

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

April 27, 1979

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: — This morning I want to take this opportunity to introduce a guest from a neighboring province, Mr. Bohdan Stefaniuk, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

I am sure all members will join me in welcoming Mr. Stefaniuk to the Table of this Assembly and wish him a pleasant stay in Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) I have a group of students to introduce from the constituency of Nipawin. I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the members of the Assembly to the east gallery and to introduce this group of Grade 8 students from the Zenon Park School, along with their chaperone, Mrs. Charlotte Du Be.

I would like to wish them a pleasant visit here in Regina. I hope your visit and your stay in the legislature is informative and enjoyable. I am sure that all members will join with me in wishing them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D. CODY (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it give me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the House, 51 Grade 8 students. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are from one of the fine communities in the Kinistino constituency from the Cudworth School. They are here today with their teacher Patti Henderson, and Lucille Riding.

I am sure all hon. members will wish them every success in their touring of Regina, and touring of the legislative buildings. We wish them a good time here and also a very safe trip back to Cudworth.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.J. GROSS (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, 25 Grade 8 students from Wymark. I understand they are sitting in the west gallery.

I am sure all members want to wish them a good session and an educational one. I understand they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Nelson. Mrs. Dyck is accompanying them as well.

I hope to meet with them later around 11:30. I am sure members will welcome the

students and wish them wonderful time.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

TAX BASE - REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When your revenue sharing program was developed, which tax sources did you tie to provide the funding for your program?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, the indexing, so far as revenue sharing, has not come into effect. If the hon. member will read the legislation, he will see that when it does come into effect (and we have announced it will come into effect next year) the tax bases that will be used for indexing are: tax on income, tax on corporate, tax on retail sales and tax on taxable fuels. Those will be the tax bases that are applied and that is in the revenue sharing legislation.

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In a recent ad in the newspaper outlining the funding that you are providing to a number of small towns and villages you list the amounts they are going to get and then at the bottom you say that the funding is going to be covered by resource revenue. I believe that that is false advertising. I think that you should be stating that it is coming out of the general fund. So my question is, are you indeed doing false advertising by making that kind of a statement in a newspaper ad?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, no we're not. The amount of money that is being applied to the pool and the amount of money that will be used when indexing comes into play, will in fact come from the consolidated fund and resource revenues go into the consolidated fund. So far as the increases, once indexing takes place they only relate to tax bases and not tax income. Certainly the increases, of significance in the last two years, have come from the general funds of the government of which that general fund draws on resource revenue. So the advertisement is not false.

MR. SWAN: — To put money into the general fund you draw from the complete tax base of the province. You do not draw only from resource revenue, and I think still, Mr. Minister, that you're making a false statement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take a new question.

FOAM LAKE TRAIN WRECK

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). Is the minister aware of the approximately 11 train wrecks over the past 12 months in Saskatchewan during this past winter? Mainly, is the minister aware of the train wreck that took place in Foam Lake?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say that yes, in a cursory way I am. I don't know what significance that is but I am in a minimal sort of way. I don't know the details.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest, Mr. Minister, that your department should be aware of all the train wrecks. This particular train contained

many propane cars full of liquid propane, and had any one of these cars exploded they could have wiped out the town of Foam Lake. My question to you is, what is your department doing to keep tab of these wrecks and what is carried in these cars?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what it is that the opposition members really consider the Department of the Environment must do in order to be able to meet their objectives. I think that it would be totally impossible to meet the objectives of the opposition. I don't run the Canadian Pacific; I don't run the Canadian National; I don't schedule trains and I don't know what kind of cars they carry. I don't even cause the wrecks, that I know of. The department officials try to keep aware and abreast of the situations which will or could occur in some damage to the environment or could cause damage in other ways. We try to keep ourselves abreast of those activities. I am not responsible for the operations of the Canadian Pacific.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that Saskatchewan is dragging its feet and is one of the provinces that is far behind other provinces as far as following the United Nations unification and identification of cars and that most people, most firemen or anyone that goes into these train wrecks have no idea what is in these cars, whether they are explosive or anything about them. What is your department doing? You are dragging your feet on looking after this environmental problem.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely ridiculous for the member to talk that way. We don't control interprovincial transportation, we don't control that. It is a federal matter. Then you go talking about international affairs — I don't really control international affairs. I am sorry about that, but it is the best I can do to handle what we have in Saskatchewan.

So far as the member suggesting that the Department of the Environment, Saskatchewan environment, should be responsible for interprovincial and national transportation, I just find that to be a false assumption and I can accept no responsibility for that.

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the minister in charge of transportation in Saskatchewan. It is of pressing and urgent necessity affecting all of the citizens of Saskatchewan including the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher).

In view of the many hundreds of miles of rail trackage now being out of service in this province, due to rail mishaps and deteriorate road beds, and in view of the fact that there have been from 12 to 14 mishaps on the Canadian Pacific district, alone, in Saskatchewan since January 1, not counting the Canadian National, I am wondering whether or not the minister could say whether or not he has been in touch with the railway transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission, concerning this serious situation as it affects the disrupting of the movement of grain, potash and other commodities out of this province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have. I think the reason for writing to the CTC (Canadian Transport Commission) relates both to the issue raised by the hon. member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) and the issue raised by the hon. member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). There is an obvious concern on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan at the number of wrecks that have been taking place and the amount of down times. I've asked CTC (who are responsible in this area) to instigate an inquiry into

the situation so that we can find out what the cause is.

MR. BERNTSON: — New question to the deputy premier. Would you not agree that in fact your government has already taken a couple of very significant steps as it relates to hazards on the railroad in Saskatchewan by electing two members from Moose Jaw to this House and thereby keeping you off . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

ATTENDANCE OF INDIAN STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Shillington). In view of the recent report entitled *The Explosive Years* concerning impending problems with people of Indian ancestry and also keeping in mind that the attendance of Indian students at our schools in Saskatchewan has been and is a serious problem and in view of the fact that Section 155 of The Education Act pertaining to the attendance of students does not pertain to Indian students, what action are you prepared to take Mr. Minister, to rectify the serious problem of attendance of Indian students at our schools?

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the concerns expressed by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and the concerns expressed in that report are also my concerns and they're the concerns of this government with respect to Indian education. I think no one would claim that education among natives is working the way it should. At the same time, I don't regard the primary problem to be attendance and I don't think very many Indian leaders do nor do leaders in our schools. The problems are much deeper than that. Indeed, the failure of native children to attend our schools is a symptom. It's not the disease. That is simply the symptom of a much deeper problem. I may say to the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley that I and various members of the Regina school boards are co-operating to do some research into the problem. We frankly do not understand the problem. I admit that freely to the member; nor do native leaders understand the problem, I think, nor do the school boards. It's not one about which we can provide pat answers.

MR. TAYLOR: — I'm pleased to hear that you're looking into the problem and I believe there is a deeper problem but attendance certainly is important. As you know, by The Department of Northern Affairs Act (DNA), education is the responsibility of the provincial government whereas Indian affairs is under the federal government. I think we agree that education of Indian students is of supreme importance. Will you enter into negotiations with the federal government to solve this problem of attendance so that someone is responsible for it?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We have, Mr. Speaker, gone to great lengths to respect the treaties and to carry out the treaties that were signed with native peoples years ago. All hon. members, I think, would be aware of the efforts we have made to fulfill our obligations under the treaties. Under those treaties, I believe, education is a responsibility of the federal government, as spelled out with some clarity. I think the native people would be the last people to want those rights abridged.

LIQUOR LICENCES FOR DISCOS

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). I suppose it's spring and time for a few changes. We discussed last night in passing during the liquor licensing bill the licensing of discos in the province of Saskatchewan and the fact that government policy at this particular time didn't go that

far. The government, I think, indicated the position of the opposition on that, that it was time for a change. Would you now, since you've got the weekend, do a House amendment to allow for the licensing of discos in Saskatchewan? Would you not now consider that? What we think it's time for.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can undertake to discuss this with my colleague, the minister in charge (Mr. Cowley) who unfortunately is absent this morning, to review that possibility. But I'm not going to raise too much hope for the hon. member in that regard because among the concerns that we have, or some have, (as the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham), I think, mentioned during his remarks, or maybe you did) is the impact that the proposed legislation may have on the question of musicians, live entertainment and so forth in Saskatchewan. The amendments as proposed, may go into the fields of activity which live musicians, Saskatchewan musicians, may now have. To go the full route of licensing discos totally may in the minds of some simply mean the total shutdown of any kind of live entertainment and its attributes or lack of attributes, depending on your point of view. I think it is a sensitive area which would require some thought and I'll undertake to discuss it with my colleague, but I don't want to raise too much hope for that kind of an amendment, basically for the reasons I've articulated and perhaps others.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. Would the Attorney General also consider and pass on to his cabinet colleague that in fact, the licensing of discos would not have that effect because it would mean an additional licensing in addition to what you've already announced in the bill. So that the impact on local musicians has already been determined. I suggest secondly, that the market should be the determining factor, that the need for Saskatchewan musicians will shift to the piano bars that were discussed last night and a different type of outlet, that in fact, it will probably have no further impact on the status of Saskatchewan musicians in the present legislation.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again I say, we will take into account over the weekend the words of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. We will let him know on Monday or Tuesday what our intentions are, but I simply don't want to raise expectations in this area at this time.

EVALUATION OF SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes). Mr. Minister, what progress has been made to date on the formation of this umbrella group to evaluate social service programs which you keep telling us about?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, up to this time only preliminary discussions have been going on.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in light of the Riches report and the confidential report which was leaked to the Leader Post yesterday, would you not agree there is an urgency at this point to get a group together that can do proper evaluation?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, first of all I think the member for Maple Creek has a misunderstanding as to what the umbrella group is going to be doing. The umbrella group is not going to be doing an evaluation of the various groups which will be representing poor peoples' groups. That will not be its function. So I don't understand

what your question is driving at.

Secondly, I have not read the Riches report so I am not going to comment on that.

Thirdly, I don't know about that mysterious leak in the Leader Post to which you are referring.

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Minister, if this umbrella group is not going to evaluate present programs and suggest new ones and how they can work, what is it going to do?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, again, the member has to look at what SCAPO (Saskatchewan Council of Anti-Poverty Organization) was doing. SCAPO did not evaluate programs which were financed by the Department of Social Services. SCAPO was there to represent poor peoples' groups and to be an advocate for poor people so they could make their views known.

Mr. Speaker, I can't compete with the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) this morning. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't lower myself to that level.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it absolutely clear to the member for Maple Creek, I indicated to this House that we would not rush into the establishment of an umbrella group. We want to make absolutely certain all of the disadvantaged groups have an opportunity to participate, to discuss with my officials, what kind of umbrella group they want to represent them. We want to review the objectives of that umbrella group.

I have indicated in this House and outside of this House that I want to have a group which will truly be an advocate group for poor people so that when they make positions known to the government, through the Minister of Social Services, they truly represent poor people. I am not going to rush into it. It may take another four or five or six months before such a group is established, but once a group like that is established, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear that that will be the wish of the poor people's group and not my wish or anybody else's.

MRS. DUNCAN: — What are these groups doing in the interim? Who's representing them right now? Does anybody listen to them? Apparently you don't.

MR. ROLFES: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is true to say that in no other province — I may be wrong in this, but I don't think there's any other group . . .

MR. LANE: — You usually are.

MR. ROLFES: — Not as wrong as you are, usually.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'm correct in saying that there is no umbrella group in any other province that represents all disadvantaged groups, and there is no advocacy group.

What I'm simply saying is that individual groups right now are representing themselves, and they make their wishes and demands known to my department and to the government. I think there is strength, Mr. Speaker, in having an umbrella group who could speak for disadvantaged groups so that they could present to us their common problems and their needs.

That is what we want, Mr. Speaker. Right now I think individual groups are making their

wishes known. We are funding these groups as we would if they were an umbrella group, but I think there's more force in unity, and therefore we would like them to be unified so that they can present their views to the government.

