

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 23, 1980

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Security of Members' Offices

MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, my question would be to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you tell me who is responsible for the security of members' offices in this building?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is the security would be, in part, in the hands of the Minister of Government Services; and in part, in the hands of Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure of the appropriate distribution of responsibility.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, a week ago this Friday, the member for Arm River reported a missing file to the Speaker. The Speaker indicated that he'd have to let the Minister of Government Services know on Tuesday. Just what action has taken place to retrieve this file in the intervening week?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Regina City Police have been called upon to investigate this matter. I'm not fully informed on it, but this is my understanding and doubtless they are taking all steps which they deem appropriate.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary. Mr. Premier, I think you would agree that a file missing from a members' office is a very serious matter. I understand that in many other legislatures throughout Canada the security is under the office of the Speaker. Would you agree that such a move would be an improvement to the situation here in Saskatchewan, if security of this building and the members' offices were put under the jurisdiction of the Speaker?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have not heard the arguments which would suggest that it would be either an improvement or not an improvement. I don't know what Mr. Speaker could have done other than that which has already been done. If hon. members allege that material is missing from their offices, it's not clear to me, I will confess, what Mr. Speaker or anyone else can do other than ask the police to investigate.

Delay re Investigation of Missing File

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I think the Premier understands the seriousness of the matter. The member did take it to Mr. Speaker last Friday, and because of doubt as to jurisdiction he seemingly had no response from the Minister of Government Services till I believe yesterday, which is a rather lengthy delay and perhaps indicates that the government didn't take the matter seriously. Now would the Premier kindly indicate why it took so long to respond to the member when he presented it to Mr. Speaker last Friday?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the hon. member's alleged facts,

and I will ask the Minister of Government Services to respond.

HON. G. T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I think you said initially that the member for Arm River conveyed to Mr. Speaker that a file was missing from his office, and subsequently (I'm not entirely sure of the exact date) the Speaker sent me a memo indicating it had been alleged that a file had been stolen. I agreed at that time the security people should be brought in and that an investigation should be proceeded with. As far as I am aware there was no particular time lapse between the period of time the report was received of the alleged incident, and the period of time that it took for the security people to begin their investigation. I am not aware that there was any great passage of time prior to that happening.

MR. LANE: — Well, to the minister. Do you mind giving to the opposition, a copy of the memo you received from the Speaker as to the date?

MR. SNYDER: — I'm not at all sure it's relevant to this set of circumstances. I think it's an internal document the Speaker forwarded to me. I trust the member will take my word for the fact that the Speaker was in touch with me and I assured him that I thought the appropriate manner was to proceed by getting the security people to conduct a full investigation. I don't believe internal memos between different members of the Assembly necessarily need to be part of the procedure here. I'm not sure there's anything particularly wrong with it but I'm not sure that my word that the security people would be brought into the picture needs to be questioned because that in effect is what has happened.

MR. LANE: — A question to the minister. It's not that you weren't advised. We assume that, and we assume that action has now been taken. I think the minister will agree that the time delay is very crucial in any investigation of a criminal offence. Why I asked for that memo was because of the time delay. Now, what I'm suggesting to you is that there was an undue delay, one that was not justified. That matter in fact should have been given to you last Friday. Action should have been taken a week ago rather than, I believe, yesterday or the day before.

MR. SNYDER: — I sometimes question whether the anxiety of the hon. member is for publicity purposes or whether it's to recover a file.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order. Order! I wonder if the members of the Chamber can observe order. Order. I wonder if the members can show the traditional respect for the Chair that is accorded in other legislative Chambers and has been in this one in the past. When the Speaker rises the members should come to order, if they are not in order. The Minister of Labour.

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Chairman, the question that arises in my mind has to be the sincerity and the genuine anxiety of the member for Arm River in recovering his file. If I had had a red . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Could the member for Qu'Appelle sit down.

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, if I had a red bicycle stolen, I would not be getting on television to notify the world that it had been stolen, because I would assume that the person who stole my red bicycle would probably secret it away and let it be known to no one else if he knew a full investigation were taking place. I question the anxiety of the hon. member for Arm River in the return of his file, and I question somehow whether or

not one of his colleagues may somehow or another have placed his manila file on top of that of the hon. member and it will be received at some other point.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. Order! I'm warning the member for Qu'Appelle for the last time that he is out of order and can be removed from the Chamber for that reason. I'll take the next question. Order. Will the members give me an opportunity to keep order in the Chamber? I said I would take the next question. I'll recognize the member for Rosthern.

Problems re Water Supply Line

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for the water supply board, Mr. Bowerman (so I get the right minister). Mr. Minister, the towns on the water supply line right now are in dire straits. The town of Dalmeny's school is closed. All the towns on the water line have had to stop watering their lawns and so forth, and there is a possibility that other schools will have to close. I am informed that your department did not even notify the right people in the city of Saskatoon about the problem of lack of supply. What is your department doing about the dire needs of these 4,000 people?

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board, has a contract with the city of Saskatoon for water which they subsequently supply to the towns north of Saskatoon. I have been on the phone this morning to the officials of the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board who have been negotiating this situation and who have been dealing with it as best they can. They are on their way to Saskatoon at the moment to discuss this matter with the city of Saskatoon and to see whether or not more water will be available to the north water supply line.

I was also on the phone to the Mayor of Dalmeny to discuss the matter with him this morning. Mr. Speaker, there are some problems with water in towns and villages and in the cities of the province because of this severe weather situation we are now having. I think it may not be so much of a problem of water quantity or the availability of water per se, but rather because of the demand and all taps or many of the taps being open, the water pressure obviously is reduced to all users. And Dalmeny, particularly because it is on the end of the water supply line, is most like to be adversely affected. But if the situation continues, the officials tell me this morning that they are considering purchasing a pressure system to add to the line so that the pressure along the line might be improved.

I don't whether that will be done in a day or two, but if the situation continues, I'm sure that they will be prepared to address the problem.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. The city of Saskatoon's contract is for 690 gallons per minute. The most your system can handle is 340 at the present time. The problem is in your system, Mr. Minister. Now the question, Mr. Minister, is: why did your people take two weeks to get to the city of Saskatoon to tell them about the problems they were having and why did an alderman from Saskatoon have to bring it to the city officials and not your officials?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosthern alleges or seems to allege that he has a great deal more information than is available to me and to the corporation which supplies the water. I'm not so sure all the alleged facts which he

states this morning are correct. His information may be slightly wanting because of the real facts related to the case. I'm not prepared to debate or argue with the hon. member at this point in time. I did say, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation officials are on their way to Saskatoon to deal with the problems associated with what is, I believe, a pressure problem at Dalmeny. And if it is necessary the corporation will be adding to the line an additional pressure system in order to alleviate the situation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, why did the city have to call your department to cure the problem, instead of you, who are having the problem, going to the city for a cure? Why did Mr. Beveridge have to demand your people to come in to find a solution to the problem? Why wasn't your department, which is responsible, trying to find a solution to the situation?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I'm neither aware nor am I sure that it was as the hon. member suggests. I would personally question whether or not all the facts, alleged facts, that the hon. member presents to the Assembly this morning are the facts in the case relevant to the water supply system at Dalmeny and other towns along the line.

Lack of National Pride

MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier are you aware of the Conference of Canada Board report which stated that Canadian consumers have never been so pessimistic about the near term prospects since the survey measuring consumer confidence began in 1960. Do you agree that this attitude is prevalent and do you believe it results partly from the lack of national pride in our system?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I saw the report in the media about the Conference Board of Canada assessment of whether or not the public in Canada were confident about the economic future. I noted with some concern, a good deal of concern, the fact there was a considerable misgiving about the economic prospects. I believe it is partly because we do not have a high level of national pride. I believe it is more because Canadians generally believe our economy is closely tied to that of the United States. They see, in the United States, a gathering recession and they believe we will not be able to avoid that gathering recession because we do not have a sufficient measure of economic independence.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I presume the Premier is admitting that our economy is tied glove in hand with that of the United States. To quote you on your recent trip to central Canada, you said:

I admit that we are in so deep now that becoming masters in our own house will be difficult;
it will be difficult but far from impossible.

How do you expect, Mr. Premier, the people of Canada to buy back their economy?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously a large subject for the question period. I would expect that we would start by taking a major position of Canadian ownership in growth industries, particularly resource industries. I would expect that basically most of the future development in resource industries such as oil, natural gas, coal, uranium, potash might well be done by firms with Canadian ownership. They need not be public ownership. It can be joint ventures; it can be private ownership. But I

would hope that Canadians would take unto themselves this measure of control of their own destiny. And as these growth sectors expanded and became a greater part of our economy, we would ipso facto be greater owners of our economy. I would see this having spinoff effects in many secondary industries and, in this way, see Canadians getting a much greater share of the control of the economy which, as the hon. member so clearly points out, governs not only our lives but our perception of the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAM: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, first of all, in as little detail as possible if you might, where do you expect Canadians to find this money and is there enough time?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, I expect Canadians to find the money in essentially the same places the money is now found. Basically the money which is being spent to expand resource extraction in Canada very largely comes from credits raised in Canada from money raised through the chartered bank system, money borrowed from insurance companies — moneys already provided by Canadians. Any hon. member will find that the figure is of the order of 80 or 90 per cent. The new investment in Canada comes from Canadian sources.

With respect to the balance, I would suggest that this be obtained on the capital markets in the world, but that it be obtained on the basis of debt capital rather than equity capital and that the equity be retained by Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Irrigation Project on Diefenbaker Lake

MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. The Government of Saskatchewan started and indeed constructed an irrigation canal on the west side of Diefenbaker Lake running through the Macrorie district and up near the village of Conquest. Now, this canal cost indeed many millions of dollars to construct. It has been a project which was closed down by your government and has remained in that position for about four years. My question to you is, when will your department move to reopen the irrigation project on the west side of Diefenbaker Lake to try to start, at least, to overcome some of the drought problems in Saskatchewan?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — I indicated to the Assembly in a question earlier in the session that this matter is under consideration by the government. I can't announce a policy at this time.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, you have had a considerable amount of time to make a decision on this one. A high percentage of the people on the west side, who have land available and suitable for irrigation, would like to proceed with the development. They are having to farm around the canal on both sides. It has been quite an inconvenience to them, without having any opportunity for water in the canal. When can we expect an answer?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate to the member that an announcement will be made in due course.

MR. SWAN: — It's fine to say, due course, but can you not be a little bit specific? Will it

be this year? Will it be next year? Will it be five years from now? When can we expect an answer?

Construction of Rafferty Dam

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC. Mr. Minister, the other day I asked you a question about the possibility of building a new power station near Estevan and Hitchcock and the proposed building of a Rafferty Dam. You answered that you hadn't look into this area as far as a new power project is concerned and you also stated that you felt you wanted to move the different power stations around Saskatchewan. I wonder, Mr. Minister, in light of the shortage and what the weather elements can do to this province, if now there isn't a real urgency in having a dam such as Rafferty, and the saving of 650,000 acre-feet of water, especially with the United States government offering to share it? Would you not agree now that this becomes more and more urgent.?

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Perhaps the member is addressing his question to the wrong minister because he is now talking about the benefit of a dam, not in generating power but in providing a source of water. I don't deny that such a project may well have some benefits for the people of Saskatchewan but the project is not without disruption, and I conveyed that to the member when he asked the question in this House several days ago. There are significant lands which would be lost; significant volumes of water which would be involved, and certainly arrangements that would have to be worked out with a number of residents of Saskatchewan. There would also have to be an agreement with the Government of Canada, the province of Saskatchewan, the Government of the United States, and the states of Montana or North Dakota.

