

*Saskatchewan*  
**ECO-NETWORK**

# NETWORKNEWS

203 - 115 2nd Avenue North, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7K 2B1 • Phone (306) 652-1275 Fax (306) 665-2128

## OH KYOTO

By Ann Coxworth, SES

Last May, some 22 Saskatchewan businesses and organizations joined with the Saskatchewan Environmental Society (SES) in a press conference calling on the federal government to announce Canadian ratification of the Kyoto agreement before the Earth Summit in Johannesburg. Right on cue, the Prime Minister used his speech at the Earth Summit as the occasion to announce that the question of Canadian ratification will be put to a vote in the House of Commons before the end of this year. *Thank you, Prime Minister!* Polls indicate that this move is popular with the Canadian public. Ninety-three Liberal MPs had signed on to a letter prior to the announcement, calling for ratification, so there is clear support within the Liberal caucus.

But what we are now confronted with is a heavily financed campaign spear-headed by the Alberta government, designed to persuade MPs to vote against ratification.

On May 21, the government of Alberta released "Albertans & Climate Change: A Plan for Action". This plan claimed to provide a practical alternative to the Kyoto Protocol, to achieve "...meaningful, long-term emissions reductions" and to "...serve as the basis for an effective, collaborative, equitable national approach to climate change . . . while contributing responsibly to solve global issues." In fact the Alberta plan would not lead to emission reductions, but rather, to significant increases. For a good critique see [www.pembina.org/publications](http://www.pembina.org/publications). The critique is entitled "An Assessment of Alberta's Climate Change Action Plan".

Various misleading horror stories are being planted about job loss and economic disaster resulting from Kyoto ratification. However, unbiased studies (e.g. "Kyoto, the Bottom Line" from the Tellus Institute), indicate that maybe ratification would result in Canada's economic growth by 2020 being reduced from 30% to 29.5% - a change which is insignificant in comparison with factors like the day-to-day fluctuation in the dollar. Increases in employment in Canada are likely, rather than decreases - the challenge is to manage the change

responsibly as some shifts occur in the type and location of work.

There is an urgent need now for exposure of the scare tactics being used by Ralph Klein and for reassurance to our MPs that we do indeed want ratification. The potential for Canada to achieve its Kyoto goal through economically feasible domestic actions is well explored in a brand new study produced jointly for the Climate Action Network and the David Suzuki Foundation by Ralph Torrie. This will be released on October 2<sup>nd</sup> and will be available on the DSF website, [www.davidsuzuki.org](http://www.davidsuzuki.org).

We expect the federal government will be releasing the plan for its Kyoto strategy in October, in time for discussion at a federal/provincial Joint Ministers' Meeting in Halifax on the 21<sup>st</sup>. A controversial factor in the design of the plan relates to Canada's attempt to get the rest of the world to agree to allow Kyoto credits for so-called Clean Energy Exports. If such credits were accepted, Canada believes it could claim credit for some 70 megatonnes of emission reductions, because of our natural gas and hydro exports to the United States. These are claimed to replace the use of coal in the US. In practice, our exports cannot be guaranteed to replace coal; they may instead be replacing conservation measures which would otherwise take place. Other Kyoto participants are virtually unanimous in opposing any credit for clean energy exports, so our government will need to assume that these will not be accepted.

SES and other climate-active environmental groups look forward to the release of the plan, and to continuing working with governments on the implementation of real emission reductions. ☀

### Inside This Issue

Oh, Kyoto	1
JEB Nuclear Waste Site	2
Open Letter to Hon. Lyle VanClief	3
Proposal Writing Guidelines	4
Potential Funding Sources	5
Action Alert for PA National Park	6
Eco-Tourism Training in PA	6
Wayne C. Harris: 1951-2002	7
Benefit Concert for OAPF	8

**Official Title:** JEB Uranium Tailings Management Facility

**What It Really Is:**

# JEB NUCLEAR WASTE SITE

by Neil Sinclair

The JEB site started out as an open pit uranium mine in northern Saskatchewan in the 80's. At the end of its mining life in the 90's, the uranium mining industry had this large empty pit. It is common practice for the mining industry to use old open pit mines as tailings waste sites. Mining creates a great deal of waste, as only a small percentage of the raw ore actually contains useful material. In the case of uranium mining in northern Saskatchewan, ore richness has been 1-5%, meaning that 95-99% of the mined material is waste. The new uranium mines are much richer, and more radioactive as a result, with an average richness of 20%.

