110.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — I thought perhaps you had decided to increase it a hundredfold there, and I was wondering what had happened.

Well, Mr. Minister, the concern remains the same, and that is that the people of Saskatchewan are really providing a sort of a hidden tax here, that is, to the Government of Saskatchewan. They're taxed 1 per cent, and the money is said to be dedicated to the fire commission's office by law, and of course only 1 million out of the 1.8 approximated amount gets to the fire commission's office. The volunteer fire-fighters still feel very strongly that the moneys . . . They need increased moneys to be dedicated towards some of the enterprises that they have suggested in their 1984 study.

I want to know, Mr. Minister, whether you are developing any new training courses or models, and whether you're intending to establish a fire college.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The level 1 training college was implemented last year and has been working for a year. I am advised that a new principal from the fire training college will be employed very shortly to work with that program and with others.

There's no proposal right at this time to build a separate fire college, but what is being looked at in just the preliminary stages is a joint emergency response facility and if that goes ahead, then the fire college would likely be incorporated with it. But it's in the very, very early stages and I couldn't even give you any guide-line or time frame of when it might happen. It's being discussed between the federal government and our department, but it's in the very, very early stages and not very far down the road at this point.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Let's turn for a minute to the other topic that we discussed very briefly last year, and that is the one of environmental hypersensitivity, as it relates to your department.

I want to know that whether as a result of any discussions you might have had or information, whether you're

planning to take any action, any proactive approach, in conjunction perhaps with the Department of Health, where you might set up an assignment to somebody in your department to document and establish a baseline of knowledge about people affected with hypersensitivity over . . . in the near future, because it's a concern certainly in industrialized areas, and I believe it's getting to be more of a concern of Saskatchewan people as we get to have more and more contact with chemicals and synthetic materials.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I am advised that our department has had nothing further on that. It would be a health issue and the Health department may have something, but we haven't.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Have you had any delegations or any representations about causes of environmental hypersensitivity from any groups such as the Catholic family services or Dr. Gerrard or Dr. Montebriand who are working in this area?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, my staff are not aware of any contact.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, just a short couple of questions concerning the environmental impact statement that was prepared for your department and approved by your department on the Uranium City-Rabbit Lake transmission line.

I have read the executive summary of the EIS, and I don't find in it any reference to something which I think ought to be of concern to you and to this House, and that is: what process will be used once the line is in place for the ongoing clearing of that line? Is it the plan, to your knowledge, that SPC will be using the spraying of herbicides along that line once it is completed?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, that line was hand cleared and the intent is that it continues to be hand cleared.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, the intent is that it continue to be hand cleared. Are you insisting that it be hand cleared in the future as well as in the developmental stage, but in the future. Are you insisting that hand clearing be done rather than use of herbicide?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the environmental impact statement recommended that that was the method of clearance, would be hand clearing and that it continue to be hand clearing, and we approved the environmental impact statement as it's stated. So we're not intending to use chemicals.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I understood that it was to be hand cleared during the construction phase. Now I've only dealt with the executive summary and so I have not read the entire environment impact, but I would really appreciate — and I'm sure a variety of other people, particularly in the North — would appreciate your guarantee, your guarantee that from your point of view, as the Department of the Environment and as minister, that hand clearing will continue in the future and that herbicide spraying will not be used along this line.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That's what the environmental impact study said, was that it would be hand cleared and continue to be hand cleared and that was what was approved by our department. So there is no authorization to go ahead with chemical clearing.

**Mr. Calvert:** — If, Mr. Minister, there is a violation of that, how is that dealt with?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that before anyone could have approval to use chemical, they would have to come back for approval through the department. If they do as you say, they violate the approval, then through minister's order you could challenge them and it could go to the court and they'd be fined in the regular legal process.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for that information and for the assurance that you've given from your point of view — it shall be hand clearing, along that line.

If I may just move back again to the more specifics of your department, would you provide for me or tonight just give it, the name, title, and the salary of each of your personal staff as minister — the name, title, and salary.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'll send that across to the member.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, you may also have this information with you. Do any of those particular employees of yours have access to a government vehicle or a car allowance, or is that information included here?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — None of those people would have a car allowance or have access to a car unless I were to ask them to go somewhere and then they would draw a vehicle from the pool for a day and it would be put back.