Even though there are some merits in looking at this, the evidence we have to date does not indicate that such a project would be in the best interests of the consumers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and that the benefits the member alludes to go beyond that. There would have to be other parties involved in a much greater way and to a much greater extent than has been evidenced to us at this point in time.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you have stated that with the other one or two proposed power units coming on stream, and with the possibility of one at Nipawin, and the use of grids tying in the provinces and United States, we may have power to the late 1980s. Would you not think an eight-year lead time is plenty, particularly when this dam could do as much good as anything you would build in the future (and I'm talking about the future water supply for Regina)? It's an unlimited water supply. Do you not think that you and the Minister of the Environment should meet with responsible people and discuss this plan?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I have already agreed that there could be certain benefits to Saskatchewan people if such a dam was constructed. The magnitude of this dam is immense, and I believe the member realizes that and he shouldn't treat it lightly. We're not talking about a small project; we are talking about a very significant project, similar to what was carried out with the Diefenbaker Lake activities. At this point in time we have discussed and we continue to have dialogue and communication with other parties who are either advocates of the dam, or are somewhat concerned about the implications of the dam. So it is not to be interpreted that we are aware of this project and have shelved it and are not giving ongoing consideration to it. It is a matter that is part of the (as far as SPC is concerned) options available to it for the generation of

power. I am sure also it is kept in mind that there are certain benefits it could offer to Saskatchewan citizens if it were to proceed, but at this point in time the parties involved do not see it as a project that could be escalated to a level of decision in the very near future.

MR. LARTER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the Souris River study really has shown the people of Saskatchewan nothing beyond the city of Weyburn. Do you not feel (and I realize it is a project of huge magnitude) that the tentative interest of the United States government (not only the federal government, but the government of North Dakota) in sharing in such a project in order that they won't have to build a dam at Burlington, is really an urgent matter now? We can use some American dollars in this project as well.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's final supplementary question, I guess there would be some difference of agreement as to the level of interest that is being conveyed by the United States government and/or by the persons of North Dakota. Certainly there have been some broad general statements made in the past but I have no evidence (and I am certain my officials have no evidence) that there is any real commitment to providing upfront moneys to carry on researching and other developments that would have to be made before we could make the decision. There is just the general observation from a community of people and general reference from government officials that there may be merits in so proceeding, but when we want to talk about any kind of specifics or cost sharing there has never been any such interest indicated to us.

Blended-Price-For-Oil

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. The current rounds of oil price negotiations are quickly coming to the July 1 deadline for the existing agreement. The minister has advised this Assembly (I believe last week) that ongoing negotiations on the proposed blend-price-for-oil formula was presently going on between members of his staff and members of energy, mines and resources. Can the minister advise this Assembly as to the progress of those negotiations and advise the people of Saskatchewan as to any clear meaning of what we are looking at in terms of blended price?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I conveyed to the member when he asked the question last week that the two meetings between myself and other provincial ministers of energy and resources were not really a level of discussion or meeting that could be termed negotiation. It was more fact finding. The federal minister was again providing us with some greater insight and information about adjustments he wanted to make in energy pricing and development in Saskatchewan. We certainly had (I guess) an opportunity to provide him with some greater detail as to how we would like to see the development of things as far as Saskatchewan is concerned.

We left that meeting hoping to have early meetings with officials at both the federal and provincial level so we could better understand just what he was talking about when we talked about blended price. We are awaiting an invitation from the federal authorities indicating that they have information to at least a level that would warrant discussions among provincial officials. I have not at this point in time received any such communique from the federal officials that they are ready to talk about that.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was Premier Buchanan

yesterday who indicated that the position of the federal government was to reduce the subsidy to the Atlantic provinces held out to them during the last election campaign. His indication was that that was in support of a blended price. Now it strikes me that Mr. Buchanan is in effect saying that the blended price is going to do this or this, and you're simply saying we're not even into the stage of negotiations yet. Now, have your negotiations come to the discussion of the continued subsidy to the eastern provinces?

MR. MESSER: — No, Mr. Speaker, they have not.

MR. ANDREW: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in view of the fact these negotiations have a time frame of July 1, do you see and does your government see these rounds of negotiations with regard to the oil pricing as a prerequisite to firm negotiations with regard to constitutional reforms, as the Premier of Alberta has advanced?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the member continues to relate to a time frame of July 1. I assume that things are not going to come to an end if the negotiations have not reached a satisfactory level of agreement by July 1. The federal government has indicated that it would very much like to have the pricing of oil and the related energy prepackages resolved by July 1. Minister Lalonde when he was questioned on that recently said there's nothing magic or committed about it. He's concerned about time frames knowing that when we discuss issues of the magnitude of energy pricing in Canada, it's unlikely that we can meet time frames; but, nevertheless, we are mindful of them. So I just want to remind the member that even though I would like to see an early settlement, one shouldn't assume that a settlement has to be reached by July 1. In response to the latter part of his question, I think it's unlikely that we're going to be able to resolve either the constitutional matters or the matters of energy development in Canada unless the two are related.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave of the House I might have the right to introduce a group of students who arrived after the proper time to introduce them? Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. With leave, I would like to introduce a group of 37 students from the centre of the constituency I represent, Kelsey-Tisdale. They are from the community of Porcupine Plain. They are Grade 8 students, 37 in number. They are accompanied by a couple of their teachers, Mr. Sweeney and Mr. Johnston and by their bus driver. I know that all members will want to recognize their presence here in Regina. I know also that they will want to wish them well, and hope that they have learned something from the process of the question period this morning. I hope their teacher does not have to be as forceful on some occasions as you do, Mr. Speaker, in order to attain a level of decorum here. I know that it is an experience for them and I welcome them here, wish them an enjoyable time in Regina, a safe journey home, and I hope all members will join with me.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Meeting re Saskatchewan Drought Situation

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, members will be aware

that representatives of Saskatchewan farm organizations met yesterday with the Department of Agriculture officials concerning the drought situation. I report to the hon. members the meeting agreed that the situation is as follows:

1. Pasture is critical throughout the province, and there is very little excess feed for movement among regions (which was not the case, incidentally, three years ago). Farmers are now making do for pasture, in some cases grazing on seeded acreage that is not yet to the stage where plants will be damaged, or they are grazing on hay land. These will last probably until about mid June, or perhaps even as late as the end of June.
2. If there is rain by that time some of the hay land may still produce one cut for use next winter. If there is no rain cattle will have to be fed straw and feed grain which will deplete all reserves. Dairy farmers are already using up feed reserves and are running out very quickly.
3. While there is herd trimming going on now, it is felt by the representatives of farm organizations that producers will try to carry and likely be able to carry their core herds through until next fall but will not be able to manage on current stocks.
4. The critical issue will be to have enough feed available to allow producers to winter their herds with reserves gone and no summer hay crops.

Mr. Speaker, members are aware that the deputy ministers of agriculture from the four western provinces (and this gives, I think, members some idea of how widespread this drought is; it involves the three prairie provinces and moves into the Peace River country and the Kootenays of British Columbia) and the federal government at a meeting in Ottawa last week agreed to share in principle the costs of a drought-relief program on a 50-50 basis. Some elements of the 1977 program will be incorporated, but obviously there will be revisions, because as I indicated earlier, the problem is different.

For instance, in 1977 the water table was very low causing water shortages. So far this year the water table is holding up. Farm to farm fodder transportation was a big component of the 1977 program; that's not possible this year. There's little excess feed in any one area of the province, in fact, in any one area of western Canada.

I am pleased to report to members that on the basis of yesterday's discussions the province will be putting forward and undertaking the following:

1. The purchase of alfalfa pellets from Saskatchewan plants that are excess to export commitments and storage and resale of such pellets at cost, in particular to meet the needs of the dairy farmers. It is estimated that we will be able to obtain about 20,000 tonnes;
2. Pursuing with Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the possibility of back hauling hay on their cattle liners moving cattle to Ontario;
3. Pursuing with the federal government and the Canadian Wheat Board the possibility of retaining enough stocks of barley in Saskatchewan to meet provincial needs. The federal government would be requested to treat the western livestock producer the same way as eastern livestock producers are treated under the domestic feed grain policy — that is guaranteed supplies to meet domestic needs. The Canadian Wheat Board will be requested to commit no further feed grain sales on the export market until

the impact of the drought is known. The federal government will be asked to direct the grain transportation authority to halt the allocation of cars to the movement of non-board feed grains from the Prairies for a period of two weeks.

Adequate stocks of feed grain are now in place in eastern Canada and Thunder Bay, and United States corn is available as a ready substitute in eastern Canada. This action will allow for a closer examination of stocks in western Canada and would be reviewed every two weeks if the drought continues;

4. Pursuing with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool the possibility of returning pelletized screenings from Thunder Bay or Vancouver that are excess to export commitments;

5. Use of provincial land belonging to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources that has been set aside as wildlife reserves. Some of this land may be used for grazing and depending on its condition, for hay. We will also pursue the availability of Canadian Wildlife Federation lands;

6. Assistance for transportation of cattle to these tourism and wildlife reserves;

7. Immediate implementation of a fodder and feed grain listing service. We will also be asking farmers to list seed oats so that any available supplies may be used for seeding in late June or up to mid-July if it does rain, to provide for green feed;

8. Assistance to farmers for developing wells, including deep wells;

9. Assistance for dugout pumping where it's possible;

10. Assistance with the development of municipal wells;

Mr. Speaker, details of the urban package are in the process of being put together and will be announced by my colleague, the member for Regina North-East, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban), early next week.

The province will be requesting federal cost sharing of the entire package. If all parts of the package have to be implemented, we can expect the cost to be in the order of at least \$15 million and could climb to \$20 million. The provincial implementation committee has been established consisting of Mr. Phil Polischuk of the Department of Agriculture, Brian Woodcock of the Department of Municipal Affairs (Urban), Mike Czornobay of the Department of Municipal Affairs (Rural), David MacLeod, of the Department of the Environment, and Stu Kramer of the Department of Finance.

Members, farmers and urban municipalities may wish to contact this committee for further details of the program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister wasn't telling us in his remarks that this program hinged on federal funding. I hope that this is a commitment to the farmers of Saskatchewan whether or not you're able to get the funding from the feds.

By and large, we agree with everything the minister has put forward. As a matter of fact I

think fully seven of the 10 points set out came from this side of the House. The only thing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Premier chuckles but if he would check the record, I'm sure he'd find that is true.

I don't agree with the situation as you have set it out here. I think the situation is much more serious. It does need immediate attention. It is important that this is a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan and is not contingent upon federal funding, although we welcome the federal funding and hope you're able to get it.

A couple of points that you didn't cover in this ministerial statement, and I'm sure that the minister is not suggesting that it's not an important and serious problem. In other jurisdictions, I think specifically of Manitoba, the degree of importance and urgency that's attached to their program is indicated by the fact their Premier is chairman of the emergency drought committee providing similar measures to those the minister has just talked about.

I didn't hear any mention, as a matter of fact during question period I heard just the opposite, of any irrigation diversion assistance. The minister knows full well that we have half-a-million irrigable acres in Saskatchewan. We haven't scratched the surface as it relates to irrigation. If that program had been followed through, our feed problems wouldn't exist.

The minister didn't mention anything about encouraging the cleaning of grain here on the Prairies to export, which would save lots of transportation costs. It's great that pelletized screenings be hauled back from Sudbury and the coast, but there would be some considerable saving cleaning it right here on the Prairies. In many of the high through-put elevators the cleaning facilities are available. It's just a matter of running it through the cleaner and into the car. It is really quite a simple operation.