Cameco and Cogema are the two mining companies that mine and sell the Uranium 238/235 around the world that is used for nuclear power generation as well as for the manufacture of nuclear bombs. Canada exports uranium to nuclear weapons possessing states.

The tailings left over from the mining of uranium contain a number of radioactive isotopes, probably the most well known being Radium 226 which emits alpha radiation and resembles calcium in its molecular structure. Because it resembles calcium, when it is absorbed into the body of a human it is treated as calcium and goes to the bones where it emits radiation at the bone marrow where blood is produced. The result is usually cancer of the blood or leukemia. This is just one example of one radioactive element out of the 16 naturally occurring radioactive isotopes involved in uranium mining. There are also large amounts of toxic material including arsenic and nickel. Uranium, apart from its radioactive dangers, is also a poisonous toxic material.

What separates the JEB pit from others is its size. It is gigantic. Its diameter is roughly that of 4 football fields, almost half a kilometre. Its depth is that of a 30-story building or 1/3 the height of the destroyed 110-story World Trade Center towers. The waste plan for the JEB site, accepted by the provincial NDP government, involves using the site for 40 years as a depository for uranium tailings waste from 3 uranium mines. The mines involved are Midwest, McClean Lake, and Cigar Lake. To contain the gamma radiation and protect the workers at the JEB waste site the pit has been filled with water and the waste has been deposited below the water. Collection sites and pumping stations have been located underneath the JEB pit to collect the water running through the waste downward and send it to a treatment facility where it is treated to meet regulatory safety limits before it is released into the surrounding environment. This will continue for the next 40 years. After the waste site closes (that is, not accepting any more waste), the waste treatment and monitoring will continue for another 30 years. Then it will stop.

The original environmental assessment panel recommended that monitoring continue in perpetuity. When the JEB waste site is closed, the plan is to remove the water cover, replace it with earth and rock, and plant trees. However, there are major problems with this plan. The site will contain 7 million cubic metres of a wet powder with a consistency of toothpaste. Questions were asked at the hearings about the long-term plan for the site. HOW will earth and rock be placed on top of this soft toothpaste-like material? HOW will heavy trucks and earth moving equipment not sink into the radioactive toxic toothpaste-like mixture? There was NO answer to this question. There has been NO experiment to see if Cogema's plan will actually work. The term "adaptive management" was used to describe how problems will be dealt with. Meaning we don't know what we'll do, but will think of something when the time comes.

This was NOT acceptable to the members of the Inter-Church Uranium Committee Educational Cooperative. As a result the ICUCEC took a big step and launched a court action. After 3 years of legal argument, a court ruling came down favouring a new environmental assessment. The operating license for the McClean Lake mine and JEB pit was quashed.

However, there are recent reports that Cogema is ignoring this court ruling and mining operations have not stopped. Most people in Saskatchewan have very little knowledge of what is really happening in northern Saskatchewan around the uranium mines. The JEB nuclear waste site is of tremendous size and will create immense problems around the containment of the waste. The amount of waste will be seven million cubic metres. If you were to line each cubic metre up back to back, it would be 7,000 kilometres long. More than enough to stretch across Canada and still have hundreds of kilometres in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans.

Recently, an open pit mine waste site in the United States has started to be cleaned up. The cost: \$250 million. And it just contained arsenic. Saskatchewan's JEB will contain vast amounts of arsenic, but it will also be radioactive, making it far more difficult to handle and more expensive.

In a nutshell what the JEB nuclear waste site will be is a huge hole in the ground filled to the brim with a radioactive and toxic mixture of a powder that resembles flour when dry and toothpaste when wet. It will be half a kilometre wide and over 100 metres deep. The "cover it up with dirt" plan simply will not work. This is clear to any rational person.