EXCESS WATER SITUATION

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last year we had a drought situation going through the province, with a lack of water. This year we have the reverse problem. Last year you allowed the use of government-owned pumps, with several miles of hose available to them to fill dugouts. Will you now allow the same pumps to be used by those who want to drain areas onto other areas of their own and therefore, to provide more crop land?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that we can stretch the units we have that far. I think if you were going to start to do that, you would be pumping water all over the province. If you start pumping for some people and not for others, you will have a lot of dissatisfaction out there in the country. I think the pumps we have are designed to resolve the problem of lack of water in dugouts and if we were to start to spread them around and pump odd sloughs for people, I think we would have real difficulty. We just wouldn't be able to provide enough facilities for them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, in certain areas there are roads that will be under water for a lengthy time, which could be pumped over, say across the road, for people who can pump them on the pasture land and therefore get the crop land free, yet not flood anybody else. Will you not make these pumps available for rent to the people of Saskatchewan who so request them, on an order as the requests come in?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, we'd certainly be prepared to look at the possibility, but I think, again, he is looking at something which our program is really not designed for. While it may have some possibilities, I would have some reservations about recommending it, but we will look at it.

ALCOHOLIC REHABILITATION CENTRE IN KINDERSLEY

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, is the minister intending on continuing the financing of the Danny Fisher Centre in Kindersley, which is an alcohol rehabilitation centre?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, the Danny Fisher Centre at Kindersley must — Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. New question.

TAKING NOTE OF QUESTION

MR. ANDREW: — I have a new question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister is taking note of that question I would also . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take a new question.

BRUCELLOSIS

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Minister, we are having enough trouble in the cattle industry right now keeping the size of our cow herds up. As the minister is well aware, brucellosis has been becoming more of a factor every year. Traditionally, this has been a responsibility of the federal Department of Health of Animals. Mr. Minister, the problem with brucellosis occurs during the breeding season, in the pasture. Has the minister given consideration in community pastures, that before animals are taken to pasture by the various pasture patrons, have you considered blood-testing these animals 30 days prior to their entrance into the pasture in order to prevent the spread of this disease?

MR. KAEDING: — No, Mr. Speaker, we are not doing that at the present time. You will be aware most of the province of Saskatchewan has been declared a brucellosis free area and, therefore, it hasn't been required by the federal authorities that we do the testing. If any community pasture committee were to decide they would not take cattle unless they were tested, then I am sure the testing could be arranged for them, but it would have to be at the request of the community pasture committees.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question to the minister.

Would the minister be so kind as to check with his department and, perhaps, your department could find time to check with the health of animals, because for the Minister of Agriculture to suggest that Saskatchewan is a brucellosis free area, I have to wonder where the minister is? Will the minister undertake to find out what is going on in this very serious area, when the cattle industry is having enough problems trying to get the cow herds built up? Will the minister undertake to consult with the federal people today and find out exactly how prevalent this disease is?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, we are aware there have been some outbreaks of brucellosis and we are aware the federal authorities know that. They are taking whatever steps they feel are appropriate in that particular area. I think it would not be appropriate for us to interject ourselves into that situation. However, I recognize it's a serious problem and I will check with my department to see if there's anything that we need to do. I suspect that whatever needs to be done is being done.

MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the House Leader. Mr. House Leader, can we expect to see the Minister of Highways before the session is out?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — . . . (inaudible answer) . . .

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE ENVIRONMENT VOTE 9

ITEM 1 (cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN:— We were on Department of Environment, Vote 9, page 36, item 1.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Chairman, last night we had what was purported to be the final and absolute defence of the government opposite as to its handling of the PCB spill in the city of Regina at the Federal Pioneer Plant. We indicated last night that

the defense as given by the minister (and we didn't have a chance to see the prepared statement) . . . We have now had an opportunity to read it. Of course, I think, members opposite will be most interested to see what the minister has said. But it became very clear last night from the statements made by the minister that the Department of Labour knew at the outset that PCBs were a dangerous chemical, dangerous to the environment and dangerous to health. And because of the existence of an occupational health and safety committee it was the Department of Labour which discovered and first acted upon the PCB spill. The Department of Environment failed and failed miserably to even recognize the potential danger.

Secondly, we saw the shocking statement by the Minister of the Environment that the public should have known about the PCB spill, the press should have known and that there was no coverup because, in fact, the PCB spill was referred to in a couple of scientific journals. Before I get into a detailed critique of the so-called defence, I'm going to state a couple of salient facts about the spill of August of '76. The two documents (that the Minister of the Environment holds up as being the basis on which people should have known, the press should have known that it was public information) which were tabled, one of which is the Recoup. Now this particular article in Recoup first of all was two years after the spill. I ask the press and I ask the Minister of the Environment and the members opposite to note that the report of the spill was two years later. And you say the public should have known about that? That is dated on your evidence Monday, October 16, 1978.

Recoup is a publication of Canada's secondary materials market. Now let me tell you how widely read this particular document is. We phoned down to the printers and publishers of Recoup. You're going to be shocked and amazed at the wide distribution of this particular document. They told us they have well over 300 subscribers. You say the public of Saskatchewan is supposed to know and the press is supposed to know. Now they say as well though, in defence of the minister, that they have a mailing list of another 700 across Canada. And you say your defence is the public should have known that this was widely printed. In fact it was two years after the spill. It only proves again you've covered up. You deliberately covered up the PCB spill in Regina.

We tried to check on the other reference material that you referred to. We started at the legislative library. They never heard of it. They eventually did some checking and determined that it was a press release type bulletin that anybody could put together. We phoned down to the alleged publishers of Eco-Log Week. They have such a massive mailing list that they refused to give it to us. They refused to tell us the number of subscribers. They cannot and will not give out any information regarding the number of subscribers. There's no advertising. I suggest to you that it's a very select press release for perhaps some people involved in the industry and is not a widely read document. I say to you that neither one of them are intended or designed for public information. They're intended to be read for public information but are for a select number of people, a very limited number of people involved in the field of environment and in the case of Recoup for those involved in Canada's secondary materials market. For you to stand up in the House and say, because a year after the spill in the case of Eco-Log Week and two years in the case of Recoup, there happened to be a reference and so the public should've known that you weren't in fact, hiding anything, I think indicates what is tantamount to gross negligence on the part of your department. I'll tell you if there happens to be one serious illness or injury as a result to the workers or anyone else, it's tantamount to criminal negligence on the part of the Department of the Environment in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Never have we had in the history of North America at least, a Department of Environment that stood up and in the words of the minister himself says to the public of Saskatchewan, you read all of the scientific journals. If you happen to find something that concerns you, let us know! We'll send someone out. But if you don't read them, it's your fault if there's environmental damage or if there's damage to health because that is what you said last night. The people of Saskatchewan had better be warned that it's the same Department of the Environment that is responsible for monitoring and protecting the environment as we embark on the uranium development of the province of Saskatchewan. If there's anything that has ever proved the incompetence of the department, it's your handling of the PCB spill and your so-called defense of your actions on the PCB spill. But let's go through with this rather lengthy dissertation by the minister last night.

First of all, when he came to the department, he decided to research the files rather carefully. It's interesting to note that the previous minister, summarily dismissed, I think, from the department and notably absent today from his seat, didn't bother to research the file. His defense was that at the time of the spill, the PCBs were not illegal and it wasn't until a year after the spill that, in fact, PCBs were called illegal by the federal Department of the Environment.

The interesting thing about that so-called defence is that the Department of the Environment, I suggest, knew that PCBs in fact were being studied as to their potential danger because it takes more than a year's study before the federal Department of the Environment rules a substance dangerous. So you should have had information at the time of the spill as to at least the studies as to the potential danger. In fact you missed it and you missed it completely.

It is interesting as well, that your Department of Labour knew about the danger of PCBs at the time of the spill, because in the words of the minister:

The whole incident which brought the reporting of the spill was first addressed because union members were, under our unique labor laws, sitting on a legal and occupational health safety committee.

This is a laudatory defence of the Department of Labour, but why would the Department of Labour decide that PCBs were dangerous when the Department of the Environment either said, we missed it, or we don't say it's dangerous, or didn't know about it which is worse yet. But no, and here is where the defence fall further apart when the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) says that they were in possession of health and safety information about PCBs, supplied to them by the Department of Labour. That is how they knew.

There was a complaint of the union about handling the orders which were given to the employees by the company which resulted in the Department of Labour sending out an inspector to the plant. Arrangements were made (this was at the time of the spill and must be kept in perspective by the minister) for immediate employee blood tests and passing on the information about the spill to the Department of the Environment. In other words, the Department of Labour and labor officials knew at the time of the spill that the PCBs were dangerous to health, and I suggest, dangerous to the environment, and you, by your own admission, state that you didn't know it, the Department of the Environment didn't know it, and secondly, the Department of the Environment, when

they were advised, took no action.

Now the minister gets all sorts of different dates. First of all, two months after the spill, he says that the Department of the Environment got the information from the Department of Labour. Now that happened in August. The spill was in August, I believe, of '76. Now look at this; two months after Department of Labour gets onto it, they advise Department of the Environment. Let me tell you the dates the hon. minister tries to stow us with. He said they advised the Department of the Environment on August 12, 1976 prior to the spill he didn't know anything about. Now what kind of a defence is that? You obviously may have searched the files but you didn't do it very carefully because your information is thoroughly inadequate. It's, in fact, wrong. Again, he spends a great deal of time stating that the Department of the Environment, where the Department of Labour were concerned, required a blood test, medical examination, which they did. I'm going to say we commend the Department of Labour. I'm going to say to the people of Saskatchewan we may have (probably do have) the most ill-prepared and least prepared Department of the Environment in this country to deal with environmental problems, particularly problems dealing with health. All that this defence of last night does is prove it and prove it in spades.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Environment now gets into some contradictory statements. First of all, they say it isn't dangerous, no clear and present danger, that they didn't know about it. They got their information from the Department of Labour so they were assuming they didn't know about it. That's why they got the information from the Department of Labour and not internally. Now all of a sudden this supposedly legal chemical for which the defence is that it's legal, now he says the Department of the Environment, when they find out about it, say they started to do soil samples (soil testing) in September, a month after the spill. Now if it's not dangerous, as you tried to say, that it was perfectly legal, why in fact did you do the soil testing? Pretty inconsistent! The fact is you did the soil testing because the Department of Labour told you this was highly dangerous, highly toxic, dangerous both to the environment and dangerous to health. But you got your information from the Department of Health and you were incapable of making these assessments internally.

Then again, we get the deflection the whole fault of this particular spill was the public failing to know about it. I mean the dirty, old general public went so far as to use PCBs on their farms. How dare they, says the minister — it's your fault, he says to the general public, you used it on your farm. Why should the Department of the Environment do anything, it's your fault? Then he blamed the media as well. That, in fact, they were profoundly indifferent to an incident known by hundreds of people. I am saying that the hundreds of people consisted of the 300 subscribers to Recoup; perhaps some people now, belatedly, in the Department of the Environment; some people in the Department of Labour; supposedly hundreds of people, two years after the spill. And you expect the press, you expect the public and you expect the opposition to have known about the dangers of PCBs and the dangers and the ramifications of the spill.

Listen to this for the ultimate in an attempt to pass the buck:

Had any Regina news outlet assigned any reporter to specialize in either industrial relations or health news, it is hard to see how they could have missed this story in 1976.

The reason that they shouldn't have missed the story is because of the two articles which the minister tabled. Recoup wasn't published until 1978 — not 1976, but 1978.

Eco-log wasn't published until 1977, a year after the spill. That's a deliberate deception and you know it. You expect and you say that had any Regina news outlet assigned any reporter to specialize in either industrial relations or health news, it is hard to see how they could have missed the story in 1976. Those are your words. In fact, the two publications you refer to weren't published until a year and two years after the spill. How could they know?

Then the minister tries to pass the buck again to the press by saying, they got word of a spill of dangerous material which caused a fish kill. We were assured by the department that it didn't cause the fish kill. They were bound to know about the fish kill. It was obvious to all. You expect because the department says they are not related that, in fact, they are supposed to be the watchdogs, guardians and ombudsmen of the environment of Saskatchewan; you say you do it and because you fail to do it, the department is doing a good job. I tell the hon. member opposite that is the defence given by the ministers opposite because the press didn't know about it; they didn't have the foresight to know what was going to be printed two years down the road. They're supposed to know about the dangers of the PCB spills, and those are the minister's own words.

Again, he comes back to dates. Even in early October of 1978 there were no secrets. Two years after, finally a Department of Environment Canada official puts the article in *Recoup*. How, in heaven's name, can you proudly say that these two articles, a year and two years after this bill, are sufficient to cause the press, the public and the opposition to be fully on guard, fully prepared, and fully aware of the PCB spill?