The third point I would like to make is you have said in your ministerial statement that members may wish to contact the committee for details of the program. I would urge the minister to publish the details of the program. People are out there now crying for some assistance to dig wells. They don't know whom to talk to. They don't know where the assistance is coming from. I would urge the minister to publish the details of the program so that the assistance is readily available to those who need it.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would congratulate the minister on this presentation. I think it is an excellent one. Whether he thought it up himself or got it from the opposition makes no difference. I congratulate the opposition for urging the government to implement these measures. I have one or two suggestions.

I think the member for Souris-Cannington makes a very valid point in terms of the cleaning of grain here. And certainly some of it could add to the existence of available feed for cattle. If the minister would contact some of the high through-put elevators, I am sure he would find that those facilities are available and at least that would add to the stocks. It certainly wouldn't solve the problem. But it would add to the stocks and save quite a sum.

The second suggestion I would make to the minister is that his implementation committee, although seemingly complete in terms of the Government of Saskatchewan, does not have leading members of the farm community on it. I would suggest that at least two members of the farm community be added to this list of the

implementation committee so that they can bring as many of the private individuals into this job as we have to, in trying to save the Saskatchewan cattle industry and the Saskatchewan dairy industry.

Point of Privilege

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Before order of the day, I rise on a point of privilege. I raised in the question period what I considered to be a very serious matter, the missing file from the office of the Opposition Whip. In the ensuing questions and supplements, the Minister of Labour or Department of Government Services, by innuendo was questioning the sincerity of the member for Arm River and was accusing the opposition of sensationalism and playing to the press and if he were in the House at this time I would ask him to apologize and withdraw those remarks. But since he's not here, if you see fit, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to review the record and the next time he is in the House ask this minister to apologize and withdraw those statements.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll review the record and see if there is a question of privilege involved.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Government Services indicated that an opposition member perhaps picked up the file, casting the innuendo that the opposition in fact took the file. I would like that matter checked for a matter of privilege and an apology.

MR. SPEAKER: — I heard that quite clearly. That is not what happened; it's in the record and the member can check it for himself. That is not what the minister said. I listened very carefully.

MR. LANE: — I would like to raise another matter of privilege. An article in today's Leader-Post refers to backbenchers; they must find other diversions; one evening not long ago one backbencher rose to give a speech while under the influence of some substance that made him slur his words. When he was finished he was assisted from the Assembly. I want it clear, and I would like Mr. Speaker to make it clear that it was not an opposition backbencher that applied to.

MR. SPEAKER: — That's not the job of the Speaker, and that's not a point of privilege.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT — VOTE 9

Item 1 (continued)

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I understand last night, Mr. Minister, you refused to answer questions regarding the PCB spill because you said the matter was before the courts. Would you kindly advise me which courts this is before and would you give us the court number of the document so that we may check the documents? I would appreciate as well your tabling now a copy of the court records. They are public records.

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, asked which court is the matter before. It's before the Court of Queen's Bench.

MR. LANE: — And what's the court number and which judicial district was it?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I don't have that before me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LANE: — Well, do you not have a copy of the court document?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, we don't have them here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LANE: — Can your officials get them?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I'm not so sure that it's necessary, Mr. Chairman, for us to deliver court documents to the House. The hon. member is perfectly aware or should be at least. That's his background and training; he should know where to get that information.

MR. LANE: — As a matter of fact I don't know where to get the information because you won't tell me which court it's in. There are several different judicial districts in this province, and you can file your court application at any one of them. It's going to mean the opposition has to go around the province to every judicial centre to find out which one you filed it in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It wouldn't surprise me a bit. Now you tell me which judicial district it's filed in and I'll get it, but I think it's a lot easier for your officials — they're public records — to supply us with the documents.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, we'll send one of the officials to get it by phone, to see whether or not we can get the judicial district.

MR. G. S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Minister, the first question I asked you last night (you probably wondered why I asked it) was, who is responsible for making up these documents, the estimates? And it bothers me when I look at the figures here, \$8,601,410; that's the total of the estimates you're asking for. What bothers me is that a little over half of that is for wages and salaries, and other expense if \$4,226,740. So we'll be coming to that item by item, and I want to warn you ahead of time that we want to know what every one of these other expenses are.

This is carrying it a little bit too far when the wages of your department are over \$4 million, and the other expenses listed are over \$4 million. So you might as well get hold of whomever you have to and start giving us an itemized list of the \$4 million. Because we want all of it. It comes under other expenses all the way through each item. So we can save time, Mr. Minister, when we come to each item; have it prepared so that (like Eric said last night, the member for Souris-Cannington) we're not here till the cows come home.

We were discussing PCBs last night and drinking water. Mr. Minister, you made an allegation to me; you insinuated that I was wrong, that Don Fast didn't give the order that I could not have drinking water from the Farrell pumping station. You made the insinuation that he had no authority to do so. Now the member is sitting in front of me here who was with me when we were refused water by Don Fast. The member for Regina South was refused water when we also had permission. I want you to call Don Fast to either come here or get an explanation from him immediately while we go ahead. I want an explanation. Ask Don Fast if he did not stop us from getting the water from Farrell pumping station. Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I will not call Mr. Fast and either inquire or make

any other inquiries of him at this point in time. I did indicate last night that we in the Department of the Environment absolutely have no authority to keep people out of the Farrell pumping station or any other property owned by the city of Regina. We have no authority to do so. And we have no authority to prevent anybody from taking a water sample if the city officials say that they can. Now, if there's been some misunderstanding or if there's been some communication which the hon. member alleges is a position taken by Mr. Fast, then we'll take it as that. But so far as I am concerned, the member, if he wanted to take water samples, would have gone to the city officials and unless there was some issue relative to a contract which we may have had between the National Research Council and the laboratories, we would have no authority to prevent Mr. Muirhead from taking water samples.

There may have been discussions which led the hon. member to conclude that we would prefer that he not take water samples but I say again, there was no authority there to prevent him from doing so.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, that is exactly what I did; I contacted the Regina Water Supply Board or Mr. Mann. He is at the head of the water system in this city and he gave me permission to get water and Don Fast stopped it. Now you're making allegations that this is not fact because you are contradicting yourself by saying that he has no authority to do so. This is making a fool out of us and I want you to straighten it out. I asked you to phone Don Fast to ask him if this was true or not because he's man enough to say that he stepped in. We could not even get one drop of water until Don Fast was there to do it himself. He walked in there, took over, went down and got us the samples himself. And the press will verify it, Mr. Minister, that Don Fast definitely overruled Mr. Mann and overruled the people who were tending at the station because they would not give me water.

Each time I went in there I said I had permission from the city to get water. The reply was, we have an order right here in writing; we must phone Don Fast. Now why do you stubbornly keep on saying that you will not phone Don Fast and verify this? Either do it now or withdraw the statement that you made last night — allegations that my statements were not true. Either do one or the other; call him or withdraw your insinuations against me.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, this seems to be out of the custom but nevertheless I will do so. I have a statement here that was prepared by Mr. Fast; the officials have just provided it to me this morning, dated May 23. I am going to read it. I've not read it previously so I don't know what's in the statement but I'll read it for the benefit of the Assembly. It seems as though the hon. member is having some problem with the answer which I gave him.

Background information on alleged refusal by Fast to Muirhead:

On July 6, 1979, an assistant of Mr. Muirhead appeared at the Farrell pumping station with a jar asking permission to take a water sample for PCB analysis. The station manager refused this since at the time the city had security in place which only allowed certain individuals on the premises. They referred Mr. Muirhead's assistant to the city official, Mr. Bill Mann. He had to give permission before an unauthorized person could take a water sample at the pumping station.

On July 7, Mr. Muirhead phoned the city and talked to a city official. The city

subsequently informed environment Saskatchewan that they told Mr. Muirhead the bottle which his assistant had was not suitable, only very specialized bottles would serve the purpose, and he should contact Mr. Don Fast to obtain such a bottle.

They also indicated to Mr. Muirhead that even if environment Saskatchewan would give them a proper bottle, they still might refuse him because of the confusion which might arise by the collection of one sample. On July 12, Mr. Mann, of the city, phoned Don Fast, of Saskatchewan environment, informing him that Mr. Muirhead was at the station and wanted to collect a sample. They would allow him to take a sample provided he would give him the proper bottle.

On July 12, Mr. Muirhead phone Mr. Fast and requested a bottle for sampling. During the phone conversation Mr. Fast explained the intricacy of the sampling process. He also explained the difficulty the department has in obtaining proven satisfactory analytical services. Mr. Fast told Mr. Muirhead he would give one of our bottles for collection purposes. Mr. Muirhead subsequently wanted to make sure the process followed was reliable. Mr. Fast suggested, why don't you accompany us when we take our samples? This provided to be satisfactory to Mr. Muirhead, and the date of July 16 was set for this to take place. Mr. Muirhead did not request a bottle.

On July 16, Mr. Muirhead and Mr. Rousseau, Kevin Scissons and Don Fast of Saskatchewan environment, carried out sampling and had lengthy discussions on the entire PCB issue. Mr. Fast thought that Messrs. Rousseau and Muirhead were satisfied. The latter did not ask for any bottles or for permission to collect samples at that time. On their request, Don Fast gave them the code number of the sample which they witnessed being collected. The result of this sample was forwarded to the minister and to Mr. Muirhead by letter on October 3.

The facts:

1. When Mr. Muirhead's assistant arrived at this pumping station the city had the security system in place. Only authorized people could enter the premises, and the assistant of Mr. Muirhead was not among them.
2. Fast never told the city, or for that matter, anyone else that they were not allowed to take any samples for the simple reason he doesn't have the authority to do so.
3. Fast did make arrangements with Mr. Muirhead which, according to our information, were to Mr. Muirhead's satisfaction, in order that he could appraise himself of the reliability of the sampling and analysis process related to the PCBs in the city water.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — The statements are exactly factual, but what you're forgetting is that last night you wouldn't admit that. Why didn't you read that last night? And what I have to tear you apart on is that you said Mr. Fast had no authority at all over city water. That's right. Then why, when the city gave me permission to get the water, did we have to sit there and wait until Don Fast came to give us the water samples? Why couldn't they give it to us? But you have to jump one further, because you always try to put words in the

people's mouths, in the mouths of the press, in the mouths of the public, and I'm going to tell you what I explained to you last night. I'll have to go over it again because you people are just a little bit blind and deaf over there.

I agreed when they said we had the improper bottle. I agreed with Mr. Fast; I agreed with Mr. Mann. That's why I went to the federal minister to ask, how do I go about getting bottles because you refused the bottles to me. Why didn't you give them to me then? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh keep quiet, you monkeys in the back there. I'm talking to the minister of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, I enjoy this because that means they are all rattled. They just can't stand a little bit of truth here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. Let's keep rolling along here — the hon. member for Arm River.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, I told you last night that I could not get bottles from the city and I couldn't get them from environment. That is why Mr. Rousseau and I agreed to go with Mr. Fast to see how it's done. They said: you can even put your name on a little tag on that bottle and you'll get the results. Before Mr. Rousseau and I left that building they put in about 30 samples. You were telling the public you took samples in December, you took them in June and you took them in July and April; you were taking them steadily every day, by the hour in there. Sometimes 20 a day were being taken in there. There were so many bottles of samples taken that day you couldn't count them and ours just went down the system. Do you think we were going to be satisfied to just put our name on a bottle? That didn't mean anything. What I wanted was my own test and to send it away myself so I could be satisfied. As critic of the environment I was entitled to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why didn't you get your own bottles?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — And so I did. So I did. This was what I was talking about last night. When I got my own bottles, it was arranged with the press that they would go with me. And they did. I will name the press if you want me to, but it isn't necessary. They know which of them were there. There were four from the press. I phoned Mr. Mann; we had the proper bottles from Cantest lab in Vancouver, arranged by the federal Minister of the Environment. Mr. Mann said: I can't give you the authority until you hear from Don Fast. I phoned Don Fast and he said: I will meet you there at 11 o'clock. Now if this isn't being overruled by environment . . . What kind of tommyrot are we hearing from you people?