The men making the decision today to go forward with the JEB waste site simply value short term money profits ahead of the welfare of people that will be living in Saskatchewan 70 years and more from now in the future. ☀️

***On behalf of its member groups, SEN would like to extend congratulations to ICUCEC for their success around the JEB site. THANKS for all your hard work and dedication!***

## Federal Government Must Rescind the "*Plant Breeders Rights Act*" To Restore The Family Farm As a Basic Unit of Agriculture Production

By: Elmer Laird, Back to the Farm Research Foundation

September 17, 2002

OPEN LETTER TO:

The Hon. Lyle VanClief, Minister of Agriculture  
Government of Canada, Ottawa

Dear Mr. VanClief:

The Federal Appeal Court Panel announced their decision on the Percy Schmieser case on Thursday, September 3, 2002, in Saskatoon. The judges ruled that it wouldn't have mattered what Schmieser knew or didn't know, what he did or didn't do, or how Round-Up Ready canola seeds were spread on his property. They ruled that "patent law" superseded farmers' rights and Schmieser was guilty of growing Round-Up Ready canola on his farm whether the seed blew off passing trucks, or pollen was carried by bees or the wind to pollute his canola. They ruled that he was growing Round-Up Ready canola without a contract or paying the \$15 per acre technology fee. The judges rejected his 17-point appeal of Judge Andrew MacKay's ruling that was heard May 15-16, 2002, in Saskatoon. This decision not only affects Percy Schmieser but all farmers in Canada who may have patented GMO seed "appear" on their land. In fact farmers all around the globe are very upset about this federal appeal court decision and have been phoning Schmieser continuously following the decision. There is little doubt that this will affect Canada's reputation of marketing quality grain and oilseeds around the world. (The decision can be found at <http://decisions.fct-cf.gc.ca/fct/2002/2002fca309.html>)

In the meantime 72 year old Bruno, Saskatchewan, farmer, Percy Schmieser, has essentially moved from being a canola farmer on his 1400-acre farm to the status of world ambassador. Schmieser is leading the fight internationally for farmers' rights to save their own seed. It all started when the transnational corporation Monsanto charged Schmieser with using Round-up Ready canola without a contract and without paying the \$15 per acre technology fee that Monsanto charges for using their genetically engineered canola seed. Schmieser spent two and a half weeks in May, 2000, in a federal court in Saskatoon defending his position that he didn't know how the Round-up Ready canola ended up in his field in 1997-98. He said that the seed could have blown off a passing truck, pollen could have drifted from neighbouring fields or bees could have carried the pollen - all of which have been proven possible since that time. Federal Court Judge Andrew MacKay ruled in March, 2001 that Schmieser "knew or should have known" that his fields were Round-up Ready tolerant. He brought down his decision in March, 2001, almost a year after the June, 2000 trial and fined him \$19,832 in damages. Schmieser appealed. Finally, on May 15-16, 2002, the appeal was heard. However in April just before the appeal was heard, Judge Andrew MacKay raised the fine to \$153,000. Apparently, to have a judge up the fine almost a year later is unprecedented in Canadian law. During the appeal which was heard in federal court in Saskatoon, Monsanto offered Schmieser an out-of-court settlement of \$105,935. Schmieser has appealed the \$153,000 Federal Appeal Court ruling. He is also appealing the case to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Since the first Schmieser trial in June, 2000, he has literally been travelling the globe as a world ambassador for farmers. In September, 2000, he was invited by India's Research Foundation for Science, Ecology and Technology to spend two weeks travelling and speaking in India. While in India he received an award he didn't expect. He was presented with India's Mahatma Gandhi Award, India's highest award, presented on the 131<sup>st</sup> anniversary of Gandhi's birth. He received the award because of his non-violent fight in a Saskatoon courtroom to protect farmers' rights to save their own seed. Schmieser spent two weeks speaking at various universities in India. Since that time, it has been go, go, go. He has been back to Bangladesh, the Cameroons, twice to Australia, South Africa, and Europe, many times to the United States (even Missouri where Monsanto's headquarters are) and to seven South American countries.

Consumers may want to know what the "family farm" system of production means to them. Well, corporate farming means more and more pesticides and GMO seeds. Before the *Plant Breeders Rights Act* legislation, taxpayers had political control of agriculture but now transnationals control it. Well, Mr. VanClief, you may not realize it, but people are becoming more and more concerned about their food. Mothers and grandmothers are become more concerned about the increasingly polluted world their children and grandchildren are growing up in. Your government is and has been for many years supporting chemical agriculture only and more recently GMOs. Consumers and taxpayers are paying large amounts of their taxes supporting chemical agriculture for the research, extension and promotion of GMOs. You are going to have to seriously consider before the next election if you are going to switch your support to the family farm by rescinding the *Plant Breeders Rights* legislation or if you are going to continue to let the transnational corporations run the farms and control the farmers.