(2100)

**Mr. Calvert:** — Now not just in respect to your own personal staff as minister, but to the department, could you give me, first of all, the numbers and the names of any staff who have been terminated in the past . . . well, in the calendar years 1986-87 and to this point in '87-88.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I wonder if the member would be specific. You realize that we had a number of early retirements. Those would not, in our term, be classed as terminations. We had only one termination, and as far as the information on that, I would likely have to send it to you. We don't have it here tonight. But we just had one. The position was abolished and the person's job ended.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, then if you would provide me the name and if the severance package was involved. If you would provide that as well.

Mr. Minister, from the introduction of your officials, I understand that Mr. Michael Hegan works in your department. I would like to ask if he has recently taken time away from his office to campaign for a PC nomination, and during that time, did he take a holiday or a leave of absence?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the member was away on holidays.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, could you provide for us then the period of time involved?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — We'll provide you with the actual dates. I don't have them here but I could get them. We have them on the application, so that's the best way to give it to you. We'll send it.

**Mr. Calvert:** — We'd appreciate that information.

Mr. Minister, I think that . . . No, I'm sorry, I do have one other short area that I would like us to look at before we can perhaps start moving through the subvotes, and that has to do with the environment and the economy task force recommendation.

As you know . . . as you well know, the task force calls for the establishment of a round table on the environment and the economy. I would like to ask tonight: at what stage are you and the department in the formation of the round table in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That plan is under development in our department. We expect to have round tables beginning this year but we aren't at that stage quite. We are doing work on it. As I advised you earlier, the two new people that will come into the planning area will be involved in part of that and we're just in the hiring stages. So sometime this year we would hope to begin to put the round tables in place.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, the report, as you know, calls for the establishment of the round tables by September of this year — and that's the recommendation. You certainly have been a part and your department has been a part of this report calling for the round tables to be in establishment by September. I realize from previous discussions we've had today you seem to find it a little difficult to get things prepared and ready on time. I'm hoping that this can be an exception.

Have you appointed a chairperson for the round table in Saskatchewan, or have you named any other individuals yet to that round table?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, we haven't at this point. As I advised you, we're still in that process, and no, the people have not been named.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Are you confident, Mr. Minister, that this work can be done, that the round table can be in existence by September, as the report calls for, or are we going to be sort of the province again that's behind the rest of Canada?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that there are only two provinces in Canada that have their action plan ready and that there are no round tables established in any province in Canada at this point.

I did suggest to you that we expect that we would have a round table established this year; whether it will be September, I'm not certain. Those are guide-lines that are

put out when the report was drafted, and whether we can meet that guide-line I'm not certain. And I don't think that's the beginning or the end, whether it's the first of September or the first of October or the first of November, as long as when we do come in with a program that it's done well and that the people that we put in place will be the qualified people that can do a good job of it.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Perhaps we could just move quickly to another recommendation, Mr. Minister. This is from that, the series of recommendations pertaining to government particularly, and recommendation 2.2, that environment ministers should be members of key economic development and priorities and planning committees of cabinet or be closely associated by appropriate mechanisms with those committees. And I'm not sure how your cabinet functions — if it functions at all — but may I ask first of all then, does your cabinet have an economic development and priority and planning committee? If it does, are you a part of that group?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The cabinet does have a priority planning group, and I'm not a part of that group at this time.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Then to follow along with the recommendations of this, which I would describe as a very welcome document, does your government plan then to make yourself or the Minister of the Environment a part of that group?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That's an answer that I couldn't give you. You'll have to, perhaps, talk to the Premier who makes those choices.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I will ask the Premier on your behalf if he is going to do that. Are you currently lobbying the Premier to find a place within that committee?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The Premier was part of the first ministers' conference that approved that task force report. He has read the report; he is aware of that recommendation; I have written a letter to him drawing his attention to it. When he makes a decision, I guess he will advise me.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well I wish you well, Mr. Minister. I'm not particularly optimistic, knowing the Premier that you work under, but I wish you well.

On to another section of the recommendations, this having to do with conservation strategies. The report calls for yourself, as Minister of the Environment, in consultation with industry and non-government organizations, to prepare a compendium of Canadian experiences in developing conservation strategies, and it is hoped that that can be done again by September of this year. How is the progress on that going, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The task force itself was given an extra year's extension to do some of that very work that you're mentioning and the department, through the deputy minister, have been very much involved in that process and will continue to be.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Again another recommendation, Mr. Minister — and I haven't seen any evidence of this happening yet in our province and I hope to soon and I'd like to hear from you tonight when we might expect it — a recommendation that over the course of the next two years, that would begin this year and next year, that provincial governments should organize workshops and seminars on conservation strategies. Are you currently, or people in your department, organizing these workshops? And I sincerely hope the answer is yes. And I'd also like to know then, where in your budget is there some funding for this to happen.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The action plan that we spoke of earlier is the first step. All of the recommendations will be dealt with in that action plan, then it has to go forward for funding through government, and it's after that that we could implement. So we don't have those meetings in place at this point.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just several brief questions as matters of information to the minister.