We met there at 11 o'clock and sat there until the press was wandering around in circles and getting madder and madder at Don Fast. We all had to leave. We went back at 3 o'clock to get our samples but we could not get them. The authorities who work there would not give them. They wouldn't let one drop of water out of those taps until Don Fast walked down into that basement with us and did it himself like he was the one who was doing it every day. Mr. Mann wasn't there nor were your authorities. The only one there was Don Fast and he was doing it because he showed us the whole set-up and how to do it. He explained each pump and explained where it came from. I asked him why pump no. 2 was shut off and he said: it's not working, pump no. 2 is shut off. Don Fast is an honourable man, I believe. I asked him if he would further explain why pump no. 2 was shut off. He said: we think there is a good chance that the old reservoir at Farrell pumping station is where the PCBs are coming from.

At that very time, I looked out the window in the back door and they were digging. I said:

Mr. Fast may I go and get a pail of dirt so I can send a sample away too? I have the water, can I have a sample of the dirt? He said: absolutely no way. And you sit over there and tell me that the city runs the show over there. Environment runs the show there and they run the show at Federal Pioneer. They sealed the tomb in 1976! Now, that has to be a real joke, boy I'll tell you.

As I finished by the clock here last night I said to you, Mr. Minister, that if I had some PCBs spilled on my farm or if I report there is an oil spill on my farm, you can come along and say: well, I don't know what we should do with it; for now put pavement over it. Then you come back after it's soaked into maybe 50 to 100 feet of dirt and say it's going to cost you a few hundred thousand dollars, Mr. Muirhead, to remove this. Hey, do you think I'm going to pay or sue you? I think Federal Pioneer should be suing you. You shouldn't be suing them. It's all turned around. Ah, laugh you monkeys, laugh! I'll tell you, now just listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order! I think that referring to the hon. members as monkeys is probably a little bit out of order. The hon. member for Arm River.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I'll withdraw. There must be another word for monkeys. I won't worry about it today. I withdraw that.

Mr. Minister, you know right well that environment was involved in August of 1976. You know you ordered (you admitted it last night) the pavement put over the PCBs. You ordered it. They said they could have hauled that little pile of stuff away for \$1,000 to the Regina nuisance ground because there was no law against it at all. There was nothing wrong with PCBs. Of course, we would have agreed. They could have put it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But Federal Pioneer didn't do that, did they? Mr. Minister, Federal Pioneer didn't do that, did they? They could have. They said for \$1,000 they could have loaded up 1,500 gallons. They reported it to labour. As I said last night, Mr. Scattergood was there two days afterwards and the labour minister was involved . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Laugh! Yes, you better be serious, Mr. Minister.

This government, Mr. Chairman, laughs when it comes to PCBs in this province and when it comes to drinking water in this province. They think it's a joke. Now, I'm serious. And if I weren't serious about environment and if I were only making hassles for you, do you think the three bills you put through . . . I have seen three good bills and I said they're good and I admire you for it. But boy, I don't admire you for the way you've handled PCBs in this province of Saskatchewan. He sits there and chuckles and chuckles.

Mr. Chairman, my associate wants to ask a question.

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, a quick question to the minister. I see your official has returned. Could you provide us now with the court number of that particular case?

MR. BOWERMAN: — It's the Court of Queen's Bench, judicial centre of Regina.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No court number?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No. Didn't ask for one.

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — I would like to make a few comments on

three areas. One is the matter of toxic chemicals. The second is the matter of uranium, particularly uranium mill tailings. The third is the question of emissions from heavy oil plants and tar sands plants.

Perhaps to deal with the question of toxic chemicals first, I'd like to open by congratulating the minister for the initiatives that he's taken by way of legislation in this session of the legislature. I think even the members of the opposition admit the initiatives that have been taken are excellent and I think he's to be congratulated on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — I want to say that I put forward these suggestions as the next steps that I think we have to take in the province because we cannot pause and think that what we have done to date is going to be sufficient. There are many new strides that need to be taken. I think the PCB issue demonstrates the need in the province to compile an inventory of all toxic chemicals that are used in Saskatchewan — the amounts that are in circulation, who is controlling them now, and the nature of their toxicity. I think it's extremely important, Mr. Chairman, that this inventory be built up and be completed by the Department of the Environment for immediate use.

I have one point which I would like to make with regard to the PCB spill in particular. Mr. Chairman, although I have discussed it with the department at various times, I have never been fully satisfied that it would not have been possible to dispose of the PCBs in the United States. I realize the volumes of material which would have to be transported are large, but I have watched Ontario and British Columbia both transport significant amounts of PCB material to the United States. While I never think it is particularly desirable for one province or country to get rid of its waste problems somewhere else, since the United States does have the facilities for properly disposing of PCBs and we don't, I have often wondered why we haven't looked more comprehensively than has been done at the possibility of transporting PCBs to the United States. Therefore we would be in a position to get rid of our problem here in Regina much more rapidly than has been the case to date.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Good luck, Peter. They won't listen to you. They will laugh at you too.

MR. PREBBLE: — This is going to be more difficult now since the United States is planning to close its border to PCBs and understandably so. But I am not convinced that arrangements couldn't still be made with the United States to have the most toxic materials transported across the border.

I would like to say with respect to toxic chemicals, as I have mentioned before in the House, the other area which deserves special attention by the Department of the Environment at this time is the farm chemical question. I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time for a royal commission to be initiated into the hazards associated with farm chemical use and into methods and policy changes which could be implemented which would lead to a reduction in the use of farm chemicals in the province.

One of the things which is unfortunate and which we need to deal with quickly is that there has never been a follow-up study, to my knowledge, of the 1977 study by the National Research Council which specifically looked at 2,4-D. It demonstrated that

about 20 per cent of 3,300 farmers and grain elevator operators who were surveyed complained of ill effects from 2,4-D after seasonal spraying. This study illustrates the need for a follow-up study in Saskatchewan to go into the problem in more detail. I think the most appropriate way of doing that would be by way of a royal commission, Mr. Chairman.

The other thing the Department of the Environment should do at this point, realizing now that this is becoming a problem which is of more concern to farmers throughout Saskatchewan, is to get proper base line data linking the use of farm chemicals to possible health effects which we might suspect these chemicals cause.

I think one of the ways of doing that is, when farm chemicals are purchased, to keep a record of the health insurance numbers of the persons purchasing those chemicals. Then in the future we would be able to basically establish a correlation, if one exists, between areas of the province that make heavy use of a particular farm chemical and the diseases most likely identified with that chemical. So if there is a link between the two, we will be able to see it quite clearly. But right now, Mr. Chairman, we don't have the base line data which allows us to be in a position to carry out that kind of correlation. I think something the Department of Environment should look at seriously is requiring that when farm chemicals are purchased, health insurance number records are also noted.

I want to also make a suggestion to the minister with respect to some reorganization within the department, particularly as it relates to co-operation with the Department of Labour and the community health services branch. We basically have three departments in the province, Mr. Chairman, that are particularly looking at health and the environment. The community health services branch has the public health inspectors and other people concerned about public health going around the province. They are basically taking an environmental approach to health, Mr. Chairman. We have the Department of Labour, the occupational health and safety division, dealing with health, safety and the environment as it relates to the work place. Then we have the Department of the Environment basically dealing with the field outside the work place.

Now we can separate that, Mr. Chairman, into neat little categories in terms of administration. But the fact of the matter is the work of these three departments is very much interrelated. I think, while there are some attempts at co-operation which are worthy of merit, there is a lot more which needs to be done in terms of making sure that these three departments are operating from a common information base, a common data base. In fact, Mr. Chairman, there might be merit in the future to look at the possibility of combining these three functions into one department. I would urge the minister to give that some consideration.

I would just like to make a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the proposed uranium refinery in Saskatoon. This, of course, has been the subject of federal hearings. The federal review panel is expected to report shortly. In the event the federal environmental review assessment panel recommends in favour of the refinery, I want to urge the minister to come forward with a statement that the province of Saskatchewan will reject the Warman area as the location for a uranium refinery in the province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hearings have clearly brought out the fact that quite apart from the broader issues associated with nuclear development (which I am of

course opposed to), there are some very good reasons for not locating the refinery near Saskatoon. One is the obvious conflict with the work of the Meewasin Valley Authority. The refinery would be located half a kilometre from a proposed major recreational development, with 130-foot high smoke stacks, Mr. Chairman, next to where people are supposed to be camping and cross-country skiing.

I think also, Mr. Chairman that the opposition, which has been demonstrated in the local area, is more than overwhelming. The large, large majority of farmers around the proposed site have indicated by way of petition that they oppose the location of the refinery. I might also mention that one of my concerns, which has received little attention so far in the public discussion, is that it would be only one of seven uranium refineries in the world and obviously has the potential to become a rather strategic military target. I think that is not something which is in the best interests of the people of Saskatoon.

I might also say that I would urge the Department of the Environment and the minister to look more critically at the Eldorado record as it relates to uranium refining. I think that record clearly shows that even if we were to have a uranium refinery in Saskatchewan, Eldorado would not be the most desirable company to operate it. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because the record is near to scandalous. Eldorado has been guilty of dumping and storing radio-active wastes literally right next to the beach at Port Hope, Ontario. Those wastes were not cleared up until 1975. Over these past years until very recently, Mr. Chairman, Eldorado was using farmers' woodlots as places for dumping wastes; those wastes have never been properly cleared up.

The record in terms of Eldorado's unwillingness and failure to fence off its radio-active wastes is also clear. We have had incidents in Port Hope, Mr. Chairman, of children playing in the wastes and of cattle being able to get in and graze where the wastes were being stored. These situations have only recently been corrected, Mr. Chairman, and I think they reflect a basic attitude on the part of Eldorado Nuclear that's clearly undesirable. Finally, we have the more recent example of Eldorado Nuclear being sued by the Ontario government for polluting the harbour at Port Hope with radio-active sulphuric acid. I understand that the matter is now in the courts. I could go on and on about the record of Eldorado Nuclear but I think the evidence is clear that it leaves much to be desired.

I now want to spend a few moments in the last area I would like to dwell on. It is an issue that I think has been long neglected in Saskatchewan, and has been long neglected for that matter, in most jurisdictions where uranium has been mined and milled. I think that it has been only very recently, Mr. Chairman, that this problem has come to the fore and been taken seriously in the United States, in other countries, and more recently even taken seriously in Ontario. It's the matter of uranium mine and mill tailings and their potential environmental consequences.

I want to urge the Minister of the Environment to launch a fairly in-depth investigation into this matter in Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman. I think that the government has demonstrated that it is concerned about the problem in a general way by allocating \$1 million to a fund for dealing with the tailings problem after the mine and mill site is abandoned. But I think that the remarks I'm going to make now show that's only a very small beginning in dealing with the problem.

The problem essentially is that the uranium mill tailings retain about 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the original radio-activity of the uranium; and of course the main radio-

active elements are radium and thorium. Now I feel that our current policies do not reflect the seriousness with which this issue is being viewed in other quarters, and I want to make reference to a few of the recent studies in this area which I think demonstrate the degree of concern we need to give this issue in Saskatchewan.