Perhaps it is time you invited Percy Schmieser to Ottawa to consult him on farm policy. He has been invited everywhere else. Schmieser says everyone he meets in his travels is very friendly except for Monsanto representatives and Canadian diplomats. I think Canadian diplomats should be instructed to support a good cause on behalf of the Canadian government.

**Support "Fight Genetically Altered Food Fund Inc.", Box 3743, Humboldt, Saskatchewan, Canada S0K 2A0**

# Proposal-Writing Guidelines

The following has been extracted from an on-line non-profit resource website, "SeaCoast Web Design and Non-Profit Guides". Additional material can be found on their website at [www.npguides.org](http://www.npguides.org).

There are different forms and formats for proposals. Every funder has different guidelines and priorities, deadlines and time-tables. Always follow the exact specifications of the grantmakers in their grant applications, Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and guidelines. Full funding proposals are generally a maximum of 15 pages (single-spaced) and include these components.

## 1) Cover Letter (one page)

Provide a clear, concise overview of the organization, purpose and reason for and amount of the funding request. Be sure to show how your proposal furthers the grantmaker's mission, goals and matches the funder's grant application guidelines. Cover Letters should be typed on letterhead.

## 2) Cover Sheet (1/2 page)

Also called an executive summary, this is a case statement and proposal summary. Introduce the proposal, present a clear, concise summary of proposal and visual framework of project, and includes: Applicant contact information, purpose of the funding request, need/problem, objectives, methods, total project cost, amount requested.

## 3) Narrative (10-15 Pages)

### a) Needs Assessment (Problem Statement) (3-4 Pages)

Objectively address specific situation, opportunity, problem, issue, need, and the community your proposal addresses. Support your statement with qualified third-party research/evidence to justify the need or problem. Clearly, concisely demonstrate that a relevant, compelling problem or need exists, and include a description of target population, and a definition of community problem to be addressed and service area need.

### b) Program Goals and Objectives (1 - 2 pages)

Describe the outcome of the grant in measurable terms, in a succinct description of the proposed project outcome and accomplishment, including your overall goal(s); specific objectives or ways in which you will meet the goal(s). Program Goals and Objectives should include:

- Minimum of one goal for each problem or need in the problem or statement.
- Description of the benefiting population.
- Performance - the action which occurs within a specific time frame at an expected proficiency.
- Process - the method by which the action will occur.
- Product - the tangible results from the action's performance and process.

### c) Methodology (4 + Pages)

Describe the process to be used to achieve the performance and product, in a rational, direct, chronological description of the proposed project; actions that will accomplish your objectives; impact of your proposed activities, how they will benefit the community and who will carry out the activities; time frame

for your project/program; long-term strategies for maintaining the on-going project/program. Methodology should include:

- Restatement of problems and objectives.
- Clear description & explanation of scope & activities.
- Sequence of activities, staffing, clients & client selection.
- Time line of activities.

### d) Evaluation (1 - 2 Pages)

Determine the plan for meeting performance and producing the program/project and justify how you will measure the effectiveness of your activities, who will be involved in evaluating and how they will be used; your measured criteria to produce a successful project/program; the expected outcome/achievement at the end of funding period. Evaluations should include:

- Plan for evaluating accomplishment of objectives.
- Plan for modifying process and methodology.
- Provide methods - criteria, data, instruments, analysis.

## 4) Budget

Clearly delineate costs to be met by the funder and all other funding sources; outline both administrative and program costs. For specific projects, include separate budgets for the general operating and the special project. Show income and expenses in columnar form (according to general accounting principles). Delineate personnel costs for salary and fringe benefit information, and expenses for facility operating (rent/mortgage, utilities, maintenance, taxes), and travel, postage, equipment costs, supplies, and insurance, etc. List actual committed & pending sources of income only. Include fees for service, government funds, corporate/private grants, individual donations, etc. Prepare a detailed budget consistent with the proposal narrative:

- Include project costs to be incurred at the time of the program's implementation
- Include no miscellaneous or contingency categories, include all items requested for funding, and all items to be paid by other sources, consultants
- Show benefits separately from salaries, detail all other costs
- List separately all donated services, including volunteers, indirect costs where appropriate
- Justify performance of the tasks described in the narrative