Mr. Minister, I wonder, as part of your operations of the Department of the Environment, are you engaged in a program, or have you developed a program to monitor ground water quality throughout the province in respect of potential contaminations by the use of agricultural herbicides or pesticides and, if so, has there been any reports prepared lately in that regard?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — In so far as the monitoring of ground water is concerned, where there are community wells in agricultural areas, we have them send in samples on a regular basis and that type of analysis is done. But we don't have any formal reports written like we do an analysis of a sample and advise them whether the water is still safe for human consumption, that sort of things, but not a formal report.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, just as a — maybe it's a practical suggestion in terms of monitoring what is becoming increasingly a problem, has been identified as a problem throughout not just Saskatchewan or Manitoba or Alberta or western Canada, but throughout all North America, and that is the increase in the number of pollutants from pesticide and herbicide use, both agriculturally and industrially as well as domestically. May I suggest that as a practical solution, or as a practical suggestion, that you, in fact, engage in some kind of monitoring process to see — given the extensive nature and the extensive use of agricultural chemicals in the province — that you develop some kind of ongoing monitoring situation in regards to ground water.

Having said that, my second question has got nothing to do with this; the second question has to do with the upgrader in Regina. Was there environmental assessment done prior to the construction of the heavy oil upgrader in Regina? If no environmental assessment was done, were there environmental guide-lines laid down in regards to potential problems which could possibly arise, given some of the dangerous and hazardous substances that are produced at the upgrader, and if so, have those reports or that environmental assessment been made public?

(2115)

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the answer to all of your questions is yes. Yes, to them all.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Just in terms of the guide-lines that are laid down for the upgrader, is it possible for every citizen of the province to get a copy of that? Are they at the libraries? I'm asking purely as a question of information.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes, that information is in the library.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a couple of very brief questions about the removal of PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyl) from transformer oil, for example. I want to know if you're aware of any new or innovative and inexpensive method of removing PCBs of low concentration from transformer oil?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — When the members asks about "new", I don't know how new he's looking for. We've had a company in Regina called PPM (Canada Inc.) that does that type of work on low levels of contamination on transformer oil. And they've been handling that type of work for Sask Power now for the last two years and, I think, are doing a commendable job of it.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't suppose, Mr. Minister, you'd be aware of the costs, the volume costs of doing that? Would you?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'm advised that the cost is relatively low but we don't have exact figures. SaskPower would likely be able to give you that information but we certainly don't have it.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The reason I asked the question, Mr. Minister, is a constituent that I'm aware of claims that he has a process for removing low concentration of PCBs from transformer oil, and I was wondering, Mr. Minister, would it be possible to get his method evaluated by your department, if he so desired?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Our department indicates they would be glad to look at it if he has a proposal to make, at any time.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

### Item 3

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, just on item 3, I would like to reiterate a comment that I made earlier this day in regard to the environmental assessment branch. You have added two staff people to that branch and explained in the House this afternoon that those two people will become essentially the planning and policy division, particularly in response to the environment and the economy task force.

Mr. Minister, I indicated this afternoon, and I want to indicate again, I think that the demand on the environmental assessment branch, which you indicated in your opening remarks, is growing, and we can expect it to grow. I was hopeful when I initially saw these figures in your budget that, in fact, you had found way clear to add two more people to that branch.

I would ask you again tonight: would you consider leaving this budgeted amount alone just for environmental assessment purposes, and to add to your budget or to find somewhere else in your budget the \$150,000 that you want to use for the planning and priority function?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well, I believe that staff in environmental assessment have been able to do a good job of reviewing the environmental assessments, even through the work-load is fairly heavy.

Putting two extra people in that department to do the work that we suggest that they will do should free up other people who had been doing that type of work for the department. And that way, in effect, it gives more time for people who are now in the department to work. So indirectly they have had more assistance at their disposal for the coming year than they had in the past.

Item 3 agreed to.

Item 4 agreed to.