In fact, everything you said last night, every attempt to blame the farmers for using PCBs on their farms or the opposition for being critical and the press for being incompetent, only proved I think, once and for all, that the Department of the Environment is neither qualified nor capable of protecting the public of Saskatchewan from environmental dangers. You proved it and I say unfortunately your so-called defence last night only proved what we have been saying all along, that in fact there should be resignations. There should be a thorough and completely independent reassessment of the Department of the Environment, so the public can finally have confidence that, as we embark on such activities as further uranium development, the Department of the Environment charged by this Assembly to be responsible has in fact the capability of doing so.

You then attack Mr. Shorvoyce and you make the sarcastic comment that Mr. Shorvoyce is unquestionably entitled to congratulations for his resurrection of an old story no one else seemed to want.

An old story! An old story that certainly was a new one to *Recoup* in 1978 and in some trade press release librarians have not heard of that won't give its number of subscribers no advertising but, as were told, anybody could put together. The fact that somebody inquired about a fish kill and failed to pursue it is absolutely ludicrous and I think you know it. In fact there was a cover up, a deliberate cover up of the PCB spill. There was in fact a deliberate attempt last night to mislead the public. In fact the Department of Environment and the cabinet and the government were deliberately covering up their inability to protect the environment. They were covering up their failure to have knowledge of a dangerous and toxic chemical that the Department of Labour knew about, that labour officials knew about. There is a deliberate cover up to protect the political hide of the government opposite.

I say to you that your so-called defence last night wasn't a defence. It was merely an attempt to deflect the heat. In fact an assessment and a close reading of your prepared statement last night proved definitely, categorically, that in fact what the opposition was saying is true. You are wrong. The department was incompetent. The department is failing in a breach of trust to the public of Saskatchewan, and a breach of its duty to protect both the environment and the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to spend a lot of time. I do want to make a couple of comments on what the member says. All members of this Chamber recognize and all members of this Chamber understand when the opposition is in difficulty, they obviously have to begin to wipe the egg off their face. They put what they think is their best foot forward and their best members and their best debaters up front. That exercise we've seen this morning. It's like having his arm tied in the centre and flopping on both ends — I suggest, we understand that. We understand your need to do that. We understand your need to sort of scrape that egg away from your caucus's face because you've been on the kick ever since the CBC made its release. So that's appreciated. I understand that I'm sure all members of the House understand it. I'm sure the public will understand you have to do something to overcome that.

The comment the member made was that the Department of the Environment failed to recognize the dangers. I want to try to restate the facts as I laid them on the Table last night. Yes it's true that the first department to become aware of the spill was the Department of Labour. The Department of Labour immediately, meaning within a day or two or within a period of 48 or so hours, had advised the Department of the Environment with respect to the spill. The Department of the Environment (it's obvious and the facts are there as well) was aware of the dangers and they were aware of the hazards. They took action to overcome those, to see that the matter was cleaned up, to see that the matter was properly looked after in the light of the information that was available at the time.

You will recall that the spill occurred somewhere in the first part of August, 1976. The Department of Labour, first of all, had examined all of the employees and by November of 1976, the Department of the Environment had assessed the site and had recommended that the Federal Pioneer Company cover the area with a blanket of asphalt so that the spring runoff would not move that chemical into the water system or into the drainage systems in Regina. So, it is wrong for the member to say that the Department of the Environment did not recognize the dangers or didn't take action with respect to that. But he has to say something. He obviously places great emphasis on that little bulletin called Recoup and he was very careful, of course, not to quote from that. The little bulletin and the article in the bulletin having been addressed by a federal employee of the Department of the Environment, Canada, was referring to the first article. That's how it happened to be there. So, it wasn't 1978, it wasn't two years after when he was commenting on the first knowledge of the spill and some of the matters relating thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I think the matter has been aired quite properly. I think the evidence is there. We have laid on the table the information which indicates to this House and will indicate to the public that, in fact, people did know about the spill. There was no attempt to make cover up; there was even no reason why a Department of the Environment

official or others would have had need to do so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, his hindsight is about as good as mine; it is always 20/20 when you look back and say, well, why didn't you do this or why didn't you do that. But the facts are there and so, Mr. Chairman, I think it's unnecessary. I know the members will feel it necessary to continue to wipe the egg off their faces. We will sit and listen to that until they finally run down but it won't change the facts. It won't change things. The facts are as they are; no matter how much you say about them or how much you want to comment about them or how much you want to make accusations about them, they're there. They're there for the public to judge. They're there for the members of the Chamber to judge. So, I trust that we can move on to the other items of the . . .

MR. LANE: — You should be so lucky. We just had a new defence and I'm sure the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) appreciates the fact that now your hindsight is 20-20 vision and hindsight is now a justification for the Department of the Environment. And I'm sure the member for Saskatoon Sutherland is anxious to hear that statement that after the damage is done on radiation sickness and whatever, that oh boy, we were wrong and hindsight is 20-20 vision. We made a little error there and the department handled it properly so it's all right. That is the defence of the Minister of the Environment.

In addition, you made an allegation last night that it's the media's fault they didn't know and it's not your duty as a department to let the public know things about dangerous chemicals and toxic substances and what not — that it's the media's fault. I'm quoting now from your statement (I notice she didn't make any reference to it; I'm sure you would be glad to forget about it now yourself:

Had a Regina news outlet assigned any reporter to specialize in either industrial relations news or health news, it is hard to see how they could possibly have missed this story in 1976.

Now, that's your own statement. Would the minister not agree that what we should do right now is immediately resolve into committee of election and privileges and call before this Assembly either the news editors or managers of the various outlets to determine their responsibility for advising, informing and protecting the public as opposed to your statutory obligation and duty which you seem to want to renege upon and pass the buck on to the news media? Would you agree that we should, in fact, call them to find out why didn't have specialists in industrial relations and health news and what their obligation is to protect and inform the public because you seem to be saying that it's their obligation, it's their fault and not yours? Would you agree that we should resolve into that committee and immediately call them?

MR. THATCHER: — Oh, come on, get up on your feet and answer the question.

MR. LANE: — Answer the question! Are you saying in fact that you're standing by your statement that it's the fault of the news media that they don't have specialists in industrial relations or health news, that their's is the whole fault for the public not being informed of the PCB spill?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He sat down. He's afraid to get up.

MR. LANE: — Are you answering the question or not? Are you refusing to answer the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't believe it! Have you ever seen that in the Assembly before?

MR. LANE: — Are you refusing to accept the challenge to call the news media here, those responsible for the operation of the news media in Saskatchewan? Are you refusing the challenge to call them here?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I don't refuse. If the member wants to propose the right kind of motion to the Chair or to the Speaker of the House that he wants to have a hearing and so on, he can go ahead and do that. I'm perfectly willing to do whatever the Chamber or whatever the Assembly suggests we should do. I laid the information on the Table and it's there for the members to read. I already said I recognize that the members must scrape the eggs off their faces and they obviously have to go through that kind of exercise in order to be able to get that done.

There's no question. The record is clear as to what I said. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) has spent a long time in rereading my speech. I congratulate him for that. I know he appreciates a good speech when he hears one. He obviously has taken time to look at it, and he's read it back, and it sounds as if it's rather accurately recorded, so far as what I was intending to say.

I suggest to the member I did not indicate that it was the responsibility of the press to in fact be the initiators, but I did say that the press was aware, the media was aware — I did say that. They were aware of it, and having been aware of it, didn't write the story. They don't believe it was significant enough to either air it over the electronic media or put in the press. That is a fact. There were others, as I said, who wrote about it. You can make all the arguments you want. Whether there was a wide circulation of the publication or whether there was a narrow circulation of it doesn't change the facts. The facts are that other people knew about it. The facts are that it came at a time in our history when there was no illegal use of PCB or chlorophenyl. It was not illegal to use them. Yes, they were hazardous. Publications had been written with respect to the hazards thereof. There had been certain experimental work done with regard to them. Yes they were aware. The Department of the Environment was aware of the hazards. There was no statutory responsibility upon anyone, as the member suggests. He says that there was a statutory responsibility upon the officials of the department or the minister of the department or the company (Federal Pioneer) to report that spill. But the spill in itself, the material which was spilled, was not illegal, so how would it be illegal for them not to report it?

That's the situation of the day — much different two years later. Sure, it's much different two years later. What I am saying is that even in the light of the 1976 situation the Department of the Environment moved in to protect the employees of the plant, which he lauds the Department of Labour for doing, but he finds it difficult to do the same thing on the actions of the Department of the Environment. This may be because he wants to leave out or not mention that the Department of the Environment did, in fact, move in in 1976 when there was no legislative authority to do so. There was no legislative authority, or no requirement by legislation (statutory requirement), to move in and to require Federal Pioneer officials to clean up the spill. Nor was there any federal legislation; the federal government could not have moved in as they had no legislation to move in and require the Federal Pioneer Plant to clean up the situation.

The Department of the Environment, Saskatchewan, did go to Federal Pioneer as soon as it was apprised of the situation, did make an inspection, did go back and deal with the

Federal Pioneer officials and required, in fact, that the Federal Pioneer go out and put a bituminous surface down. All this was done — remember the dates — the spill occurred some time around the first two weeks in August of 1976 and by November of 1976 the cleanup had taken place; the materials had been sent out across Canada into the States for disposal and the Department of the Environment had moved in and inspected the site and had requested and got the co-operation of the Federal Pioneer plant to lay down a bituminous surface so that the spring run-offs would not take the chemicals into the water system.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is very little more that we can say with regard to this. I have to say, again, I appreciate the members having to save face for their caucus and to exercise what they think is a responsible action in view of the rather hurried-up position which they have taken previously.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a few remarks on this very important topic of the environment.

One wonders what really are the parameters of the environment? One can look at the physical environment which I think is mainly what your department is responsible for. I would suggest that there is also a psychological environment in our society that perhaps needs some protection too. However, I am going to confine my remarks to the minister in terms of the physical environment — the components of the air and the water and the earth — which I think he and his department are charged with protecting for the generation of Saskatchewan today, and also for future generations.

My colleague and seatmate, I think, has done a commendable job on pointing to the errors and problems that existed with the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer. The minister has tried to defend his position, which I don't blame him for at all. I would like to quote, in regard to this, a couple of comments from a news release from his department on November 24, in which the deputy minister admits having made an error. I would just like to draw these to his attention again, so they are on the record. He said:

Quite properly the question has been asked why the city of Regina was not informed? The frank answer is that it is an error and a serious error on the part of our department. There is no question that the city should have been informed officially. This was not done on behalf of the department. I accept the responsibility for this error.

Now what I'm trying to say here is that in a matter as precious as the environment and with the many contaminants and the possible dangers to our environment which exist in our modern technological society, I don't think we can stand to have too many of these types of errors.

Also in this same news release you state:

Some citizens have expressed the view that all spills should be made public. I have asked for a full review of the current policy, including discussions with officials of other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States. The object of this review will be to revise our policy when it is feasible and practicable.

Sir, I would like to know when that policy is going to be revised? I think the sooner you get on with this, the better we will be in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now the minister was inclined to shift the blame last night a bit. He talked about the news media. I wondered how far he was going to go to bring other people in. I think he tried to blame the opposition. I don't know who all he was shifting the blame to. However, this is evidence after the fact. I think you as the minister of the environment had better start developing a bit of foresight, not looking at the things which have happened and trying to make excuses why you didn't do the right thing then, my friend. You should start looking with a bit of imagination, which your side lacks, I'm afraid to look at the other possibilities of danger to the province of Saskatchewan and the people living here today. That is the challenge for you and the people in your department.

So what I'm going to do today is help you a bit because I think you need a little bit of help and I'm glad to offer it to you. I want to alert you to a few situations which I think we in Saskatchewan should be looking at. One is the uranium development in our province. Now I want to make it very clear at the outset of my remarks that I'm not giving a judgment of mine as to whether we should or should not do uranium. I will try to outline to all members opposite and especially to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) some of the possible things which your department should be looking at so that we don't have to be sitting in a situation of trying to justify why the barn door was not fixed before the horses got out. I believe in prevention and that takes insight and a bit of imagination, which I the minister does have.

Now as we know, if you have been listening to the radio and reading the reports, right in our neighboring country, the United States of America, today the investigations are going on about the Harrisburg uranium problem. I think there is something we can learn from this. I would like to just point out a couple of things here which your department should be looking at. We are into uranium and you had better be getting the tools, getting the expertise, getting the plans and gaining from the experience of the United States so that if we ever do have these types of dangers to our environment, we in Saskatchewan will be ready to combat them.