## 5) Qualifications (1-2 pages)

Describe applicant, qualifications for funding and establish credibility. Demonstrate the means and methodology to solve the problem, or meet the need, within 12-15 months, and include:

- Organization identity & purpose, constituents & services
- Brief summary of organization history, mission and goals.
- Brief description of organization current programs, activities, service statistics, and strengths/accomplishments.
- Long-range goals and current programs/projects and activities.
- Evidence and support (including qualified third-party statistics) of accomplishments.
- Number of board members, full time paid staff, part-time paid staff, and volunteers.
- Evidence of Board involvement, activity and key staff members qualifications and administrative competence.

## 6) Conclusion (1/2 page)

Present a brief, concise summary of your proposal that states your case, problem, solution and sources/uses of project/program funds.

## 7) Appendices

Additional attachments are usually required at the funder's discretion. Typical appendices generally include:

- Verification of tax-exempt status
- Certificate of Incorporation and By-Laws
- Listing of officers and Board of Directors
- Financial statements for last completed fiscal year
- Current operating budget and special project budget
- List of clients served
- List of other current funding sources and uses
- Biographies/resumes key personnel
- Support letters or endorsements
- Diagrams for equipment or building requests

Present your full proposal neatly, professionally, and in an organized package. Type and single-space all proposals. Write, organize and present your proposal in the order listed in the application and guidelines. Only include the information and materials specifically requested by the grantmaker. The proposal is judged on content and presentation, not weight.

Unless required, do not include an index or table of contents, or bind the proposal. Be sure to sign it and submit the number of copies requested by the grantmaker.

*Copyright SeaCoast Web Design and Non-Profit Guides 1996-2002. This document is reproduced and distributed with the permission of SeaCoast Web Design and Non-Profit Guides. It is distributed electronically online at [www.npguides.org](http://www.npguides.org) to provide free information, and resources to non-profit organizations charitable, educational, public organizations, and other community-minded groups.*

---

---

## Sources of Funding

### Name: ECO-ACTION 2000

**Focus:** An Environment Canada funding program that helps groups to implement projects that protect or enhance the environment in their community **Telephone:** 800-665-7135 **Website:** [www.ec.gc.ca/ecoaction](http://www.ec.gc.ca/ecoaction)

### Name: CARDS - ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

**Focus:** To increase the understanding and practice of environmental and resource stewardship in the agriculture and agri-food industry, and to support producers and industry in the development and adoption of more environmentally friendly practices. Funding is targeted at projects that will have a significant impact on the industry as a whole or a specific sector within the industry. **Address:** PO Box 21038, Saskatoon, SK S7H 5N9

**Phone:** 1-800-641-8256 **Fax:** (306)975-6850 **E-mail:** [cards@sccd.sk.ca](mailto:cards@sccd.sk.ca) **Website:** [www.sccd.sk.ca/aesi](http://www.sccd.sk.ca/aesi)

### Name: CARCI

**Focus:** To enhance the viability of agricultural rural communities, particularly those communities undergoing change as a result of adjustment in the agricultural sector. **Address:** 500-303 Main St, Winnipeg, MN R3C 3G7

**Phone:** 1-877-295-7160 (general) or (204) 983-8466 (SK/MN region) **Fax:** (204) 983-8357

**E-mail:** [Nawolskyb@em.agr.ca](mailto:Nawolskyb@em.agr.ca) **Website:** [www.agr.gc.ca/carci/](http://www.agr.gc.ca/carci/)

### Name: THE SAMUAL AND SAIDYE BRONFMAN FAMILY FOUNDATION\*

**Focus:** Dedicated to fostering initiative and enterprise among Canadians. It is a leader in providing developmental funding to non-profit ventures in Canada which deal with challenging social, cultural and educational issues. It promotes the development and sharing of new ideas of potential lasting value. The Foundation invests in people whose creative and innovative projects help contribute workable solutions to important emerging issues facing the country.

**Address:** 1170 Peel St, 8th Floor, Montreal, QC H3B 4P2 **Phone:** 514-878-5270 **Fax:** 514-878-5293

**E-mail:** [info@bronfmanfoundation.org](mailto:info@bronfmanfoundation.org) **Website:** [www.bronfmanfoundation.org](http://www.bronfmanfoundation.org)

### Name: EVERGREEN FOUNDATION\*

**Focus:** To bring nature to our cities through naturalization projects. Evergreen motivates people to create and sustain healthy, natural outdoor spaces and gives them the practical tools to be successful.