**Item 5**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, this is the, of course, the division of your department that chose the reduction of the staff. And I understand from the notations here in the blue book that some of . . . it would appear to me that some of these folks are going over to SaskPower. Is that true? Is that assessment correct?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes, that's the intent.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Is it your intent to move more of the public safety branch into SaskPower, or is this the extent of the move?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — It's just the gas and electrical that will be moving, the inspection side of the gas and electrical.

**Mr. Calvert:** — So you don't anticipate any further functions of that branch being moved out of our department and into SaskPower — just the gas and the electrical?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes, that's all to SaskPower.

Item 5 agreed to.

Items 6 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

**Item 9**

**Mr. Calvert:** — This is, I find, to be a rather peculiar item. I shouldn't say peculiar, that the water appeal board is peculiar — I find your budgeting for the water appeal

board to be very peculiar.

As I checked back in preparation for these estimates, in 1986-87 the budgeted figure for the water appeal board was \$91,000. Last year the budgeted amount went to \$41,000. This year it is up to 103,600. Now could you explain those wild variations in budgeted figures for the water appeal board, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I believe I did explain it to you last year. They had a surplus in their budget from the year before, and that surplus was used along with the 41,000 that showed in the budget; they utilized the surplus that they had on hand. This year the surplus is gone, and their work-load has increased to some extent, and they have one extra person on the board so their costs are a bit higher, and that's the reason for the budget increase.

Item 9 agreed to.

**Item 10 Statutory**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, just to respond a little bit to your last remark. You did not explain to me last year about the water appeal board. I was not serving as the environment critic; I would not have forgotten such an explanation.

On item 10, Mr. Minister, I see that the budgeted amount for the members of the Executive Council statutory has gone from 28,300 last year to 35,200 this year. Would you explain to the House the almost \$7,000 increase?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The change is that I now have a Legislative Secretary charged to the Department of Environment. Last year I just had a Legislative Secretary charged to the water corporation. I just still have one Legislative Secretary, but this time he was appointed to the department. So the difference is that appointment.

**Mr. Calvert:** — So this year the department is paying the extra salary to the member who serves as your Legislative Secretary, whereas last year the water corporation paid it. That's correct?

Mr. Minister, could you tell this House who your Legislative Secretary is?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes, the member for Nipawin.

**Mr. Calvert:** — The member from Nipawin. Mr. Minister, could you provide for this House a summary, a list of the activities undertaken by the member from Nipawin as your Legislative Secretary in the course of the past year so that we might know what we're getting for this \$7,000?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — As the member may realize, he was appointed in late January, so his year was fairly short; it was just a couple of months. Just for the two month period I could give you that information.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Yes, I would appreciate that information, Mr. Minister. And I take it that you will provide it in printed form and send it. Thank you very much.

Vote 9 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates (No. 2)  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Environment and Public Safety  
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 9**

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

**Item 3**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, the operation recycle program of course has been wiped out. There was a budgeted amount of 700,000, if I recall, in last year's budget. Here we're having an additional \$650,000. Why? Why the extra 650,000?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That 650,000 included 200,000 for the completion of the vehicle gathering and hauling from all the collection sites in the province; clean-up of the collection sites was 350,000, and compensation for contract terminations was 100,000, for a total of 650,000.

**Mr. Calvert:** — I'm sorry, I didn't just catch that, Mr. Minister. One hundred thousand for contract terminations? Figure was correct?

Item 3 agreed to.

Vote 9 agreed to.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, are your officials from the department . . . will they be leaving now?

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes

**Mr. Calvert:** — Then let me take this opportunity to thank them for their part in these estimates and to thank them for their ongoing contribution to the people of Saskatchewan. When I look at a budget that has been cut since some years ago, I recognize that perhaps your work is not always easy, that the demands are heavy. And I want to, on behalf of the opposition and certainly on behalf of the people I represent in Moose Jaw and on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, to extend thanks to you folks.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to thank my officials for the work and the assistance they provide me on a daily basis, and or the special assistance they provide during the time of our estimates. I might also say that we appreciate them having an extra four weeks to get this year's work done. Thanks very much.

(2130)

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Saskatchewan Water Corporation  
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 50**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Would the minister introduce his official.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce my officials: Vern Fowke, president of the water corporation sitting here beside; directly behind me Wayne Phillips, vice-president, finance and administration; and here, Wayne Dybvig, chief planner, resource management

division? The critic for Environment have said that others were not making speeches. I'll bless them tonight, no speech. We'll go right into the question and answer period.