I would just like to point out a few things from this article, quoting the president of the company at the Three Mile Island. He says on March 28 of the accident, they did not realize how bad it was for two or three days. So there is the situation there. They had no idea. This is a new thing; I think we should gain from this.

The other thing they point out is that on March 30 when they urged an exodus of pregnant women and small children within 8 kilometres of the stricken plant, some senior NRC (Nuclear Regulatory Commission) officials were leaning towards a full-scale evacuation. So they didn't know who to take out. Do you take them all out? Do you take some of them out? What are the dangers? And it goes on to say in this article that there was a crisis in leadership. If there is anything we don't want in Saskatchewan, it is a crisis of leadership or a series of indecisions, not knowing where to go or what to do next when we may be subjected to a very serious environmental decision. Sir, I would hate to be in your position if that was the situation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Don't be too sure my friends, don't be too sure.

It goes on to say that nuclear power can have a future only if the people are confident and it is being safely regulated. These are some of the things that we should be concerned with.

I would like to quote a few remarks of the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr.

Prebble) in which he says, 'The report did not address the problems created by radioactive tailings.' He goes on to talk about the tailings of uranium. He cites an example at Elliot Lake in Ontario, in our own country. 'The entire Serpent River system was contaminated. Fish were killed and the water made undrinkable.' Prebble said: 'Studies show lethal radon and radium emitted by the tailings. These things can go for hundreds of thousands of years.' This is one of your own members — a man with a little vision and insight, I do believe, a man who is concerned, stating to his own government, the same policy we are. For goodness sake, if we are into this thing, let's, in the Department of the Environment, be ready for it.

I'd like to relate another incident in Russia. In December, 1957, in central Russia, the nuclear depot of a commercial plant exploded. Although much of the accident remains a mystery, it is known that hundreds and perhaps thousands of people died because they lived in the region over which the winds blew the radioactive cloud. The earth lay barren for years and for as long as 10 years after it was thought necessary to advise pregnant women in the area to abort because of the lingering effects of radiation. Now those are the kinds of things I'm trying to bring to your attention, Mr. Minister, the kinds of things that I think foresight and planning and making plans at this time is what the Department of the Environment must be involved in. Goodness sakes, if we don't have water as my friend from Arm River is very concerned about — pure water — if the air that we're going to breathe is contaminated — and it is to a certain extent at this time — and if our soils are laid barren where are we going to be as people in Saskatchewan?

I have two more incidents I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Minister. This is from a Dr. Robert Paul of Cornell University. You may read them my friends but I often really wonder if you understand them. I want to mention again about what this expert from Cornell University says about uranium. He says, uranium decays in 14 steps to become lead, and in that process a number of highly toxic elements including thorium 230 and radon gas are created. This man goes on again as Mr. Prebble did so eloquently to show this chamber the dangers of these gases in the environment. Have a talk to that man. I think he has some ideas for the government opposite. I'd hate to see him muzzled, a man who has the feelings of the people of Saskatchewan at heart. And lastly, on these tailings as I understand, there are the high level ones and the low level ones. The high level ones it's pretty obvious, they just kill you, but it is the low level ones that I'm concerned about. They are the concern of many people, in which you get the chromosome splits, and you get the mutations in our society.

Mr. Minister, I believe that you have one of the most important portfolios in the Government of Saskatchewan at this time to look at such things as PCB immediate spills, problems in our society. Look at our water. You heard me say the other day I don't think you have to look too far down the road to where, if we continue at the rate we are, I wonder if surface run-off water will be safe for human consumption. And the one thing I wish you would address yourself to that your government is going ahead with the development of uranium. We've tried to put some of these problems to you. For goodness sake, sir, develop your policies. I would be embarrassed to hear you sometime down the road have to get up and explain, or try and justify why things weren't looked after. Talking about activities after the accident in something as serious as the problems that are related to the environment and the development of uranium.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, Mr. Chairman, again I think the member has made some good points and I want to give him full marks for those points. I think one is able to quote from papers as he did and express the concerns about our environment. I think all of us

are concerned and we want to be concerned. I think the nature of public interest today out there is concerned, and there are many things about which we — even the experts — disagree. I suppose that raises the level of concern among the public as to really who has the answer. And it also, while it raises the level of concern among the public, produces for those who are required to make decisions, a very frustrating kind of situation because you can't get the experts to agree. Half of them are on one side and half of them on the other, both diametrically opposed to each other and who is to make the final decision and on what basis? So, the decisions will not come easy.

I want to make just one comment with respect to your earlier remarks and that is there is no question about the fact that the deputy minister did make his statement from which you quoted; there is no question about the fact that the Premier made his statement; there is no question about the fact that I made my statements, and they are there for the public to read. I think it's true. I think there was an error in judgment. I think as we look back we can say, well certainly, if it happens again we would do things differently.

But because there was an error in judgment as to the communication process, it doesn't mean to say that certain things didn't happen, like the facts which I laid on the table last night. That doesn't say because there was an error in judgment in the communication process that, in fact, there was an intent to cover up and to keep the information from the public which has been the position of the media. When it was released that was the approach and that's the approach which the opposition has taken — an accusation of a cover-up. I'm saying that that is not the case . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, sure, an error in judgement. An error in judgment that we should have advised the city engineer and so on and so forth. All good and proper kinds of criticisms and there's a willingness in department officials to agree to that position and I agree to that position.

That same position may, in fact, arise again because of some circumstances. There will be errors in judgment because we are human and no matter who sits on these treasury benches there are going to be these kinds of errors. We don't cover that up and we don't make excuses for it. For the opposition to sit and to say that that is justification for them to claim there was an intent to somehow suppress or to somehow not tell or to suggest for some reason they didn't want to be found out; that's not right. That's wrong for them to say that. I say to you and I say to the members of the press, it is wrong for them to come out with that story and to suggest that it was a cover up in the first place. And the reason I suggest that is because I think they didn't take time to do any investigation with respect to what had happened in those two years. I say that there is a responsibility there as well. There is a responsibility upon the media as to what materials go to the public and they can't absolve themselves of that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that I generally agree with the remarks of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) with regard to his concern and his interest expressed in the overall general considerations of environment — air, water, and so on. I say to you again though: if you say surface run-off water is the danger occurring now, I agree with you. I think that's more vital than any of the other things we might consider because when there is no water, when water is of such a quality where we can't drink it without it becoming injurious to our health, I think that's serious. But what are the implications of what the member says? In his constituency, he's saying runoff waters, the situation is occurring where the water will become so polluted we won't be able to use it. What are you saying when you say that? How do we stop that? You stop the water from running? No, no, I'm serious as you were serious. I'm saying when you say that, are you saying to this government we've got to go out and say to the farmers,

look, no more sprays? What are the implications of that Mr. Hon. Member? I'm not sure the public is willing to go, maybe to the extent of that. We should lead the way and we should provide the leadership but I think there are some implications there which are very serious and which have got to be given some serious attention. While I concur with what you say that serious consideration must be given to this fact, I honestly admit I don't know what the solutions are.

MRS. DUNCAN: — I listened with interest, Mr. Chairman, to some of the statements just made by the Minister of the Environment. The one that caught my attention was the error in judgment. Certainly, we are all human and there are errors in judgment, but when we talked about the PCB spill at the beginning of this session the hon. member went on television and said, well, yes, the deputy minister should have informed him, but he did not and therefore, it was an error in judgement. Now, Mr. Chairman, I could've accept that if he had not made the following statement:

that should an occurrence such as this arise again, and I'm not informed, I'm sure it will be an error in judgment.

He is making excuses for future environmental catastrophes which might occur in this province. I would like to address the minister on my concerns with the nuclear development, the uranium development in this province and he says that hindsight is better. Well, we all know hindsight is 20-20 vision as he says, but what concerns me is that the Government of Saskatchewan is going to be playing a large part in uranium development in the financial end of it. The Government of Saskatchewan has committed large portions of our tax moneys to uranium development and the members opposite are quick to criticize multinational companies with their profit motivation. I say to the Minister of Environment, if you were not to be a partner in this development, if you could be a department that would be able to monitor the uranium development without the profit motivation on one side, I could accept it. I do not feel the person who makes the rules can participate. I do not think that if you set the rules then you are going to be the referee. In the United States a Nuclear Regulatory Commission has inspectors which make unannounced visits to the various plants. I say to the Minister of the Environment, what would happen if one of your inspectors discovered something? Would you really close a plant down or would you get opposition from the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) because it would be highly unprofitable at that time? I think that's a decision which you would have to make.

Now the Minister of Mineral Resources, the other day, said, and I quote from Hansard:

The point I want to make is that you can only be as positive as technology and science will allow you to be at any given point in time and that's where we are with uranium in Saskatchewan.

You state that PCBs and chlorophenyls were legal in 1976, and surely they were, but in 1976 we also knew that it was a highly toxic chemical.

With regard to uranium, I quote:

Despite science's long experience with radiation and bitter knowledge of its risks, like the cancers inflicted on early radium workers (including Madame Curie) disturbingly little is known about how much radiation or what length of exposure is safe for humans. Standards have been sharply questioned by radiation biologists, physicians and other scientists and the government

(which is the United States government) is now reviewing its policy.

I think that's a stand we have to take in Saskatchewan. You say scientists are split on it. Those are very learned people. I think we can learn from them and if they are split down the middle, surely there is cause for a lot of concern.

Experts now believe any radiation carries with it some risks as yet undetermined that may take many, many years to show up.

You can say, well, there is danger riding a bicycle and there is danger driving a car and there is danger working in a mine. I don't dispute that, but I do dispute that uranium and its by-products are a lot different. If there is a catastrophe in a coal mine, that's a catastrophe which affects those people and those people only. It doesn't affect future generations. We do not know enough about radiation.

Nobel prize winning biologist George Wald stated that every dose is an overdose and there is no threshold where radiation is concerned. A little radiation does a little harm and a lot does a lot of harm.

I will just close my remarks by saying that some scientists have been pondering the problems of disposing of atomic wastes and MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) nuclear physicist Henry Kendall says that the radio-active waste problem alone is enough justification for halting the expansion of nuclear power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I only want to make a brief comment and that is that the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) is not careful to distinguish between nuclear development and uranium mining. You mix the two together. We don't have nuclear power in Saskatchewan. In the foreseeable future it is said that we don't know that we'll not have it in the foreseeable future. So I don't know how I can say anything with respect to nuclear power, that is in Saskatchewan. You can talk about it in Ontario if you will because they do have nuclear power there. You can talk about Harrisburg if you want to because they develop nuclear. They have them all over the states. Or you can talk about them in other countries. But what can I do or what can this legislature do to change the decisions of elected governments in other provinces in Canada, let alone other states in the United States or in other countries of the world? I can't change it. This legislature can't change. So don't confuse the issue in Saskatchewan with one dealing — you talk about Harrisburg, and you talk about nuclear power as if it were here in Saskatchewan. It's not here. Therefore I can't deal with that subject. I can't deal with it in a practical way because it's not here.

With regard to uranium development, yes, the decision of the government has been that we will go ahead with uranium development. No question about the fact that there's . . . You acknowledge there is a division between the experts and you say that's a reason for caution. I agree with that. When decisions have to be made, and decisions must be made, then on what basis are you going to make the decision? The governments obviously are criticized (everybody knows) for not making decisions. So when there is a split between the experts and decision has to be made, then obviously you're going to come down on the wrong side or the other of the experts. You can't help it. So I guess we must go on making some decisions and not wait. We must do it with caution, true.

Yes indeed, the Department of the Environment would and does have the authority to close down an operation. Amok if you will, or Gulf, or Eldorado mining operations in Saskatchewan if the health and safety of the miners are not taken into account. I want to leave with you for your own research and consideration the number of deaths that occur in the coal mining industry as opposed to the uranium mining industry. The conclusion you'll arrive at is that there is a greater measure of fatality in lung disease and disorders and so on, in blow-ups in the mines than there is in the uranium industry. And not only that but if you're suggesting we generate the same amount of electricity by coal fired furnaces as they are now generating by nuclear powered furnaces, there is a hazard to the environment in that respect as well — a very serious hazard because of the smoke which goes up and shuts off the sun and all of the other things implicated with that, which have helped varying kinds of responsibilities which we have to take into account. I guess one has to measure the concern of the environment with some trade offs, and I guess that's a fact of life.