**Address:** 355 Adelaide Street West, Fifth Floor, Toronto, ON M5V 1S2 **Phone:** (416) 596-1495

**Fax:** (416) 596-1443 **E-mail:** [info@evergreen.ca](mailto:info@evergreen.ca) **Website:** [www.evergreen.ca](http://www.evergreen.ca)

*\*accepts applications from registered charities only*

## ACTION ALERT for PA NATIONAL PARK

From: *Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, SK Chapter*

Prince Albert National Park is one of two National Parks in Saskatchewan. It is the province's largest protected area, encompassing almost 4000 square km of blue-green boreal forest. A small community, Waskesiu, is located inside the park. Currently, Prince Albert National Park is threatened by the potential use of an insecticide (Btk), sprayed by aircraft to kill a naturally occurring insect, the spruce budworm.

### What Has Happened?

The Park, including the townsite of Waskesiu, is undergoing heavy outbreaks of spruce budworm. In spring and early summer 2002, Parks Canada said "no" to spraying for budworm in Waskesiu. Their decision was supported by both scientific reasoning and the National Park mandate to keep park lands natural. In August, Parks Canada revoked that initial decision, and is now considering pesticide spraying. The change is in response to pressure from a small interest group that wants to preserve aging spruce trees that are infected by budworm.

### Why is Spraying a Problem?

Spraying will affect the natural ecosystem in a National Park. Spraying for budworm will disregard Parks Canada's mandate to preserve all natural species and processes in our National Park. Spraying for budworm will not save the aging spruce trees in Waskesiu. Spraying for budworm will not address the long-term needs for vegetation management in Waskesiu. If Parks Canada allows aerial spraying of pesticides in a National Park, it does not bode well for future management decisions in this National Park or in other parks. The concern is, how many other ecosystem health issues, such as maintaining Lake Trout populations, risk being overturned?

### Solution

CPAWS supports the solution that park staff in Prince Albert National Park has been promoting all along. That is, don't spray pesticide, but rather develop a comprehensive vegetation management plan to ensure an ecologically healthy townsite with diverse native vegetation, natural processes, and short and long-term aesthetic values. Waskesiu is deemed a model environmental community. To the greatest extent possible, the community is to strive to be representative of its surrounding forest ecosystem, and it must be managed in a manner that protects natural features and processes. It is well understood that a diverse ecosystem is a healthy system armed with nature's vigour to respond to natural disturbances such as spruce budworm outbreaks. It behooves the Waskesiu community to seek management alternatives that will create a diverse native plant community, rather than artificially maintaining weakened, aging trees.

### What can you do?

People who support maintenance of ecological integrity as a guiding principle in Park management must make their voices heard. Personal letters are needed now. Please write to the Hon. Sheila Copps and ask her to ensure that Parks Cda does not allow spraying for spruce budworm in Prince Albert National Park. Please take a few moments to write:

Hon. Sheila Copps, Minister of Heritage  
House of Commons, Parliament Buildings  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0A6 (no postage needed)  
Fax: 613-994-1267; e-mail: [Copps.s@parl.gc.ca](mailto:Copps.s@parl.gc.ca)

For more information about the spruce budworm, please visit the CPAWS website at:  
[www.cpaws-sask.org/campaign/parks/budworm-background.html](http://www.cpaws-sask.org/campaign/parks/budworm-background.html)

---


## Eco-Tourism Training Program in Prince Albert

September saw the start of SIAST Woodland Campus's 4th intake of students into the Ecotourism Certificate Program. Ecotourism is a nature-based, educational and sustainable form of nature-based tourism. Nine students have enrolled in the Ecotourism Certificate 32-week program. On September 12 the class swelled to 20 as eleven students from SIAST Kelsey Campus's Tourism Management Diploma joined the program. These students take the Ecotourism Certificate as the third semester of their 2-year program.