**Item 1**

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, I want to welcome your officials to this House. Mr. Minister, I would like some clarification from you as to the questions that perhaps are most appropriately asked here, and other questions that may more appropriately be asked in Crown Corporations Committee.

Perhaps because I am a junior member of this House, if you could just give me some indication as to the field of questioning that you will permit in the Crown Corporations Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well the Crown Corporations Committee is always the year under review, so in that term you would have to stay within the things that the water corporation did during the year that will be under review next . . . and I believe we're up on Tuesday.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, that's not true in this committee.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, just . . . he asked about the Crown corporations and that's what's available then.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, again just for my clarification, if in fact a study was commissioned by the water corporation in the year under review, but that study has only become available publicly now, or at least parts of it, will you accept questions in Crown Corporations Committee in regard to that kind of study?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I believe that if a report were commissioned on a certain year, then that report . . . the cost of the report and who is doing it, that sort of things would be up for discussion. But the actual report, if it came in in the following year, would not be up for discussion till the following year.

**Mr. Calvert:** — And, Mr. Minister, we may or may not then be able to complete this portion of your estimates tonight. I'd hope we could do much of the material in the Crown Corporations Committee.

Let me begin by asking if you will provide for this House . . . The other day in question period we had a very short exchange about a study, which I believe was commissioned by the water corporation, into soil salinity and related problems to irrigation, a study conducted by Professor Henry of Saskatoon. Mr. Minister, would you make a copy of Professor Henry's study available to myself as critic?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — That particular study arrived on my desk yesterday. I haven't had an opportunity to even take it to the Sask Water Corporation board of directors yet, so I can't tell you just when it will be released, but it's not available at this point.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, this is a very peculiar

thing, because in question period you were telling me what was in the report, and what was in the study, and what it was recommending, and where it was recommending things not be done. And now you tell me tonight you just got it yesterday. How is it that you had the knowledge of what's in the report when we dealt with this issue in question period and you haven't had a chance to read it?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — If the hon. member will recall, the question he asked was yesterday, and I got the report yesterday. And yes, I read the executive summary and parts of the main report yesterday, and I gave you factual information.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, these days in this House seem so long.

Mr. Minister, then let me ask a number of questions around that report. If I understood you correctly in this House you said to the House that Professor Henry's recommendation for a moratorium on irrigation applied only to that area around Outlook that has been irrigated for some years. Is that the recommendation of Professor Henry that only that area have a moratorium placed on it?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Yes. I would tell the hon. member that the study only covered irrigation district no. 1, it didn't cover any other area of the province. It looked at specific soil difficulties that haven't shown up in that irrigation district, so his recommendation can only apply to the district that was under study.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Did he, Mr. Minister, intend his recommendation only to apply to that area under study?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Or did he intend that his findings in that area should be extrapolated to the province? Because my understanding of that study — and I only understand it through the public reports, the press reports — my understanding is that Professor Henry was calling for an immediate and total moratorium across the province until long-term studies could be completed based on his research in that one area.

That's my understanding. Is that true or false, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — From your research paper, which was the newspaper, I think maybe you could extrapolate that kind of information. But when you have an opportunity to review the report in the near future, I believe then you will realize that he's only dealing with the Outlook irrigation district no. 1.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, then how soon will I have the opportunity to review the report?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — As a minister of Sask Water I would take that report to our board of directors and to our staff, and then the decision will be made on which date it will be released for public review. And that process will take a little while — a month or so, but not too long.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, it's my understanding, actually from an engineering newsletter, that a new irrigation pump is under construction, or soon will be under construction, to serve that area. Am I mistaken about that?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The pump that you're talking about will be a pump for that pump-house at Gardiner Dam. The pump will not be used only for irrigation. It's for the pumping of water in that whole area. It will be pump unit no. 4 because at times they were short of water. The water that it supplies, part of it goes to Blackstrap, part of it will go to the water supply system out of Saskatoon, and some of the water would be used for irrigation, but it's not used just for irrigation. It's a pump utilized for all of those services.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, then, I guess when I see a new pump being constructed — and I understand it's \$1 million that we're looking at spending there, \$1 million — at least certain part of the function of that pump is for irrigation.

Mr. Minister, what I want to ask you then, is when you get this recommendation from Professor Henry that calls for a moratorium on further irrigation, and you say only in that district — and I'm not so sure that's what he's calling for, but that's what you say, it's only in that district. Do you accept, then, Professor Henry's recommendation for that district?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — When you speak of that report and that recommendation, the pump was ordered about two months ago, and the report of Professor Henry came to my desk yesterday. So the pump was needed. If we had one pump stop for any reason, that whole area was in difficulty for water, and the water system that covers the area near Saskatoon services many farms and businesses.