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon Sutherland): — Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments, especially in terms of directions that I think the Department of the Environment needs to be taking in the year ahead. I would like the minister to comment on plans the department has in this regard in light of the estimates.

I just want to say I think I agree with the member for Indian Head-Wolseley when he makes the point that the PCB spill shows the need for legislation requiring the reporting of significant spills and the need for those spills to be made public.

I am glad to see the Department of the Environment is planning to introduce regulations to this effect, at least requiring the reporting of spills. I think it is going to be important those spills are made public and I hope that will be enshrined in legislation because it makes it then much harder to change.

I also think the PCB spill shows, very dramatically, the need for some kind of a waste disposal site on the prairies where we can dispose of toxic chemicals in the event we do have the kind of problems that have occurred here in Regina. Clearly the lack of a place to put dangerous chemicals in the event of accidents and clean ups is a real problem right now and it is something that we are going to deal with as quickly as possible.

I think enough has been said about the PCB spill specifically in regard to Regina, but I am disappointed that more attention hasn't been given to the fact we have a PCB problem in the water supplies in Saskatchewan right now. PCBs — and three different kinds of PCBs — are showing up occasionally in water supplies around the province. When you consider the environmental protection agency in the states sets a limit of about one part per trillion, for PCB contamination in water supplies, I think that shows the toxicity of PCBs very clearly. Nobody has pointed out, by the way, that PCBs are essentially a chlorinated hydro-carbon that is very similar to DDT, has a half life of somewhere between 25 and 47 years and is, therefore, long lived in the environment and is clearly dangerous and highly toxic.

I think, therefore, we should be concerned about the fact that trace elements of PCBs are showing up in water supplies around the province.

Now, comments have been made, briefly, on the importance of clean water and the importance of ensuring surface water supplies in Saskatchewan remain in good condition. I think we have a serious problem in this province right now in terms of

declining quality of surface water. That is, in large part, coming about as a result of soil erosion problems and as a result of the use of chemicals being sprayed on the land in Saskatchewan.

In 1976, there were 3,600,000 pounds of 2,4-D applied in the province and I think that gives us some measures of the degree of significance of the problem. We also have another of the dioxanes that's in frequent use in Saskatchewan, and the dioxanes, I think, are clearly the type of agricultural chemical that we have to be the most concerned about because the dioxanes have been proven to cause genetic damage, cancer, birth defects, nervous disorders, and a number of other problems. And 2,4,5-T is being used for brush clearing, in community pastures, and along power lines. Some of the rural municipalities are making use of it.

Now, in the water quality surveys that have been done in this province, in the last seven or eight years, show very clearly that 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, lindane, and in fact seven pesticides and 15 herbicides are showing up regularly in Saskatchewan water supplies. If you look at the Qu'Appelle River District, for instance, 48 per cent of the sample tests in the Qu'Appelle River show traces of 2,4,5-T. When you see traces of these kinds of chemicals in the water supply, you can be assured that the build-up of those toxic substances in the river sediment is much, much higher than actually in the river itself. I think that this is going to have to be a problem that the Department of the Environment deals with in a concrete way in the year ahead, and I hope the minister will comment on what his plans are in that regard.

The National Research Council undertook a study last year in Saskatchewan in which it surveyed 3,300 grain elevator operators and farmers, and 20 per cent of those surveyed complained of suffering ill effects during the seasonal spraying of 2,4-D. This, I think, again very clearly shows the kind of health problem that is emerging as a result of the high use of chemicals in the province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a need for a ban, to begin with, on 2,4,5-T in Saskatchewan. I would like to see, 2,4,5-T banned and I think that that position is backed up, Mr. Chairman, by the fact that the United States Environmental Protection Agency has recently placed a temporary ban on 2,4,5-T for most uses in the United States, and the province of British Columbia has taken similar action. This was based on the result of research which showed that the number of miscarriages in an area of Oregon, where these chemicals are used, was running at a rate of 128 per thousand pregnancies, compared to 46 per thousand in regular control areas.

Apart from banning 2,4,5-T, I would like to see the Department of the Environment calling and encouraging farmers to reduce their use of the herbicide 2,4-D in the province. Mr. Chairman, I point out the dilemma that the Department of the Environment and we as the Government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan are in. On one hand, we are saying that grain exports in this province should go up 50 per cent, in the next seven to eight years, and that clearly means increased production. And the only way of really achieving increased production in the short run, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the path that will be used will be the increased application of agricultural chemicals and at the same time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, irrigation will also be important but I fear that one of the ways in which this increased production will be achieved will be through increased application of agricultural chemicals. I think that that would be disastrous in the long term, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be better if the Department of the Environment and the Department of Agriculture aimed at less increases in production and instead sought to

decrease the amount of agricultural chemicals being applied in the province.

I think that the problem clearly shows the need for the Department of the Environment and the Department of Agriculture to be putting funding (and I don't see it in the budget, Mr. Chairman, in the estimates) into alternative ways of controlling pests — mechanical control of pests, biological control of pests, and cultural control of pests. A lot of interesting work in this area is going on at the University of British Columbia. We should be looking at those kinds of things and I hope that next year when the estimates come forward, we'll see some funding in there for alternative means of controlling pests. I'm hopeful that possibly some of the money in the agricultural research fund will be used in this area. I was very pleased to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) express an interest in that and comment on that in the throne speech.

I think that we should also be collecting the agricultural spray cans when they are empty and left around on farms right now. Those should be picked up in the province just like we have recycling programs for other things, Mr. Chairman.

Clearly what is needed in light of the heavy application of agricultural chemicals in the province (these chemicals are not only showing up in the water supply but also in our food) is a policy of encouraging pure, healthy food. Again, I don't see initiatives in the estimates, Mr. Chairman, for that. I think that we need to make concrete expenditures on encouraging the growing of pure, healthy food in the province.

On the matter of water supply, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to urge the Department of the Environment to take action on the fact that chloroform is showing up in certain water supplies in Saskatchewan. I think that's alarming and it's coming about as a result of the high use of chlorine in some of the water areas. You can see this kind of problem in Davidson, as an example. I think that that shows specific steps are going to be required to protect residents from chloroform showing up in their water supplies. I urge the Department of the Environment to take action on some of the measures that can readily be implemented to overcome this problem.

I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of the Environment hasn't addressed itself fully enough to the problem of declining soil quality in the province. I'm disappointed that the opposition hasn't commented at all on that matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We were going to.

MR. PREBBLE — Well, I can't make a judgment on that. That may well be. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the humus in Saskatchewan soil has now declined 50 per cent over what it was some 70 to 80 years ago. That means that the very foundation of the soil structure which the agricultural industry in this province is dependent on is rapidly declining. I've seen very little being done in a concrete way to deal with that problem. I think that's clearly a problem which the Department of the Environment and the Department of Agriculture are going to have to come to grips with in the years ahead.

I also want to point out, while I'm commenting on agriculture, that we also have an increasing problem (and this applies not only in Saskatchewan but is a global problem and certainly a problem in North America, but it hits home at us very much because we are so highly dependent on farming) that we've seen an increased movement towards monoculture in the province. We have a smaller and smaller variety and diversity of crops that are being grown in Saskatchewan. The diversity of crops has declined very significantly over the last 20 years and that is something we are going to have to

correct, Mr. Chairman, because it's a fundamental environmental rule that diversity is absolutely essential to long-run health in the environment, and that when you become dependent on only a few crops you become very subject to problems associated with disease.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to keep the rest of my remarks brief but I would like to say that another thing I'm disappointed that the opposition hasn't commented on is the need to level out energy demand in Saskatchewan. You have lots of opportunities.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I've got it right here, Peter. I was all set to raise it, right here in a report.

MR. PREBBLE: — Good show. The minister, Mr. Chairman, has suggested that the choice we have is between coal and uranium and I think that's not entirely accurate. I'm not an advocate of coal, Mr. Chairman. I think the choice is between uranium and conservation, and I want to say that I think the Department of the Environment should be urging the Department of Mineral Resources to level out energy demand, and rather than trying to continually increase the number of generating facilities in the province, instead pursue a policy of conserving energy.

I think there are a number of things that could be done to do that. One thing the Environmental Advisory Council points out in their report is that there is a shocking difference between peak demand in this province and off-peak demand. We clearly need to take measures to level out peak demand and to encourage people to use energy in off-peak hours instead of peak hours. That's the kind of policy I'd like to see the Department of the Environment encouraging the Department of Mineral Resources and Saskatchewan Power Corporation to look at seriously.

I'd like to make a few comments on the proposal that Esso has to build a \$4.7 billion bituminum recovery operation near Cold Lake. I think this operation is important because it very clearly displays the problem we face of operations just outside the border of Saskatchewan having very significant impacts upon the Saskatchewan environment.

I feel right now, Mr. Chairman, very strongly, that Saskatchewan does not have sufficient say in these kinds of border-line developments.

If you look at the impact of this one project, we are looking at 580,000 barrels of fresh water per day being removed from Cold Lake, which certainly could have an impact on the Cold River and the Waterhen River. We are looking at 5 million gallons a day of polluted water going into the Beaver River and we are looking at sulphur dioxide emissions at close to 70 tons a day, which will obviously have an impact on the province of Saskatchewan because most of the winds are blowing this way. We are looking at thousands of barrels a day of waste effluent to be disposed of by deep well disposal and the injections of these kinds of wastes in the McMurray salt mine foundation could easily migrate into Saskatchewan.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that those kinds of environmental impacts clearly show the need to, first of all, request of the Alberta government that Saskatchewan and Alberta jointly undertake environmental impact assessments on a number of projects that are planned in terms of heavy oil along the Alberta-Saskatchewan border and for those hearings not only to be held in Alberta, Mr. Chairman, but to be held in Saskatchewan. I hope that the Department of the Environment will provide moneys for that in the

coming year.

The last thing that I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, is in regard to environmental impact assessment legislation. We have made, I think, in this province significant progress in terms of establishing a policy in regard to how environmental impact assessment must take place and how the public is to be involved. I think that it's important at this time, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of the Environment enshrine that policy, place that policy into legislation so that it is something we can be assured will be a permanent kind of policy in this province. I think that in addition to that there are some important changes that are needed in the environmental impact assessment process. I will close by simply outlining a few of the changes that I would like to see in that area.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Department of the Environment change their policy in regard to requiring the companies to undertake their environmental impact assessments. I think that the Department of the Environment should be saying, we shall undertake the environmental impact assessment. We shall commission it out and the company shall pay for it. Because, I think, Mr. Chairman, what is often happening right now and what often happens in the consultant industry is that the consultant companies doing these environmental impact assessments know the kinds of things that the companies are looking for. I have been involved in many hearings and looked at many reports and I continually see significant inadequacies in those reports, significant instances in which information that is very pertinent to the inquiry and the examination has not been collected. I think the way to overcome that is for the Department of the Environment to decide on the terms of reference that it wants for an environmental impact study and for it to commission it out so that there are no vested interests involved and so that the consultant company doing the study doesn't have to worry about coming forward with a recommendation that says, no, you won't go ahead . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I think that's quite a different matter. I think we're not talking about vested interests on the part of government. The government involvement makes a good deal of sense because that way, you can directly have your finger on the problem. You don't have to be taking an indirect approach.

I also want to say in terms of the environmental impact assessment process, I think there would be a good deal of merit in providing for more time, more notice for citizens' groups to comment on environmental impact studies. Right now, they get very little notice. In fact, in the past the policy has been to provide as little notice as 30 days to comment on a very comprehensive environmental impact statement.

Finally, I would like to see a much freer flow of information in regard to these environmental assessments in the sense that I think right now the public doesn't really know what project environmental impact assessments are being carried out until the assessment is pretty well complete and is made public. There is very little information that can be obtained on the environmental impacts of the project. I think that's a policy that has to change. I want to say to the members opposite that if they want to see examples of environmental impact assessments under Tory governments they only have to look at the absolutely dismal environmental record in Ontario and the absolutely dismal opportunities for public participation in Ontario, and Saskatchewan would like an angel. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't mean we are doing the things we should be doing. That doesn't mean we're doing well enough; I say we need significant improvements in our own environmental impact assessment policies.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. member for his views. Obviously, he raises a number of issues which are important to both himself and to the Department of the Environment. These issues are, as all members know, a matter of the record. I will take notice of the specific points he's made from the record and not attempt to respond to each item. I think it would take us too long, take me too long, to respond to each item here this morning. So, I will as I said, take notice from the Hansard, from the record and respond to the member on the points which he has raised.