All of these students will be taking the following classes before the Christmas break: *Introduction to Ecotourism, Conservation, Interpretation, Elements of Ecology, Sustainable Site and Facilities Design, Leadership and Guiding, Outdoor Skills and Low Impact Technologies, and Wilderness First Aid*. After the Christmas break the Tourism Management students will return to Kelsey Campus to finish their diploma program and the remaining Ecotourism Certificate students will take: *Environmental Education, Customer Service and Expectation, Tourism Marketing,*

*Business Planning and Winter Survival*. The final component of their training will be a 160 hour work-based practicum with a nature-based SK tourism operator, between March 1 and June 15, 2003.

Since 1999, 42 students have successfully completed the Ecotourism Certificate Program. Some of these students have started their own Ecotourism businesses, some have diversified their businesses to include Ecotourism, others have found employment in Adventure/Ecotourism based businesses here in Saskatchewan and elsewhere in Canada, others have found related work, while still others are looking for employment in the tourism industry.

For further information about the program, practicum placements, or hiring graduates, please contact Jackie Carter (Ecotourism Instructor, SIAST Woodland Campus, PO Box 3003, PA, SK S6V 6G1 Phone:(953-4042); [carter@siast.sk.ca](mailto:carter@siast.sk.ca). 

## Wayne C. Harris: 1951 – 2002

By: Alan Appleby

Wayne Harris, one of Saskatchewan's best and best-known naturalists, died in an accident at his farm near Raymore on October 7, 2002. Wayne was raised on the farm, schooled in Raymore, and graduated from the University of Saskatchewan with an advanced degree in biology.

Wayne had a varied but focused and productive work life. When I met Wayne in the late 1970's he was with the Forestry Branch of the then Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, where he proudly identified himself as a non-forester, working to integrate understory vegetation into forest inventory and planning. In 1980 he published his "Guide to Forest Understory Vegetation" which describes 82 species of plants that live among the eleven species of trees in our mixed wood forests. He also took most of the several hundred photos in the book. In the early 1980's Wayne drafted an integrated land use plan for the Wapawekka Hills, with an early proposal for a large protected area.

During much of the 1980's and early 1990's, Wayne and his wife, Sheila Lamont, a noted provincial botanist, operated Prairie Environmental Services, a consulting business based at their farm. During this time their two daughters Ann and Val were born. In 1983 he co-authored "Ecological Regions of Saskatchewan" a precursor to later books and maps on our ecoregions.

In the 1990's Wayne took on his "dream job" as regional biologist for Saskatchewan Environment in the prairie region. He often remarked to me how lucky he felt to be able to combine his hobby and his job, and get paid to do it. Having spent several days in the field with Wayne this year,



I can attest to how lucky the people of Saskatchewan were to have such a dedicated and knowledgeable biologist doing this work. Last June myself and a visitor from Ontario were accompanying Wayne on a day's field work monitoring Ferruginous Hawk nests north of Maple Creek. An inquiry about Loggerhead Shrikes was met in about 10 minutes with a perfectly posed bird on a fence line. Each request brought the same result.

Wayne had an encyclopaedic knowledge of Saskatchewan's flora and fauna, in both English and Latin. In the words of Dr. Stuart Houston, Wayne was "Saskatchewan's 'all-round naturalist' in every sense of that phrase, and the foremost Saskatchewan authority on rare and endangered bird species." He was the featured speaker at the SEN AGM at Elbow Harbour in 2000, and made a presentation on the status of rare and endangered species. Wayne was also an active volunteer in the environmental movement, and served in various capacities with Nature Saskatchewan over the years, including vice-president, co-editor of Blue Jay, and the editor of the annual Christmas bird and mammal counts for the past 12 years.

We have lost someone very special in the untimely death of Wayne Harris. His contributions to conservation were many. His knowledge of this province's environment was an irreplaceable treasure, as was he. Those of us who knew Wayne will remember him every time we wonder "what is that bird?". Wayne would know.