First of all, the Porter inquiry, the interim report of which came out in 1978, was basically an inquiry into the use of electrical power and long-term planning for electrical power in Ontario. The report recommended the establishment of an independent review committee to study the problem of uranium mill tailings in depth and Porter said that the uranium tailings disposal issue is an increasing health and environmental problem. And Porter, Mr. Chairman, goes so far as to state that the problem is so serious that in fact by 1985 the Government of Ontario will need to reassess its commitment to nuclear expansion if the problem has not been satisfactorily resolved. And I think that statement demonstrates the seriousness of the problem.

In a similar way the Ontario Environmental Assessment Board said, in its May 1979 report on the expansion of uranium mines in the Elliot Lake area, that the long-term impermeability of tailings basins and tailings dams cannot be guaranteed. And the board went on to say that it found very little evidence that the various means used to cover tailings disposal sites upon abandonment, in other words, asphalt, cement, synthetic membranes, chemical techniques, would be effective in the long run, little evidence to show that these techniques would be able to inhibit water infiltration and little evidence to show, therefore that these techniques would prevent the risk of radium contamination in the long term. The board finds that the mill tailings have the greatest potential impact on the natural environment of all of the activities related to uranium mining expansion.

Similar statements, Mr. Chairman, have been made by the United States interagency review group on nuclear waste management in the U.S. I think it is of interest to note, Mr. Chairman, that the comptroller general of the United States, in his September, 1977 report to the United States Congress, stated that the hazard of mill tailings is not only a serious abandonment problem but may threaten uranium markets by challenging the economic viability of the nuclear industry. I think that statement, Mr. Chairman, demonstrates the seriousness of the issue.

I want to now make some comments with respect to this latter statement, because it reflects the costs which may well be involved in satisfactorily resolving a problem which I think to date the Government of Saskatchewan has underestimated. I want to quote from the Ontario legislature's select committee on Ontario Hydro, page 35 of the October 12, 1978 transcripts, in which the chairman of the committee, Donald MacDonald, cites that tentative costs for disposing of uranium mill tailings in Elliott Lake will be at least \$300 million, Mr. Chairman, and he notes that some experts have estimated the costs as high as \$18 billion. I think that demonstrates the costs we are looking at and it demonstrates to me that the \$1 million figure which we have allocated for each uranium mine for disposal may be somewhat inadequate.

I want to comment for a moment on the potential health risks which could be associated with this mill tailings problem. I want to quote Dr. Victor Archer, who is the medical director of the United States National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. In a recent publication he states that after a review of 15 epidemiological studies he is convinced these studies have demonstrated that the risk of low dose exposure to radon gas has been greatly underestimated by health experts

in the past.

The reason these radon gas emissions are serious and are, Mr. Chairman, a potential concern (not just in the immediate area where uranium is being mined, but to the Saskatchewan population as a whole), is that radon gas can travel as much as 1,000 miles in a period as short as four days if you assume a 10-mile per hour wind. These calculations have been documented by Dr. Robert Poll in New York in his study Health Effects of Radon 222 from Uranium Mining. In that study Poll says that the latency period for lung cancer following exposure to radon gas is in the vicinity of 20 years.

Victor Gilinsky, who is one of the 12 commissioners on the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is responsible for regulating the industry, has also addressed this problem in a very serious way and I think has some of the same concerns that Poll does. I would just like to quote from an article by Gilinsky, entitled NRC Regulation of the Uranium Mining Industry — Problems and Prospects, May 2, 1978. He says:

As long as the uranium ore is undisturbed deep underground not too much radon diffuses to the surface, but when the uranium ore is brought to the surface radon is released into the atmosphere where it can be inhaled. Since radon is a gas, it is also possible for large populations to be exposed, albeit to extremely low doses.

And this is the most important paragraph, I think. It identifies the controversy around this question and the difference of opinion.

Assessing the health significance of radon releases from uranium mill tailings is not simple (says Gilinsky). On the one hand the relative increase to the existing natural level of radio-activity, at least away from the tailings pile, is exceedingly slight.

And I would agree with Gilinsky's comment, that it's exceedingly slight.

On the other hand, the tailings continue to release this radon for over 100,000 years. If the tailings are not isolated from the environment the sum of the exposures for all these years could large in absolute terms. In fact, it becomes the dominant contribution to radiation exposure from the nuclear fuel cycle.

Now I think therefore, Mr. Chairman, that summarizes the hazard with respect to radon gas emissions from uranium mine tailings; the hazard that I don't think the Department of the Environment in Saskatchewan has adequately addressed to date. The other hazard is with respect to radium contamination from uranium mine tailings. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment in their status report on water pollution in the Serpent River basin, 1976 identifies the potential problem. I'm not suggesting we face this kind of a problem from radium contamination in Saskatchewan because we don't. But the Serpent River system in Ontario, Mr. Chairman, illustrates the potential risk. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment says in their report:

The potential for radium contamination of water systems as a result of improper disposal of uranium tailings is demonstrated by the example of the Serpent River system in which the river system including 18 lakes downstream from Elliot Lake is contaminated with radium to such an extent

that it is unfit for human use and all fish life has been killed off.

The other potential risk in terms of radium contamination, is with respect to the possibility of the failure of the tailings dam behind which the uranium mill tailings are being stored. And I think the potential risk that's associated here is illustrated by an article in the *Prairie Messenger* of November 25, 1979 reporting on a 100 million gallon spill of radio active water into the River Rio Puerco. This 100 million gallon spill results from a tailings dam failure at the United Nuclear Home Stake Uranium Mine near Grants, New Mexico.

Now this accident, Mr. Chairman, is a very important one because it illustrates the kind of risk that we are taking here in Saskatchewan. This tailings mine dam was one of the most modern in design in the world. The accident took place on July 16, 1979 and it resulted in 250 acres of land being contaminated and 48 kilometres of the river downstream being contaminated and approximately 1,000 Navaho Indians were directly affected as a result of this spill.

This spill is just one of approximately 15 spills, tailings dam failures, that have taken place in New Mexico since 1959. I think New Mexico is a good example of a state that's been in the uranium business for a long time. I see no reason to think that we will not have a potentially serious uranium tailings dam failure with the subsequent radium contamination of downstream waters if we make a major commitment to uranium mining here in Saskatchewan.

Therefore it's particularly important that the Department of the Environment find alternatives to the methods used in the past to deal with the tailings problems in other provinces and in other countries. Because similar tailings dams have occurred wherever uranium has been mined — in Colorado in the United States, in Australia and in many other cases. One of the things that's particularly worrying about the radium contamination which results is that the effects are very difficult to measure in the short term, because as we know the latency period from radium exposure for cancer to develop is in the vicinity of 20 years. So we have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where hundreds of thousands of tons of radioactive tailings are building up in northern Saskatchewan, and the volume of tailings will increase very rapidly with the opening of new mines in Saskatchewan. Therefore, I think it's imperative that the Department of the Environment come forward with new initiatives to adequately deal with the long-term disposal of tailings.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, in just finishing up, I think there are really only two major alternatives the Department of the Environment can adopt that would be adequate. One is the deep burial of the uranium mine tailings themselves. Given their volume, Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a very expensive process but it's one that I think has to be looked at seriously.

The option that I think is much more desirable and the one that should be looked at most seriously is the separation of radio-active thorium and radium from the rest of the tailings during the milling process. In other words, separating the radio-active materials out from the rest of the tailings, burying those radio-active materials deep under the ground in vaults, and then leaving the rest of the tailings on the surface where they can be left safely.

Both these alternatives, as I mentioned particularly the first, will be quite expensive. The second alternative requires further research before it can be implemented. I say,

Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Environment needs to spearhead that research just as quickly as possible. I think it is just imperative that before any more uranium mines are approved one of the two solutions I've just mentioned should be agreed to by the uranium mining company involved. The Department of the Environment should set that down as a requirement for opening the next uranium mine.

It is also my view therefore that the \$1 million set aside for tailings disposal at each mine in the 1980-81 budget is unlikely to be enough in light of the much larger cost estimates made by other jurisdictions for uranium mill tailings disposal. Finally, I want to urge the Minister of the Environment to require that in future the uranium mining companies post a bond of several million dollars to cover tailings disposal after their existing mines are abandoned. I feel the uranium mining companies themselves should be bearing the cost of tailings disposal, Mr. Chairman, and not the people of Saskatchewan, as is the case under the present budget. I think therefore this is a matter that I want to urge the Minister of the Environment to have his staff look seriously at in the next year, and to come forward with better solutions than are currently on the books. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Minister, could you tell us what control of the environment you have in Eldorado Nuclear in northern Saskatchewan?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The authorization which we use in our inspections and in our control of Eldorado is The Water Resources Management Act, and other control of course is by the Atomic Energy Corporation of Canada. Other than that there are no other legislative controls.

MR. LARTER: — Does your department periodically go in to check the possible environmental pollution on the Eldorado scene?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, we do. With the establishment of the mines pollution control branch, that is one of the activities we now undertake.

MR. LARTER: — Is your department completely satisfied that Eldorado is living up to every possible pollution control? Are you satisfied their long-range planning adequately controls the tailings?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I wouldn't be quite as definitive as the hon. member was in making his point. I think there is always room for improvement. I don't think we ever reach complete satisfaction unless we get a Utopian situation. I am not sure we can arrive at that. But we are at least satisfied as we proceed and progress in measures which are being taken. We will see they will be taken in the future. Should we have added concern, we would then issue the requisite kind of orders to clean up and so on. But I think we would not say that we have reached any position where we are completely satisfied.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, with the possibility of the federal government becoming more involved in uranium mining in the North through partnership shares, would you say you are satisfied, where they are involved, that you are going to have as complete control of monitoring the environment as you would in other mines?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The hon. member will know that really the control rests with the atomic energy control board. That is where the authority had been until we began to

develop, particularly the Amok developments at Cluff Lake where the surface lease agreement went beyond the atomic energy control board provisions. We believe now that our control in Saskatchewan and the initiatives we are taking are more advanced and more comprehensive than those of the atomic energy control board.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, do you regularly receive reports from Eldorado, for instance, and do you regularly give the federal government reports on the environment in the North?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes. I understand from the officials that we do have a reasonably good interchange of information between AECSB and ourselves, both from them to us and from us to them. The monitoring they do and the results thereof are provided to us. Similarly, we provide the information to them.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, is it the plans of your department to increase (not only for environmental work close to the mining) these reports and have a closer monitoring arrangement with the Government of Canada?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes. I generally think this is true. In consideration of the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland, I have taken notes of the comments he made. We have made notes of some of the points he raised. I think, generally yes, in response to the hon. member's questions. I think, as we proceed, there is no question that we are much further ahead today in our co-ordination, in our assessment, in our monitoring and in our evaluation of the effects of low level radiation, the effects of mill tailings and so on, than we were five or 10 years ago. I can recall going into the first mines in the Uranium City area. Eldorado and Gunner and some of those mines which were opened 30 years ago. I would suspect that we are much further ahead today than we were then. I am not saying we were doing the right thing then and I'm not saying we have completely arrived at the point in time where we are totally sufficient and adequate in all the measures which we are attempting to take. But, I think it's a process which takes place and will increase and will improve as time goes by.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I noticed in today's Leader-Post that Saskatchewan has asked Manitoba to cut back on Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting sulphur emissions in that area and you have stated that there is a legal sulphur dioxide limit of one hour standards of 0.17 parts per million compared with 0.34 parts per million in Manitoba. I noticed your concern over what is happening at that plant with those sulphur emissions. Can you tell me what the weekly emission from the Boundary Dam five stacks are? Can you tell me what the emission standards are there?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The officials think we have it here in our material. I'm not sure whether it's a direct answer to your question but with respect to the question of sulphur dioxide levels in the Flin Flon area (Creighton), Mr. Carter, the deputy minister did issue a press release the other day expressing an opinion with respect to that. There is no question about the fact that over the years this has had a very visible effect in the Flin Flon - Creighton area because of the . . . I can give you some figures and I will send them to you if we can get them Xeroxed. There is no reason why you shouldn't have them if you want them.