MR. LANE: — I would like to make a few comments. If one takes a look at the annual report of the Saskatchewan Environmental Advisory Council, it makes some rather severe criticisms of the department. I don't think anyone is going to argue there was not some influence in the appointments of those members to the environmental advisory council by the government opposite. When criticism starts coming from people like Jerry MacDonald, the fiercely independent NDP perennial candidate, as a member of that board then you know that perhaps the government opposite and its Department of the Environment is not doing the job that the legislature gave to it. We were a little surprised at the rather naive statements of the hon. member from Saskatoon Sutherland when he says that it's good for the government to be involved in the nuclear mining and the nuclear development in the province of Saskatchewan. That's a significant admission that the people in Saskatoon would like to hear — that it's good to have the government involved in it. I would hope that at some point he would consider federal government involvement in the atomic energy of Canada and the problems they are having with some of the Candu reactors, and potential problems he has referred to in the past. But when it comes to the provincial government, we've had the first endorsement of provincial government involved in nuclear development by the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble).

The environmental advisory council is strongly critical of the Bayda report and indicates, and I quote:

It appears that the largest single failure of the Bayda Inquiry was that it was seen in many quarters as having little credibility. If people continue to believe that such inquiries are not to be taken seriously the inquiry process could become meaningless.

They are somewhat critical of the way the Bayda Inquiry was handled. We were going to raise the matters of the failure of the Government of Saskatchewan to have a provincial energy policy. And I will quote again from the environmental advisory council annual report:

. . . Supply alternatives and demand patterns should be examined within the framework of a provincial energy policy. Regrettably this is still not possible in Saskatchewan. Instead the province continues to lurch from one real or imagined crisis to the next, adding or postponing on a project by project basis and never coming to grips with the long-term problem. In accordance with what has become something of an annual tradition we must again emphasize that Saskatchewan needs a provincial energy policy. (I'm taking this out of the paragraph but I don't think out of context.) No overall energy plan exists, nor does one appear to be on the horizon. Project by project

energy planning continues, limited by tunnel vision of project proponents and ignoring long-term implementation.

Unless and until a province-wide energy policy is developed, boards of inquiry are merely ways of determining, not which projects should or should not proceed, but which projects should proceed first.

That's a pretty damning statement about your environmental policies in the province of Saskatchewan. We have documented the problems, I think in some detail, and the minister was forced to chew on and swallow his own words today on the PCB spill. The interesting thing about the Department of the Environment is that it is criticized about its position on the Bayda Inquiry; it is criticized by its own people on its failure to have a national energy policy, and it is criticized in a nice, easy, soft and gentle manner by the member for Saskatoon Sutherland for failing to deal with the problem of agricultural chemicals. It blew the PCB spill.

The Department of the Environment has only done one particular project in great detail, and that was its heavy involvement in the land use workshops across the province of Saskatchewan. The reason it was involved in the land use workshops across the province was because one of the five criteria for the land use policy in the land use workshop studies was to study a new land tenure system for the province of Saskatchewan, which has nothing to do with environment, but which has a great deal to do with politics and a great deal to do with the political philosophy of the government opposite and a great deal to do with the type of farm ownership it wants in this province. It has not a thing to do with environment and protecting the environment.

The record of the government opposite, when it comes to environment, is one of failure, cover up, hiding, ignorance, an inability to determine what the real problems are and an inability to come to grips with what those problems are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — It is a record of mismanagement. I tell you it is a touchstone of concern for the people of this province when they have to think that it is that department or that minister and his predecessor who may, in fact, have the responsibility of protecting the public from the environmental impact from uranium development and the continued use of toxic substances. I think the people of this province should be scared and frightened and deeply concerned at the inability of that department to deal with environmental problems. I don't think we have ever seen a department less prepared, less able and less competent to deal with some of the most significant problems that are going to be facing the people of this province in the next decade.

We are going to give the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) and the members opposite an opportunity to vote on how satisfied they are with the Department of the Environment. We are going to make the traditional or the formal vote of non-confidence motion in estimates in this department, and that form (for the new members opposite) is a formal motion that the expenditures be reduced to \$1. That is a traditional financial motion of non-confidence and the critic for the environment of the opposition is going to make that formal motion.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has a great ability to inspire debate and to want to get people involved. I am going to restrain myself. One has to take into account where it comes from and in doing that, you can't

get too serious about the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). It is interesting if you in the opposition benches would like to check Hansard (when the Department of the Environment was formed and came into existence) the record of the member who was then in another political party (it was Liberal then, not Conservative) and his response to an environmental department in the first place. Knowing that past history, it is easy to understand how he now performs in this rather monkey-like fashion in order to get his message across that he somehow continues to disagree with that, and yet portrays a position to the public of Saskatchewan that he is in favor of it.

He referred to the Environmental Advisory Council report and he read certain items of that report into the record. All I want to say is that at least this government has the courage to appoint advisory councils to ministers and allows them the freedom and flexibility to express an opinion. That is what that report is. It is an opinion. I don't necessarily agree with that report. In fact, I think there are a number of contradictions in that report, if I may say so quite candidly. There are a number of contradictions in that report. They are a group of people who are looking at it from their point of view and from their considerations.

One of the contradictions is that it says there is no energy policy. I want to refer to the hon. member this little pamphlet. It has 65 pages of the energy policy in Saskatchewan. Now, surely that couldn't be called a cover up, that the advisory council didn't know there was an energy policy in Saskatchewan, and because we didn't publish it or hand it to them that that is a cover up. I'm sure you people wouldn't say that. I'm sure the member for Qu'Appelle now will have some second thoughts about what he said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know, he was reading. But you see, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I said last night. The member comes into this House with an armful of clippings from the paper, or he reads that little report and he reads it and takes it as the gospel. He makes no effort on his own part to research it at all.

Here is another one. I'll send it to you. I wish the page would take this over to the hon. member so that he can read the energy resource management in Saskatchewan and so that he doesn't need to really only rely on those little points of view that he personally takes as being the issues in Saskatchewan today.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the comments of the member for Qu'Appelle need no further comment.

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Chairman, I am glad to get back up on my feet. It was 8:55 last night since I had a chance to say a word. It is pretty hard to get back up on my feet when you asked me to have this done at 10 o'clock last night. I get a five minute report and then you took nearly until 10 o'clock yourself, so I am going to say a few words now.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you. You did a wonderful job. You have been elected as captain of the ship, of a sinking ship. You remind me of the sinking of the Titanic. I will say, Mr. Minister, in no way was this your responsibility. And you did a wonderful job of trying to present to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan that you had no responsibility and that it wasn't your fault at all. But that phony material which you presented last night didn't go too far with me and it didn't go too far with the rest of this caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I want it on record that there are no red faced Tories over here, but I sure watched a lot of red faced Tories last night when the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) . . . down and down you went and your head went down . . .

The minister even turned around; even his deputy minister had to turn around for a while . . . I will tell you, there were red-faced people over there. But anyway, we're not going to get very far here if we keep on debating and debating and debating. I have a few proposals . . . I had to listen . . . You said listen very carefully last night for 25 minutes and I might learn something. Well, if you would just give me five minutes I have a few proposals and maybe you might learn something.

First, I should just suggest one more thing. Would this ever have come up if I hadn't asked that nice question? How would you have got that prepared speech out last night if I hadn't brought the subject up in the first place? I thank you very much that you had it prepared and ready to go because I am sure you have sunk a little deeper, everyone of you. All you are doing is trying to convince the people in here that you are so innocent, you are such a sweet, innocent little group. It's the people out in the boondocks of Saskatchewan to whom you should have been taking that evidence, two months ago, last fall. Why didn't you take it out there and see if they would have believed you? They weren't going to believe you any more than we would believe you here.

Proposals for the Department of the Environment — I don't have as much help as you — my speech may not be as good as yours. I have to make my own up myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It will be better! It's from your heart and that's the difference.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — We in Saskatchewan, under the present NDP government, are faced with the most massive uranium mining development undertaken anywhere in the world today. Environment Canada admits that because of the huge size of the operation they have no idea what the environmental effects are likely to be. Environment Canada admits that such inquiries as the Bayda inquiry are really a political trick to get the developer to foot the cost of the environmental impact study and so they shift the onus for such impact studies onto the shoulders of the developers and save the province the time and the money of doing a thorough investigation itself.

The result of such a tactic, however, is to have the research done by the developer and so receive a report which is biased to the developer's position.

The only environmental impact study done to date by a government in northern Saskatchewan is one instigated since the Bayda inquiry by the Environment Canada on which a mere \$50,000 is being spent. All this is intended to do is to scratch the surface and point out potential problem areas, which will then be monitored on an ongoing basis by the companies themselves. This monitoring will, hopefully, help environmental agencies to detect problems as soon as they begin to happen so that the countermeasures can be instigated on an ad hoc basis as they arise. Northern Saskatchewan contains vast quantities of unspoiled water resting in lakes, and flowing in rivers and streams. That's something you people don't think about when you talk about environment — checking into the dangers of the North. Do you realize we have potentially clean waters in the North and that the wells in southern Saskatchewan get their water from the North? Take a look at that before you start checking your environment department. You never even thought of that. It is one of the few remaining areas of unspoiled water, that most precious of natural resources known to man, on which his very life depends, available in North America.

Saskatchewan also sits on vast, unspoiled, underground water reserves on which future generations may need to rely. It is imperative that the people of Saskatchewan feel that they can rely upon the word of Environment Saskatchewan, and upon the idea that they are looking out for the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan. The Progressive Conservatives have stated time and time again that one cannot be a player and a referee too; that the government should pull out of the joint ventures into the uranium development and let the private sector do the developing; that by taxing and regulating the private sector developers just as much money can be made for the Saskatchewan treasury as can be made by direct participation and without the risk involved in putting forward taxpayers money as venture capital. But most of all people would have more faith in the Department of the Environment if they thought it was there to monitor and regulate and not be put in the position of taking a back seat to the push for profit which will inevitably take precedence over environment protection, especially prior to elections.

The Progressive Conservatives propose that this government make the Department of the Environment a priority department. We propose that money spent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . a little bit of money, in answer to the minister over there . . . yes, it might as well be a dollar a year for the little bit you put in. I totalled up that book of estimates. That amounts to nothing. Your wages come to just exactly the same amount. That \$3 million is the total wages of an entire department, and you've only got a little bit more to run the whole environment of Saskatchewan. That's why we say it might as well be a dollar. Shame on you! The wages — same thing. I've never heard of such carryings on. I'd be ashamed of that book, ashamed of it. I totalled it here. I'll give you the exact figures. The total is \$2,712,480 while the other expenses, which must include all the environment work you are going to do in Saskatchewan along with your other expenses, is only \$800,000 more. Shame on you! That's why we say it's got to be a dollar, because it's going to go as far as that.

We've seen the PCB spill incident at Federal Pioneer hushed and boxed up to the point where it will now cost 10 times as much to clean up as it would have if immediate action had been taken in the first place. Where do you think you're going with this? You can't leave it forever.

Was it two years last summer when it first came to light? It'll be three years in August and I don't see any money in this. I don't see any money here that's going to take care of burying or hauling that PCB pile away. Where is it? It's not there! When you get on to the fourth year, it's going to cost you millions because you can't haul it to New York for \$500 a ton now; in fact it's doubtful, at this late stage, that the spill can be adequately cleaned up at all.

How do you know? Who can prove, with all your investigations, that water streams haven't already found a way to get through that and have taken it somewhere now? Nobody's even checking it out there, because I've got clippings from the paper here that say you promised to have inquiries. You were supposed to go into this and set up boards to give us answers back. Where are these inquiries?

They just hushed it up! I think that if we'd never mentioned the word PCB in this House it never would have been brought up at all. That prepared speech was only for if we brought it up. That's why I said in question period yesterday that there was no legislation brought in because the PCs kept quiet for a little while. You were just thinking that we might forget about it. You'll find out whether we're going to forget

about it or not!

We ask the minister to seriously consider the following suggestions. Oh, I wouldn't bother looking at the clock; I looked at it last night, trying to get on. I looked at it and looked at it and looked at it and I didn't make it. You may have to look at that clock for the rest of the day and Monday and Tuesday, and maybe a little longer, because I've got some things to say to you.

I haven't even gotten to my important item. We've got to get down to water yet, my subject, water!