So we can't have that area without water and the Blackstrap area without water. So the pump is very much needed whether we add additional irrigation or not. When you speak of a moratorium, that doesn't mean to stop the irrigation that's been going, it's to not start new irrigation. And the intent that we have at this time is not to develop new irrigation in that Outlook area.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, you have had a chance to read Professor Henry's report and I have not, so I'll ask you: does Professor Henry in his report indicate how much land, productive land, has been lost due to the irrigation project there at Outlook?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — When I tell you I've read it, I didn't read in detail all of the maps and the technical part of the report; that would take a considerable length of time. It's a major report; you don't read it in just an hour or two. I did spend about three hours with it, but there's much more that I would like to extract from that. I couldn't give you figures from it at this point.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Have your officials had a chance to read it, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, they haven't had the opportunity yet.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, another report that has received some publicity in the last number of days has to do with the South Saskatchewan study and the proposed diversion of waters from the South Saskatchewan into the Souris Basin. Mr. Minister, I want to ask you tonight, in the files of the water corporation, does there exist a plan for the diversion of waters from one basin to another?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Well as the member will realize, there are some diversions taking place now, like the water that comes to Buffalo Pound that serves the city of Moose Jaw and Regina is a diversion. The water that we talk about pumping through the SSEWS (Saskatoon South-East Water Supply) canal to go to Blackstrap is also a form of diversion, I suppose.

But in the water corporation files there are a number of studies that go back many years that have been done by PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration), and they have looked at diversions of different types. There are no active consideration by the water corporation since it was formed for diversions of any kind.

And the report you asked about, though there was a bit of information in the paper put forward by a man by the name of Kendall that was doing the actual study, we don't expect to have that study for at least two years yet. So it's in the very early stages of a study, so no, I can't give you any more information than what the paper gave you. But as a corporation, we're not considering diverting water out of the South Saskatchewan into the Souris or anything like it.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, is it not true that the interim report from Dr. or Mr. Kendall is due very shortly, that the final report is due in some length of time, but that there is an interim report due that will be made available?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — No, there is no interim report expected, and the final report is about two years away.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Well, Mr. Minister, then I guess . . . Again maybe you'll want to blame the media for this, but I understood through the press that indeed an interim report was going to be available.

The studies that you now have in the water corporation which propose diversions and map out possible routes for diversions from the South Saskatchewan into the Souris, would you make those available? Would you make those available to me or any others who may request to see them?

(2145)

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I might advise the hon. member that there was a study done between 1974 and 1978, and as you realize, that was done under the time when the NDP were government. That report I believe is in the files and maybe I'll be able to give you a copy, or maybe it's even in the library, I'm not sure. But we could look for it. I haven't seen it, but they indicate that if they have it, they could likely make it available.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, "if" and "likely" are not quite satisfactory to me tonight. If the report, I believe,

was done and does exist and is in the files, then I would like your assurance that your officials will find that report and provide it to us.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — My staff advise that they could find the report and they would make a copy available.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, we have indicated here in the blue book that \$59,500,000 is coming as a loan and advance to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation for construction of the Rafferty-Alameda dam project. Mr. Minister, what happens to this money if, in fact, the federal approval is not given? What happens to this money?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The water corporation would only borrow money from the Department of Finance as it's needed, and unless the money is being spent to build the project, there would be no need for it. So we don't have it sitting idle anywhere, it would just come forward from Finance as needed.

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Minister, then this figure of \$59,500,000 is all then money that could be loan; there is no advance money in this?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — There were moneys advanced — I haven't got the exact figure here, but approximately 5 million during the study period to do the environmental impact study and some of the other studies that have been done over the last two years.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I've got several questions regarding the irrigation project that my colleague from Moose Jaw South referred to, and then we'll get back to the minister's favourite project, the Rafferty-Alameda project.

In regards to the . . . Mr. Minister, you have just said in the House about 10 minutes ago, I believe, that in fact you were going to introduce a moratorium on the development of the irrigation no. 1 district, no 1, the projects which were outlined there.

I wonder, sir, could you tell us how much money has been spent to date by the water corporation on the development of those particular irrigation projects? How much had been earmarked for future development, and what happens to all the infrastructural capital equipment, the new pump, for example, now that you're placing a moratorium on that?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I believe again the member is putting words in my mouth. I didn't say a moratorium. What I said to you was that we have no intentions at this time to proceed with further irrigation in that area, and that's the way I put it. We haven't put a moratorium on it. I said we have no intentions.