Total sulphur dioxide emissions (1978) in Alberta are 629,500 tons per year. The projected to the year 2006 is 1.3 million tons per year. The oil sands only in 1978 is 112,000 tons per year, with the projected by 2006 (and if the hon. member for

Meadow Lake is here, he will be interested in this) 470,800 tons. Manitoba Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company 300,000 tons per year; Sudbury International Nickel Company 1.314 million tons per year; Saskatchewan Boundary Dam power station, 31,400 tons per year; Queen Elizabeth power station, 600,200 tons per year; Poplar River power station projected to be 23,700 tons per year; the Gulf acid plant 360 tons per year; the Co-op Refinery here in Regina, 4,200 tons per year, for total emissions in Saskatchewan of 65,860 tons per year.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, you haven't answered my question yet. You were able to come up with the figure in monitoring the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting but you haven't given me the figures affecting an area such as the one around Boundary Dam which is a populated area.

MR. BOWERMAN: — The officials can get that. I think what the hon. member is asking Mr. Chairman, is the relevance of the figure of 0.17 to Flin Flon. I'm not sure if we have the figure for Boundary Dam, but they tell me it would certainly be less, even on the basis of the figures I gave you of the tonnages relative to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, which is 300,000 tons per year emissions as opposed to the Boundary Dam station of 31,000. There is a fair difference there so you will acknowledge that it will obviously be less than 0.17.

MR. LARTER: — I'm not an environmentalist but when you start talking about pollution coming from another province (and we are concerned with acid rain, as they should be in eastern Canada), and you talk about 31,000 tons coming from Boundary Dam, I must say that on four of those stacks there are no controls whatsoever. I think you know that. It is only on the other stack that we have the electrostatic precipitator — only on one. There are no scrubbers. Now, probably since unit no. 6 came on, the people working outside in that area are finding they are having eye irritations. They are noticing more and more dust on their cars.

The reason I'm asking this is because, if we are interested in the environment from other provinces affecting us, we had better be looking at what we're doing right here, and what we're doing to North Dakota because our prevailing northwest winds take it right into North Dakota, and our southeast winds take it up toward Hitchcock and Midale. I wonder if you are monitoring these areas?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Well, I can answer the hon. member's question this way, Mr. Chairman, and that is, yes we do have monitors in the areas, both at Weyburn and at Estevan. At Poplar River, of course, we have monitors. So we are monitoring the effects in these areas and we will continue to do so and if there is any noticeable change, we certainly will take some action to resolve the situation.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I mentioned the prevailing winds in Estevan. I would like to ask you if you are monitoring down wind in both directions, with the southeast and northwest prevailing winds? Are you monitoring both directions, not only 5 miles or 2 miles, but 50 miles and 100 miles down wind?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I did indicate down wind in both directions, yes. Weyburn has a monitor and so on. You can get this in the urban air monitoring program, 1978. The 1979 one has not been published as yet. The suspended particulates at Estevan in 1978 from January, February, March and April right through to December — you can get the publication if you want to relate how Estevan fares with the other communities.

MR. LARTER: — You mentioned you would let me have this chart on the tons of emissions. I would appreciate that, if you can Xerox it.

Mr. Minister, I don't believe you have answered me about whether you monitor down wind toward the North Portal - Northgate area from Boundary Dam and into North Dakota.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We can't seem to answer your question. We can get the information, but we can't answer your question as to whether or not there is a station at North Portal at the present time.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, before there is agitation for the restrictions of what is happening at Boundary Dam, would your department consider doing an entire monitoring check over a given period just to see exactly . . . You can use 31,000 tons. But do you realize that's in a very restricted area? Our winds down there are prevailing northwest and southeast. That smoke is in a very narrow prevailing area. When you say 31,000 tons, that's not as if it were going out 360 degrees. It is not; it is in a very condensed area.

MR. BOWERMAN: — The figure we provided to you, the 31,000 tons, is an emission monitored at the stack. So however far and wide it goes it still will be no more than the 31,000 tons. It is a measurement of the amount of sulphur emission as it comes from the stacks. Wherever it goes from there it goes into the atmosphere and is dispersed in a wide area. The monitors in the city of Estevan indicate the amounts of dust and ash and fall-out there is in the city.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I agree that monitoring is done at the stack and it's 31,000 tons. There is no argument there. I am just saying that smoke is in a very narrow area during the year. It is not dispersed over 360 degrees. Our prevailing winds keep that in a very limited area; that is continual.

Do you monitor the return water? Is the plant contributing boron, for instance, to the Boundary Dam lake?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, we monitor return water, SPC and environment both.

MR. LARTER: — Has it done anything noticeable to the Boundary Dam water since no. 6 unit came on?

MR. BOWERMAN: — My officials say there is no evidence of any marked increase in the water constituents since that time.

MR. LARTER: — Is it the plan of your department to do a little more extensive monitoring in the Boundary Dam area? Would it be in light of the prevailing winds which I mentioned?

MR. BOWERMAN: — I am trying to get some response to what the hon. member is asking for, some monitoring facility in the area to give a better base line, to give recognition should there be any changes in the area. I don't think we will ever be able, in the process of discussion here, to adequately answer the hon. member's questions. We may be able to do so if he wants to pursue the questioning. We can, however, provide for the hon. member through correspondence, a more detailed assessment of where

the monitors are; what the effects are; what we propose to do; what we have done, this type of thing, if that will suffice.

MR. LARTER: — Just one more question, Mr. Minister. I notice here you do not have the IPSCO plant. You show 65,860 tons, yet nothing on here. What are the tons out of IPSCO every year?

MR. BOWERMAN: — The question is that the information I provided you is for sulphur dioxide. The indications are that from IPSCO this would be very low; although I'm not sure that we have monitors directly at IPSCO for that, there are monitors in the city of Regina which would pick it up. In the report I referred you to earlier, the city of Regina summary of sulphur dioxide levels, maximum daily average: January — 0.0; February — 0.0; March — 0.0; April — 0.0; May, June, July, August, September, October — no data obtained this month due to monitor malfunctions; November 0.1; December — 0.0. So you can see it is fairly low.

MR. LARTER: — Is your department satisfied that it has complete control over any pollution coming out of IPSCO? What is happening for instance on the extension of IPSCO? Is there a safeguard being built into the extension?

MR. BOWERMAN: — A meeting has been arranged as I understand it to go over the expansion plans with the Department of the Environment for IPSCO. I don't think we ever believe we have complete control over emissions, but we do monitor IPSCO as well as Co-op Refinery and other areas in the city.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Chairman, I think we'll just drop the piece. I have some more questions I want to ask on PCBs but not at the moment. I'm going to move over to Saskatchewan drinking water. This is something that I'm sure we're all concerned about. I'm sure the minister is real concerned and the first question I want to ask him is, does he have a concern for the safe quality of drinking water used every day in Saskatchewan?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Obviously, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned about safe drinking water in the province of Saskatchewan. That, I suppose one could say, would go without exception that there is concern. There is concern by this government, by myself as Minister of the Environment, by the officials of the environment and also by the Department of Public Health about safe drinking water supplies.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Well do you agree, Mr. Minister, that the water situation and the water quality in Saskatchewan could be improved (we'll just say in the province of Saskatchewan, let alone the city of Regina at this moment). We're just talking about water as a whole in the province of Saskatchewan, that it could be improved.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, it goes without saying it would be fallacious of me to say that the water quality in Saskatchewan couldn't be improved. I think that's a matter of fact statement. I'm not sure where this leads us but surely we haven't arrived at what is considered to be a supreme water supply system in the province of Saskatchewan. Some of the problems associated with ground water as with surface water in the province of Saskatchewan which are unique to the province are issues which need to be dealt with. But I suppose an absolutely supreme water supply would include taste and smell and colour and all of those things which will differ with the persons who drink the water.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Chairman, on the subject of water control or water quality, has your department done any research in the studies on the quality of different filters and purifiers being offered on the market today?

MR. BOWERMAN: — With respect to commercial purifiers, the department is current and up-to-date we believe; but not with regard to home treatment facilities. We have not attempted to draw conclusions with regard to the multiplicity of home treatment facilities. The U.S. Environmental Agency has been doing much of the research there and we have not done so.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will the minister be aware that there are several different filters and purifiers being offered for sale on the market within this province? Wouldn't it be advisable and your responsibility to see to it that these filters and purifiers are in fact doing the job they claim they are doing? There are different ones on the market. I for one have one in my home. They don't all clean and purify the water. Now the question I come back to is, what interest does your department have in seeing that these are tested to provide a better drinking water than we have?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I think that's really not the role of the Department of the Environment. I am not passing the buck here but if you take environment in its broadest terms, you really wouldn't need another department. You could do it all under environment. But I think testing home water treatment types of technology is not in our scope. It would either be in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or it would be in the Department of Health or someone in that area. In terms of the commercial community water supply and the sources of community water supply, that kind of thing I think is a departmental responsibility. And I think if we were to attempt to analyse each one of these things coming on the market, we wouldn't have time for the other things that are necessary to be dealt with.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Obviously the minister is not aware of the simplicity of testing such a device or such a filter or a purifier. You install one and you take the water and test; then you will find what quality it is. Is there any liaison between your department and the Department of Consumer Affairs or the Department of Health? Let's face it, you are not going to be able to do a purification of water on a commercial basis, or not commercial basis, but on a production basis of doing a whole community or city. That's an impossibility and no such purifier has yet been invented or designed and built. So therefore it would be up to the home-owner or the commercial establishment to investigate these possibilities. However, my question and I come back to that again is, why wouldn't you take an interest to see that there is that liaison with whatever department (if you don't want to take the responsibility for it) to see that the quality of that particular type of purifier meets certain standards.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, we see our responsibility in the Department of the Environment as attempting to assure or secure the quality of a drinking water supply for a community. The treatment facilities that are there are generally assumed (and we believe so because of the analysis and checking that is constant and continuous with regard to the water treatment for the city of Regina for example) to supply adequate and quality drinking water.

Now, everyone won't agree because the taste is not good; the smell is not good; some of the other things we don't like. So, then, a person and individuals will buy additional equipment, either a tap attachment or to incorporate into the water line somehow.

Maybe the hon. member doesn't realize the complexity of the testing of some of these facilities. We think that's not the role of the Department of the Environment. I'm sure that there is some liaison; I can't tell you whether that is formal. I would suspect that it's not formal in nature, but there more than likely is liaison and communication between the respective departments.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm well aware of the complexities of testing, Mr. Minister. As I indicated to you earlier, it's very simple. Let me ask you this question. Are you aware of the various tests that have been made, for example, in the city of Regina as to the content of solids in the water? And, are you aware of the standards set by the United States today, the maximum allowable parts per million of solids in water? Are you aware of what they are here in the city of Regina at various times of the year? If you're not, I'll give you the figures.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I have here a note passed to me by the officials with respect to the previous question. The Department of the Environment, the Department of Health, and the Department of Consumer Affairs have co-operated on, and issued a bulletin for, consumers wishing to purchase in-house filters. It is available through our department. We'll send you one.