First, we suggest that a stringent new bill be brought before the legislature to allow the Department of the Environment to take — I'll tell you, to save us some time, these five suggestions . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not really. Get it into the record; get it into the record.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — You want it into the record?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — O.K., the boys want it in the record.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — A new bill should be brought before the legislature to allow the Department of the Environment to take immediate action in the case of environmental hazards, be they on land, water or the air, without first having to consult the Attorney General's department to figure out under which act they can intervene.

That's the way the law is now; you don't even know where to turn if you have a PCB spill in this province! You have to run around and find some further legislation to cover it! They covered it with some asphalt; nobody knows where it's gone now.

Immediate action taken to clean up the PCB spill or the wreck of a train carrying toxic chemicals or whatever the emergency would inspire confidence on the part of the public, would cut down on future potential health hazards, and would save money in the long run. It seems unbelievable that legislation giving blanket authority for the Department of the Environment to act in emergency and to protect the environment from damage is not now in place.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That is unbelievable . . .

MR. MUIRHEAD: — It is absolutely unbelievable. I don't see quite so many smiling faces as there were last night there for a little while. They seem to be kind of sad today.

I might add such a move would be a first in Canada since neither the federal government nor any other province in Canada has taken such a decisive, yet necessary, step . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They have the same program because they are in the same ship. They are all sinking in the Titanic together but there were a few survivors from the Titanic, if you remember back. I hope a few of you survive because there are some pretty good fellows over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Name one.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes, I can think of one. Yes, I can, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). I feel sorry for that poor fellow who has to go through what he's had to go through because it wasn't his responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He was captain of the ship.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — The captain did go down with that ship. It seems ridiculous; a relatively small number of cubic yards of earth could have been removed and disposed of at the time for \$500 a ton but delays caused by red tape now mean that thousands of extra cubic yards of earth must be moved, at who knows what additional cost to ensure that confidence on the part of the public is restored.

Personnel in environment Saskatchewan like personnel in environment Canada feel such a blanket act would facilitate their action. I urge the minister to consider the merits of introducing such legislation as soon as possible.

Second, I would suggest immediate steps be taken to establish a kind of environmental SWAT team that could be dropped into hazardous environmental situations, who are trained and equipped to take whatever remedial actions are necessary to clean up the contaminated area. I would suggest this could be done best at the federal level but perhaps an armed forces chemical warfare team could be utilized for this purpose. It would make far more sense for such a group to be immediately dispatched to the kind of PCB spill we had in Regina, protectively clothed and adequately equipped, than to have local plant workers out on their hands and knees (like he said last night, they mopped it up). I wonder how many people got PCBs on their hands unprotected and using equipment of buckets and mops to clean up such toxic waste? What a way! It was right in your speech last night that they did mop it up. I wonder if they even had gloves on. Failing such a force being set up federally, surely Saskatchewan environment could develop its own mini-task force. There is no using saying we have the Emergency Measures Organization (EMO) to deal with such things. By the time the word is filtered up to the Minister of the Environment and he has contacted the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy), who in turn, has contacted EMO the damage is done. All done. We need immediate action to be taken. There are any number where trained environmental personnel could do an urgent and necessary job. For instance, a fire near a stock of toxic chemicals could be handled far better if trained personnel were immediately available than if a local firefighting personnel, unsure of the potential hazards, have to deal with the situation.

Thirdly, I would urge that an inventory of all toxic chemicals be set up for the province so that the Department of the Environment of Saskatchewan is aware of where the potential hazards lay.

Fourth, I would urge the government to get the federal government to pass legislation requiring standardized danger markings on all industrial and farming toxic chemicals much the same as warnings are used on consumer products. You said last night I may have had some on my farm and you'd blame me for not reporting them. Well for goodness sake, please tell me. I want you to tell me every PCB that I have in my constituency and where they are so I can warn my people. This province spends thousands of dollars on ads hung on fences around power plants declaring, children stay out, children stay out. Put them around where the PCBs are and say, children stay out and warn the farmers where they are. Quit hiding this any longer.

It is imperative that farmers and workers be aware of the dangers inherited in the

chemicals they are handling so they can ensure they are adequately protected personally and so they are aware of the toxicity of the material they are handling and the possible ill effects these chemicals might have on the public at large if not properly used.

I see that my caucus has no confidence in the Department of the Environment. I submit this motion:

That item 1 of the estimates of the Department of the Environment be reduced to \$1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I said earlier at the close of the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) that when he started out to search the record, when he started out in the Liberal Party and is now in the Conservative Party, his position remains the same. He doesn't want Saskatchewan to have a Department of the Environment. He doesn't want it. The evidence of the fact is that all of his caucus doesn't want it because of the resolution which you just passed.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the resolution which has just been passed will withdraw from the Souris Valley the money which is allocated to resolve some of the flooding problems. I wonder if the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) is going to vote for that resolution. I wonder, because if he does, if he votes for the resolution to reduce this department's expenditures to \$1, the Souris Valley money goes and I want to tell him that. Not only does the Souris Valley money go, but the money goes from Fort Qu'Appelle; it goes from the Qu'Appelle River drainage system. I wonder how you are going to vote? You are going to have to tell your constituents that you vote against the resolving of the water problems in the Qu'Appelle Valley River system and in the Souris River Valley. I am interested to see how you are going to vote! I am interested to see how the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) is going to vote. I am interested to see how he is going to vote because the resolution which you have passed will withdraw from the Moose Jaw situation at best \$100,000. I want to see how you are going to vote Mr. Member for Thunder Creek. Oh, you fellows have just jumped into bed with those who operated the Titanic and I am telling you, you are going with it. You bet you are! It is going to be nice to see you stand and vote on this resolution. And you are going to have to stand and vote on this resolution, each one of you, each one of you in your own place. That is going to be an interesting exercise.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go through the expenditures of this budget of the environment which will relate the implementation of the Qu'Appelle Valley agreement — \$613,000. I wonder how the member is going to vote on that?

MR. ROMANOW: — He wants it down to zero.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, he wants it for nothing. He wants it to be even less than \$1 because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's all right, don't worry about that. No, no, no, you want to reduce it all. You bet you do. You don't want any Department of the Environment because if you don't have anybody to manage it, you don't have a

department. You don't want it. You can be technical if you like. You crawfished on the PCB issue last night and you are going to crawfish now. You have been wiping egg off your face all morning and you are going to wipe more egg off your face. You don't have the intelligence to know how to operate in this Chamber and when you're caught short all you can do is holler . . . (inaudible interjection) . Yes I know, it's nice for you to say, nice to point your fingers at the first item. That doesn't save you . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Chairman, rather than me take the time of the House to debate this issue any longer I think it's important that we come to the question and we call the question and see how these people are going to vote with respect to the resolution.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the minister in his Army and Navy suit and his Saan Store tie for his acknowledgment as I tried to get into the debate.

Mr. Minister, I think once again that you just put your foot into it. Because, read the motion, it says very clearly item 1 and we know the people who are involved in item 1.

Mr. Minister, we have been at this since last night. I was not present last night, but I have heard you most of the time since you got up this morning to speak. I suppose the most noticeable thing about your comments today, is the way you just simply don't want to talk about your department and the way you don't want to talk about the issues. As you were replying to a person, on every single occasion this morning, you have had to start it out on a personal basis. I think that is pretty well highly indicative of the sort of case your department has got.

You were challenging us a moment or two ago to state where we are going to vote on that. Let me assure you, I don't know about the other gentlemen, but from Thunder Creek, I'm proud, happy and I hope you tell all my constituents that I voted for it. All that we have seen from the Department of the Environment in Thunder Creek (oh, we see your field people going out in the areas which you call the Qu'Appelle basin) . . . We see them going out and talking to farmers and throwing their weight around — you can't do that; if you are going to put a building up over here, you get a permit from us; or if you are going to drain this here you are going to talk to us. We have seen your boys come out in Thunder Creek and throw their weight around — we are from the government, we are the big guys. We know all about you in Thunder Creek. So I sincerely hope I can count on you to tell my constituents in Thunder Creek that I voted for \$1.

Frankly, Mr. Minister, your department has been a failure in so many aspects which were described last night and this morning. Very briefly I want to touch you up on another area in which your department has skirted, has ducked away from and has always refused to come to grips with. You're great at throwing your weight around. You're great at setting up red tape entanglements. You have never had the nerve to come to grips with one of the most pressing problems in Saskatchewan, rural Saskatchewan. That's the question of water drainage. You have been afraid to tackle it and there has been no other issue that has put neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, because there is no policy. The government has no policy in this area and it's a tough one. If there's ever an area the Department of the Environment should be taking a very, very close look at to come to grips with, that has got to be it! That's another area on top of the many, many issues that have been talked about today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

MR. THATCHER: — If I may proceed, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I sincerely hope — and

I'm sure the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and many of his constituents north of Regina through the Qu'Appelle River area and the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) — you will go to great lengths and inform their constituents how they are about to vote. I'm quite sure the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) hopes you will go to great lengths to inform his constituents they voted for this. Mr. Minister, make no mistake, if there is a department in this government (and there are many) if there is a department that is inadequate, poorly run, poorly managed, doesn't cut the mustard and needs a thorough and complete re-organization of priorities and objectives, it is yours. And with a great deal of pleasure, you better believe we'll vote to cut you to a buck.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Just before we take the vote, Mr. Chairman, I want to say the members can crawlfish all they want on the technical wording of the motion, but the effect of the motion is that it does away with the administration of the department and therefore, verily does away with the department. If you do away with the department, I tell you, the subvotes go with it. I'll tell you, you go out and explain that. You go and explain it to your people in the Souris and I will be sure to be in Estevan to tell the folks how their member voted on their behalf. I will be out in Fort Qu'Appelle to tell the Qu'Appelle Valley Development Association how their member voted with respect to that. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think it's time for us to get on with the vote in order that these members indeed, can show their hand to the public of Saskatchewan.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 16

Larter	Birkbeck	Garner
Berntson	Ham	Muirhead
Katzman	Pickering	Rousseau
Swan	McLeod	
Thatcher	Andrew	
Taylor	Duncan	
Lane		

NAYS — 26

Bowerman	MacMurchy	Shillington
Smishek	Mostoway	Cody
Romanow	Banda	Koskie
Snyder	MacAuley	Prebble
Byers	McArthur	Long
Skoberg	Allen	Gross
Kowalchuk	Vickar	Thompson
Matsalla	Rolfes	Engel
Poniatowski	White	

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I have to ask a few questions. The question I want to ask is can you guarantee me that through your officials the environmental staff regularly checks the water supply in my constituency, particularly in respect to the safety for human

consumption . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, there's a man on his feet speaking. Order, order! If you want to make some settlements, do it in a quiet way. We have a member on his feet speaking. Please, we cannot hear him.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, can you guarantee me that through your officials the environmental staff regularly check the water supply in my constituency, particularly in respect to the safety for human consumption from public municipal water supplies?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, I believe I can, Mr. Chairman, because the municipal authorities are required to submit water samples regularly. If they are submitting those water samples regularly, as I think they will be doing, then obviously we will be giving regular examinations to that.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — You're saying, Mr. Minister, then, these tests will guarantee safe water for human consumption in these municipal distribution centres? Is this what you're saying?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — What kind of a test do they do at the municipal centres? Do you know what kind of a test they do?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, I can't give the hon. member the details of the tests but they are the normal water chemistry tests and water analysis tests that are given for standard water analysis for human consumption. So, they are a standard here in Saskatchewan as they are anywhere.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure glad to know he feels that water in my constituency is safe and in some other constituencies and that your department is doing its job because I have some evidence here to say otherwise. Can you explain this to me, Mr. Minister? I've had doubts about the water in my constituency. I have people who won't drink the water. Since I've been critic of environment, I have had people all over Saskatchewan who have contacted me saying they cannot drink the water in their town. Yet, it gets a two week regular check.

What I did, Mr. Minister, was take samples from three towns in Saskatchewan and one city. I submitted the samples to the provincial lab and I sent duplicate samples to an out-of-province lab. That is what upsets me. When the samples come back, all of the samples that come back from the Regina lab are safe; so safe that everyone can drink all they want. Safe! But they're misrepresented. I have a chart here saying what water is to have in it to be safe for human consumption. I am not going to name the names of the towns or the city because it would panic people. It would panic them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now just listen and you will learn something. What my main concern is here is the lives of people. Now just don't forget that, the lives of people! This is very serious. If we're drinking water . . . I am saying that environment has failed to do its job. All that is going on in my constituency, and in the other constituency where I took a sample from a town, is they submit a sample twice monthly. All they do is a bacterial test. That's all they do. They said the rest of the responsibility for any town with more than 4,000 gallons of water used daily is the Department of the Environment's responsibility.