The pump is needed for what is there now. We were having difficulty last year in supplying the water because if one pump slows down or goes out of service — and that can happen with mechanical equipment — then we couldn't supply the amount of water that was needed. So we're going to need that pump, and it's been ordered and will be installed this year.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Okay. Mr. Minister, maybe you don't want to call it a moratorium, but the fact that you're not going to proceed with any future irrigation developments and that you have said at this time that you're stopping any future developments, I guess if you look in the dictionary, you'd probably find that under the word "moratorium".

However, given that there is an agreement in place, the Saskatchewan-Canada agreement on irrigation — and there is \$100 million committed to this project — and given that concerns have been raised over the last two or three years, not only by people in this House, on this side of the House, but also by many farmers in the district, when will you be undertaking the long-term studies that need to be done to determine whether or not irrigation in that area will be viable?

And secondly, is it the intention of the water corporation to utilize those findings for those studies which have been recommended by Professor Henry to apply to other areas of the province with similar soil types and similar identified high salinity levels?

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The type of study that Professor Henry did in irrigation district no. 1 are very technical kinds of studies that are not transposable from one area to another. He even broke that area down into a number of different areas because of differences in soils and different problems that occur.

So no, you couldn't transpose the work that he did there to any other area. Each area has to stand alone, and the studies must be done on each individual irrigation project to be sure that that project meets the requirements, soil-wise, salt-wise — the whole bit. You have to do each one individually.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you and I had a fairly lengthy go-around last year in Crown Corporations, on the water corporation, regarding the problems of soil salinity. At that point in time you assured the House and you assured the people of the province that salinity wasn't a problem in that area, that you were confident that the \$100 million would be spent, and that the Saskatchewan-Canada irrigation project would be going forward. Now we've got a report that says, whoop, you were wrong, that yes, the problems of soil salinity are our problem.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: given the experiences of Alberta in which salinity has proven a major drawback to irrigation, and given the experiences in irrigation district no. 1, in which soil salinity has been a problem for the development and which has been identified by Professor Henry, don't you suppose that prior to granting irrigation development licences to the Souris valley, which is earmarked as an area for irrigation development through the Rafferty-Alameda project, don't you think that it would perhaps be a wise thing, before we get hooked into spending tens of millions of dollars in capital investment, that perhaps you say there will be a moratorium on irrigation and development in that area; that we will have some test, maybe test plots; we will have maybe pilot projects run there, so that we're not going to have to commit all this capital; that in fact, given the nature of soil

salinity problems in the province, that it may be a wise thing to indeed put a moratorium or, in your words, to halt development of those irrigation developments before the soil salinity problems?

And I just remind you, Mr. Minister, that that particular area of Saskatchewan is earmarked as one of the areas with the highest potential for salinity problems, in terms of soil types, in the province.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — The irrigation agreement has not put any money into irrigation district no. 1, but it is putting money into the Luck Lake project and the Riverhurst project, and possibly Grainland.

The hon. member is concerned about salt, as we in the water corporation have been, so we have as a project adviser for the Luck Lake project and for the Riverhurst project, professor Henry, who did the study at Outlook. And he has been working very carefully to test the soils and to advise the corporation and the farmers of the possible areas that should be watched to avoid salt problems.

I believe the method that we are using to put in the irrigation there is good, because it's all piped. You won't have open ditches that cause salt problems, and there are major drainage ditches installed which take back the surplus water back to the lake. I believe that in this particular project you will find that it will go ahead and do a good job, and we expect to turn the pumps on for the spring of 1989.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Minister, that doesn't answer the question regarding the proposed irrigation development in the Souris Valley. Perhaps, sir, if I could make the suggestion, perhaps, sir, I can make the suggestion that you hire Professor Henry, or you get Professor Henry to do a real study — not the phoney study that was done in the EIS — but a real study in terms of the problems and potential problems of irrigation in the Souris Valley and that area before you give the okay and the go-ahead for any potential irrigation development down in that area.

I make that suggestion, sir, because what has happened and what the farmers of the area of Outlook are reporting to us is that we're finding hectare after hectare of good — what was formerly good arable land — now not, has gone sour because of salt problems, and that, in fact, will not be productive for years and years to come.