The answer to the other question is yes, we are aware — they are more guidelines than they are standards. We are aware of the Canadian and United States and Saskatchewan standards.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What are they?

MR. BOWERMAN: — There will be a long answer for this one. It's not possible to give you a short one.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Are you aware that in the United States water with 500 parts per million of solids would be condemned? In Regina we've had as high as 1,300 parts per million.

MR. BOWERMAN: — The member is talking about dissolved solids and I understand from the officials that the hon. member is partly correct in that the U.S. standard is 500 parts per million. They'll go up to 1,000 parts per million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right, he knows. Why did he ask the question?

If you're not going to drink water above 500 parts per million I'm not sure we can deliver or if you can pump any in Saskatchewan into your system.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You can't pump it into the system but I can tell you it can be taken out of the system with 95 per cent of the solids removed, with certain purifiers.

And if you say that there are some standards in Saskatchewan, would you mind telling me what those standards are because to my knowledge there are no such standards.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We may be getting mixed up on the terminology but there are no standards in Saskatchewan, no water standards per se. There are guidelines and objectives. I'm not sure what it was that you wanted to know with respect to the Saskatchewan Water . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I think you've answered my question. You just admitted there are no

standards in the province of Saskatchewan. That's right; there are none. But getting back to the question of the United States standards, where and when will they allow up to 1,000. I'm not aware of that. I'd like to have that information because the information I have received is that they will condemn any water supply that has over 500 parts of dissolved solids.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I'm not going to be able to answer specifically the location, but wherever they do not have a water supply that can meet the 500, then obviously in order to have water they go to 1,000. I'm not going to attempt to read this — May, 1980, Municipal Drinking Water Quality Objectives — I have a table here and list of names that I couldn't pronounce if I tried to read them, adding up to what is total dissolved solids of 1,500 for Saskatchewan. And I'm not going to try to read it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be obliging enough to send me copies of that particular report, as well as the copies of the purifiers and filters that you recommend or approve in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. BOWERMAN: — These are advance copies, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and all notes are not final but I'll send it to you anyway. I'll make that notation. It hasn't been finalized for release.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I appreciate that. I'd like to look it over, but my colleague has just handed me a document which I was not familiar with indicating as at April, 1972, Saskatchewan Department of the Environment, Water Quality Division set satisfactory quality and total dissolved solids at 100 to 1,500. I wonder if this has been changed and updated since that time because I was not aware of any standards that you had for water supplies.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We don't have the standards per se. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm not standing up here. We do have water quality objectives and I guess that's a play on words but . . .

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Chairman, when my colleague for Regina South wanted to ask a few questions, we were talking. I asked you of your concern for drinking water and naturally you said you were concerned about the quality of drinking water in Saskatchewan. You said you were concerned and wanted to do something about it. What I am getting to, Mr. Minister, is this. It was one year ago in the House when we were doing estimates in environment, you and I had quite a discussion on the two different methods of testing water.

Mr. Minister, are you in favour of the towns in Saskatchewan doing a complete, comprehensive water test at certain intervals, say once a year or every two years? Are you in favour of this or not?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Certainly I am in favour of it, but I don't know what that implies or what the hon. member may take from that. It would be a very expensive process for a town to do so, but wouldn't negate my feelings about the fact that I would agree it should be done. But where does that lead us?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — It leads us to here. I asked you last year and I pleaded with you to let the people of Saskatchewan know, every town and hamlet and village (this excludes the cities because they have to do their tests regularly) the difference between a bacteria

test and a complete comprehensive test. You agreed to do it. All you had to do was send a letter out. I've done it. It didn't cost millions of dollars. I will read you the letter I sent to over 400 towns in Saskatchewan. I asked you to do this and I waited and waited and you didn't do it. The councillors in the province of Saskatchewan do not understand and I will prove to you that they do not understand. This is the letter I sent to 480 towns, hamlets, and villages in Saskatchewan:

As opposition critic responsible for the Department of Environment, I have become increasingly concerned about the quality of the drinking water in our province. There are two different ways of having water tested at the provincial lab in Regina.

One method, and the one commonly used by the lab is a simple bacteria test (I hope the minister is listening). The other method is a comprehensive test designed to give both bacterial and chemical analysis of the water.

Now this is the most serious situation here, Mr. Minister, because the towns don't understand the two.

I enclose copies of both kinds of tests conducted on water samples I submitted in certain towns. You will notice that the bacteria test shows the water is simply marked safe; whereas the comprehensive test shows dangerous, high levels of various chemicals or groups of chemicals can have adverse affects on health. For instance, sodium levels are important to people restricted to a salt-free diet.

Also enclosed is a routine analysis of drinking water from certain towns, for comparison, together with chemical analysis level sheets.

I would encourage you to submit samples of your town's water by comprehensive testing. If you do so I would appreciate you sending me a copy of the test results.

My purpose is an attempt to build up an overall picture of Saskatchewan's drinking water quality to see whether or not measures are needed to improve its quality.

I would appreciate receiving copies of test results at the following address . . .

Now that's all I asked you to do last year, Mr. Minister, to let the people know. It doesn't cost anything for a bacteria test and it costs \$12.50 to get a comprehensive test done.

Mr. Minister, did I or did I not ask you a year ago in estimates to do this?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if we're getting warm in the Chamber again, we should take our coats off.

Mr. Chairman, the material I provided to the hon. member for Regina South is the response to what the member was asking for last year. It is, I would suggest, a little more comprehensive than just sitting down and asking for somebody to send you a water sample, as they have undertaken. What we have attempted to do here is to provide drinking water quality objectives for communities, some analysis of how it should be

done and how often it should be taken and so on. It's a fairly comprehensive undertaking. It does take some time and it's there for your use. It isn't final, as you see. You're getting the advance copy. It has not really been redone and there may be some errors that need to be corrected, but basically that's it.

With regard to the department's responsibility, I don't see it as a responsibility of the Department of the Environment to go to test each community's water supply. We do so as much as we are able but it's basically a responsibility of the urban government. It's basically a responsibility of those who put together a community water supply to have that water supply tested and monitored. So we don't see that the Department of the Environment is responsible for making the initial tests and for following up those tests, although we do so from time to time. Any samples that have been taken and all those you say you've got, we probably have done it. So I see nothing more in the statement or the proposition of the hon. member than what we are already doing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — We on this side are very happy to see the rules or objectives. They're probably as a result of our request last year. I guess the next step in this is for your department to ensure that this is carried out by the different municipalities. I see no big promotion or big deal in seeing it is done and that these rules are adhered to. Frankly, I think if you were to set down rules and regulations on this particular paper, you'd find support from all the communities in Saskatchewan and they would indeed follow these instructions. If they didn't I think it would be incumbent on your department to make sure they did. That is basically my question to you now. Will you try in some way or another to enforce this in the communities?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, this is water quality objectives, environment Saskatchewan, water pollution control branch, January, 1975. So there is a little brochure that was printed. I think you had a Xerox copy of one of the pages that you were reading from. So it didn't result from Mr. Muirhead's question last year. It's been revised.

I want to say that with regard to the enforcement aspect of the municipal drinking water quality objectives, and the guidelines for sampling and so on, I think that yes, we want to make them water quality objectives. We want to make them guidelines for sampling. We want to impress upon the communities the importance of them. I think, however, if we were to jump into the system now and attempt to get all communities to conform, we would really bring about a whole series of crises in the province and in the communities, because they wouldn't have the facilities nor do I think that we would have the facilities to handle it. So we can't jump in and go at it. But we'll do what we can to enforce it and to bring it to the attention of the community.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, the fact of the matter is you are absolutely right; there are no facilities in Saskatchewan. These samples have to go to Calgary for proper analysis, and I think it's time that your department, with the condition and quality of the water in Saskatchewan, had a laboratory here in Saskatchewan that could do these tests without having to send them to the province of Alberta.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, about this misunderstanding you and I are having about this cost, all I asked you to do was let the towns in Saskatchewan know so they understand because they don't understand out in the boondocks that they have a right to send in a comprehensive test. They do not know that. And all I asked you to do is what I've done — send a letter out. You won't answer that question. What is wrong with you sending out a letter? It's far better for you to do it than me. Send a letter, not demanding,

just ask and explain like I did, and tell them the difference between the two tests; because all towns send in the bacteria test.

You must believe in this pamphlet you made up yourself. It comes from the Department of the Environment. It was handed to me in '79. It gives the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment Water Quality Division for private water supplies and municipal water supplies. It says right here. If you don't then I'm going to have to do it again. It's so simple to let people know.

Do you believe this pamphlet where it says: total dissolved solids satisfactory quality — 100 to 1,500? Do you believe your own pamphlet? You must. The poor quality — 1,500 to 3,000; not recommended for consumption — 3,000 to 4,000; and absolutely unsuitable for use — 4,000. Then you get down to sulfates in the water. Mr. Minister this is yours; this is what they hand out at the lab. Sulfates: up to 400 is satisfactory quality; poor quality — 400 to 800; not recommended for use — over 1,000. Mr. Minister, why can't you tell the people in this province? You don't have to spend any money just warning them so they don't drink the water at their own risk. After I sent the letters out, Mr. Minister, Paul Brettle wrote an article in the paper about what I had done. You showed no interest but he did. I won't go into the first part because the headline said: Discovery of PCBs in Water said a Sign of Severe Problem. Now that's been discovered before, but I'm going to read this part of it.

Muirhead recently sent letters to the councils of over 400 Saskatchewan towns, villages, hamlets asking if they have their public water supplies regularly tested and monitored.

And I was shocked that the public water suppliers are not checked at regular intervals by either the Department of Health or the Department of the Environment. They are not. I will prove to you they are not. I am going to read you some letters from throughout Saskatchewan:

Muirhead said in the 75 responses he had received to letters, councils are complaining of water containing chemicals ranging from sodium to sulphate in quantities that make the water unfit for drinking in some towns.

Now the minister wrote a letter to me when he checked into the town of Craik. You don't seem to understand that doctors know a little bit about the health of people. But whatever you decide, that's fine! Just do what the Minister of the Environment says! Here is your own letter here. You were telling the doctors in Craik and a group of doctors I have met in Regina that it doesn't hurt you to have these chemicals, sulphates and all this. You try to tell the doctors who have people on salt-free diets. They don't agree with you, Mr. Minister.

I have four doctors in Davidson, one in Craik, four in Outlook, two in Imperial, and they completely disagree with this letter. I don't see why you should go against the doctors of Saskatchewan, because you are not a doctor. All they are asking you to do is not to spend any money on it, but to make the people aware. What our doctor in Craik did was to put an article in the paper saying what our drinking water was, the analysis of our water. You drink it at your own risk.

You can't do anything about the drinking water in all the towns of this province. There's no way you can but you could let people know. Before I go on with this, tell me what you have against sending this letter, like I said, out to the people of Saskatchewan? Why are

you so stubborn, Mr. Minister? Just explain the two ways of testing water so they know. Get the bacteria test done. I'll tell you there is town after town that has never heard of a comprehensive test. They think their water is safe. They sent in their water after I let them know the two ways and there are many town water supplies unfit for human consumption . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sure they have been drinking it. He laughs. They have been drinking it he says. Of course they haven't quit drinking; you have to have water to live on! . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would you quit drinking? I have to drink this junk here! I have to have water. My doctor says I have to have 10 glasses of water a day to stay alive. I have to drink this PCB junk. It's full of trash and everything else.