I am going to read out the one town where the doctor is so upset that he has been telling people who have been on salt free diets for years, that three glasses of this water a day

is worse than shaking the salt shaker all day.

Now, the sulphates in this one town are 980 milligrams per litre. Sulphates — as indicated on the chart which I received from the public lab — up to 400 are a satisfactory quality; poor quality, 400 to 800; not recommended for consumption, 800 to 1,200.

We have one city here that is just on the line of being safe, the sulphates are 200; conductivity, 875 — just on the line. This is milligrams per litres of sodium; the water is just barely safe to drink, just on the line. What do you think the people in my town, who, in seven years, have never had anybody from the Department of the Environment pick up a full quart of water to have a full analysis done? What do you think they think when sulphates are 980; conductivity, 2,350 and sodium, 150? The nitrates are high and not fit for human consumption. We can't even tell the people this; they would panic. What are we going to do about this, Mr. Minister? What can we do? I don't want to panic the people of Saskatchewan about this water. But if one town out of the three towns I tested came back not fit for human consumption, I say there's maybe 300. Someone has failed because I phoned every department that I possibly could and I just got the run around — well it's this man's job; it's that man's job. I found out that it's nobody's job.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Shame!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes, it is a shame. I just don't have the answers for this. I will not give out the names of these towns and cities because there are further tests going on.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Because you don't have them!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I have them all right . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well they are already tabled because they came from his office. You already have the results. I will just read you where the results came from. I'm going to read this. It came from your office. But I don't want to panic the individual towns. The one doctor said, we cannot get this out in this town or we would be in trouble. Now just listen! This is the one which went to an out-of-province lab — submitted by Gerald Muirhead, Craik, Saskatchewan, results mailed to R. MacDonald, director with the Pollution Branch, Saskatchewan Environment, 1855 Victoria Avenue, Regina, Saskatchewan and that's where I picked these results up from.

MRS. DUNCAN: — An error in judgment and he didn't let you know.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — He didn't even tell you about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you know about it Ted?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, he figured the press would find out for him.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — The same ones here — these are the samples back from the Regina lab.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Gerry, the minister thinks it's a joke.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I know he thinks it's a joke, but I tell you, when it comes to drinking water in this province it's no joke. That's just about the case in some of these cities. That's why so many people drink beer, I guess.

What are you going to do about this?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The standard water quality is stated as 1,500 parts per million of total dissolved solids. I know the member is reading off various contributing parts to that standard, but that's what it is, that's what we go by, and I don't know what specific town the member may be referring to. I'm prepared to look at it if he wants to talk to me about it. I'm prepared to look at it and see what we can do.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Chairman, I think it is a well-known fact that Saskatchewan and Alberta at the present time are probably the focal points of any possible environmental problems which could take place in the next few years because of the extensive development which has taken place, not only in the tar sands, but in heavy oil, in potash and more recently in uranium.

The United Nations has developed a unification of codes. The member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), mentioned this afternoon they have developed a unification of codes to identify PCB threats as far as railroad cars are concerned. The minister laughed this morning when I brought up the possible railroad accident at Foam Lake. Mr. Minister, I would like to tell you that if these cars, when there is an accident, were properly identified according to the codes of the United Nations, the fire departments in the various communities would have a catalogue and would be able to determine, through a phone call to Ottawa (which is on a 24-hour standby) and they in turn, if they couldn't solve it, would put them in direct connection with the manufacturer of the product that is in that boxcar. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) mentioned there was a train wreck in his town and the firemen and other people were roving around that area where that spill was. They didn't know what the spill was. It was mentioned that the engineers were supposed to know what those cars contained but they had to go to Moose Jaw to find out what was in those tank cars. They didn't find out for 45 minutes. I would like to tell you also that if these were identified according to the United Nations plan on identifying such things, they would be in eight categories. They would be listed. Number one category, for instance, would be explosives (there might be eight categories of explosives under there) but your catalogue would tell you this and your fire departments in each area would know exactly what to do.

You have indicated this morning that it was none of your responsibility for boxcars that are passing through these communities. I say it is your responsibility to educate the people responsible for such spills in this province. If you're going to laugh at that, I can tell you, as I said this morning, you are behind all the provinces in going after the United Nations code. As a matter of fact, I think you send people to Alberta to train them in what is happening along this United Nations way. Alberta, I think, is one of the leading provinces in going into this United Nations set-up so they can identify these problems.

I can tell you, there have been a lot of young people killed in the Estevan area through going into treater plants and being gassed. If you were doing your job properly, these treater plants would be identified and you would be able to make a test before you ever entered that door. The minister is shaking his head again. This isn't your responsibility either, is that correct?

You have a responsibility to take towards training these people in Saskatchewan. Instead you are, I think, regressing as far as your duties are concerned. I think further indications of what the Government of Saskatchewan is doing, the department of the EMO (Emergency Measures Office) was reduced in strength two years ago. Again I

think that gives you an idea of what they think of any possible emergencies or environmental problems that are coming for the future.

If ever we needed to be conscious of the environment, it is right now with the developing of uranium. As we have said many, many times, we don't feel the Government of Saskatchewan should be monitoring this. I think you have proven beyond a doubt to the people of Saskatchewan (I think you tried to prove it last night) that you were defending your department. You had absolutely zero to go on and tried to make the people of Saskatchewan believe that truly everything is fine within your department. I say to you, Mr. Minister, you are not only not taking leadership in this province in showing the people of Saskatchewan that you really can handle the future of uranium, but I say that everything you do proves you can't handle uranium as it is being developed.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, the member makes a good point with regard to the United Nations code of classifications, if that's what he calls them. He says that we should implement that in Saskatchewan but I know that if he will just stop and think about that — what does it mean?

Does it mean that when a train leaves Ontario, the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to notify the Department of the Environment of what's in those cars? Is that what they're supposed to do? As it goes across Canada to Vancouver, he obviously is suggesting that each place, each province they go through, and each town needs to be notified as to what's on the train.

All I'm saying is, if you'll just think about it for a minute, Mr. Member, you will come to the conclusion that the responsibility rests on the national government in interprovincial transportation network. It has always been the case and will continue to be so.

Now with regard to the reference to the young men in the Estevan area being gassed, or whatever, in certain plants. I tell you that's not the responsibility of the Department of the Environment; it is health and safety in the Department of Labour. They have a branch there which deals with that. Therefore, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the member comes to the understanding of how government in fact works.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment. The minister still skirts around the issue of it being a provincial responsibility. I say it's a federal and a provincial responsibility. If a tank car is flagged with the same unification as the United Nations has for identifying deals, perhaps it's a sticker that goes on when the car leaves, you will know what's in that car when it's coming across Saskatchewan. I am not asking you to put the identification on that car. When it leaves the supplier it has to be on there.

But your fire departments in this province don't even know what those . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who put the sticker on?

MR. LARTER: — You can make it your business . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . All right! Work with the Government of Canada and make sure it is your business! Show a little leadership!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Straighten out your mind!

MR. LARTER: — You show a little leadership and do the same thing in Saskatchewan as

they're doing in the United Nations. Just get with it, that's all!

Mr. Minister, I say that you are shirking your responsibility when you say that it's the responsibility of the federal government. That's just like saying when 20 people get killed up in Foam Lake or the whole town gets wiped out, that's not our responsibility. What a stupid statement to make!

Work towards the identifying of dangerous things like this in Canada, particularly in this province. Somehow a little leadership, maybe the rest of Canada will follow. Maybe Trudeau won't, but Clark will in a few weeks here.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, I just have one more remark on this water. I was asked to table all this information. I just want to ask the minister, in view of the lives of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, if I come to you, can we talk this over in confidence and work together on these water tests? I'm interested in it. I'm sure you are too, and will you talk this over with me? I'll show you what I've got; I've got further tests going on and maybe we can work out something that's better for the people of Saskatchewan. That's all I ask.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if the member didn't hear my comments after his first remarks. I invited him to bring that confidential information to me and we'll work it out.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Sorry, I didn't get that and that's what I wanted. We've talked too much about PCBs. I had a whole bunch of PCB questions I was going to ask, but we're going to get off that and I've just one question I would like to ask. What are your plans for the removal of the PCBs at Federal Pioneer, if any? What are your plans?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The National Research Council is now doing its studies as to how and what the nature of the displacement will be. Until that report is received from the National Research Council, I am unable to answer the member's question.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, you have indicated that there's PCBs perhaps all through our areas now that we're not aware of. How can I assure the people in my constituency where these are? Where can I get this help from? Who will show me where we have booster transformers and what not just so we can make the people aware? We did have one accident in the Craik area from out in a field, several years ago. It was brought to my attention by the power man. He knew it was a dangerous situation — a transformer blew up, not in a farm yard but a booster one. It wasn't on my farm, but a neighboring farm and it was all hushed up. Saskatchewan Power brought a truck in and they chopped the poles all up and they took the clothes away from the people and hauled it all away. It went to New York then; but now it can't go to New York anymore. What would be your answer, if this happened tomorrow? What would you do? If a transformer blows up tomorrow, what do we do when we can't get across the line with it?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a very complicated subject, but Saskatchewan Power do have containers and storage facilities where they take this spill and the material that has been contaminated by the spill, until we find a suitable disposal place somewhere in North America that can take care of this. Let me suggest to the member that one of the situations they are finding in central Canada and to the bordering states south of there is that in the disposal of PCB material up to now: if it is not raised to the heat which completely destroys it, what it does and has done, is gone

into the atmosphere and returns back to the water and the ground in terms of chemical rain or in that respect. There's a great amount of this in eastern Canada. Now, it's not a simple subject. It's not as simple as one might think to just clean it up and put it away and store it and dispose of it or burn it up if you will. But there has to be some work done with respect to what the disposition will be or the disposal system will be. The correct answer to your question is Saskatchewan Power has a contingency plan until such time as there is a suitable site located for the disposal of these wastes.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — On one question from my municipality. If they request in their municipality any place that there are PCBs is there someone that will tell them this now?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, with regard to the SPC stuff, that's right. I'm going to send the member a list of the things that contain chlorophenyls and maybe he will be surprised to know that toilet paper is one of them. I don't know what he is going to do about that. I don't know what he wants me to do about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, it's a serious problem, but what is he suggesting? I'm going to send the member a list of all of the items in which there are chlorophenyls. I say on his farm, some of the hydraulic pumps that he has on his machinery may well include that.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Then, what about this law that was passed on the 1 of January that there would be no more items made with PCBs? Is there going to be any more toilet paper made with it or not?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Since the law has come into effect, Mr. Chairman, the companies and those people who used that material are gradually getting away from it, so it will not be contained in those anymore. But, in fact, those that have been constructed and are in place now have to be a part of the system.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I have one more question but I have to look it up here. Just one moment.

MR. LARTER: — Can the minister tell me if the environment department is doing anything about going into the training of fire departments or offering courses to train them in this United Nations' system of identifying dangerous conditions with tank cars?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, the Department of Labour and the Department of the Environment are putting together a training program for firemen.

MR. LARTER: — Can the minister tell me, does his department agree that with this United Nations' plan they could identify these dangerous situations all across Canada?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Surely, Mr. Chairman, anything that will help any department of the environment in any province in Canada, including Environment Canada, is a good thing. Why would I object to it?

MR. LARTER: — Do you at the present time, Mr. Minister, send any of the Department of Environment people to Alberta for training?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, we likely have in a limited way. I could probably get the information but I don't have it in detail.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — This is my last question on item 1. It takes us back to a question I asked in this House quite a while ago. Everybody has done quite a bit of laughing (and

so did the railroad man from over here) that I said water runs uphill. I just want to go through this question; perhaps I didn't phrase it right but I want to read the question very carefully. If you are going to get it to sink in, you'll have to listen very carefully. I'm going to read it because I want this question still answered. Before I ask it, is the Minister of the Environment familiar with the problem from Diefenbaker Lake to Buffalo Pound, with all the cattle involved in that valley, having people out from your department spending thousands of dollars, moving cattle and ranches out of this valley on account of the run-off into this open channel? Do you understand this or do I have to explain it more, Mr. Minister?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Move along; just keep going.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — O.K. This has been a problem right in my area (now I'm sorry if I didn't bring this question right to the floor of the House but I still want it answered) . . .

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:17 p.m.