And it's not, sir, with all due respect, just a question of having water through the open ditches. It's not just that problem at all. Having pipes will not solve the questions of water logging; neither will the installation of big drainage ditches or, for that matter, weeping tiles throughout the whole land area solve the problems. There are some inherent problems in soil types, as you well know, and as your experts at the water corporation know, involved in irrigation when you have high salinity soils.

The fact of the matter is that when it comes to developing irrigation, it's a fairly heavily capital intensive operation at the best of times, and when you have the potential problems, perhaps it would be more prudent — although

given your push, your own personal predilection, and I speak personally of you and also of the Premier of this province, your personal and his personal predilection to go ahead with irrigation regardless of what the experts say — perhaps it would be more prudent, however, if you took an expert like Professor Henry, had him do the investigation before we got into the mess that you're now in.

And the mess that you're now in, I may remind you, is a mess that was raised last year and which you refuse to see. The mess we raised was that you're going to run into problems with salt problems in that area because you already are running into salt problems in that area, but you refuse to recognize it. It took this kind of capital commitment, which, as you well realize, will not be utilized to its fullest capacity for irrigation — and you know very well that what I am saying in this matter is true, given your own projected rate of utilization of that irrigation project — that will not be utilized; that you made some significant expenditures on behalf of the people of the province, despite the fact that other people, not just members of the House, but there were technical experts at that time and over the last three or four years have been raising, in a very serious manner, the question of soil salinity.

(2200)

I want to say, Mr. Minister, that perhaps what I am saying is not just political rhetoric. And perhaps what the farmers of the area . . . of this province are saying is not just rhetoric. And perhaps what the technical experts outside your own coterie of technical experts are saying, when it comes to irrigation and the problems associated with irrigation, is not just rhetoric.

Perhaps there is a real problem there and perhaps it's more . . . the prudent course of action, just perhaps, although given your track record, I doubt very much whether you're going to even agree with prudence — but just perhaps the prudence in this area is the wisest course of action and that you will say, yes, we have got a moratorium, irrigation district no. 1, and we're going to put a moratorium on blanket irrigation. In fact what we're going to do — and again I make this suggestion — perhaps the prudent course of action would be to develop targeted irrigation projects more suited for Saskatchewan, the kind of irrigation project that the member from Thunder Creek is involved in, an irrigation project which makes sense, which is environmentally and ecologically sound.

Perhaps it's more prudent to follow that course of action than to try to throw gigantic sums of money at this grand vision of irrigation in Saskatchewan which, quite frankly, sir, will not work. We said it before; it won't work; the experts are saying it won't work; your own people are now saying it won't work, and I'm glad that you have realized that, moratorium or not, whatever semantics you want to use in the fact, the fact that you are going to stop it until you see some common sense approach to irrigation in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Sometimes it's very difficult to get a question from my farmer friend. He makes a speech, but

he doesn't really get around to the question.

**An Hon. Member:** — I made a couple of suggestions.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — You made a lot of suggestions. I might tell you that in the Souris area, the land that was proposed that could be irrigated has been tested and found to be suitable for irrigation. But we have no application from anyone wanting to irrigate there at this time, and we aren't far enough to have any water yet. So that one we don't need to worry about too long.

The development at Luck Lake has been studied very carefully by Professor Henry and by other engineering firms prior to the time when the irrigation was approved. I believe that the method that we're using to develop that particular project is good.

I don't take the responsibility for irrigation district no. 1 because that was done at the time that the NDP were in power. They started by scraping all the topsoil off and levelling that land which caused considerable difficulty, in itself, and with flood irrigation it just didn't work properly. So we have a problem, and our government is not going to take credit for it; it happened when the NDP were in power — without proper studies; maybe the studies were not available at that time. But that was not done properly. We have a problem on our hands and we're going to address it to see if we can correct it to reclaim it.

Item 1 agreed.

Items 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Item 6 — Statutory.

Vote 50 agreed to.

**Consolidated Fund Loans, Advances and Investments  
Saskatchewan Water Corporation  
Vote 140**

Item 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 140 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I'd like to thank the minister's officials.

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the critics and my officials. Thanks for a job well done tonight.

**Mr. Calvert:** — We would also want to add our thanks to the officials from the water corporation, and we look forward to raising many, many more issues and asking many, many more questions when we meet again in Crown corporations next Tuesday morning.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The committee reported progress.

**MOTIONS**

**Change in Hours of Friday's Assembly**

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Nipawin:

That with leave, notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly shall, on Friday, May 6, 1988, meet from 9:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

n