Why are you so stubborn, Mr. Minister, that you are against this letter? You said it's a big cost. Why? Tell me why you are against sending this out to the people of Saskatchewan, to every town and hamlet? It's only a letter telling them what to do.

MR. BOWERMAN: — I would do you out of a job Gerry.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I hope the press heard what you said.

MR. BOWERMAN: — You've got a tough one to do Gerry.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, do you think this is a joke? Answer that question. Is this a joke?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to have a question to answer. The hon. member leaves the impression that there is no communication between the Department of the Environment and these towns on the water supply system. We have courses where water technicians come to take their training for the treatment of water as well as for effluent in sewage and so on. We do have communication with the communities. We don't have it on the same basis as the hon. member suggests; we don't sit down to write a letter to each one of them. We have other kinds of communication between ourselves and the department officials . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe there are some towns, I wouldn't deny it for a moment, that were not aware that they might have . . . I don't know what he means by the comprehensive treatment he talks about. I don't know whether they have followed up or whether they haven't followed up.

What I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, is yes, we are concerned about the water supply in Saskatchewan. Yes, we will continue to check and monitor the situation as best we are able with the staff and the funds available to us. We will also continue to issue the guidelines we have issued previously. There is a brochure which is available, maybe you didn't see that. I suppose it was printed in 1975. Perhaps we should have written a letter to the hon. member sending him a copy. We have made available to you the advance copy of the material which we now have on hand and which will be subsequently put into print. It will be made available to towns and communities that have community water supply systems. They will do their analysis and their checking on that basis.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Well, Mr. Minister, if you do not know what a comprehensive test is, I think you should resign as the Minister of the Environment and let some of the backbenchers take your place because that has to be terrible. You admitted last night you never were in the Farrell pumping station. You didn't show enough interest as the Minister of the Environment to go down to see what's going on. Have you ever been in

the provincial lab to see what's going on? Because if anybody goes in there with a water test which . . . When I made this announcement and sent these letters, they couldn't keep up with the testing over there. People would come in with a little bottle of water, and so what they had to do over there was send them home with a quart to get a comprehensive test.

Now you must know what a comprehensive test is. It's a simple piece of paper that your own provincial lab sends out if you ask for it; a comprehensive test showing the calcium, magnesium, sodium, iron, manganese, bicarbonate sulphate, chlorides, total dissolved solids, total hardness. You have to know what that is. This is a bacteria test that just comes through every two weeks. Most towns send them in. It just says nil, safe to use. I'll just go through a few of these letters. I couldn't go through 75 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not tabling anything for you. You people don't table anything for me and I'm not tabling anything. I have here in my hand 75 letters, and I had 35 phone . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The hon. member for Arm River has the floor and should be able to speak unimpeded by anyone.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have in my hand 75 letters here, responses from 75 towns out of 400 and some 36, or 37 phone calls, not knowing what I was talking about when the letter came out, never heard of the test before, never heard of a bacteria test, so I told them what to do. If you go down to check with the lab you had quite a run. And if you think I'm going to table this evidence or these materials — you get your own. You go do it. I'm not tabling anything because I have been asking for things to be tabled for a year in this House and you laugh. Town after town has written back to me. Here's a little town, the village of Lancer. The first one I picked up.

Mr. Muirhead, all we have ever heard of is a bacterial test. Would you please explain further.

And they tell me that they have been doing the bacterial test for years. Here's one.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Table them.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I'm not tabling anything so keep your . . . I don't understand this one here. It says Mistatim River. They write back to me saying we have never had a comprehensive test. We never knew anything about it but we do our bacteria test regularly. They have never had it done. Here's a village of Fairlight. I'll read what they say.

In reply to your letter of May 18 regarding water samples, our village water supply is being tested regularly by a local health officer. And the comprehensive test is used in all cases.

Now I want you to tell me why that one town knows all about it and a health officer comes in and makes sure it's done, and then the rest of the towns do nothing about it. This is the point I am getting at. All you have to do is let them know.

We have no complaints as to the quality of our water nor the frequency of our test being made so we see no reason to do anything further about it.

And they are absolutely right because your health officer has been at Fairlight, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that I will be tabling nothing. I will not be doing it because he knows how to get the same material I have by sending out one simple letter like this. He'll get them back. And I think the Minister of the Environment should send out this same letter (I'll table the letter I sent out); put it in your own words and you'll get a lot more than 75 responses. I think for the critic to get 75 responses and 35 telephone calls is quite a response . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

In the village of Milestone, total dissolved solids were nearly 3,000 and they didn't know about it. They sent a letter along; they didn't know anything, only that they had to do a bacteria test. But they sent it in and found out that the total dissolved solids were nearly 3,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Nearly — yes, and the Minister of Health laughs. I am not tabling anything, I am reading. You don't table anything that I ask for. I don't have to table it, Mr. Chairman, because they can get their own information. It says right here — total dissolved solids, satisfactory quality, 100 to 1,500; poor quality, 1,500 to 2,000; not recommended for human consumption, over 2,000. This comes from you. But the people have to drink it. All you have to do is make the people aware.

If they are older people who have problems their doctors say, you drink it at your own risk. In my constituency of Arm River I have many people who, since they've been made aware, go out to the farms to get water from safe wells (where the town can't improve the water any more). You said last year that you would check into the town of Craik, which you did, and there was nothing more that could be done to improve it.

There's another one from the town of Qu'Appelle. They never heard anything about it before. In the town of Qu'Appelle it's always been necessary, so they've been sending the bacteria test in.

Take this one which comes from St. Brieux, Saskatchewan. As requested, we sent a sample of water from the village well to the department and asked for a comprehensive test. However, they just gave us a simple analysis the results of which I have enclosed. We have been told since that in order to get a comprehensive test we must send a quart of water plus \$12.50. If we are required to send in a sample of water twice a month for a simple analysis, a comprehensive test each month would be too costly.

Is this not of any interest to you, Mr. Minister? But there's a little town here that would like to have a comprehensive test. You could explain to them that they can still do their . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want the minister to hear it.

Mr. Minister, are you not interested in something like this, where the town of St. Brieux said it cannot afford to send the money to have a comprehensive test done twice monthly? If you would explain to them they can go ahead with their bacteria test, but maybe once a year or every two years or every three years; even that would be better. Some towns I've talked to haven't done it for 20 years. The towns in this province that have been doing what you say they're doing and have been in contact with you are just the towns that have put in municipal wells in the last few years. They find out about the comprehensive test so they're the ones that have been doing it. But the towns in Saskatchewan that put wells in years ago and never had any contact with environment are the ones that you have to get in contact with. Well, I have Turtleford in my hand here. That's all they sent back. They just sent back this and said, hope this is satisfactory.

Bacteria tests, that's all it is. They know nothing about Turtleford, nothing about it. A comprehensive test always come back, safe, safe, safe, safe, safe.

All right, here's the town of Elstow.

Enclosed please find last complete water analysis for our village well. We would appreciate your comments on the quality of our drinking water and how it compares with other communities in our province.

They don't know. I looked through this and I was in touch with them and said, you have nothing to worry about, the water in your town is all right. They didn't know. I sent them back a guideline. This is your job, not my job . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't think it's a very nice comment for somebody to tell me to shut up when I'm talking about something as important and serious as drinking water. I think it was the member for Saskatoon and I'm very ashamed of him.

This is the town of Fleming and they get their water from some other town so they don't have anything to do with their drinking water. This is the town of Liberty (in my own constituency). When I sent them the letter, they phoned me and they said, we've heard of only the bacteria test. So they sent in and had it tested. They said their water was rotten; they couldn't drink it, it was horrible. They had it tested and the test came back saying the water was all right; the people didn't think it tasted so bad once they found out it was all right. Wasn't that nice? See, it was all in the imagination.

Now here's the town of Shellbrook. It just happened to pop up here. Ho, ho, ho, my goodness, I can't touch that one. Maybe I should ask you, Mr. Minister, what is the test of the water in Shellbrook? You tell me. You should know, that's your town, Mr. Minister of the Environment. Before I give you my information, you tell me all about the town of Shellbrook. Are you going to explain to me about Shellbrook or do you not know, Mr. Minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't even know what the water tests on my own farm are. I couldn't give it to you now and you couldn't give me yours.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I sure can.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No you can't.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No you can't.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes, and I'll tell you what it is. We have a well that we spent \$2,000 on last fall. I brought a test in to the lab and it is unfit for human consumption. We have another small well and it is fit for infants. We get our water tested.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's the total amount of dissolved solids?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — The totals of all dissolved solids in the new well we dug was over 4,000. And the sulphates were over 2,000. The well we use comes through a dugout into a well and is fit for infants. The total dissolved solids are under 400. Don't think I don't know.

In the town of Craik the sulphates run from 1,000 to 1,300 and over 500 is not safe. Now if I know about my town, surely to goodness the Minister of the Environment should know about his.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He doesn't care about his town.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — He doesn't care about any of the towns in the province of Saskatchewan. This is what they said about Shellbrook. I'll tell you. There is nothing too serious there:

To answer your request of some time ago, please find enclosed a photocopy of the data sheet we received subsequent to having analysis done on a sample of your town water.

And for your information, your total dissolved solids are just about 2,000. That is not too good there either, you know. I would be concerned if I was the Minister of the Environment living there. But your sulphates are just 520. That is over the line though because it says 500 here. I had better just check that because maybe you shouldn't be drinking water when you go home on the weekends.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That is maybe what is wrong with him. He has been drinking that water.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Yes. Water of satisfactory quality has sulphates up to 400, poor quality, 400 to 800; the town of Shellbrook has 520 with alkalinity, 570 and sodium, 361.

AN HON. MEMBER: — For what town is that one?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Buchanan. Now from this town here, they say in the letter that they just put their well in in the last few years. They have been doing a comprehensive test yearly costing \$12.50 a year. Now there is no town in this province that can't afford \$12.50 to make sure they have a comprehensive test to make sure of the safety of the water. And you have been laughing for two estimates (last year's and this year's) that we don't have to let them know. It isn't necessary. We send the odd pamphlet out. I think you are just plainly a stubborn man. You, straight, are stubborn. Well, I do admire you as a man (as I have said before) but you are a mighty stubborn one. I am determined that the people will have safe drinking water in the province of Saskatchewan. And you will never, never see me laugh when it comes to PCBs and drinking water safety for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And you people sit there and laugh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Can you imagine them monitoring the uranium environment? That is a laugh.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I will talk about that on Monday.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — In the town of Cut Knife, the last time they had a comprehensive test was in 1967. I guess that is when they put their well in.

For the town of Rocanville, the total dissolved solids are pretty near 3,000 down there.

Now, there is one here, the village of Lake Lenore. I think if I were the Minister of the Environment I would move to Lake Lenore because there is no problem with the water there. It is better than his own place, Shellbrook. Some of these I am putting down as towns. White City, for instance, is hooked up with the city here. That is why I am by-passing them; I can't do them all. We would use all the time.

We are halfway through it and I just have one thing I want to say, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Health is making fun of these results which I have here, these tests. He makes a joke of it. And I want it on the record. I want the press to hear that the Minister of Health thinks this is a joke. This is no joke . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You know how to get the information. I will not table my information. I showed it to the press last summer. So it has been made public. I have shown this to the press. You don't hand us things when we want them. We asked you last night about the court documents. Boy, it took a long time to wiggle that out. Maybe if you get down on your hands and knees and pray on Monday, I might give it to you. Maybe I'd better not take a chance on that last minute. I move this committee rise and report progress.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:03 p.m.