### SEN Steering Committee 2002/2003

Alan Appleby  
CPAWS-Sask.  
3079 Athol Street  
Regina, SK S4S 1Y6  
Phone: 586-3863  
Fax: 586-3863  
Email: aappleby@accesscomm.ca

Greg Fenty  
Saskatoon Nature Society  
2327 Lansdowne Ave.  
Saskatoon, SK S7J 1G8  
Phone: 975-3042  
Fax: 975-3326  
Email: zoosociety@quadrant.net

Mike Finley  
Saskatoon Nature Society  
410 26th St. W.  
Saskatoon, SK S7L 0H9  
Phone: 665-6428  
Email: mjfinley@home.com

Glenn Gustafson  
Saskatchewan Environmental Society  
302 - 327 11th Street East  
Saskatoon, SK S7N 0E5  
Phone: 665-6922  
Fax: 665-6922  
Email: glenn.g@sk.sympatico.ca

Larry Hawrysh  
Redberry Biosphere Reserve  
Box 28  
Hafford, SK S0J 1A0  
Phone: 549-4627  
Email: dhawrysh@sk.sympatico.ca

Isabel Muzichuk  
Citizens for a Safe and Healthy  
Environment  
Box 102  
Buchanan, SK S0A 0J0  
Telephone: 592-2122

Ernie Paskaruk  
Forest Fringe Citizens Coalition  
Box 10, Site 6  
Christopher Lake, SK S0J 0N0  
Phone: 989-4702  
Fax: 989-4702

Sharon Power  
CUPE Environment Committee  
Box 2174  
Humboldt, SK S0K 2A0  
Phone: 682-5157  
Fax: 682-4046  
Email: sharon.power@sk.sympatico.ca

**Benefit Concert**  
for the  
**Organic Agriculture  
Protection Fund**



Fred Eaglesmith is a Juno award winning singer/songwriter who lives on a farm in Ontario. His music is hard to peg, but has elements of bluegrass, folk, country and rock, with more than a dash of trailer trash thrown in. He can make you laugh and cry with the best of them. He really wanted to do this concert and his heart is definitely with ordinary people and the plight of the family farm.

The cabaret style concert is at the Ukrainian Orthodox Holy Trinity Hall, 919 - 20th St. West, Saskatoon on Saturday November 30th. The doors are open at 7:00. At 7:30 and the opening entertainment will be "The Boogie-Men"; self-described as a "neo-typical danceband" of old farmers from the hills of Elrose Sask. Fred will perform a solo concert from 9 to 11. The "Good Food Box" will serve lunch, at 11 with more dancing to music by "Boogie-Men" to follow.

Tickets are \$20, available advance at the "Vinyl Exchange" in Saskatoon, or from Doug Bone, Box 3, Elrose, Sask. S0L-0Z0, Ph.(306)-574-4323 or other OAPF Committee Members. They will also be available at the door, but seating is limited so to avoid disappointment you should get your tickets early. There will be a cash bar with proceeds going to the OAPF legal fund.

We hope you will come out to support a great cause, but most of all to enjoy yourselves with some fabulous entertainment. 🎵

*For more information about OAPF's legal action against Monsanto and Aventis, see [www.saskorganic.com](http://www.saskorganic.com).*

**Join the Network!**

New members are welcome. Membership is open to non-governmental, not-for-profit organizations involved in environmental protection activities. Individuals who support the Network's objectives may also join as subscribers but may not vote or hold office.

Name/Contact Person .....  
 Organization .....  
 Title .....  
 Address .....  
 Postal Code .....  
 Phone ..... Fax .....  
 Email .....

**Membership fees:**

Annual budget of less than \$5,000 .....	\$30.00
Annual budget from \$5,000 to \$29,999 .....	\$35.00
Annual budget from \$30,000 to \$99,999 .....	\$45.00
Annual budget of \$100,000 or more .....	\$50.00
Organization fees include \$10.00 membership in the CEN	
Individual subscriber .....	\$10.00

Please send your cheque to Saskatchewan Eco-Network,  
 #203-115 2nd Ave. North, Saskatoon, SK. S7K 2B1.

*Network News is published quarterly  
 by the Saskatchewan Eco Network.*

*Editor: Cathy Holtslander*

*Layout & design: Dianne Manegre*

*Opinions expressed herein are those  
 of the authors and do not necessarily  
 reflect the policy of the Saskatchewan*

*Eco-Network. Submissions are wel-  
 come. For permission to reprint  
 articles please contact the author or  
 SEN.*

*Phone: (306) 652-1275*

*Fax: (306) 665-2128*

*Email: [sen@link.ca](mailto:sen@link.ca)*

*Website: [www.econet.sk.ca](http://www.econet.sk.ca)*

*Canadian Publications Mail*

*Agreement # 40037170*

*Printed at Muenster, SK on 100%  
 post-consumer recycled paper.*

